



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2012

No. 160

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
December 12, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN 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 11:50 a.m.

### GUN VIOLENCE ECLIPSES FISCAL CLIFF DEBATE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It's difficult to focus on the task at hand in the aftermath of a shooting rampage in my district yesterday. With at least 10,000 people in a shopping mall, a young man allegedly, say some eyewitnesses, in body armor, and armed with a semi-automatic weapon discharged 60 or more shots. There were two people killed and a young 15-year-old girl seriously wounded.

Mr. Speaker, one is haunted by these events. We had one in Aurora, Colorado, at the theater where there were 12 people killed, 60 wounded; six people killed at the Sikh temple this summer; and the day spa in Milwaukee, where three women were killed before the shooter turned the gun on himself. We had a horrific episode earlier in my congressional career in Springfield, Oregon.

It is hard to have meaningful conversations on a variety of subjects. I was going to deal with that problem with the fiscal cliff today, but gun violence is another area in America where it seems we can't have a discussion without delusional claims of overreach and taking away hunting rifles. Congress won't even allow statistics on gun violence to be gathered, and we certainly have made no progress towards closing the gun show loophole.

Yet I come today, in the aftermath of this tragedy, with a small ray of hope. When nearly half of all military suicides are committed with privately owned weapons, the Pentagon and Congress are moving towards establishing policies to separate at-risk servicemembers from personal private weapons. Congress is poised to enact legislation to end a prohibition about the military collecting information about firearms kept at home. These are simple, commonsense steps for an armed services where more military personnel take their own life than who die in battle.

Perhaps if we can take these reasonable steps to protect our servicemen and their families, perhaps we can develop the courage to treat the epidemic of gun violence with the same thoughtful, small steps when it comes to protecting the rest of our families. Until then, we will mourn the victims and thank God that our families were not at that mall.

### AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, in this very chaotic time for the House of Representatives and for the American people, we need to remain focused on the fact that our young men and women are still dying in Afghanistan. Our involvement in Afghanistan has become a confused strategy at best.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit a news article for the RECORD. The title of this article is: Afghan peace plan gives U.S. smaller role. With it, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit 12 names of American servicepeople killed recently.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to listen to the American people and start acting on their wishes. Poll after poll shows that they want to get out of Afghanistan now, they want our troops home, they want to stop seeing our young men and women dying, and the American people want the \$10 billion a month being spent in Afghanistan to be spent here in America to help all our economic problems. I do not understand why we in Congress seem to be without debate about this problem in Afghanistan.

We are currently in the process of a bilateral security agreement that will keep our troops in Afghanistan for 10 years after 2014. Where is the outrage by Congress? We are financially broke. We complain all the time about we can't reach this deal or that deal, we're going over the cliff, and yet our troops are dying in Afghanistan and we're spending money we don't have.

Mr. Speaker, the article states:

The Afghan Government is pursuing a peace initiative in which Pakistan would replace the United States in arranging talks between the warring sides and the Taliban would be granted government posts that effectively could cede to them political control of the southern and the eastern strongholds.

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.

H6703

Mr. Speaker, those areas are where we've lost most of our young men and women fighting the war in Afghanistan, and yet we are going to give those areas where our young men and women died to the Taliban so they can control it? Where is the outrage here in Congress? I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, in plain English, Afghanistan is allowing Pakistan and the Taliban to control half the country. And while the Taliban takes back Afghanistan, how does this make any sense? Where is the outrage? The American people are outraged, Mr. Speaker, but not Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have beside me a poster that tells pain. There is this little girl sitting in her mother's arms. The mother is crying. The little girl is so young, she doesn't know why this Army officer is presenting her mother a flag. She doesn't know that her daddy has been killed. She will one day, and she'll ask her mom, What was my daddy like? And the mom will say, He was a great man. He would love to see you now as you've grown older, but he died in a country known as Afghanistan, a country that will never change, no matter how much blood or how much money is spent in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I have a Web site that if people would join and sign, and the Web site is [www.bringthemhome2013.com](http://www.bringthemhome2013.com).

It is time for this administration and Congress to say enough has been done. It is time to bring our young men and women home. If Pakistan is going to have more influence in Afghanistan than America, then let Pakistan send their soldiers to die in Afghanistan. Let Pakistan pay the \$10 billion a month that America is paying right now—and it is borrowed money from the Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I will close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq, God to please bless the House and Senate that we will do what's right for the American people in the House and the Senate. I ask God to give strength, wisdom, and courage to President Obama that he would do what is right in the eyes of God, and I'll close by asking three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

[From the McClatchy Washington Bureau,  
Dec. 8, 2012]

#### AFGHANISTAN PEACE PLAN WOULD INCREASE PAKISTAN'S ROLE

(By Jonathan S. Landay)

The Afghan government is pursuing an ambitious new peace initiative in which Pakistan would replace the United States in arranging direct talks between the warring sides and the Taliban would be granted government posts that effectively could cede to them political control of their southern and eastern strongholds.

If implemented, the plan would diminish the role of the United States in the peace process, but would still leave Washington with input on a number of critical issues, in-

cluding the terms for initiating negotiations. Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Great Britain also would be involved.

The plan envisions ending the war by 2015 through a ceasefire and negotiations in the second half of next year, most likely in Saudi Arabia. Pakistan would help select the leaders of the Taliban and other rebel groups who would take part in the negotiations with the Afghan government. The effort, the plan says, should be conducted "through one consistent and coherent channel," a measure that would secure a role for Afghan President Hamid Karzai after the end of his term following April 2014 elections.

Another provision would give the insurgents a voice on "issues related . . . to the withdrawal" of the U.S.-led NATO force by the end of 2014.

The plan foresees the United States working with Kabul and Islamabad in determining which insurgent leaders would participate. The United States also would be critical to approving the removal of the insurgent negotiators from the U.N.'s list of terrorists.

Entitled "Peace Process Roadmap to 2015," the blueprint represents a decision by Karzai—in close coordination with Pakistan—to assume the lead in peace-making efforts following the collapse earlier this year of an Obama administration bid to persuade the Taliban to participate in direct talks with Kabul.

The new initiative comes amid persistent distrust between Karzai and the Obama administration and deep insecurity in Kabul over future U.S. support. Those concerns and the U.S. failure to arrange peace talks appear to have pushed Karzai closer to Pakistan, whose army and main intelligence service are widely believed to exercise significant influence over Taliban and other militant leaders based in Pakistan's border areas with Afghanistan.

The plan also comes as the ongoing U.S. combat troop pullout and cuts in U.S. financial aid to Afghanistan are fueling fears in both countries that violence and instability could worsen, spurring them to take matters into their own hands.

The blueprint, a copy of which was obtained by McClatchy, officially is the work of Afghanistan's High Peace Council, which is charged with overseeing government peace efforts. But it was drafted by Karzai and his inner circle over the past six months in coordination with Pakistan, according to a person familiar with the document who requested anonymity because of the matter's sensitivity.

The plan was presented to Pakistan and the United States during visits last month by High Peace Council Chairman Salauddin Rabbani, who Karzai named to the post after Rabbani's father, former Afghan President Burhanuddin Rabbani, was assassinated in September 2011.

The State Department declined to comment on the plan, refusing even to confirm its existence. However, a State Department official, who requested anonymity because of the issue's sensitivity, was authorized to say that, "The United States continues to support an Afghan-led peace process and welcomes initiatives through which Afghans sit down with other Afghans in pursuit of that goal."

The Afghan embassy did not respond to a request to discuss the plan.

"By 2015, Taliban, Hezb-e-Islami and other armed groups will have given up armed opposition, transformed from military entities into political parties, and are actively participating in the country's political and constitutional processes, including national elections," says the plan's preamble. "NATO/ISAF forces will have departed from Afghan-

istan, leaving the ANSF (Afghan National Security Forces) as the only legitimate armed forces delivering security and protection to the Afghan population."

Despite that optimistic forecast, however, the plan may rest on shaky legs. Its far-reaching assumptions not only could doom it to failure, but risk an all-out civil war before the U.S.-led International Security Assistance Force, or ISAF, completes its pullout.

"This is living in a dream world of wishful thinking," said Marvin Weinbaum, a Middle East Institute scholar who served as a State Department intelligence analyst on Afghanistan. "It is not based on anything that the Taliban has given us reason to expect."

A major assumption is that all insurgent leaders and their fighters will participate even though the Taliban have consistently rejected negotiations with Karzai, who they denounce as an American puppet. Moreover, the insurgency is far from being monolithic and many leaders are known to distrust each other and Pakistan.

Taliban chief Mullah Mohammad Omar and other leaders based in Pakistan could come under pressure from the Pakistani military to take part if they balk. But such pressure could backfire, risking Afghan militants joining Pakistani Islamists fighting to topple their government.

In an incident underscoring the hurdles, two Taliban factions claimed responsibility for a suicide bomb attack on Thursday that wounded Asadullah Khalid, the chief of Afghanistan's intelligence service. Karzai on Saturday alleged that the attack was planned in Pakistan, but he denied that the Taliban were responsible.

The new plan would preserve Afghanistan as a parliamentary democracy, denying the militants the Islamic rule for which they've spent years fighting.

It also appears to ignore warnings from politicians of the former Northern Alliance against giving the Taliban and their allies power that they hadn't won in elections. The Northern Alliance, dominated by ethnic minorities, battled the Taliban, which is made up primarily of the dominant Pashtun ethnic group, until the 2001 U.S. invasion. Many former alliance members now head Karzai's political opposition and hold key army, police and intelligence posts.

"Any Afghanistan reconciliation effort will have to address varied and complex ethnic concerns," acknowledged a U.S. official, who requested anonymity in order to discuss the issue.

Finally, the key role that the plan confers on Pakistan could inflame suspicion among many Afghans that Islamabad plans to exert influence in a post-war Afghanistan—especially to block a pro-India tilt—by placing former insurgents in cabinet posts, ministries, provincial governorships and positions like police chiefs and district administrators.

"The northerners won't buy this," said Weinbaum, referring to former Northern Alliance leaders. "So what you get then is the beginning of a civil war."

Pakistan is widely despised in Afghanistan, particularly by minorities who dominate the country's north, because of its sponsorship of the Taliban's bloody nationwide takeover in the mid-1990s and the support and sanctuary that they and other insurgents allegedly still receive from the Pakistani army and the army-run Inter-Services Intelligence Directorate, or ISI.

In principles governing the new peace process, the plan reiterates Afghan and U.S. demands that the Taliban and other insurgents cut ties with al Qaida and renounce violence.

But in a shift that could raise concerns among human rights and women's groups, the plan changes what had been a demand for

the insurgents to “accept” the Afghan Constitution to one that they “respect” it.

“Any outcome of the peace process must respect the Afghan Constitution and must not jeopardize the rights and freedoms that the citizens of Afghanistan, both men and women, enjoy under the Constitution,” the plan says.

The plan comprises five steps. The first step, which now appears underway, calls for Pakistan to end cross-border shelling of Afghan villages and to free Taliban detainees. Nine were released last month after Rabbani’s visit, and Pakistan has agreed to free more.

In the first half of 2013, Afghan, U.S. and Pakistani officials are to agree on terms for removing Taliban leaders “willing to engage in peace talks” from a U.N. terrorism list and giving them safe passage. Pakistan would “facilitate direct contact” between Afghan officials “and identified leaders of the Taliban and other armed opposition groups.”

Afghan, Pakistani and U.S. officials would “explore and agree to terms for initiating direct peace talks” between the sides “with a focus on Saudi Arabia as the venue.”

The negotiations would begin in the second half of 2013 “preferably through one consistent and coherent channel, with the aim of securing agreements on priority issues, such as ending violence, allowing space for the provision of basic public services, e.g. education, humanitarian aid, and security in the conduct of the upcoming elections,” the plan says.

The sides would agree to a ceasefire and terms for the release of Taliban prisoners by the government “in return for their agreement to disengage and renounce violence.”

The sides also would “reach an understanding on issues related to security and the withdrawal of international forces,” and agree on rules for the insurgents’ participation in 2014 provincial council and 2015 parliamentary elections.

Another provision would confer considerable political power on the insurgents by allowing them to become cabinet members, provincial governors, district administrators, police chiefs and other key officials.

“The negotiating parties to agree on modalities for the inclusion of Taliban and other armed opposition leaders in the power structure of the state, to include non-elected positions at different levels with due consideration of legal and governance principles,” the plan says.

That provision, combined with one for an agreement “creating immediate space for education and humanitarian and development aid and public services,” could effectively cede political control of the Taliban’s southern and eastern heartland to the insurgents.

The agreements would be implemented in the first half of 2014, and the final phase, set for the second half of 2014, would be used to build international cooperation on preserving the long-term stability of Afghanistan and the region, the plan says.

Correction: Paragraph 10 of this version has been revised to provide the correct date for the assassination of former Afghan President Burhanuddin Rabbani.

#### LIST OF NAMES TO SUBMIT FOR THE RECORD

Sgt. 1st Class Darren M. Linde  
 Spc. Tyler J. Orgaard  
 Lance Cpl. Anthony J. Denier  
 Cpl. Christopher M. Monahan, Jr.  
 Petty Officer 1st Class Kevin R. Ebbert  
 Lance Cpl. Dale W. Means  
 Sgt. Channing B. Hicks  
 Spc. Joseph A. Richardson  
 Staff Sgt. Rayvon Battle, Jr.

Sgt. Matthew H. Stiltz  
 Capt. James D. Nehl  
 Kenneth W. Bennett

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO ALABAMA STATE REPRESENTATIVE DR. YVONNE KENNEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of an Alabama State representative, Dr. Yvonne Kennedy, a lawmaker from Mobile, Alabama, who passed away, sadly, on Saturday at the age of 67.

Dr. Kennedy was a pillar in the community and a tremendous public servant. She was the epitome of a servant leader, and she blazed the trails in Alabama politics that so many of us now follow. She led by example and was motivated by a drive and a passion for public service and education.

□ 1010

I am deeply saddened by her passing and know that her legacy of service will live on.

Yvonne Kennedy was born on January 8, 1945, in Mobile, Alabama, to Leroy and Thelma Kennedy. At a young age, she displayed a commitment to academic excellence, and upon graduating from high school, she earned her bachelor’s degree from Alabama State University, a master’s degree from Morgan State University, and a Ph.D. from the University of Alabama. These early accomplishments were the beginning of an illustrious career both as a lawmaker and a community leader.

First elected to the Alabama State House of Representatives in a special election in 1979, Dr. Kennedy was one of the longest-serving members of the Alabama State legislature. She served the 97th District of Mobile for more than 33 years. She was a prominent lawmaker who fought against Alabama’s egregious voter ID laws, and she also championed the restoration of voter rights for rehabilitated ex-felons. She was the former chair of Alabama’s legislative black caucus and was well respected by her colleagues. Her tireless commitment to public service and her advocacy for quality education in Alabama was unparalleled.

In 1981, Dr. Kennedy became the president of Bishop State Community College in Mobile, Alabama, and she served in that role for over 25 years. Under her leadership, Bishop State expanded from one campus to three campuses, and flourished until her departure in 2007. Dr. Kennedy was a premier educator whose commitment to education knew no bounds.

Dr. Kennedy was a member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated, and was their 19th national President from 1988 to 1992. She served on the boards of the Association of Higher Education, America’s Junior Miss, was

a trustee for Miles College, and she was a longstanding member of the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church. She was chairwoman of the Mobile County United Negro College Fund and youth director of the Board of Christian Education-Southeast Alabama Conference.

I know that my generation owes Dr. Kennedy a debt of gratitude. I know that my generation stands on the shoulders of trailblazers like Dr. Yvonne Kennedy. It was her light that guided the path that led me to become Alabama’s first African American Congresswoman, and for that I am eternally grateful.

She left an indelible imprint on Alabama and across this Nation, and her legacy will live on. It is indeed a great privilege and an honor that I have today to recognize the legacy and contributions of Dr. Yvonne Kennedy with this tribute on the floor of the House of Representatives. Let her life stand as a testament to the courage and strength of one individual’s ability to shape the lives of so many. On behalf of the Seventh Congressional District and the State of Alabama and a grateful Nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Dr. Yvonne Kennedy.

#### THE FISCAL CLIFF

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, to understand the Federal budget mess and the so-called fiscal cliff, it’s important to know three numbers: 39, 37, and 64.

Thirty-nine percent is the combined growth of inflation and population over the last 10 years. Thirty-seven percent is the increase in revenues in the same period. That’s despite the recession and the tax cuts. It’s not quite keeping pace, but it’s pretty close. Sixty-four percent is the number that is killing us. Sixty-four percent is the increase in Federal spending in that period. That’s nearly twice the rate of inflation and population growth over the last 10 years.

The spending side of the fiscal cliff is the so-called “sequester,” automatic cuts in Federal spending. To hear some tell it, it is the end of Western civilization as we know it. That’s hardly the case. After a 64 percent increase in expenditures during this decade, the sequester doesn’t actually cut spending at all. It simply limits spending growth next year to about a half of a percent. I opposed the budget deal that created the sequester last year because it fell woefully short of what Standard & Poor’s clearly warned was necessary to preserve the Nation’s AAA credit rating. Sadly, that fear was borne out, but now the sequester is all we have.

It’s true defense takes the brunt of it, but does our defense spending really need to be higher—inflation adjusted—

than it was at the height of the Vietnam War, when we faced down the Soviet Union and had 500,000 combat troops in the field? The sequester isn't stepping off a cliff; it is taking one step back from the cliff.

The tax increases, however, are a very different matter. Without intervention, the Federal tax burden will balloon 21 percent at the stroke of midnight on New Year's Eve, taking somewhere between \$2,000 and \$3,000 from an average family. This summer, the House passed legislation to protect our Nation from such a calamity, but Mr. Obama vowed to veto it, and the Senate killed it. Instead, Mr. Obama tells us that he'll veto any plan that stops taxes from going up on all of those very wealthy folks making over \$200,000, who he says need to pay their fair share. I suppose fairness is in the eye of the beholder. The top 1 percent earns 17 percent of all income and pays 37 percent of all income taxes, but that's beside the point. The fine point of it is that a lot of these very wealthy folks making over \$200,000 aren't very wealthy, and they aren't even folks. They're 1.3 million struggling small businesses filing under subchapter S. Our small businesses produce two-thirds of the new jobs in our economy. So this battle is very much for the middle class.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that Mr. Obama's tax increase on the so-called "wealthy" will actually throw 200,000 middle and working class families into unemployment. That's 200,000 lost jobs. By the way, that is the optimistic estimate. An independent analysis by Ernst & Young puts that figure closer to 700,000 lost jobs. That's because the President's taxes would slam 84 percent of the net small business income in the country. That's precisely the income that is used to support and expand our labor force.

In their blind pursuit of an eat-the-rich ideology, Mr. Obama and his acolytes are imposing a policy that would utterly devastate hundreds of thousands of middle class families who depend upon the jobs that these small businesses provide. And for what? To wring enough money to fund Mr. Obama's spending spree for a grand total of 8 days. It's telling that three-fourths of the new taxes he's proposed would be used to finance the new spending that he's also proposed.

We Republicans don't want to see taxes go up on anyone, period. We don't want to see this government willfully throw hundreds of thousands of Americans out of work by this policy. The President obviously believes that in the eleventh hour Republicans will have no choice but ultimately to protect as many taxpayers as we possibly can since the only alternative would be tax increases on everyone, including those job creators. He may be right, but that would mean a bleak and bitter New Year for all of those families who will watch helplessly as their jobs

evaporate before their eyes. Let us pray that this President has a change of heart before setting this calamity in motion.

#### THE REAL VICTIMS OF SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we just heard a terrible cry on behalf of the wealthy in the United States, that top 2 percent. Tax them, and it will kill jobs, put people out of work.

If you want to know the real victims of sequestration, the real victims of the Republican fight to protect that 2 percent at all costs, it's the homeless, it's the poor, it's the lower income, and it's the vulnerable amongst us.

Most of the debate up until now about the fiscal cliff has focused on defense cuts and expiring tax cuts justifiably, but the ramifications for local safety nets are equally portentous. In my district, for example, Fairfax County recently kicked off its annual hypothermia prevention program. During my tenure on the county board, I worked with faith, business, and community leaders to open houses of worship and other places to offer shelter from the cold and a hot meal for the homeless, individuals, and families. It saves lives.

Last winter, the program served more than 1,000 clients in one of the wealthiest districts in the United States. Sequestration threatens support for this and other Federal homeless prevention efforts. The McKinney-Vento homeless prevention program would be cut by as much as \$156 million. You didn't hear anything about that just now.

□ 1020

You didn't hear anything about that just now, and it would leave more than 145,000 more people out in the cold and at risk of dying from hypothermia.

Similarly, families in every State rely on low-income heating assistance, which stands to lose as much as \$270 million in sequestration. That may not seem like much, but that program has already been cut by the Republicans by 30 percent. Millions of Americans in every State rely on this support, including 145,000 in my home State of Virginia.

The picture gets even worse when you look at the looming cuts to Federal housing assistance. Programs like the Community Development Block Grants, section 8 housing, and rental assistance for the needy and senior citizens already have sustained dramatic cuts over the last 2 years under Republican control. The HOME Investment Partnership Program, which supports homeownership and rental assistance, was cut by more than \$600 million, or 38 percent, last year alone. It faces another \$82 million cut in seques-

tration. Prince William County, in my district, was one of the hardest-hit by foreclosures, and it has an acute shortage of affordable housing right now. Cuts in Federal housing support would further exacerbate that situation just as the local housing market is beginning to recover.

There is an old proverb about someone always getting "left out in the cold," but in this case, people literally will be left out in the cold if we allow sequestration to go forward.

Mr. Speaker, the cuts in housing assistance are just one piece of the local safety net threatened by sequestration. I recently met with the disability community in my district, and they, too, are anxious about losing the vital support that allows disabled loved ones to live independently. One local organization, for example, is providing work opportunities and rehabilitative services to more than 650 disabled adults in our community. Whether it's performing custodial services, packing medical kits for our troops, working in food services or other duties, these Ability One workers are making a positive difference in providing autonomy for individuals in our community. I and many of my colleagues here in the House, both Democrats and Republicans, are Ability One champions, and we know firsthand the positive effect this program has had, not only on the individuals, but on their families and their friends.

Employment opportunities for the disabled and revenue from their work reached an all-time high last year, but that momentum is at risk because of looming cuts through sequestration. Community service boards, for example, could lose as much as \$52 million, which would reduce services for more than 1.5 million people in America. You heard my colleague talk about maybe a few hundred thousand jobs being at risk if we cut taxes for the rich. What about these people? What about the real cuts and real effects on real people in America?

What has been troubling to the residents of my district is the fact that, up until now, the Republican alternative to these cuts has been to shift even more of the burden, not less, onto the social safety net programs. The sequestration replacement bill, which was pushed through earlier by House Republicans, cuts \$261 billion from safety net programs. It eliminates social service block grants, which support Meals on Wheels for 1.7 million seniors. Where is the concern for that? It also provides child care assistance for low-income parents who are returning to work. That plan cut \$36 billion in nutrition assistance for at-risk families. In my district, the demand for nutrition assistance has jumped by 135 percent since the recession, and it has gone up by 73 percent in the Commonwealth of Virginia during that same time period.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to turn our backs on these families. Sequestration is a real threat. We need to

have a compromise and a deal now to help these families.

REVEREND JEROME R. MILTON

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Today, when the House opens for regular session, we will be led by visiting chaplain Reverend Jerome R. Milton. This extraordinary man is a friend, and he is an inspiration to me.

To borrow from a testimonial sermon of his, Reverend Milton, as a very small child, was left to die with his brother and sister in a rundown California motel. The San Diego County welfare department found them and placed them in a horrific orphanage, called the Hillcrest Orphanage, where abuse of all kinds imaginable and unimaginable were inflicted upon them. Many of the children in such terrible conditions committed suicide, which included his brother and sister. After the horrors of this orphanage, he was placed in 13 different foster homes, where he suffered more unfathomable abuse and inhuman treatment.

Finally, as Jerome says, "God heard the cry of the lamb," and he was placed in his 14th home, that of Dadie Florence Johnson Brown. She could not read or write, but she was a good woman with a big heart and a stronger will. She took Jerome, and she said she could not imagine all the abuse he had been through, that it just sounded too unbelievable, but she looked him in the eye and said, Don't let your abuse be your excuse. She said, Someday, you can be a great juvenile judge or a case worker or something special.

But there was a lot of rebellion and anger in the young man. He hated lots of people and things, and especially God. Ms. Brown would not heed Jerome's pleas to leave him alone. She kept praying for him every single day by name. She said she knew there was good in him, but prayed that God would not let him end up in jail or in prison, because she knew God could do something very special with him.

He eventually tried the praying thing himself, but he was very cynical. He wanted to go to college, he wanted to be a coach, but he knew no one who had money. Then he found out he could run really fast, and he could play football really well. Though his teacher told him he was too black and too stupid to ever amount to anything, he proved her wrong when, just 4½ years later, he taught in a classroom right next to hers.

As Reverend Milton says, God moved him from foster care to people care. This angry, black, abused, hopeless shell of a downtrodden young boy had God-given potential. This is what Dadie Brown saw in him. Before she died, she told Jerome, All you can do for me is, if you can do for a group of children what I've done for you, then my living will not have been in vain.

She said, I don't have \$1 million, but I hope I made a \$1 million difference. When she died, she had raised 44 children, giving hope to each one.

Jerome says she led him to Jesus and that Jesus opened his heart. He providentially met and married Charlene Olgis, and together, they have nine children. Six of them were adopted through the foster care program. Tyler, Texas, is where two Heisman Trophy winners grew up, Earl Campbell and Johnny Manziel, but it is also the mission field of Reverend Jerome R. Milton and his wife, Charlene, and that's where they've invested their lives.

He is the senior pastor of the Greater New Pleasant Hill Baptist Church in Tyler. He has been there for 25 years. He established the Dadie Florence Brown children's home for homeless mothers and abused children. He has been the head track and field coach at Bishop Gorman Catholic High School for 24 years, leading his team to 10 State track and field championships, and he has helped 150 athletes earn scholarships. He has also been the Tyler Citizen of the Year, winning the T.B. Butler Award. His work toward spanning race and religion and all types of barriers is boundless, and his list of accomplishments would take all day long to read.

He has blessed our town, our district, our State, and our country. It is an honor and an inspiration to know him and to count him as a friend. I so look forward to having my friend as a visiting chaplain today at noon eastern time when he opens the official part of this session in Congress.

God bless America, and God bless Jerome Milton.

THE WIND INDUSTRY AND OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. This morning, I rise to talk about two issues I care very passionately about: wind energy and veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I spent more than 20 years in the wind industry as a technology development engineer. In those early days, we saw some spectacular failures and dramatic failures, but every year, we put more into the technology development. We put a little bit this year in the gear box, in the foundations. Every year, we put a little increment of improvement in the control systems, in the field testing, in the power electronics so that we understood what was going on.

□ 1030

Today we have an industry that is a spectacular industry. The wind turbines now are hundreds of feet tall. They are extremely reliable. They produce power for 4 to 5 cents a kilowatt hour, depending on the resource. It's been a very successful business.

In the early days, the United States of America dominated that business because of consistent policies, consistent tax policies. We could rely on the policies being there year after year. Investors came in; engineers came in. But in the early 1980s, those policies began to change, and the technology began to leave our country.

We've seen, I've seen in my career, the incentives come and go over the years. I can tell you, it's devastating to the industry. It takes years to develop the infrastructure to produce wind turbines. The bearings are 20 feet in diameter. It takes expertise. In order to get a project in, you need to get a power purchase agreement. You need to get permits. You need to get investments, and then you need to order products. The products have a 1- to 2-year lead time they're so large. We're putting a lot at risk by ending the production tax credit.

And not only that, we'll see at least 40,000 jobs lost when the production tax credit expires at the end of this year. A lot of those jobs go to United States veterans, veterans of our armed services. And I can tell you what, when soldiers are trained, they're trained on large equipment. They're trained on big projects. They're well disciplined. They're reliable. They work in very adverse conditions. And that's exactly the kind of training you need to be a windsmith and a wind turbine installer, so it's been a very good fit.

There's one company in particular, Airstreams. They train wind turbine windsmiths, and 80 percent of their graduates are veterans. They get good jobs in this country. And when the production tax credit goes away, that removes the hope of many of our veterans.

Now, the veterans of our country were soldiers and sailors. They volunteered their time for our country. They put themselves in grave danger, and they came home and found a very bad employment situation. The wind energy has been a tremendous opportunity for them, and to take this hope away from our veterans is a travesty. Eliminating those jobs for veterans is absolutely unacceptable.

Now, the production tax credit, itself, is a very effective way to produce energy. You get paid for when you deliver energy in the production tax credit. In the early days, the credits went to investments, and a lot of investments were not so good. But today, the motive is to have a very reliable, a very productive set of equipment, and that's what happens when the production tax credit is extended. It creates jobs. It helps develop the manufacturing base in this country. And I can tell you, if you want to be a great country, you have to have a big manufacturing base. Of those things that are at risk of going overseas, our manufacturing base, our engineering expertise, jobs, investment, this will be a real loss for our country. It will hurt our veterans. And the last thing it will hurt is our climate.

Now, there are people who don't believe in climate change, but I can tell you what: The evidence out there is absolutely overwhelming, whether it's biological systems migrating to higher elevations, more northern latitude, whether it's the melting of our glaciers, whether it's Hurricane Sandy, event after event shows climate change is here; it's real; it's a threat, and we need to reduce our consumption of fossil fuels. Wind energy is a tremendous opportunity for us to do that.

So if we let the production tax credit expire, we are risking losing manufacturing. We're risking putting veterans out of work. We're risking climate change. This is something we can't afford to do as a Nation. The production tax credit is a very good investment in America and our future and our manufacturing base.

I urge all of my colleagues to consider helping to extend the production tax credits for our Nation and for our future.

#### TAKE THEM BACK HOME

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, according to the Boston Globe, Qian Wu was beaten, choked, punched, and held at knifepoint by Chinese national Huang Chen. That was in 2006.

Her attacker was sent to prison in Texas, supposedly never to be heard of again. Or so she thought. Four years later, Wu was sitting alone in her apartment when guess who shows up—the person who assaulted her to begin with—busting through her door. He reportedly said in a taunting voice, "I bet you didn't expect to see me here."

Wu called the police, and Chen quickly fled the scene, but 2 weeks later, he returned to finish what began 4 years before. Chen beat Ms. Wu to death with a hammer, stabbed her with a knife, leaving her to die in her own pool of blood.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Wu's death did not have to occur. This crime could have actually been prevented. Chen should not have been back on the streets after serving time in prison, but he was, and here's why.

After he had served his initial sentence for assaulting Ms. Wu, he was ordered legally deported back where he came from, back to China. But his home country, our good old buddies the Chinese, refused to take him back. They didn't want him. And so they stalled and stalled and stalled, and over those 3 years of Chinese stalling and giving the runaround, Chen was eventually freed—free to kill, and kill he did.

Mr. Speaker, this tragedy is not an isolated phenomenon. Unfortunately, other Americans have died as a result of this gaping hole in the immigration system. It's no secret that everybody believes our immigration system is broken. Fixing it down the road will be

complex and complicated. But there are some things that we can do about immigration right now to fix specific problems, and here's one.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, thousands of criminal aliens are in our country, just like Chen, who have committed a crime and gone to prison. Our immigration system worked to order them deported, but their country won't take them back. They refuse to do so. So those countries stall and delay and eventually never take back their outlaws. So by law, after the person serves the time in our prisons, we can't keep them indefinitely waiting on their country to take them back, and so they are eventually released. These countries know that, and that's why they stall.

Many of those criminals now are running around on American streets looking for more crime and up to malicious mischief.

The blood of American victims are not only on the hands of the felons who commit these crimes from foreign countries, but they're also the fault of those countries that refuse to take back these criminal citizens.

You know, the blood of Ms. Wu is on the hands of Chinese citizen Huang Chen, but it's also on the hands of the Chinese bureaucrats that would not take Chen back. Oh, Mr. Speaker, they may wear white gloves because they weren't the direct killer of Ms. Wu, but their delay allowed for that crime to be committed. And below those white gloves are the blood of this citizen who was killed in this country.

And it's not just China committing these acts of not taking back lawfully deported individuals; there are numerous countries. Vietnam, Jamaica, Pakistan, and Cuba are just a few.

So what should we do? Well, Mr. Speaker, there's already a law to require that there be some sanctions against these countries that refuse to take back their lawfully deported aliens, but the State Department doesn't enforce the law. The State Department says, well, we want to work diplomatically to get these people sent back. We don't want to require any sanctions. And so they talk and they talk and they talk. Meanwhile, more crimes are being committed by these people who are released, who should have been sent home, while the State Department continues to talk. Like my grandfather used to say: When all is said and done, more is said than done.

We need to get these people out of our country who have been lawfully deported. These countries need to take them back, or there ought to be a consequence.

I've introduced legislation that removes the uncertainty and the weak knees of bureaucrats and requires the State Department to follow through with visa sanctions against the countries that won't take back their lawfully deported criminals. I repeat, those visa sanctions should be primarily against, first, diplomats from

these countries when they don't take back these individuals.

□ 1040

It's time to play a little bit of diplomatic hard ball with these nations. After all, Americans are dying because these criminals are illegally on the streets and our Nation does not insist on them being taken back.

It's time to make these crooks and misfits the problem of their home country, rather than continue to remain our problem. Otherwise, more Americans are going to die.

It's time to play a little hard ball with these countries.

And that's just the way it is.

#### FISCAL CONCERNS AND OTHER ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know that America watches as we deliberate—and I'd like to use that terminology—on facing the fiscal concerns of this Nation.

Let me quickly remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that America is on the upswing, with increased manufacturing, more consumer confidence. We're moving forward. The economy is moving up. And so I believe it should be pronounced here today that the reform of the entitlements, based upon slipshod, reckless deliberations, or should I say actions, are a nonstarter.

There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that we should raise the eligibility age for Medicare, that we should not think carefully about how we approach the reform of Medicaid, and that we don't tell the American people that Social Security is solvent.

So I would say, move quickly to pass the middle class tax cuts that would be for all Americans, 100 percent, up to \$250,000, and let's think about, moving into 2013, how we make this economy better by looking carefully at how we reform entitlements that are not hand-outs, but they are earned.

I wanted to move to something else, offer my deepest sympathy for those who lost their lives in the Oregon massacre, again, at the hands of a gun and a perpetrator that is now dead, and to say that I thank Bob Costa for having the courage to get on national TV and speak to those who are rabid sports fans and say it's time for some form of gun regulation.

The tragedy that occurred with the NFL player and his girlfriend speaks volumes to the idea of individuals who don't need to have guns in their hands. This phenomenon that guns don't kill, people do, is a trite and redundant and ridiculous statement.

We understand that guns have to have someone at their trigger; but the idea that with no regulations about those who've had previous offenses, no regulations dealing with those who've had mental health issues, no regulations for the gun show loophole, that

you can go in and buy guns on top of guns, it is time to reflect.

I think the sports community could work with us to ensure that America realizes that there's nothing wrong with standing up for gun regulation.

As well, let me offer my sympathy to the Brent and Brown families of the tragedy of the NFL players in Dallas. Let me ask the commissioner to work with those of us who are concerned about athletes in pro ball, that we can find a way to intervene. There should be intervention on a lot of these incidences of violence.

Let me close and speak well about the issue of millions of workers in the United States Postal Service, yes, government workers, public servants, who, over the decades, have made Americans' lives easier. Just yesterday we were speaking about another day of—or Monday I think it was, on online shopping.

I have small businesses who always say the post office is the most efficient and the, if you will, cheapest source of getting their business products where they need to be. It is a shame that we have not addressed the question of hardworking postal workers, rural post offices that are prolific in the State of Texas, rural postmasters who've come and said it'll be the death knell of their community.

Let us stand the post office up. Let us view it as a vital system. Oh, we are online, but there are individuals who depend upon this massive postal system. It can be made efficient. It can be made better. We can protect the workers.

Do we want to give a Christmas gift to hardworking postal workers, who as they are known to go through rain or snow or sleet, that is, give them a pink slip for no fault of their own?

This is not the American way. We create jobs; we don't destroy jobs. And it's time now for us to stand up and be heard before the deadline, that our postal workers who are always there, who are the ones that find the elderly and the sick in their home because they know their route and they find those persons if they're in need, they are the good-news people that come by the seniors and come by the disabled and come by the poor families.

I want to say that we can work together, bring our postal workers here to make a difference and to reform the postal system to keep it alive. It is a vital source of work, but it is a vital service to the American people.

#### CONGRATULATING JOHNNY MANZIEL

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, this is the second consecutive year that I have had the privilege to congratulate a Heisman Trophy winner from one of the two universities in the 17th Congressional District of Texas.

Today, I want to congratulate Johnny Manziel of Texas A&M University in College Station, Texas, as the 2012 recipient of the 78th annual Heisman Memorial Trophy.

On Saturdays, "Johnny Football," as he is now known, wowed audiences across the Nation with his steady poise and his remarkable playmaking ability. As a freshman, he personifies the fighting Texas Aggie spirit, and he proves that the impossible is never out of reach.

Leading the Aggies in their inaugural season in the Southeastern Athletic Conference, Johnny threw for 3,419 yards and ran for 1,181 yards, and he garnered 43 touchdowns. He broke a multitude of A&M, SEC, and NCAA records along the way.

Johnny is the first freshman, and only the fifth player, in FBS history to have at least 3,000 yards passing and 1,000 yards rushing in a season. He holds FBS freshman records for both rushing yards by a quarterback and all-purpose yards by an individual.

He is the SEC record-holder for total yards in a season, at 4,600, breaking the previous record in two fewer games than the prior record-holder. He also achieved an SEC record for total yards in a single game, at 557 yards, only to break that record 2 weeks later with a 576-yard game.

Johnny has logged nine straight games with 300 or more yards and generated five or more touchdowns in six different games. He tied an 85-year-old A&M record with 19 rushing touchdowns in a season. And, oh, by the way, he still has one more game to play this season.

Johnny has many firsts among the awards and accolades he has garnered in 2012. He was the first player in the history of the SEC to win the Freshman of the Year and the Player of the Year in the same season. He is also the first freshman in FBS history to win the Davey O'Brien National Quarterback Award. Most notably, he is the first freshman in college football history to win the Heisman Memorial Trophy, awarded to the most outstanding player in college football each year.

Johnny not only shined on the field, but off it as well. Academically, he has successfully completed enough credit hours to be classified as a junior, even though he's just a redshirt freshman.

When he first addressed the media at the end of the regular season, Johnny remained humble and gave credit to his teammates, to his coaches, and to the Aggie 12th man, which is the greatest tradition in all sports. When he addressed the Nation after receiving the Heisman Trophy, he named his offensive line individually, and honored the 1-year anniversary of the passing of a beloved teammate.

Johnny knows where his talents and blessings come from; and he gave glory to God, most importantly.

What makes this year so special is how Johnny and the Aggie football team excelled in their first year play-

ing in the SEC. Not too many people from outside their locker room gave them a fighting chance in their inaugural SEC season, but they believed in themselves.

I want to congratulate Texas A&M University and football coach Kevin Sumlin on a terrific 10-2 regular season. He and his coaching staff are doing extraordinary work down in Aggieland during their first year. Keep up the great work.

As Johnny said, leadership, respect and putting others first are what being an Aggie is all about. Aggies all across the world stand together, not only as fans, but as members of a team. I proudly echo Johnny's words when I say to the 12th man, to Texas A&M University and to Aggies everywhere, this honor is for you.

As an Aggie former student, I want to thank Johnny for an incredible season, and I look for more exciting seasons in the coming years.

Before I close, I ask all Americans to pray for our country during these difficult times and for our brave military men and women and first responders who are protecting us at home and abroad.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to address the House today.

Gig 'em Aggies, God bless America, and Merry Christmas to all.

□ 1050

#### A LEGACY OF WORKING FOR PEACE AND A MORE PERFECT WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout my career in public life, and even before, nothing has motivated me more than a desire to end wars and violent conflicts. When I was a small girl saying bedtime prayers or making a birthday wish when blowing out the candles, I always asked for world peace. So it's no surprise that over a decade ago, I opposed the Iraq war before it even started. It was appalling that we would invade a nation that hadn't provoked us, had nothing to do with 9/11, and did not have weapons of mass destruction. It was a lonely fight at that time. But I didn't do it to be loved. It was a matter of principle.

BARBARA LEE, MAXINE WATERS, and I formed The Triad—WOOLSEY, WATERS, and LEE—to organize our opposition. We held forums, we developed an Out of Iraq Caucus, we traveled around the country, and in January 2005, I offered the first amendment here on the House floor calling for our troops to be brought home. Some in my own party thought that it was a mistake, that we wouldn't get any votes—or enough votes—and that we would be embarrassed. Well, I told them that even if I were the only one voting to bring our troops home, I would not be embarrassed.

Well, as it happened, we got 128 bipartisan votes that very first time. So you see, Mr. Speaker, when you lead, people follow. Because of a handful of progressive leaders and progressives in our country that were vocal and fearless, eventually public opinion turned. It turned against the Iraq war and turned towards peace. If we and other outspoken advocates hadn't ignored conventional wisdom and hadn't pressed for peace, the war in Iraq could still be going on today.

In April, Mr. Speaker, of 2004, I started speaking from this very spot on the House floor about my strong anti-Iraq war convictions. Eventually, these speeches focused on Afghanistan, where we've now been waging war for more than 11 years, despite more than 2,000 Americans dead and nearly \$600 billion wasted and even though we are undermining our own interests in failing to bring security and stability to Afghanistan.

Over the last 8-plus years, I've spoken here nearly every day that I could to drive home what a moral disaster and strategic failure these wars have been. When constituents and others call or come up to me or write and thank me, I say, But we're still there. I don't deserve thanks until all of our troops are home.

You know, Mr. Speaker, because you've been here for many of them, that my speeches haven't just been about bringing our troops home. They've offered a new vision for global engagement. From here I've outlined my SMART Security platform, which calls for development and diplomacy instead of invasions and occupations; civilian surges instead of military surges. SMART Security means helping other nations educate their children, care for their sick, and strengthen their democratic institutions. SMART Security says we can make America safe by building international good will and by empowering people with humanitarian assistance instead of sending troops or launching drone attacks. It's the right thing to do. It's the smart thing to do. And it costs pennies on the dollar compared to military force.

So, Mr. Speaker, today I'm delivering that message for the 444th and final time on the House floor to speak on a 5-minute Special Order. This is the last of my Special Order speeches on war and peace and SMART Security. I'm retiring from Congress at the end of this year, and I believe part of my legacy will be that I worked diligently for peace and a safer world.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to acknowledge that sometimes I've been accused of wanting a "perfect world." But I consider that a compliment. Our Founders strove to form a "more perfect Union." Why shouldn't we aim for a perfect world? You see, I'm absolutely certain that if we don't work toward a perfect world, we won't ever come close to providing a safe, healthy, and secure world for our grandchildren and their grandchildren.

I thank my wonderful staff who have helped me over the last 20 years to work for a perfect world, which means peace, health, and security for all.

#### SO-CALLED RIGHT TO WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from Ohio, a State that borders Michigan, I rise to stand in solidarity with the workers of Michigan. Many Ohioans I represent actually drive to work in Michigan. And due to the high-handed actions of Michigan's Governor and its legislature, they actually railroaded legislation through Michigan, with no hearings, to take away the rights of Michigan workers to fund the collective bargaining process that results in living-wage worker contracts.

The workers of Michigan are fighting to maintain their rights to a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. I support their rights and the rights of every American to organize and negotiate by contract for proper pay and benefits, regardless of which State they live in. The rights of labor by contract are critical to growing our middle class, as opposed to rights by happenstance that are always up for grabs, where workers have no rights and live in fear of the future.

Michigan's Republican ideologues passed so-called "right-to-work" legislation. Well, let's be clear: the bill being pushed there by the far right should really be called the Right to Work for Less. And that is exactly what President Obama called it. To quote Bob King, the visionary president of the United Auto Workers of this country:

Every right-to-work State has lower wages, lower benefits, less security for workers and more income inequality.

And they have a shrinking middle class. The UAW is right: if you happen to live and work in a State that has a so-called right-to-work law on the books, you earn an average of \$5,000 less a year than if you lived in a worker rights State. The bill signed last night in Michigan strips labor organizations of their right to collect dues to cover the cost of negotiating a collective bargaining agreement.

The Michigan law is pure politics. No, it is more than that. It is an old-school union-busting technique, pure and simple. And in Michigan and Ohio, we know a lot about union busting. As a daughter of auto workers, I know the history of the hired goons who bludgeoned auto workers back in the 1930s at River Rouge as workers began to stand up for their human rights as they labored in the dungeons of the automotive production facilities at the time.

I actually would like to challenge the Governor of Michigan to come with me and let's work on the line for a month in one of those repetitive-motion jobs

that make and characterize modern automotive production. They're not easy jobs. I would like him to install the windows on the right side of a vehicle as it moves down the line over and over and over and over and over and over again. Let's see how much fun he'll have.

A year ago, we in Ohio witnessed a similar effort to eliminate unions. Right-wing legislators moved through legislation that would have ended collective bargaining as we know it in Ohio for public sector workers. We're talking about firefighters, police, and teachers. Well, the people of Ohio broadly rejected that union busting earlier this year.

□ 1100

Citizens organized a ballot initiative to restore worker rights in Ohio, and they won. It was called Issue 2. The people of Ohio voted to overwhelmingly protect the rights of those who protect us and who teach our children.

While worker rights were protected in Ohio, up north, what was done in Lansing, intends to extend far beyond the borders of just Michigan. It will impact workers who commute from my State of Ohio and Indiana.

This is about more than just one State. In fact, this is a national issue, not a states' rights issue at all. The Michigan union-busting bill is a direct result of weak Federal legislation, and I'm talking about section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which weakens the rights of labor. Congress should overturn that part of the law and reaffirm its role in protecting the internationally recognized labor rights of every American citizen.

That is why I have joined a number of my colleagues in introducing legislation, H.R. 2775, that would do just that. We should not have individual States competing against each other in a race to the bottom. Haven't we seen enough of that?

We need to support and build back the American middle class by creating good jobs, good-paying jobs, and secure benefits through secure contracts. I stand attired in red today in solidarity with the workers of Michigan, and I am proud to do so.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Reverend Jerome Milton, Greater New Pleasant Hill Missionary Baptist

Church, Tyler, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Father God, how loving, how gracious, how wonderful, how good, how vast are Your methods for bringing us ever so close to You so that we might experience Your awesome power of love and care for us as a Nation.

Lord God, we pray today that You will let common ground and middle ground be the order of the day for the common good of our Nation.

Loving God, bless the Members of the people's House. Give them wisdom and understanding to be a blessing to our house.

Merciful God, in times like these, oh, precious Lord, take their hands, touch their hearts, speak to their souls, that the Members of this body may be bold servants of this Nation.

Our eternal God, may all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory, forever and ever.

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 Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SARBANES 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.

### WELCOMING REVEREND JEROME R. MILTON

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, our visiting chaplain today is Reverend Jerome R. Milton, pastor of the Greater New Pleasant Hill Missionary Baptist Church in Tyler, Texas.

As a small child, he was left with his brother and sister in a rundown motel in San Diego to die. They were placed in a horrific orphanage, where despicable abuses were inflicted, ultimately resulting in the suicide of his siblings.

Jerome was eventually placed in the home of Dadie Florence Brown, the 14th foster home. This uneducated but strong-willed lady told young Jerome that, despite all he'd been through, "Don't allow your abuse to be your excuse." She knew God would make him something special, and she prayed for him every day.

Jerome could run fast and play football well and got a scholarship to do

both at UCLA. As he says, God moved him from foster care to people care. He and his wife, Charlene, have nine children, six of them adopted.

In addition to being a pastor, he's the head track coach at Gorman Catholic High School, leading his teams to 10 State championships, and has been Tyler's Citizen of the Year with the T.B. Butler Award. His work has spanned race, religion, all types of barriers, and he has blessed so many lives, including mine.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 12, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 12, 2012 at 11:08 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4014.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4367.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2467.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3319.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 6328.

That the Senate passed S. 3564.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### PRESIDENT OBAMA'S FISCAL CLIFF PLAN CALLS FOR \$1.2 TRILLION IN NEW SPENDING

(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, during his campaign for reelection, the President called for a balanced approach to solve the fiscal cliff crisis. Unfortunately, the plan his administration submitted to Congress does not include the spending cuts necessary to address our Nation's \$16 trillion national debt.

According to Senate Budget Committee Ranking Member JEFF SESSIONS' staff's calculation of data from the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget, the President's plan suggests that

roughly 75 percent, or \$1.2 trillion, in new revenue be directed to new spending instead of deficit reduction.

The fiscal cliff must be averted to protect our economy for future generations. Yesterday, House Speaker JOHN BOEHNER asked the President to identify specific cuts he is willing to make for a balanced approach. I hope the President will take immediate action so progress can be made for a bipartisan solution.

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

### LESSONS LEARNED IN THE WAKE OF HURRICANE SANDY

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, there are many lessons to be learned in the wake of the hurricane that devastated parts of New York and New Jersey, one of which is the importance of electronic medical records and health information technology.

While many hospitals and medical centers were damaged by the storm, hospitals that employed electronic medical records were able to ensure that vital health information was maintained and not lost. Not only that, electronic medical records enabled continuity of care as patients were transferred between hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one example of how electronic health records can improve quality of patient care, integrate health systems, and ultimately, reduce unnecessary costs.

My western New York community was an early adopter of electronic medical records and has since been recognized nationally as a leader in health information technology. I urge the House to continue the widespread adoption of health information technology and to assist in its expansion across the country.

□ 1210

### TOMBSTONE, ARIZONA, WATER SUPPLY FIASCO

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

Mr. GOSAR. Last week, the ninth circuit court heard a case regarding Tombstone, Arizona's right to access its water supply. Last year, a devastating combination of wildfires and monsoons struck Tombstone, leaving only 3 of its 25 springs in operation. Tombstone has been engaged in a year-long standoff with the Federal Government over the repairs that will restore the town's water supply because those springs are in wilderness areas and they are prohibited from using mechanized equipment to make the necessary repairs.

This situation is not unique. A similar disaster occurred in northern Arizona after the 2010 Schultz Pass fire.

The Inner Basin pipeline, infrastructure that delivers water to Flagstaff, was severed during catastrophic floods that followed the fire. In our case, a lawsuit wasn't necessary, but it took my team and the city over a year to persuade multiple agencies to allow for repairs. Last month, I took the first sip of water out of the repaired infrastructure with Mayor Jerry Nabours.

Our communities shouldn't need their Congressman or a lawsuit to make basic repairs to infrastructure. The Federal Government should work with us, not against us, to preserve western water supplies.

#### FISCAL CLIFF

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, our country faces a critical financial deadline in just 19 days. While Democrats are offering solutions to raise revenue and cut government spending, the House Republican leadership still refuses to take action on something we all agree on—extending middle class tax cuts.

We need to give middle class families in my home State of Rhode Island and across our Nation the certainty that they will not see a tax increase at a time when they can least afford it. I've heard from hundreds of Rhode Islanders who want to know why we don't have a deal already. I've heard from seniors who want us to protect Social Security, working parents who want us to extend tax cuts for the middle class, and those still struggling to find work who rely on unemployment insurance to make ends meet.

It's time for the Republican leadership to work across the aisle to reach a deal that strengthens the middle class and responsibly addresses our debt.

#### ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT AND THE LESSER PRAIRIE CHICKEN

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

Mr. POMPEO. Today, I rise to talk about a bird, the Lesser Prairie Chicken. Actually, it's not about the bird; it's about jobs. I happen to represent Cassoday, Kansas, the American capital of the Lesser Prairie Chicken.

The Environmental Protection Agency and this administration are about to do great harm to the bird but, more importantly, present great risk to energy exploration all across America. They want to put the Lesser Prairie Chicken under the Endangered Species Act. The impact of this decision will be enormous on our burgeoning domestic energy industry. Millions of public acres could be closed to exploration, and a labyrinth of bureaucratic nightmares awaits any investor foolish enough to explore land that might be home to even one Lesser Prairie Chicken. The uncertainty that listing this

bird would create will discourage investments where they are most needed in our country.

It's time to find a practical, realistic solution to protect our environment and spur economic growth, but manipulating the Endangered Species Act and exploiting the Lesser Prairie Chicken is simply wrong.

#### INQUIRY INTO THE MURDER OF PATRICK FINUCANE

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, hours ago, British Prime Minister David Cameron told the House of Commons that a report he commissioned acknowledged there was a "shocking level of state collusion" into the murder of Attorney Patrick Finucane in Belfast in 1989.

I appreciate Prime Minister Cameron's recognition that the agents of the British state were involved in the murder of Pat Finucane and his apology to the family, but I will continue to be a strong and outspoken advocate for a full, open, and transparent public inquiry into the case of British collusion in the murder of Pat Finucane. It is the only way to get to the truth and the only way we can convince the public that one of the most controversial murders during the Troubles has been thoroughly investigated.

I have known Geraldine Finucane and her family for more than two decades. Their campaign for justice and truth has been honorable and remarkable. The killing of Patrick Finucane was a dark stain in the north of Ireland, which has not gone away by today's report. The British Government agreed to conduct a full inquiry into the murder at Weston Park, and they should honor that commitment, as Prime Minister Enda Kenny of Ireland has suggested today as well.

As we've seen many times before during the Irish peace process, whether it was the Birmingham Six, the Guildford Four, or Bloody Sunday, the truth eventually emerges. Pat Finucane's family deserves to know the whole truth. That is why we will continue to demand that the British Government hold a full public inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane.

#### STOP FOREIGN AID TO TUNISIA

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 3-month anniversary of the terrorist attack in Benghazi, Libya, where four Americans' lives were tragically lost, including U.S. Ambassador Chris Stevens. To date, none of the terrorists have been brought to justice. In fact, in the months following the attack, the Tunisian Government blocked the FBI from interviewing the

only known detained suspect in the attack, a Tunisian man named Ali Harzi. The FBI team has been there for 5 weeks, and they will not make him available.

Since January 2011, the U.S. has given more than \$320 million in taxpayer dollars to Tunisia. I rise to ask that all U.S. aid to Tunisia be immediately cut off, in light of the country's blocking the FBI's attempt to investigate the attack and interview Harzi.

Why are we giving any sort of aid to a country that has proven at this time it is no friend or ally of the United States? Why are we not doing everything in our power to investigate the events in Benghazi that killed four Americans?

Should Secretary Clinton fail to cut off aid to Tunisia, I will take legislative action to cut off the aid.

#### RECOGNIZING JEH JOHNSON, GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE DEFENSE

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I rise today to recognize the outstanding service of Jeh Johnson, general counsel of the Department of Defense.

In navigating a wide range of important legal issues, Jeh has been an invaluable partner to the House Armed Services Committee over the last 4 years, and he is respected by Members on both sides of the aisle. Over the last 4 years, Jeh has advised the committee on numerous national security challenges, including cyberwarfare, counterterrorism operations, the legal boundaries of the conflict against al Qaeda and its affiliates, sensitive intelligence matters, and detainee operations worldwide. Jeh was integral to our efforts to reform military commissions—where those accused of planning and executing 9/11 attacks will be prosecuted. He has regularly testified before Congress and provided briefings on the Don't Ask, Don't Tell law and policy, efforts to combat sexual assault in the military, changes to the combat exclusion policy, the membership of the Joint Chiefs, and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq.

There has been no shortage of very difficult and very controversial issues. Jeh has always approached them intelligently and professionally and served this country, the President and Congress well.

The one thing I always noticed about Jeh is he liked coming over and talking to Congress, which is not always the case in the executive branch. He recognized the importance of the relationship between the legislative branch and the executive branch. He has served our country very well.

I wish him well in private practice and thank him for his service.

TEXAS SENATOR KAY BAILEY  
HUTCHISON

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON has been a fighter for the State of Texas long before she came to the U.S. Senate. As a graduate of the University of Texas and the University of Texas Law School, she first served in Austin, Texas, in the House of Representatives. She then served as State treasurer, and then she made up her mind to become the first woman to ever represent the great State of Texas in the United States Senate.

Texans have been fortunate to have KAY as a feisty advocate for them. She's been a leader here in the Senate for almost 20 years. My grandmother used to always say that there's nothing more powerful than a woman who has made up her mind. Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON is one of those women. She is a leader and a role model for all of us. She will be missed.

Thank you, KAY, for your service to the great State of Texas and the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1220

PROTECTING CRITICAL PROGRAMS

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, critical initiatives that help the Chesapeake Bay will be among the hardest hit by sequestration. These programs, including the Small Watersheds Program, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, and the Section 319 Program, provide much needed resources for on-the-ground restoration and conservation efforts in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

These programs are some of the most important tools we have for addressing pollution and storm water runoff in the bay. An 8 percent cut would cost thousands of jobs and exacerbate the already crumbling public water infrastructure that is so prevalent in Maryland and across the country, adding pressure to State and local governments to pay for Federal programs that have been slashed. As we all know, the budget process is entirely about choices. We must make clean water and clean air a priority. I urge my colleagues to protect these critical programs from reckless cuts that will destroy jobs and destroy the environment.

SEQUESTRATION IMPACT ON  
ENVIRONMENT

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

Ms. CHU. Sequestration wasn't written to be good fiscal policy. It was

never intended to be policy, period. These automatic cuts would deeply hurt our environment. This Congress has already tried to roll back our strongest environmental laws. Now we're on the verge of setting a new low.

Sequestration could force the national parks and forests to turn away visitors. Our Forest Service, which fights wildfires, might not have enough money to put out all the flames. Agencies protecting us from harmful toxic waste may have difficulty going after our worst polluters. This is no solution to our deficit problems.

Now is the time for both sides to work toward a responsible compromise. As I said before, sequestration was never intended to happen, so let's not let it.

NATURAL DISASTER HELP

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, you can't walk two steps in this Capitol without getting into a discussion these days about the fiscal cliff. The fiscal cliff is comprised of a lot of very serious issues, but it is a metaphor. Meanwhile, tens of thousands of my constituents and hundreds of thousands of people in the States of Connecticut, New Jersey and New York are suffering as a result of a natural disaster which was anything but a metaphor. Hurricane Sandy devastated communities across those three States.

Traditionally, when our constituents were homeless, when they were hungry, when they were standing amidst the wreckage of their homes, they looked to this body for help and this body always said, yes, we will help. As we speak, there is a bill in the Senate that would provide that assistance to so many distressed constituents, Republican and Democrat, rural and urban. When that bill gets to this House, I urge my colleagues to remember that whether it was Hurricane Katrina or Andrew or the earthquakes of the west coast, we have always set aside considerations of the budget, or offsets, or whatnot, to do the decent and moral thing and help our constituents.

Let's do it again.

PAY AS YOU EARN PROGRAM

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, while the whole world is waiting to see whether the House Republicans say "yes" to extending middle class tax cuts, President Obama, on Friday, moved ahead with following through on a campaign promise to help people with student loan payments which are at record-high levels.

The Pay as You Earn program, starting next Friday, will accept applica-

tions to cap repayment at 10 percent of discretionary income. So, for example, an individual with \$30,000 in income and \$26,000 in debt will see their monthly payments drop from \$166 a month to \$110 a month.

Individuals can contact the U.S. Department of Education's Web site to apply for this assistance or call your Member of Congress. And while you're at it, tell them to extend middle class tax cuts, sign on to the Walz bill, and let's get away from this fiscal cliff.

Congratulations to the President for following through for young Americans to make sure that they're going to get needed help to pay for college.

PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT  
EXTENSION

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I rise today to highlight the critical importance of extending the Production Tax Credit for wind energy, which expires this month. The Production Tax Credit is essential for energy independence, the environment, and public health; and it is critical for job creation and our economy.

The Production Tax Credit has helped to create good-paying jobs across the country, including 7,000 in my home State of Illinois. Because of uncertainty, the wind industry is hurting and job losses have already begun. The failure to extend the Production Tax Credit will result in the loss of 37,000 of the 78,000 American wind jobs. Those are not just numbers on a sheet of paper; they represent people and families and communities.

This is not a partisan issue. Eighty-nine percent of Americans, including 84 percent of Republicans, want more wind power. We must act to extend the Production Tax Credit for wind without delay. The American people can't wait any longer.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, impending budget cuts under sequestration pose a serious risk to America's leadership in a variety of areas. The one in particular that I want to focus on today is the serious risk to America's leadership on a clean-energy economy and to developing grid-scale energy infrastructure, made possible in part by the Production Tax Credit. These investments help to ensure our Nation's energy security and independence while spurring growth in a wind industry that supports over 70,000 jobs nationwide, including hundreds in Rhode Island.

Mr. Speaker, Rhode Island receives 7 percent of its State revenue from Federal grants that are subject to sequestration. Unless averted by Congress, it

could threaten the health of Rhode Island's local economies and risk another national recession.

I know we have difficult choices ahead; but if there's one mandate both parties can claim from the November election, it is to solve our Nation's economic and fiscal challenges together. Although we may not agree on all aspects of a solution, we can all agree on the need to address the impending problem. The clock is ticking.

#### SUPPORTING RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank all of the members, first of all, of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition for working so hard to protect vital funding for environmental programs, including renewable energy initiatives from the so-called fiscal cliff.

Renewable energy research is the first step for job creation and building up American manufacturing. I'm proud to say that in my own district we're leading the way with a vibrant renewable energy research industry led by the University of California at Berkeley, the East Bay Municipal Utility District, the PolyPlus Battery Company, and the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab. They and others work day and night on innovations that will power our future and fuel our economy.

Mr. Speaker, we must end the billions we give in special tax breaks and subsidies to Big Oil and instead invest in manufacturing and green renewable energy projects here at home. And ending the Bush-era tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires will create more revenue for ending our dependence on foreign oil.

#### DON'T RAISE ELIGIBILITY AGE FOR MEDICARE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, we're in these fiscal cliff talks, and the President and the Speaker are trying to work out a solution. They're talking about tax rates for the top 2 percent and taxing their wealth. That's something they should do because it's fair and it gives the other 98 percent tax relief. But at the same time they're talking about increasing the Medicare age from 65 to 67. That's taxing the wealth of the less fortunate people who are 65 and 67. For them and for everybody, your health is your wealth. Jimmy Copeland, a friend and semi-philosopher, said that "your health is your wealth." If you raise the Medicare age from 65 to 67, you're going to sacrifice the health of people who are not the most fortunate. So while we tax the income of the most wealthy, we'll be taxing what wealth the less wealthy

have—their health. That's wrong. Mr. President and Mr. Speaker should not increase that age and tax the poor.

#### LET'S WORK TOGETHER

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Speaking in the instance of deliberations, redundancy is sometimes good. So I join my colleagues in again placing the defining word "nonstarter" on any idea to raise the eligibility age for Medicare for hardworking seniors, but hardworking Americans.

Let me clarify that Medicare is earned; it is not a handout. The word that we use as "entitlement" sometimes now has become on the order of what ObamaCare used to be. An entitlement is entitled because of earning it, and that goes to Social Security—which is solvent until 2037—and even Medicaid for seniors who are in nursing homes who have worked.

So if we move that aside to look long term at how we begin to look at entitlements, we're open-minded. But the bottom line is let's pass the middle class tax cuts that are for 100 percent of Americans. Let's join Senator TOM COBURN: I'm for raising revenue because we have to; or Senator CORKER: There's a growing body of folks who are willing to look at the rate on the top 2 percent; or KAY GRANGER: Extending middle class tax cuts is just the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, let's get busy in a bipartisan way.

□ 1230

#### MANTI TE'O

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, much of Hawaii was waiting this past Saturday for word of whether one of our own, Manti Te'o, would win the Heisman trophy. It would have been a first for Hawaii. Manti shares Punahou, the same high school alma mater as President Obama, and his story is compelling.

Manti is someone who has trained so hard with his parents solidly by his side to play football well. You should hear the stories by his father. He plays the game for the sense of camaraderie and the building of friendships. He is not only gifted, but a very humble young man. But many may not know that he may not have played his senior year because he lost his girlfriend and grandmother within 4 days of each other. He did play because he promised his girlfriend that he would.

Manti, you have made many of us all proud, especially those of us from Hawaii. And to you and your teammates from Hawaii, Robby Toma and Kona Schwenke, we say, go fighting Irish! Mahalo and aloha.

#### TAX CREDITS AND TAX CUTS

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, the permission I request is to make two simple requests to my friends in the Republican leadership and to the Rules Committee, and that is to bring to the floor two bills. One is to extend middle class tax cuts for 98 percent of the country. So that has been passed by the Senate. It provides relief to so many Americans. It should be done immediately, and it will be passed overwhelmingly here in the House of Representatives. So the request is the middle class tax cuts. Let's bring them to the floor. That deals with a big portion of the budget conversation that's going on today in Washington.

Second is for the production tax credit to be brought to the floor. Thousands of jobs all across the country are dependent upon that tax credit. Again, it would be passed overwhelmingly if it were brought to the floor. There's no reason to hold these up any longer. We need to pass these. I ask the Republican leadership and the Rules Committee to bring them to the floor.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 827 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 827

*Resolved*, That it shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of December 28, 2012, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Fairport, New York, my dear friend, the ranking member on the committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. I rise today in support of this rule, which will provide this body the ability to consider legislation under suspension of the rules for

the remainder of this Congress. However, I would prefer not really to be here today talking about this resolution. I was speaking with the gentlewoman, Ms. SLAUGHTER, a few minutes ago, and we concluded that it sounds a lot like Christmas, and that's why we're all here. It must be Christmastime, and so we're going to work all the way through. But I'd like to be home with my constituents, I'd like to be home with the family, I'd like to be doing things. But the reality is that Congress will have to remain in session for the holiday season because we're the ones that said we would help solve the problems of this country, that we would step up to the plate on behalf of the American people and make sure we did what we said we'd do, and that is to make life better for people. We set the dates, we set the timing, and that's why we're here.

So while families all across the country are with their loved ones, we will be here working. We said we would, and what we're going to wait for is our two sides, our leaders, the President of the United States, Barack Obama, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, certainly Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, to lead those efforts to find a legislative deal that is designed to avoid America and this country, including our government, from going off the fiscal cliff. We have heard a lot about that. We are speaking about it. We've had discussions on the floor today about it. That's why we're here. And we're trying to make sure that we, as Members of Congress from both parties, are here trying to help resolve that so we can still do work in between that period of time.

So, 2 weeks ago, House Republicans proposed this solution of trying to make sure that we would have an answer. The President has come back with a solution, and we now know where to point where. Our friends, the Democrats, are insisting upon a tax increase to move forward, and Republicans are saying, hold on, hold on; we need new revenue, but we don't need new taxes, especially taxes on small business owners that are the creators of jobs in our economy. And so Republicans are saying, we're not going to fall victim for being for the President's ideas and the Democrats' ideas that destroy 700,000 American jobs.

So, here we are. We're here. We're going to stay here in town. Republicans have resolved to stay here. We said we'd sit at the table, we said we would do the American workers' and the American people's bidding at the table to make sure that we have a bipartisan answer, and that's what we are going to do.

So we all remember that following the election in November that our Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, committed that this body would continue working with the President to reach a compromise that averts the fiscal cliff. Avoiding the fiscal cliff is what we should continue to do, and we should work very diligently. So for my friends

that wonder why we're here, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, our families, we're here. We're going to keep working. We're going to work day in and day out, and we're going to hope that our leadership, including the President, is able to make counteroffers until we reach that exact point where a deal can be done.

This is not just about negotiating. It is about finding an answer for the American people. By the way, for people that think this is all about politics and the things that are going on, perhaps it is, but it's going to take both sides—two sides, two willing partners—to want to come to an agreement. That's why we're still in town.

To date, I know we've not seen a lot of progress, and I know we are worried about it. But I would remind us, and I believe this is true, that the President said he is going to stay at the table, he is going to work with Republicans, he is going to get a deal that's good for the American people, and the President said this during the election, and so I think we're here to make sure that is what happens.

Mr. Speaker, in less than 20 days, in addition to the beginning of the New Year, we're going to find out that we also have a new set of taxes that have already been agreed to by the Congress. Ms. PELOSI, when she was Speaker, and the President ran through something that the President likes to call ObamaCare. But there are massive taxes already ahead in law for the American people, many of which we're just now becoming aware of. I guess that's what happens when you don't read the bill before you pass it. But every single American will see their personal taxes already go up, and that's before we get to whatever happens with the fiscal cliff.

□ 1240

This is an arbitrary across-the-board tax increase, the combination of which will mean that if we are unable to resolve the fiscal cliff without raising taxes, we'll already see a lot of new taxes as a result of the health care law on financial transactions, on insurance programs, on every single working American. That's why we have Speaker JOHN BOEHNER trying to present President Obama with an alternative that says rather than raising taxes, which is already going to happen on January 1 from this massive new tax increase that was in the health care bill, why don't we find a way to understand and have the economy take that in hand first.

I know the President stood here at the State of the Union address and said we're not going to spend one dime of taxpayer money. I know the President stood here and said every single American can keep their own insurance plan. I know the President has made these promises to the American people, and these are the things that we're going to have to understand about January 1 of next year. I believe that's why we need to have JOHN BOEHNER be

successful, and the President, to make sure we avoid further tax increases because we already have a massive tax increase that's going to take place. This would, in essence, be a double whammy on not just a fragile economy, but an economy that is in far worse shape with a country that is far more in debt and much more at risk today.

So you and I understand, the CBO has estimated some 2 million American jobs would be at risk because of the ObamaCare implementation and its massive impact on the free-enterprise system and taxation, combined with what would be this new—if the President gets his way—tax increase on working Americans and, in particular, small business.

While much has been made about the debates surrounding tax rates, there is, I think, a larger picture that we need to consider. We should focus on employment and jobs. Instead of trying to necessarily aim for fairness just by using this weapon against small business, we should focus, I think, on job creation.

We understand that if the President's bill passes, we will lose 700,000 jobs. That means 700,000 Americans and their families would then qualify, I presume, for unemployment, and it would mean that we begin the new year once again on a negative pathway. That's why we are here today talking and trying to have our leaders of this great Nation make sure that we avoid this.

This country is in desperate need of an economic kick-start. Lower taxes, we believe, through stimulating job creation and job investment and by stimulating the economy, will allow all Americans not only to keep their jobs but also to keep more of their own hard-earned pay. In fact, President John F. Kennedy, I think, agreed with us when he said:

It is a paradoxical truth that tax rates are too high and tax revenues are too low, and the soundest way to increase revenues in the long run is to cut rates now.

That's exactly where we are. Republicans are arguing not to increase taxes at a time when the American economy is struggling, when families are struggling. Let's not ask them to go into their pockets and pay more to a government that simply wants to spend more of this money.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues and I remain committed to staying in Washington, D.C., to try and get this done. Between now and then, what this rule is all about is saying that we're going to put us to work on solving some of the ideas and issues that remain in the workplace where there are answers with suspension votes. So that's why we're here today pending conference reports and decisions that need to be made.

I encourage my colleagues to support this rule with a "yes" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do want to thank my true and good friend, Mr. SESSIONS, for yielding this time; and I want to congratulate him on his ascension to the chair of the Rules Committee. I look forward to working with him.

I think, though, what we want to do this morning perhaps is debate the health care bill one more time. It's not enough that this House in the last term debated it 32 times at least to try to repeal all or part of it, and we know that not a single person on the other side voted for that bill. But as it gets more and more popular in the United States, I think sooner or later they'll wish that they had.

There is one comment I need to make before I get to the business at hand, and that is the notion that it was rammed through in the middle of the night. The health care bill went through the entire committee process. There are pieces in there that Republican members of committees put in. Although they may not want to admit it, they're there. In addition, the Democratic Caucus, under the leadership of NANCY PELOSI, went over that bill line by line three times. I remember it well.

But let me get to the business at hand because, Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen an honest day's work from Congress here in quite a while.

Earlier this year, the Columbia Broadcasting System News reported that it costs \$24 million a week to run the House of Representatives. But for the last month, the majority has spent the money on shuttling us back and forth to Washington and then asking us to sit here and twiddle our thumbs. No more. It's time to get down to brass tacks and give the American people a return on their multimillion dollar investment. We need to start right here and right now by passing the tax cut for the middle class. We could do it tomorrow. All we have to do is take up the Senate bill. It's right there.

In addition to that, we ought to really take up the Violence Against Women Act from the Senate, not the House bill. The House bill did not include numbers of women in America under this act: Native American women, gay women, and immigrant women. We couldn't tolerate that. So let's take the Senate bill and pass it. That bill has reduced domestic violence 67 percent. We need to reduce it 100 percent, but we cannot do without that. It's terribly important.

The farm bill is important, but we'll get to more of that. I cannot say enough that we absolutely need—and I think so many people this morning on 1-minute made the point clear. I know that numbers of Republicans want to do it in a bipartisan way. What we can do is what we've already agreed on, and that is that the middle class should not have a tax increase, but that the richer people in this country should be paying their fair share. There is simply no reason for this delay. Once those tax cuts are passed, then we can move on to the

countless other issues that I've already mentioned that demand our attention. We can extend unemployment insurance. It's set to expire on January 1 and will affect millions and certainly affect our economy. We can give support to millions of Americans struggling to recover from Hurricane Sandy. We can begin an open debate, as I said, on the Violence Against Women Act.

Historians have said that this term of Congress these last 2 years has been the least productive in American history. That is not anything to be proud of, but the majority seems to be intent on keeping that title. They spent 2 years taking vote after vote to repeal health care and even more time to make sure that the \$4 billion subsidy to the big oil companies stays intact. It's shameless, and we need to do more than that. The people who sent us here deserve more than that. We should not be crying out in the wilderness to work. We have been sent here to work, and we need to get down to it in the final hours of this Congress. We have always had the threat of a working Christmas. If we have to do it to get things done, I'm certainly willing to do that. But the majority should help solve the Nation's most pressing issues. That's why we're here. Do not actively choose—as that's what's going on—to leave the work unfinished.

As we sit and wait for the negotiations on the fiscal cliff, there is always other legislation that is ready, that could be done now, could help our markets, could relieve the minds of employer, could give security to the middle class and people below that; and we certainly ought to be doing it.

All we're doing now with today's rule is giving the majority the freedom to spend the rest of this month and the rest of this year on minor, non-controversial legislation. I refuse to give this blank check to a majority that has yet to show any interest in completing outstanding work.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing today's rule so that we can try to get back to work. This Wednesday should be the day we start doing our job to provide real solutions to those we represent who have real problems.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1250

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman makes a number of good points. We did pass in the House the Violence Against Women Act. It passed on May 16 of this year, 222-205. The House has passed, by the way—256 of our colleagues to 171—what's called the Job Protection and Recession Prevention Act. It was passed on August 1.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I will yield in just a second.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would have extended all current rates and would

have compelled Congress to enact meaningful tax reform in 2013. We passed this. We've said we ought to do what we should do, and that was back in August.

I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank you, Mr. SESSIONS, because I know you, and I know that you understand that I've already talked about this. That bill that passed this House excluded a large number of women. Basically, what this House said with that vote was to go ahead and beat them up, that we don't want them covered.

After the election, after what everybody has been through, after what the American public thinks about what a large number of our cohorts believe here, surely to goodness, you would not recommend that that bill become the law of the land. The simple thing we're asking for is to take up the Senate bill, which covers everybody in domestic violence.

Mr. SESSIONS. In reclaiming my time, I do appreciate the gentlewoman in that we will be engaged in many of these debates. We have been in the past, and we will be in the future. I think the gentlewoman makes a good point.

We offered this bill. We debated it. We passed it. We are waiting for the Senate to get to a point at which they can get to conference. I mean, this is how this thing works. We're not going to take the Senate bill and pass it. We passed our bill. Now, if we could get to conference, where the Senate and the House get together and they resolve their differences, then we can bring it back, and we'll have a bill. That's supposed to be how this place works. It's not where we pass our bill and then, all of a sudden, we decide we're just going to take the Senate bill and re-pass it and negotiate with ourselves. I think what we need to do is to stick to what we understand, and that is that we are waiting for the Senate to come and do business with us.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to a young, new member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. He will be our chairman next year, and I'm looking forward to his leadership.

We are kind of setting the tone for what's going to happen next year. I said all through the fall, Mr. Speaker, that this was going to be that opportunity, that we were going to have to kind of define where this Congress was going to go for the next 2 years.

I'd say to my friend from New York, for whom I have great respect and with whom I've enjoyed working on the Rules Committee for 2 years, Mr. Speaker, that this rule today does exactly what my constituents back home have asked me to come back to Washington to do. The gentlelady cited bill after bill after bill that I have been proud to support to try to rip the

President's health care bill out by its roots. We absolutely worked hard at that. Of course, the Senate hasn't cooperated with us and the President hasn't cooperated with us, so we weren't able to get that done.

What this rule does is to say let's move beyond those controversial topics, and let's move beyond those topics that we know we could jam through. For Pete's sake, there's a Republican majority in this House. We could jam through absolutely any piece of legislation we wanted to jam through. But what this rule says is that that's not the way to finish out the year. The way to finish out this year is to make sure that we're grabbing each piece of legislation out there that has bipartisan support. Let's grab each piece of legislation out there that folks have been laboring on for 2 years, that folks have brought together a consensus around and brought together a majority behind, and let's pass those things.

I think that's fantastic. I think that's fantastic that every single bill that Members have been investing their energy in they'll now have a chance to move to the floor. My frustration is, what about the bills that we've already worked on here in a bipartisan way that have yet to be taken up on the Senate side?

I heard from my constituents in a town hall meeting last night, and somebody said, Rob, why do you always put everything off until the last minute? Why didn't you deal with this sequester earlier?

I said, Do you mean like back in May when the U.S. House passed the only sequester replacement bill to have been passed in this town? It was back in May.

He said, Okay. Maybe that takes care of the sequester problem, but why didn't you fix these tax rates?

I said, Well, we did. As my friend from Texas just pointed out, what about back in August? In a bipartisan way, we passed a bill in this House to extend current tax rates for everyone in order to prevent tax rates from going up.

Then I took another question from one of the folks who said, But what about that Senate bill people keep talking about? What about the Senate bill? Why won't that get a vote in the House?

I said, Well, actually, it's quite unusual in the Rules Committee. You don't see it very often when a tax bill is coming to the floor. The Rules Committee back in August, when we were voting on taxes in general, waived all the points of order, took all the roadblocks out of the way, in kind of an unprecedented way, to allow what we call the Levin amendment, which was, basically, exactly the plan the President has been pushing, which is to raise taxes on family-owned businesses, to punish those job creators.

We took that vote here on the House floor, and I'm proud to say that, again, in a bipartisan way, Republicans and

Democrats came together, rejected class warfare, and said let's get behind a program that expands the economy for everyone. We passed that tax bill back in August, then again in September. Again, in being worried about this defense sequester that's coming up, we took up the bill from the gentleman from Florida to say, how could we deal with these defense sequestrations in a responsible way?

So I go back to May when this House did its work. I go back to August when this House did its work. I go back to September when this House did its work. There is proposal after proposal after proposal that, as the gentleman from Texas said, we could take to conference tomorrow.

If I could ask the gentleman from Texas, because you know better than I: I know this rule allows for suspensions to come to the floor, but what about that? What about when the Senate decides to get to work and takes up the companion legislation to some of these bills that we've passed in the House? Will we be able to move to go to conference?

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate the gentleman's engaging me. I would say to you there is nothing in this rule that will preclude our taking a conference report or any business on what we might call "regular order" that would require a rule to come forth.

Mr. WOODALL. So, as the gentlelady from New York was talking about some of these important pieces of legislation coming to the floor, you're saying, if the House appoints conferees and if the Senate appoints conferees, we can get together and bring legislation back to the House for every piece of legislation that she has on her agenda?

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentleman would be correct, and we do expect those.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

This is exactly the kind of deliberative House that I came to be a part of just 2 short years ago. We have the ability to get these things done in the next few days. I reject the idea that I read over and over and over again, Mr. Speaker, that this House has been delaying action. This House got it right. We got it right in our budget in April of 2011. We got it right in our budget in 2012. We got it right when we passed a sequester replacement. We got it right when we passed a tax replacement—and we're getting it right with this rule today, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to our leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you very much, Ranking Member.

Mr. Speaker, why did I sort of smell smoke when I heard this debate? It's reminiscent of Nero fiddling while Rome burned. The American people are waiting for us to get the job done here, not to make a myriad of excuses about why stuff hasn't been done.

You're bringing up a rule that says we should have a suspension authority?

Let's bring the middle-income tax cut up under suspension. I believe—and I am willing to take the chance—that this House would give over two-thirds of a vote to the middle-income tax cut.

Do I detect your smirk to mean that you don't think Republicans will vote for a middle-income tax cut, Mr. SESSIONS? Should I take it to mean that you will continue to hold middle-income tax cuts hostage, giving tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country?

The unfairness of it is appalling. The fact that it increases the deficit is disgraceful, and that it does not create jobs is a big mistake for us to make.

What we are asking for in this rule is to say "no" to the previous question so that we can take up a rule that says that we cannot leave here until we and unless we pass the middle-income tax cut, whatever else happens on a whole myriad of other issues that relate to the cliff. This matters, what happens here. It matters that we get the job done. It is relevant to the lives of the American people.

□ 1300

As we gather here—we, a country of great family tradition, of family values, of commitment to faith, faith in ourselves, our families and our God, our country—we are away from home while people are lighting a Menorah candle, a Chanukah candle, while people are trimming trees and the rest of that. Okay, we're here to do our job. But we hear from the Republican side that they might not be ready to relieve the pain and curiosity that American families have about whether we are going to get this done. They are going to put this off until the very last minute, as to whether the markets will have confidence on how to grow the economy and create jobs and remove all doubt—remove all doubt in the full faith and credit in the United States of America.

Every time you come to this floor, it's an existential question: Why are we here? We are here to do the people's work. Let's sit down, get it done, and move forward, instead of filling the agenda, however worthy some of those initiatives may be; instead of, not along with, passing a middle-income tax cut.

This is also reminiscent of a year ago. The President proposed, the Senate Democrats and Republicans voted for the payroll tax holiday. The Republicans in the House resisted, painted themselves into a corner until they had no choice. The issue had been made too hot for them to handle, and they finally had to come around to supporting the payroll tax holiday.

And here we are again.

One hundred percent of the American people will receive a tax cut when we pass the middle-income tax cut. The wealthiest people in our country will receive a tax cut up to their income of \$250,000. We're asking them to pay a little bit more for what they make over

\$250,000 a year to help reduce the deficit, to help grow the economy. Grow the economy. That growth is what is essential. If you want to reduce the deficit, create jobs.

So why aren't we doing that? Why are we just having all this subterfuge and this, that, and the other thing? Why are we being told to make a reservation on Christmas Eve and one on the day after Christmas to come back. Is there not an appreciation for the Jewish holidays, the Christmas holidays, Kwanzaa, all the other things that families come together around, bonding rituals important to the strength of our society? Do we not care about that? Well, the American people do. And they want to shop for it. They want to have family dinners and they want to exchange gifts, as is the tradition. But they really don't know if they're going to be able to pay the bill in January for their purchases in December.

The President has been very clear: Democrats have agreed to \$1.6 trillion in cuts, much of it voted on—all of it voted on already either in the Budget Control Act or in other actions taken by this Congress in the course of this Congress. We have already taken a savings of over a trillion dollars, redirected savings in Medicare to prolong its life and to increase benefits. That would be \$700 billion in the Affordable Care Act and now another \$400 billion or such in the President's budget. We're committed to that.

Where are the tax cuts? Where are the tax cuts for the middle class that would inject demand into the economy and would therefore create jobs and create growth? Where are the revenues that we would get if we did that and then had the additional participation of those who make over \$250,000? Where is the revenue that the Republicans are willing to bring to the table? All we've seen from them is a letter. All we've heard from them is that they don't want to tax the rich. All we know is that the public is very much on board with everyone in our country paying his or her fair share.

And so this rule today that says give us authority to have other bills brought to the floor, well, if one of those bills is the middle-income tax cut, we're happy with that. But if that isn't the plan, then I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question because that will then enable us to bring a rule to the floor which calls for bringing forth the middle-income tax cut before we leave here.

Again, we support the President and his proposal, which is fair, which reduces the deficit, which creates jobs, and which will work for the American people.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, with great respect to my dear friend, the gentlewoman from San Francisco and minority leader, I'm delighted that she came down to engage us on this very important issue. The gentlewoman does recognize and know that the

House on August 1, in fact, did exactly what she is suggesting today, and that is to take action on what the future tax rates would be in this country. And on a bipartisan basis, 256-171, this House of Representatives said let's understand that now is a bad time to raise taxes on the American people; and let's extend for a period of time all of what are known as the tax cuts which allow America to keep working. We passed it 256-171.

Mr. Speaker, I'll insert into the RECORD a chart that exists on the House Budget Committee that shows the choice of the futures. And one future that was presented, this slide that I've got that's on the House Budget Committee is essentially about the current pathway as the President would choose as outlined in his budget that the gentlewoman, Ms. PELOSI, spoke of that got no votes in the United States Senate. Not one vote. No votes here, the plan that the President has presented which would substantially not just raise taxes, but substantially raise spending.

If you isolate the President's ideas of simply raising taxes on whatever he calls the top 2 percent, those who have a household income of \$250,000 and above, what you essentially do, Mr. Speaker, is very quickly lose 700,000 American jobs. And that's the answer that this administration fails to include in their talking points, that there's a huge impact. And part of that impact, Mr. Speaker, comes from the problem where dividends, and dividends are that money that comes back as a result of an investment, would rise essentially from 15 percent to whatever a person's top tax rate is—meaning it could go, at least under the scenario that the President wants, to 39 percent. That means from 15 to 39 percent.

That window, that value in between is what people reinvest in their companies. They reinvest that many times in small business, and that's the job creation element. When you make this rate go up, you arbitrarily take away some 700,000 American jobs that need current capital every day, a small business owner, reputting that money, re-investing that money for the life of their business.

And this is the part that we believe as Republicans, that we stand on the side of saying we shouldn't lose American jobs just for the sake of fairness, of what the President, what the minority leader is down arguing for, of increasing taxes.

□ 1310

So it's obvious to Republicans that what we believe we stand for is creation of jobs and making sure that that capital that's invested in the economy continues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the assistant Democrat leader.

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, when the so-called supercommittee failed last year to overcome the obstruction of the Tea Party Republicans and their leader, Grover Norquist, to achieve a fair and balanced plan for deficit reduction, economic growth, and job creation, I said it would take a decisive national election in order to settle the matter. I believe President Obama's victory on November 6 was very decisive and pretty definitive.

During the campaign, President Obama very clearly laid out his vision, and the American people strongly affirmed his position. The President won all but one of the swing States, 62 percent of the Electoral College, and carried the popular vote by more than 4½ million votes. Democrats added to our numbers in the House and Senate and captured a House popular vote by more than a million votes.

In February 2010, President Obama began the process to reduce our deficit by establishing the Simpson-Bowles Commission. Since that time, many bipartisan groups have made recommendations on how to reduce the deficit, and they have all been in agreement: We need a balanced deal that requires shared sacrifice from all Americans, including the wealthy.

In 2011, we began to reduce the deficit, but we did it entirely through spending cuts, over \$1.5 trillion, and have asked nothing of the most fortunate.

In 2012, the American people spoke. It is time for balance and shared sacrifice, and the first step is to allow the Bush tax cuts for income over \$250,000 to expire. But that is a debate for another day. Now we must do what we agreed on, extend the tax cuts for everyone on their first \$250,000 of income.

The proposals put forth by the Republicans since the election and their refusal to extend the middle class tax cuts, which we all agree should be extended, are just more of the same obstructionism.

The time for posturing is over. It's time for our House Republicans to accept the express will of the American people and get beyond their pledge to a special interest lobbyist here in Washington, D.C.; although, frankly, I fail to see how voting to cut taxes violates a pledge to never raise taxes.

We need to defeat the previous question.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind the gentleman that Republicans have already passed the bill for the middle class tax cut on August 1 of this year, and it passed 256-171. We're now waiting for the Senate to act on that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'll gladly yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If you're in the middle class, shouldn't it feel like you're in the middle of America? Yet the politics of extremism is pushing the middle class to the very edge—the very edge.

Our House Republican colleagues continue to ignore the calls from the American people to extend middle class tax cuts now. That politics of extremism is threatening to raise taxes on the middle class by the amount of about \$2,200 starting January 1.

Republicans should, once and for all, join with Democrats and the American public to bring the bipartisan, Senate-passed middle class tax cut bill to a vote on the House floor. Passage of the bipartisan middle class tax cut bill ensures that 98 percent of Americans and 97 percent of small businesses don't see a single tax increase next year.

Democrats and two-thirds of the American people agree with a growing number of Republicans who are telling their Republican colleagues, Take the 98 percent deal; take the 98 percent deal.

My friends, this is not the time to put a foot on the brake of our economic recovery that we're beginning to experience. It's time to get our work done.

Remember, colleagues, where we were 4 years ago. Four years ago, November 2008, our country was hemorrhaging 800,000 American jobs. This November, we got the news, 146,000 new jobs. It's time to continue that progress.

Let's stop abiding by these pledges to special interests and start abiding by our pledge to the United States of America and to the people who elected us to serve the interest of all Americans, not those of special interests. Let's pass this middle class tax cut bill now.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just make sure that the speaker that was up here, Mr. BECERRA, understands that on August 1 of this year we passed a bill to extend tax cuts for the middle class, 256-171. We've already done that, and it's now awaiting Senate approval.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I want to thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for his efforts as well.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, we talked a lot about, correctly, creating certainty, alleviating uncertainty, alleviating angst among our people and among our economy.

We have an opportunity to bring certainty to a large segment of the America that they will not receive a tax increase on January 1. We have that abil-

ity because the United States Senate has acted on a bill which will allow us to do that.

Even if we don't take their bill up, we could take a bill that TIM WALZ has introduced. Congressman WALZ has introduced a bill which will say to the 98 percent that we've talked about, You won't get a tax increase. I think that we have agreement on that. As the gentleman from Texas indicated, we have agreement on that.

I think there's not anybody here—or very, very few at least, on either side of the aisle—who doesn't say that those who are making \$250,000 or less as families or \$200,000 as individuals, or less, shouldn't get a tax increase.

Now, there are some who say that those above should not get a tax increase either. I understand that. But we have disagreement on that.

The American people are frustrated by the fact that even that on which we have agreement we can't move. That's their frustration. They understand that we have policy differences, but they are hopeful that when, at least, we have agreement on an issue that we can move it. And if we did so, think of the confidence.

Mr. COLE, former—had your job as the chairman of the Campaign Committee, said let's pass this. Let's give the middle class, the working people of America, a Christmas present, a sense of certainty, a sense of self-confidence, a sense of well-being. That will be good for our economy, but certainly good for them individually and as families as well.

So I would urge my colleagues on the Republican side and my colleagues on the Democratic side, vote against the previous question.

□ 1320

Now that's somewhat esoteric, Mr. Speaker. Those watching us say, What does that mean, voting against the previous question? What's the previous question? That's some sort of political jargon that they use in Washington.

What it means is, if we vote against the previous question, we will then be empowered to bring forward the middle class tax cut bill and we'll put it on the floor, and Mr. WALZ will be our leader on this because he's put it in the hopper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. We'll put that on the floor, and every Member of this House, all 435 Members, will have the opportunity to say to the American people, Yes, on December 12, we're going to tell you that on January 1 your taxes will not go up.

Give us that opportunity. Give us that opportunity to say "yes" to the American middle class. Give us the opportunity to say "yes" to certainty in our economy. Give us the opportunity to say "yes," we agree on something,

and aren't you proud of the fact that when we agree, your Congress can act? Let's say "yes."

Vote "no" on the previous question, and then vote "yes" for the middle class.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the gentleman, my dear friend from Maryland, whom I have not only regular conversations with but enjoy very much. I would once again remind the gentleman that on August 1 of this year we passed, 256-171, an idea that would be about not losing 700,000 jobs by doing it the way that our friends the Democrats want to do it.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. It's never wrong to do the right thing twice.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, it is wrong to lose 700,000 more American jobs, and that's the practical effect.

The minority leader and our speakers here all day want to talk about sequestration. The sequestration came as a result of a promise, a deal, an agreement that we as Republicans and House and Senate and the President agreed upon that we would come to an agreement upon how to cut some spending. The President says it's absolutely essential. Now they want to back away from the deal.

Well, here's what their deal is:

Their deal is, among other things, about the new taxes that will take place. Here's one of them that we know will happen already under law: Medicare DSH payments paid to qualifying hospitals that serve low-income patients will be reduced by 75 percent starting October 1, 2013, in addition to the \$700 billion that will be transferred away from senior care. And I know we had an election where we talked about this. One person tried to explain, Well, that's not really right. Those were to a certain group of people that may be rich. But it's right here, to low-income hospitals. That means that we're going to have hospitals that no longer will serve seniors because their payment rate got cut by 75 percent. Tax increases, tax increases on health care; tax increases, as we learned last week, when it was announced that all insurance plans will now be paying an extra \$63. Those are passed on to customers, consumers.

This is an outrageous government takeover of health care, and now what they want to do is diminish another 700,000 jobs. No, sir, we're not going to fall victim to that.

[From the House Committee on Small Business]

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is currently being implemented. The following table lists some of the provisions affecting small businesses that take effect in 2013.

## PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT—PROVISIONS EFFECTIVE IN 2013

Provision Law, Section (Effective date)	Description	Consequences for small businesses
Medicare Tax Increase ..... P.L. No. 111-148, Sec. 9015 (January 1, 2013)	The Medicare Part A tax rate on wages increases from 1.45% to 2.35% for those single filers earning over \$200,000 (\$250,000 for married joint filers). A new and additional 3.8% tax will be assessed on unearned income such as taxable capital gains, dividends, rents, royalties, and interest for taxpayers with modified adjusted gross income (MAGI) over \$200,000 single and \$250,000 married joint filers.	Small businesses structured as pass-through entities that earn over the threshold amount will pay a significantly higher Medicare Part A tax rate. Small businesses relying on unearned income will be taxed an additional 3.8%.
New Medical Device Tax ..... P.L. No. 111-148, Sec. 9009 (January 1, 2013)	A 2.3% excise tax will be levied on manufacturers, producers, or importers on the sale of most medical devices that are not directly marketed to consumers.	Higher costs for the manufacturers of medical devices are likely to be passed on to health care entities (often small and solo practice physicians and hospitals) and patients who rely on them. Several device manufacturers have already announced job cuts in anticipation of this tax.
Decrease in Deductions for Medical Expenses ..... P.L. No. 111-148, Sec. 9013 (January 1, 2013)	The threshold for claiming an itemized deduction on medical expenses rises from 7.5% to 10% of adjusted gross income for those under age 65 effective in 2013; for those 65 or older, the 10% threshold will be effective after 2016.	Given the increased qualifying threshold, fewer small business owners and workers may be permitted to claim itemized deductions for medical expenses.
Limit on Flexible Spending Account (FSA) Contributions ..... P.L. No. 111-148, Sec. 9005 (January 1, 2013)	Caps FSA contributions at \$2,500 per year	The new limit increases the tax burden for small business owners and employees with FSAs.
Elimination of Deduction for Employer Part D Subsidy ..... P.L. No. 111-148, Sec. 9012 (January 1, 2013)	Prior to ACA, employers were able to deduct the cost of providing Medicare Part D to retirees and also were not taxed on the subsidy they received for providing this coverage. ACA eliminated the additional deduction employers receive for providing Part D coverage.	The number of employers offering prescription drug plans for Medicare-eligible retirees is likely to decrease, as there will be a reduced incentive to sponsor such plans.
Reduced Medicare Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) Payments ..... P.L. No. 111-148, Sec. 3133 (October 1, 2013)	Medicare DSH payments, paid to qualifying hospitals that serve low-income patients, will be reduced by 75% starting October 1, 2013. A hospital will receive an additional payment based on three factors: 1) the remaining pool of DSH payments that would have been paid absent these changes; 2) current estimates of the uninsured compared to the estimate for 2013, the last year before the expansion of coverage; and 3) the hospital-specific share of uncompensated care. The estimate of the percentage of individuals who are uninsured will be decreased by 0.1 percentage points for FY2014 and by 0.2 percentage points for each year from FY2015–FY2019.	Small hospitals that currently receive Medicare DSH payments may find their DSH payments reduced.
Reduced Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital Payments ..... P.L. No. 111-148, Sec. 2551 as modified by Sec. 10201(e); P.L. 111-152: Sec. 1203 (October 1, 2013)	In FY2012, Medicaid DSH allotments to states (i.e., the maximum amount of federal matching funds that each state is permitted to claim for Medicaid DSH payments) totaled \$11.3 billion. Medicaid DSH allotments to states will be reduced by \$500 million in FY2014, \$600 million in FY2015, \$600 million in FY2016, \$1.8 billion in FY2017, \$5.0 billion in FY2018, \$5.6 billion in FY2019, and \$4.0 billion in FY2020. The Secretary of Health and Human Services is responsible for determining how to distribute the aggregate DSH reductions among the states using some broad statutory guidelines.	Small hospitals that currently receive Medicaid DSH payments may find their DSH payments reduced.
Increase in Medicaid Medicaid Payments for Primary Care ..... P.L. No. 111-418, Sec. 1202 (January 1, 2013)	Medicaid payments for primary care services furnished by physicians with a specialty designation of family medicine, general internal medicine, or pediatric medicine will increase to 100% of Medicare payment rates for CY2013 and CY2014 (i.e., January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2014).	Small and solo practices with physicians specializing in family medicine, general internal medicine, or pediatric medicine will receive larger Medicaid reimbursements (equal to 100% of Medicare payments) for primary care services for a 2-year period beginning in January 2013.
State Notification Regarding Exchanges ..... P.L. 111-148, Sec. 1321 December 14, 2012, February 15, 2013)	States will have indicated to the Department of Health and Human Services by December 14, 2012 whether they will be creating a state-based American Health Benefit Exchanges and Small Business Health Options (SHOP) Exchanges. A state must declare its intention to create a partnership exchange by February 15, 2013.	Small businesses with 100 or fewer employees for 50 or fewer employees, at state option may be able to purchase insurance through these exchanges. All non-grandfathered plans offered in the individual and small group markets (both inside and outside an exchange) must cover certain minimum benefits (the essential health benefits).

Prepared by Small Business Committee Republican staff.

Sources:

The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, Health Reform Source, Implementation Timeline, 2012.

The Commonwealth Fund, Health Reform Resource Center, Find Health Reform Provisions Tool, 2012.

U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means, Timeline of Major Provisions in the Democrats' Health Care Package, 2010.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself 2 seconds to say it is not a government takeover of health care. It will be performed by private insurance companies.

I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my colleague from New York for yielding me this time.

Ladies and gentlemen of America, this is not a mirage. We are actually here in this building, the U.S. Capitol. America, your Congress is in session and we're here to work, yet my Republican colleagues refuse to bring up the middle class tax cut bill that is right behind me at this desk.

My colleague from Texas can continue to talk about what happened in August of this year—staging votes for the election that took place. And we know the results of that election. What our constituents are concerned about is what happens in January if and when we fail to do our work here, now, and also to expose that the vote that took place in August was a vote to continue the Bush-era tax cuts, the very same tax cuts that got us into the mess we're in right now. They're doing that because they're holding hostage the 98 percent of Americans who will receive a tax cut under Mr. WALZ's bill that's at the desk today. And they're holding

them hostage to make sure that the wealthiest 2 percent continue to get that tax cut.

Our economy is 70 percent consumer-driven. That means when the middle class spends more, we all benefit. When the opposite takes place, when they spend less, we all are worse off for it. Holding the middle class hostage by threatening to raise their taxes not only hurts the American families, but it also hurts America's businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CROWLEY. I think we owe it to our constituents to take this one single vote to ensure the middle class won't be held hostage any longer, one vote to give them the economic certainty that they so desperately need now, and one vote to keep our middle class spending and investing in creating jobs for American businesses. But we can't do that, ladies and gentlemen of America, unless our Republican colleagues allow Mr. WALZ's bill, which is at our desk right now behind me, up for a vote on this floor. That's why I will vote against the previous question, so that we can come back and have an opportunity to include Mr. WALZ's bill in that package.

We're here. We're ready. Let's vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentleman from New York, a very dear friend of mine, really, I think, got something wrong. What we're trying to extend is the law that President Obama signed into law as a result of bipartisan action 2 years ago, and the economy was better then than it is now. We were trying to extend the tax cuts that President Obama was asking us to do, and that's what we simply did in August again. So it is a President Obama last-signed bill that we're trying to offer an extension of.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, my discharge petition at the desk is really an approach that the American people spoke loudly in. Every single one of us just came through an election, and the message was abundantly clear to me: Why do you continue to bicker? Why do you continue to stand on the floor and make these ridiculous Kabuki-dance statements with one another when it shouldn't be that difficult? We came out of a Constitutional Convention, and when they asked James Madison

what the secret to this new government was: compromise, compromise, compromise.

Mr. Speaker, to sit here and do what we're doing—not bringing this forward and releasing the tension on the middle class, making sure the economy knows there's stability amongst taxes—is holding our economy back. And to be very honest, it's insulting to the American people. This is a Nation that won two world wars. This is a Nation that split the atom. This is a Nation that put a man on the Moon. This is a Nation sending pictures back from Mars from Curiosity.

Sign the discharge petition, bring it to the floor, get 435 votes, put it online for 24 hours, send it to the President, and by 3 o'clock tomorrow, the big chunk of the fiscal cliff is done. Don't insult the people with things that aren't true. Don't tell them that it's not about compromise, and don't sit here and pretend like we're working when we're not. They know better. They're smarter. They deserve better.

□ 1330

Bring the discharge petition to the floor, allow Members to vote for it, give the American people what they want—stability and a Congress that works—and let's move on to other pressing issues.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of disagreement about the future of our country. There's disagreement over how to handle spending—what should be cut, what should be reduced, what should be increased. There's disagreement over how much and when to raise the debt ceiling. These are very important questions.

There's a disagreement over whether taxes should or should not go up on income over \$250,000 a year. Our friends on the other side in good faith believe that's a bad idea. We know the economic history tells us that the last time the rates were at the level of 39.6 percent, 600,000 new businesses were formed and 23 million new jobs were created, so we think it works.

But there's something that everyone says they agree on, and that is that income up to \$250,000 a year should not have a tax increase. Everyone on both sides says that when January 1 shows up on the calendar there shouldn't be a tax increase on the middle class people of this country, that their first paycheck on the first Friday of the New Year should not have more taken out of it so as not to hurt our economy or hurt those families. Now, we all say we agree on this. It seems to me the right course is to put a bill on the floor that says exactly that, that says that for in-

come of less than \$250,000 a year, the tax rates for every American should stay where they are now and there should not be a tax increase.

My friend from Texas says that the majority did that in July. That's not quite right. What the majority did in July was to keep the rates low for people making less than \$250,000, but also keep them low for people making more than \$250,000. We just don't agree with that. Why don't we take the 98 percent that we agree on and vote on it right now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend.

If we don't do this, 19 days from today 98 percent of the American people—really 100 percent of the American people—get a tax increase. They have more taken out of their checks. It will hurt shoppers in the stores, diners in the restaurants, it will hurt jobs across the country. So why don't we take the 98 percent that we agree on right now and put it on the floor right now. By voting "no" on the previous question, that's what we can do and should do.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the ranking member on the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that my Republican friends are turning this House of Representatives into a place where trivial issues get debated passionately and important ones not at all.

The bill that we are talking about right now on the House floor basically gives the majority who run this House the authority to bring up suspension bills from now until December 28. Suspension bills, for those who don't know, are bills really of not much consequence, by and large. They are bills that most of the time could pass by a voice vote.

Last night in the Rules Committee the distinguished ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER, suggested that instead of doing suspension bills we ought to be doing bills of some consequence, like reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, doing postal reform, doing a farm bill, or what we're talking about right now—passing a middle class tax cut extension. Those are real things that mean real things to real people in this country, and yet we're not talking about any of those things. We're talking today about basically doing not much of anything between now and December 28.

Last night in the Rules Committee we were told, well, we're trying to negotiate a deal on this fiscal cliff. Well, the reality is that there are a few Members of this House who are probably in discussions with the White

House about trying to work out a deal, but the vast majority here, Democrats and Republicans, are being asked to do nothing. Last night we came back and we voted on one bill, to approve the Journal. That's all we had to do last night, to approve the Journal. We haven't reauthorized the Violence Against Women Act. We haven't extended the middle class tax cut. We haven't reauthorized the farm bill—I can go on and on and on—but we had to come back and have a Journal vote last night.

The time has come for us to get back to work. The election was clear: the views advocated by Governor Romney and the Republican majority were rejected. The President won comfortably. Democrats won more seats in the Senate, we won more seats here in the House. I think it's a pretty clear message that the American people think that we ought to do what's right in terms of balancing the budget, and that is ask the Donald Trumps of the world to pay a little bit more.

We have already cut, I should say to the gentleman, \$1.5 trillion in discretionary spending. A lot of those cuts are in programs that I think help people. So, \$1.5 trillion in discretionary spending we've already cut, and my friends on the Republican side are saying that Donald Trump can't pay one penny more. Give me a break. Give me a break.

This is about fairness. This is about justice. This is about doing the right thing. At the very minimum, we should be debating now not suspension bills, but we should be debating the extension of the middle class tax cut. That is why we need to vote "no" on the previous question, to allow us to bring this bill to the floor.

If my Republican friends say they agree with us on a middle class tax cut, fine, let's vote it, vote overwhelmingly for it. You don't have to agree on everything to agree on something. Let's give the middle class certainty. Let's vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman, my friend, who formerly was the vice chairman of the Rules Committee. I would like to remind him that when he was the vice chairman of the committee, almost half of the 3,075 bills considered under suspension in the 110th and 111th Congress were for post offices and Federal building namings, or resolutions, or things just like National Pollinators Week.

What we're trying to talk about is, at the end of the year, since we're going to be here waiting for the "big deal," that we're going to make sure that we can take ideas that still exist and reside on a bipartisan basis.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I just want to say when we were in charge, we were able to walk and chew gum at the same

time. We passed some pretty important and substantive legislation that I'm proud of. We should be talking about real things that matter to real people right now instead of just extending the suspension authority.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

The message from my constituents and from the American people is loud and clear, and that's to extend the middle class tax cuts now. Republicans are simply holding hostage tax cuts for 98 percent of Americans and 97 percent of small businesses to give more tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans.

Now, Democrats have a commonsense solution, and we can't wait around any longer as real proposals languish while the House GOP gets its act together. Spearheaded by Congressman WALZ, Democrats last week filed the Walz discharge petition to automatically bring to the floor the Senate-passed middle class tax cuts—which the President has said that he will sign immediately—and overwhelmingly Members have signed this discharge petition.

My point is we don't have any time to waste. We can pass this extension of the middle class tax cuts now as we find a bold and balanced and fair agreement to avoid the fiscal cliff. There is a consensus that we do this. So why are the Republicans holding this hostage?

Once again, let us vote "no" on the previous question. Let's bring this middle class tax cut up now. It is the solution.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, and I wondered if my colleague is prepared to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentlewoman for asking. I have no further speakers and will allow her that opportunity, and then I will close.

□ 1340

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, we should be doing one thing today, and that's passing the continuation of tax cuts for the middle class. The American people couldn't be more united in their support for a tax cut, and there's no reason for delay. The Senate has already passed the bill that we could take up now. It's here at the desk. Members across our aisle agree, quite intelligently, that we must not let middle class taxes go up.

With such common ground, why would the majority waste another minute before ensuring that the taxes will not go up on the middle class? The answer isn't clear to me. I simply cannot fathom it. But if the majority won't take action, we will.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I'm going to offer an

amendment to the rule that says two things. One is first that we will pass a bill to extend the middle class tax cut, and second that we will pass legislation that will avoid the fiscal cliff and the chaos that would ensue.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment to the rule in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question so that we may put our rule on the floor. I urge a "no" vote on the rule if we are unsuccessful, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for this vigorous debate that we had on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, top to bottom, the leadership of the Democratic Party has been on record here again today saying they want to increase taxes on small business. They want to increase taxes on family-owned businesses and people who get up every day and want to employ people and work harder. Small business is the engine of our economy, and our friends, the Democrats, want to punish them through taxes for fairness issues.

Well, I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, we've got a bunch of problems in this country, and that's why we're at the fiscal cliff. This thing is not as a result of taxes, it's as a result of spending and too many people not having jobs to be able to pay in not just their taxes, but to be able to sustain our economy.

So we have millions of people that are unemployed and drawing unemployment compensation. We're seeing disabilities rise at a rate of 16 percent every year. One thing which we note is that just before President Obama took effect, the White House figure showed the Federal budget was \$2.9 trillion. Next year's estimate is going to be \$3.8 trillion. This is a 31 percent increase in spending in just 4 years.

We have someone as President, our great President, who is hung up on taxing and spending. What we need is a House of Representatives that's hung up on jobs and job creation, the American product, entrepreneurship, creativity, and competition with the world. The next new great ideas will not come from this body but from the creativity of the American people.

This is what Republicans are trying to keep alive in our country, the idea of self-reliance and working hard and taking care of people that are not just in your house but are in your neighborhood, your cities, our States, the vibrancy of our country. We are headed over the fiscal cliff after 4 years of leadership from this President who is running—running—directly to the fiscal cliff, and he has even said, and his

Secretary of the Treasury said, We don't mind jumping off this cliff.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be having that kind of attitude. We should have the attitude that we're for everybody. We want to be for American entrepreneurship and especially small business, because it's small business such as family farms, small business such as electrical companies and people who put their name on the buildings, the creative people who get up to go to work every day. That is who we're going to hurt.

We're not just going to hurt them, we're going to hurt their business families, the people they have had employed, small communities, large communities, but small business which is the engine of our economy. That's really who we're going to punish.

Lastly, we should not do it at this time, just like we should not have 2 years ago, but I guess we were aiming for an election at that time, and now the President does not have one ahead of him.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage a "yes" vote on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 827 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. It shall not be in order to consider a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment or adjournment sine die unless the House has been notified that the President has signed a bill to extend for one year certain expired or expiring tax provisions that apply to middle-income taxpayers with income below \$250,000 for married couples filing jointly, and below \$200,000 for single filers, and other provisions to address the so-called "fiscal cliff."

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused,

the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution. . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. 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.

#### 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 later.

#### ELIMINATE PRIVACY NOTICE CONFUSION ACT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5817) to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual privacy notice requirement, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5817

*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 "Eliminate Privacy Notice Confusion Act".

#### SEC. 2. EXCEPTION TO ANNUAL PRIVACY NOTICE REQUIREMENT UNDER THE GRAMM- LEACH-BLILEY ACT.

Section 503 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6803) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) EXCEPTION TO ANNUAL NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—A financial institution that—

"(1) provides nonpublic personal information only in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b)(2) or (e) of section 502 or regulations prescribed under section 504(b), and

"(2) has not changed its policies and practices with regard to disclosing nonpublic personal information from the policies and practices that were disclosed in the most recent disclosure sent to consumers in accordance with this subsection,

shall not be required to provide an annual disclosure under this subsection until such time as the financial institution fails to comply with any criteria described in paragraph (1) or (2)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous materials on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amended version of H.R. 5817 represents compromise language that addresses concerns raised by some Members about the last section of the bill, which provided certain regulatory relief to State-licensed financial institutions. The bill before the House today is substantially the same as the legislation that passed the House by voice vote in April 2010, and we actually debated this bill a week ago.

I would like to thank the sponsors of H.R. 5817, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. FRANK, for agreeing to this compromise language.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I will be brief. We passed substantially the same language unanimously by voice vote 2 years ago. This bill has been amended by unanimous consent so as to be virtually identical with what was passed 2 years ago. It now has the support of the ranking member.

I urge an "aye" vote and reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield as much time as he needs to consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), who is the primary sponsor of this bill.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Thank you, Chairman CAPITO, for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of the amended version of H.R. 5817, the Eliminate Privacy Notice Confusion Act. Under current law, all financial institutions are required to provide annual privacy notices explaining information-sharing practices to customers. Banks and credit unions are required to give these notices each year even if their privacy notice has not changed. This creates not only waste for financial institutions but confusion among and increased costs to consumers.

In his book entitled "The Financial Crisis and the Free Market Cure," John Allison reports that one bank offered at the end of its privacy notice to pay \$100 to any customer that read its notice in full. Only one customer took the bank up on that offer.

Year after year, millions of dollars are spent on privacy notices that are either disregarded by or confuse the customers. Let's think about this cost for a second. This outdated requirement doesn't cost only in postage alone, but also costs in compliance costs, cost of supplies, printing fees, and man hours.

I talked to one community bank in my district that said they spent roughly 70 cents per disclosure. With a minimum of 250,000 accounts and customers, this one bank spends \$175,000 a year on this requirement. It may not seem like a lot of money to some of my colleagues, but I can tell you that \$175,000 is a lot of money for a small institution like this one in my district, especially when a lot of those costs are passed on to the customer.

There is some debate over what this legislation will do. Let me be completely clear: this legislation will only remove the Gramm-Leach-Bliley annual privacy notice requirement of an institution if an institution has not, in any way, changed its privacy notice or procedures.

□ 1350

This legislation does not exempt any institution from an initial privacy notice, nor does it allow a loophole for an institution to avoid issuing an updated notice.

We worked in a bipartisan fashion to amend this legislation to remove the stipulations for State-regulated financial institutions. The amended language is now identical to the legislation that passed the House by a voice

vote in the 111th Congress. Additionally, I would like to remind my colleagues that similar language, language that was the basis for the first version of legislation, passed in both the 109th Congress and the 110th Congress.

This language is not controversial, it does not jeopardize consumer privacy, and it does not exempt an institution from having to produce an initial or amended privacy notice. This legislation does eliminate millions of costly, confusing, and often ignored mailings. And, with the passage of this bill, the information included in these mailings would likely become more significant to the consumer because it would come only after a change in the privacy policy.

This legislation is supported by the Independent Community Bankers of America, the Credit Union National Association, the American Bankers Association, the National Association of Federal Credit Unions, and the Consumer Bankers Association, among others.

I'd like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for his work on this bill. I would also like to thank Chairman BACHUS, Ranking Member FRANK, Chairman CAPITO, and Ranking Member MALONEY for their work with us toward swift passage of this legislation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues for their support.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri for his work and leadership on this bill. I also want to thank the ranking member, Mr. FRANK, for his support, and, of course, the gentlelady from West Virginia.

If this bill becomes law, a written copy of the privacy policy will still go by postal mail to every customer when he or she becomes a customer of the financial institution. Another copy will go every time that policy is changed, and the policy will be available day and night on the Internet on the Web site of the financial institution. The privacy policy will be known to everyone who has an interest in reading it, whether \$100 is paid as a bonus for reading it or not.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I also urge passage of this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5817, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ASTHMA INHALERS RELIEF ACT OF 2012

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6190) to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to allow for the distribution, sale, and consumption in the United States of remaining inventories of over-the-counter CFC epinephrine inhalers.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6190

*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 "Asthma Inhalers Relief Act of 2012".

### SEC. 2. DISTRIBUTION, SALE, AND CONSUMPTION OF REMAINING INVENTORIES OF OVER-THE-COUNTER CFC EPINEPHRINE INHALERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency—

(1) shall allow for the distribution, sale, and consumption in the United States of remaining inventories of CFC epinephrine inhalers manufactured pursuant to the exception for medical devices under section 604(d)(2) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7671c(d)(2));

(2) shall not take any enforcement action or otherwise seek to restrict the distribution, sale, or consumption of such inhalers on the basis of any Federal law implementing the Montreal Protocol; and

(3) shall, in response to any request of any distributor or seller of such inhalers, including any such request pending on the date of the enactment of this Act, issue a No Action Assurance Letter to the requesting party stating that the Environmental Protection Agency will not initiate an enforcement action relating to the distribution or sale of any such inhaler occurring prior to August 1, 2013.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit or otherwise affect the authority of the Food and Drug Administration under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) to ensure the safety and effectiveness of CFC epinephrine inhalers to be distributed, sold, or consumed pursuant to this Act.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) The term "CFC epinephrine inhaler" means any epinephrine inhaler containing chlorofluorocarbons that was manufactured and classified as over-the-counter before January 1, 2012.

(2) The phrase "Federal law implementing the Montreal Protocol"—

(A) means any provision of title VI of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7671 et seq.) or other Federal law implementing the Montreal Protocol; and

(B) includes the final rule published by the Food and Drug Administration entitled "Use of Ozone-Depleting Substances; Removal of Essential-Use Designation (Epinephrine)" published in the Federal Register at 73 Federal Register 69532 (November 19, 2008).

(3) The term "Montreal Protocol" has the meaning given such term in section 601 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7671).

(4) The term "over-the-counter" means not subject to section 503(b)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 353(b)(1)) or otherwise required pursuant to Federal law to be dispensed only upon issuance of a prescription.

(d) SUNSET.—This section ceases to be effective August 1, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 6190, this is a bill that I honestly wish we did not have to consider today.

Over the past several years, I have repeatedly asked the Food and Drug Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, and even the White House, the President himself, for answers to questions that I and other members of the committee have as to why the administration has refused to grant a waiver to sell the existing stock of over-the-counter epinephrine inhalers. Only last summer, and because the committee was moving legislation at the time, did the Food and Drug Administration finally provide at least some sort of response, albeit one that was entirely unsatisfactory.

Under the rules known as the Montreal Protocol, certain chemical propellants used in a number of medical and cosmetic devices were to be phased out over a number of years, the chlorofluorocarbons, CFC, used in the epinephrine inhalers. Here is one of the ones that was one of those propellants. One of the manufacturers of these over-the-counter inhalers has worked on a replacement inhaler only to meet with stonewalling through the Food and Drug Administration and requests for more studies into the device. Although the Food and Drug Administration claims they are awaiting an application from the company, the company counters that the Food and Drug Administration once again continues to move the goalpost. Regardless of the finger-pointing, Mr. Speaker—and there is much of it surrounding this issue—the fact remains that there is no viable alternative for the over-the-counter purchase by an asthmatic suffering from an acute emergency attack.

We've heard that a company is about to market a device, and indeed there is a device available without a prescription, but it's behind the counter. In other words, if the pharmacy is open but the pharmacist is not there, you cannot purchase this device. I know this firsthand because it happened to me one evening while we were home on one of the district work periods. The new product uses a nebulizer rather than a propellant. It's a little more complicated. In my experience, it's a little more difficult to use and less effective. Nevertheless, it is available, but the cost differential is significant

when compared with the old over-the-counter CFC propellant epinephrine inhaler.

The committee and the Congress should be on the side of putting more available products into the hands of patients and allowing them to effectively manage their medical issues. Instead, opponents of this legislation hide behind false claims of the safety and efficacy of epinephrine.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that I've been an asthmatic my entire life. I have utilized rescue inhalers for a long time. Racemic epinephrine, the active pharmaceutical ingredient in an over-the-counter asthma inhaler, has been around for 60 years. There has not been a question of its safety and efficacy. If so, we know the FDA has the power to remove a drug or device that they think is unsafe or not effective. They have given their stamp of approval to racemic epinephrine again and again over the last 60 years. There continue to be dozens of epinephrine-based treatments for asthma-related issues that are used by doctors and medical professionals. Although opponents of this legislation will claim that they're opposed to the bill because epinephrine is not safe, this claim is simply not true.

There are currently over 1 million units of these inhalers sitting in a warehouse in California not helping patients currently suffering from an asthma attack, not available for a rescue treatment for someone who cannot get their breath. It's unconscionable to allow them to sit and gather dust when they could be used to provide relief to America's asthmatic patients. Moreover, the company is committed to donating any proceeds from the sale to charity to remove any possible profit motive from their request to sell these products.

This is not about allowing a company to continue to sell their product; it's about not allowing a regulatory agency to unreasonably restrict the access of America's asthmatics to a useful product. I wish more companies would come forward with a viable over-the-counter asthma inhaler so that asthmatics could have more and more choices instead of that costly emergency room visit at 2 a.m.

This bill is about allowing asthmatics to continue to get relief during an asthma attack, to continue to have an emergency rescue inhaler available when they deem that they need it, not when the Administrator of the EPA says they need it or not when the Administrator of the FDA says they need it.

Members of Congress spend a lot of time talking about how much they care about the plight of patients—and asthmatics in particular—and decrying the high cost of health care. Even if it is just for a limited time, this bill returns a safe, effective, and inexpensive treatment into the hands of patients suffering from asthma, one that has been in use for decades.

For me, at least, the issue is clear. Let's side with patients on this issue.

Let's stop this senseless war on asthmatics the administration has waged for the last 3 years.

With that, I'll reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. I thank my colleague, the ranking member from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Congress gave the FDA the responsibility of deciding whether specific types of inhalers containing ozone-depleting substances are essential uses and need to remain on the market, and the FDA has established an orderly and open process for making these determinations: 13 types of inhalers containing CFCs were phased out prior to the phase-out of Primatene Mist. The remaining two CFC-propelled inhalers are scheduled for phase-out at the end of 2013.

The FDA determined in 2008 that Primatene Mist was not an essential use. They concluded that there are no substantial technical barriers to developing epinephrine inhalers that do not release ozone-depleting substances. At the request of Armstrong, the manufacturer of Primatene Mist, the FDA set a phase-out date of December 31, 2011, which was 1 year longer than the FDA initially proposed. The FDA took steps to prepare the public for the phase-out. It approved a label for Primatene Mist which indicated to consumers that Primatene Mist would not be available after December 31, 2011, and Primatene Mist was phased out on that date. It has not been available for the past 11 months.

This bill would intervene to put Primatene Mist back on the market. It is a legislative earmark that directly benefits just one company—Armstrong. A long list of public health groups, physician organizations, and patient advocates oppose this bill. They do not believe that returning Primatene Mist to the market is in the best interest of patients with asthma or in the best interest of public health. The following organizations, Mr. Speaker, that oppose this bill wrote to Members of the House: the American Lung Association, the American Thoracic Society, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America, Mothers of Asthmatics.

I could go on. There are eight other public health organizations on this one letter alone, and I am not aware of any public health organization that supports this bill. When FDA officials briefed Members, they expressed many of the same concerns about patient confusion and of Primatene Mist no longer being the standard of care for asthma patients.

Now, let's be clear, Mr. Speaker. Every public health group and patient advocacy group that has looked at this

bill has concluded it is a bad idea. Congress shouldn't be overriding FDA's established regulatory process if doing so would pose significant patient confusion and undermine public health. That's just common sense.

Even if we pass this bill, it would not lead to the widespread availability of Primatene Mist that is sought by the proponents of the legislation. According to Armstrong, between 2 million and 3 million people used Primatene Mist before the phase-out, but fewer than 1.5 million Primatene Mist inhalers remain in Armstrong's inventory. That means that as many as half of all previous users of Primatene Mist would not be able to obtain even one inhaler if Armstrong were allowed to sell off its remaining inventory, and it assumes that pharmacies or drug stores would even carry it. Retailers may decide not to sell inventoried units of Primatene Mist because the units will start to expire in January, and that's only a few weeks from now.

So the real effect of this bill would be to provide a regulatory earmark to Armstrong rather than a rescue inhaler that would be available in the middle of the night to someone suffering from an asthma attack.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what else I can say. This is a bad bill, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 1 minute.

I would point out that the FDA has not retracted the use of racemic epinephrine for the short-term use of a rescue inhaler in the treatment of an acute asthmatic attack. That just simply has not happened. Then to say that Congress is now seeking to overrule the FDA is preposterous because those are not the facts on the table right now.

A regulatory earmark? Come on, give me a break. I would welcome other companies into the marketplace that wanted to create a low-cost, effective, convenient treatment for asthmatics who need acute respiratory relief when their standard meds, when their meds that they take on a chronic basis, either are not working or when, for whatever reason, a flare-up has occurred.

Look, I'm an asthma patient—I'm on asthma medicine—but in the product information provided to patients on the long-term medicine is a statement that this is not intended as a rescue device for an acute attack. For that, you need something that was previously available over the counter. I've got to tell you that I was astounded by the elitism by the EPA at the table in front of us when they told us that they know better than America's asthma patients. Come on. This is the land of liberty. Let's give patients the devices they need to manage their illnesses.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My colleagues, this is a bill that is special for one company in order for it

to sell off the batches of the Primatene Mist that it has on stock. This is a product that's not on the market now—it was taken off the market—and there are substitutes on the market that the public health and medical groups say are far better and are far safer.

There are a large number of organizations that have come to the floor on this bill to oppose it. The Energy and Commerce Committee heard expert medical testimony that Primatene Mist is not safe or recommended for treating asthma, and we have a chart here. These are the groups that oppose this bill and that would urge you to vote "no": the American Lung Association, the American Thoracic Society, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America. All of the people involved in health are saying they don't want this drug on the market, that it will only confuse asthma patients, and that it is not the safest drug that they could have.

Now, the gentleman from Texas has said what we ought to do if it's not safe is to take it off the market. It is off the market. It hasn't been taken off because of safety, but it is not recommended by the medical community.

There is another group here called the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy, and I'd like to indicate some of the organizations that are part of that alliance, which are some of the major corporations in this country.

Lastly, I want to show a chart of those who are in favor of this bill: Armstrong Pharmaceuticals. It is the one company that will benefit from this bill because it will be able to sell off the reserves of its product.

Now, is that in the best interest of the patients? Is that what Congress ought to be doing, passing a special earmarked bill to favor one company in order for it to be able to take the rest of its stock and sell it to people?

We do have a Food and Drug Administration, and we do have an Environmental Protection Agency. We've delegated to them the responsibility to protect the public health, to make sure that drugs are safe and effective. This Primatene Mist was supposed to come off the market, and it was given an additional year. Other companies were also going to have to go off the market. They knew that, and they're not on the market now. So why should we take one company's drug and put it back on the market so that it could sell off the products that it still has in its backlog?

In fact, as you might imagine, those companies are against this bill. They say it would overturn an established regulatory framework to directly benefit just one company—Armstrong. Over the years, more than a dozen types of inhalers containing CFCs have been phased out, but these companies say: Why should we do something special for only one company? We're talking about not just the health groups, but drug companies like AstraZeneca

and GlaxoSmithKline. They oppose this bill because it provides one company with the special treatment that none of these other companies receive.

There is no reason for this bill. This is a drug that is already off the market. There are substitutes that are being developed, and there are substitutes that are already on the market. I don't think we ought to be using the Suspension Calendar, of all procedures, to give a special deal to just one company.

I urge Members to oppose the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1410

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 1 minute.

The ranking member spoke of a group called the Alliance for Sensible Atmospheric Policy. I wish this were sensible, Madam Speaker. This is the most nonsensical thing I have ever encountered. Look, America's asthma patients are not blowing a hole in the ozone above Antarctica. I get the fact that Mr. WAXMAN and I have to give up our hair spray. I get that. Too much CFCs. You've got it.

I get the fact that our underarm deodorant had too many CFCs and we had to have a different propellant. But we're talking about an effective treatment for a very vulnerable group of patients—2 o'clock in the morning, someone who has asthma who might have run out of their medicine, or maybe they encountered something that caused their airways to react, what choice do they now have? They go to the emergency room, spend \$1,500 for a breathing treatment.

This is not something that was held behind the counter by the pharmacist. This was out on the open shelf available to anyone at any hour of the day or night. Asthma patients need access to this type of medication. I would welcome the fact that other companies would want to create a low-cost, available product for asthmatics to use as a rescue inhaler.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. First of all, I want to address some of these issues myself, and then I will yield to others who want to speak.

There is an environmental problem along with this medical problem. The environmental problem is that there is a deterioration of the upper ozone layer. And the United States, under President George H.W. Bush, negotiated an international treaty called the Montreal Protocol to get those products off the market that add chlorofluorocarbons which cause this environmental damage.

And so my friend from Texas is right: we can't get hair spray or deodorant that has the propellant that has been taken off the market. But no one's arguing we should let them come back on the market to sell off their products. There are substitutes. My hair is in place because I don't need those products any longer. And my friend from

Texas is handling his deodorant problem adequately. The fact of the matter is there are other products for asthma that the people in the medical professions say is superior; and they say that Primatene Mist can lead to damage and become a threat to health. So why are we going to take this one drug and put it back on the market?

With those comments, I now yield 3 minutes to my good friend from the State of Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the House.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me this time. Neither he nor I need hair spray, and so we can approach that matter with some serenity. But I want to say here, I yield to no one in this Chamber over what has been done or what I have done on food and drug safety for the American consuming public. I'm the author of the provisions that require Food and Drug to only market those things which are safe and effective. If Food and Drug doesn't like this, they can take it off the market on that ground. They have not chosen to do so. The only reason it is going off the market is because of the fact that it bothers the folks who want the Montreal Protocol to go into place.

Now, let's take a little bit of a look at it. There are 1.2 million issues of this particular pharmaceutical. A piddling amount of CFCs is going to be released in that these inhalers are very small. They have a few milliliters of propellant. It's not going to make any significant difference. Food and Drug can take it off the market. It is safe. It is efficacious.

Now I want to talk about a couple of other things. The gentleman from Texas has talked about what happens when you have these problem as an asthmatic. My old dad was a former tubercular. He lived through his life with about half a lung, and I listened to him every night, up walking around, gasping like a fish on a rock because he couldn't get air.

There are a lot of people who have used Primatene Mist because they thought it worked. And if that is so, in fact it does work because it gives relief to people who are sick. If it is bad, Food and Drug can take it off the market because it is unsafe. That is not the reason it is off the market; it is the Montreal Protocol.

Let us consider the fact that there are people out there who need this substance. Now, I hear that it is going to benefit one company, the current manufacturer. That manufacturer is not going to make 10 cents on this deal, and the reason is very simple: the profits and the benefits that are going to be generated by these sales of Primatene Mist are going to go—guess where—to charity. That's where they're going.

Who we are helping is the people who have need of this; and if you haven't

had a situation where you couldn't get your breath, you don't know the terrors that exist there. And you don't know the kind of terrors that my old dad had when I listened to him walking up and down at night, every night, gasping to get a breath of air. There was no Primatene Mist in those days, and so there was no relief for him.

Now, they say, well, you can go to the emergency room or somebody's going to develop relief, but there's nothing on the market that matches the price. Some of these things that they have that they are saying are going to be available are possibly going to be available in a little bit—possibly not. And they also are big, so big that they're not going to be readily available to somebody who has need. They might be helpful if they can put them on wheels so that the fellow can tow them around behind him. But the hard fact of the matter is that Primatene Mist is going to be there when it is needed, and it is going to provide the people who want their free choice to have that particular medication. It will be available to them.

I say make it available to the people. There's no rascality. This is a safe substance. If it weren't, Food and Drug wouldn't have taken it off the market because it was either unsafe or inefficacious.

So having said those things, let us support the bill. It's a good bill. The opposition of other manufacturers is to be expected. They simply want to cut a fat hog by making profits by selling their competitive devices.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 1 minute.

The dean of the House described the amount of CFC released into the atmosphere as a "piddling" amount. Actually, the Food and Drug Administration has quantitated "piddling" for us in the Federal Register of November 19, 2008. They describe that as less than 0.1 percent of the total 1986 global production of CFCs. For the purpose of edification of the body, I did want to provide that information as to a definition of piddling.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased now to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), an important member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, there are a number of reasons why H.R. 6190 is poor public policy, but I'd like to focus on just one, and that is the unfair advantage that this bill will grant to a single business to the detriment of other businesses and manufacturers. And, in fact, the Congress has received a letter from the International Pharmaceutical Aerosol Consortium:

On behalf of the International Pharmaceutical Aerosol Consortium—an association of companies that manufacture medicines for the treatment of respiratory illnesses,

such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease—I am writing to you today in opposition to H.R. 6190.

IPAC's members include AstraZeneca, GlaxoSmithKline, and a number of other manufacturers. They say that they strongly oppose efforts within the House of Representatives to lift the December 31, 2011, ban on the sale of CFC-based epinephrine Primatene Mist because such drastic reversal in settled law will be, one, unnecessary to protect the public health of asthma patients; and, two, it's contrary to the United States' important and long-standing commitment to international treaties.

They point out that this has been on-going for two decades. The companies involved in international manufacture, national manufacturers, have known about this for a long time. They say the only possible beneficiary of a reversal of the ban on Primatene Mist would be its manufacturer, which stands to garner a financial windfall if its limited stocks are sold. Granting extraordinary, unwarranted special treatment to a single company would send an extremely negative signal to manufacturers that responded to the U.S. Government's call many years ago to be a partner in meeting our commitment. Similar prior requests for deadline relief have been firmly denied by all of the relevant agencies.

□ 1420

Now, here's the problem: I was contacted by a Florida company some months ago. Part of the early rationale for this bill was there was no alternative. But this Florida manufacturer that played by the rules called me up. They said, We hear about this hearing on Capitol Hill. Do you know that we are manufacturing an alternative to Primatene Mist that will be over-the-counter and that will be affordable?

Nephron Pharmaceuticals has developed such a product, Asthmanefrin, a handheld, battery-operated device that will allow asthma patients to inhale a drug similar to epinephrine in Primatene Mist. It is readily available at Walmart, CVS, Walgreens, Drugstore.com, Walgreens.com, CVS.com. It's also accessible through McKesson Drug, a national wholesaler; Smith Drug, a wholesaler covering the Southeast; and OptiSource. They are doing a national TV campaign now. They have starter kits. This is available. So that rationale, that early rationale that there is no alternative does not exist anymore.

But here's the important point: We can't have the Congress granting an advantage to a single company to the disadvantage of other companies that have played by the rules. This bill would seriously undermine the investment decisions of innovative companies like Nephron that have developed alternatives and solutions to short-term asthma relief. Congress should not pick winners and losers.

Colleagues, we repeatedly heard the rationale for this bill: there was no alternative. That rationale is incorrect. It's inaccurate. Congress should not pull the rug out from under companies

that have followed the rules and expect regulatory certainty in order to benefit another single company.

I urge you to vote "no" on H.R. 6190.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has and which side has the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has the right to close.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to myself.

I just want to point out what the allergy and asthma networks, mothers of asthmatics, the people who are dealing with this problem, they say this act gives unprecedented preferential and exclusive exceptions and financial benefits to Armstrong Pharmaceuticals.

Primatene Mist is specifically not recommended for the treatment of asthma in the National Institutes of Health NHLBI asthma guidelines. They don't see a reason this ought to come back on the market. And the same point of view is expressed by the others that are the professionals that treat asthma patients.

The effect of this bill will be to take the inventory that this company has and allow it to go back on the market, from January to August of 2013, so they can sell it off. It's not going back to the market; it's just going to allow the inventory to be sold off. A lot of that inventory is expiring in terms of its efficacy; so a lot of people, we hope, will not get some Primatene Mist back on the market that's not going to do them any good.

And there are better alternatives. All the medical groups are telling us there are better alternatives.

This is a special interest bill. It's a bad bill. It's bad for public health. It will confuse asthma patients. It provides special treatment to one company at the expense of its competitors. It's opposed by the people involved in health, the people who have asthma, the people who treat asthma, the manufacturers of drugs for asthma.

We don't have to go back to a drug that's been outdated already and put it back on the market so this company can sell off their inventory. They say they're going to give all the money to charity. Well, I don't know what kind of tax breaks they get. I don't see why we should let them sell off their inventory, especially an inventory that's not going to be any good beyond August of next year.

This is a bill that we ought to oppose, and I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

If advocating for America's asthmatic patients is a special interest group, guilty as charged. But, Madam Speaker, we have heard so much stuff

today that it's almost difficult to refute every point that's been brought up.

Look, we heard from the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee that the FDA had deemed the active pharmaceutical ingredient in Primatene Mist to be dangerous. What is the active ingredient in Primatene Mist? It's racemic epinephrine.

We heard from the gentlelady from Florida that a product manufactured in her district was a good product and was available. What's the active pharmaceutical in Asthmanefrin? Racemic epinephrine. It's exactly the same product. The difference, of course, is the propellant, and that's the object of our discussion here today.

Now, I will tell you, as an asthmatic patient, there are things that I know work better for me than others. I'm willing to go along with a lot of stuff from the EPA, but I will just tell you, the replacement propellant that is available in albuterol inhalers does not work nearly as well as CFC. You don't have to believe me. Go to the Facebook page that has been developed by asthma sufferers who, one after the other, will delineate why CFC worked for them when HFA-containing products do not.

Now, what about Asthmanefrin? There is no propellant. It is delivered because of an ultrasonic nebulizer, a unique approach and one that, quite frankly, I welcome.

But let me stress, Madam Speaker, although this product, Asthmanefrin, is available without a physician's prescription, it's not generally available over the counter, and I know this because of my own experience. Number 1, I had to call several pharmacies back in Texas before I found a Walmart that carried it. After finishing some event late at night in Fort Worth, I stopped by the Walmart near my home that I had already talked to that I knew they had the product there. I went in, but the pharmacy was closed. The pharmacist was gone.

Now, you can buy a vast panoply of almost anything else over the counter in the pharmacy, off the pharmacy shelves at Walmart—in fact, you used to be able to pick up two Primatene Mist inhalers for \$30 before January 1 of this year—but no Asthmanefrin was available. When I questioned why, they said that is something that has to be dispensed by the pharmacist. In other words, it's behind the counter, not over the counter.

What does that mean as a functional issue?

If an asthmatic patient woke up at 2 that morning and said, Oh, my golly, I should have never ridden that horse, I should have never petted that cat, I guess the mountain cedar bloomed down by Waco because now I've got a snoutful and I cannot breathe, and they go down to the Walmart, the Walmart's open, the store's lit up, the shelves are full of product, but Asthmanefrin is

not available to that patient. They'll have to come back at 9 in the morning when the pharmacist is on duty that can dispense the product to them.

Now, I would also point out that there is a cost differential between Asthmanefrin and Primatene Mist. We've heard a lot about costs and profits and who we're helping and who we're not. The cost for the starter kit for Asthmanefrin is right at \$50. At Walmart in my district it was \$49.96. A boxful of the packets of the medicine that is necessary to place into the machine to dispense costs \$27 for a box of 30. And I'm not that good at math, but that's about 92, 93 cents per packet, one packet per treatment.

How many treatments are in this? I don't know. I've never used one completely. I always lose them before I get to the end. But it's advertised to be between 250 and 275 treatments.

The cost differential, a little bit less than 6 cents for this, 93 cents for this per treatment episode. Not a big deal in days you're talking about medicines that might cost \$250, \$280 a month for maintenance therapy for asthma. Yeah, the cost is negligible, but for some people it's not. For some people that represents a significant expenditure.

This, I can carry in my pocket. I can bring it to the House floor. If someone's smoking a cigar in one of the anterooms and I get a puff of that, I'll have this available when I get to the House floor.

This is harder to carry in your pocket, not impossible, but much harder to carry in your pocket.

There is a convenience factor. Dean of the House DINGEL mentioned that when he talked about his efforts to preserve products for patients with asthma. A little less user friendly to go through the multiple steps for Asthmanefrin as opposed to squeezing the Primatene Mist bottle and dispensing the medicine where it needs to go into a patient's chest.

The other over-the-counter products are absolutely not equivalent to Primatene. Primatene tablets are, indeed, still available. But what are Primatene tablets? They're ephedrine. That's the active ingredient in some of the diet pills that the FDA pulled off the market a few months ago. Yeah, ephedrine will help you if you're in a tight spot with your breathing, but it's not instantaneous. It's about 30 minutes away after you take the pill.

□ 1430

And you want to talk about something that makes your heart race, it's not Primatene Mist, but the Primatene tablets will do it every time it's tried.

Madam Speaker, here's the real issue: Should we let elites at the Federal agency dictate to our asthma patients in our districts what they can and can't have?

This is one of those instances where I say the Federal agency has gone too far. Ranking Member WAXMAN said

that the FDA didn't need to ban Primatene Mist because the EPA had already done it. By what authority does the EPA regulate medicines that I prescribe for my patients? There is no such authority, unless I missed something and we gave them authority where none existed before.

This is about common sense. This is about doing the right thing for the American people. We took away their toilets. We took away their lightbulbs. For heaven's sake, let's not take away their asthma inhalers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6190.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. 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.

#### NO-HASSLE FLYING ACT OF 2012

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3542) to authorize the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to modify screening requirements for checked baggage arriving from preclearance airports, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3542

*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 "No-Hassle Flying Act of 2012".

#### SEC. 2. PRECLEARANCE AIRPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 44901(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) PRECLEARANCE AIRPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For a flight or flight segment originating at an airport outside the United States and traveling to the United States with respect to which checked baggage has been screened in accordance with an aviation security preclearance agreement between the United States and the country in which such airport is located, the Assistant Secretary (Transportation Security Administration) may, in coordination with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, determine whether such baggage must be rescreened in the United States by an explosives detection system before such baggage continues on any additional flight or flight segment.

“(B) AVIATION SECURITY PRECLEARANCE AGREEMENT DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘aviation security preclearance agreement’ means an agreement that delineates and implements security standards and protocols that are determined by the Assistant Secretary, in coordination with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, to be comparable to those of the United States and

therefore sufficiently effective to enable passengers to deplane into sterile areas of airports in the United States.

“(C) REPORT.—The Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate an annual report on the re-screening of baggage under this paragraph. Each such report shall include the following for the year covered by the report:

“(i) A list of airports outside the United States from which a flight or flight segment traveled to the United States for which the Assistant Secretary determined, in accordance with the authority under subparagraph (A), that checked baggage was not required to be re-screened in the United States by an explosive detection system before such baggage continued on an additional flight or flight segment.

“(ii) The amount of Federal savings generated from the exercise of such authority.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 44901 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “explosive” each place it appears and inserting “explosives”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of S. 3542, the No-Hassle Flying Act of 2012.

At the outset, let me commend the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman WALSH, for introducing the House companion to this important measure. H.R. 6028 passed the House in September by voice vote.

Madam Speaker, this bill gives TSA the discretion to determine if checked luggage arriving from a foreign airport with an aviation security preclearance agreement must be rescreened before it continues on to a connecting flight inside the U.S. The bill explicitly defines such an agreement as one that delineates and implements security standards and protocols that are determined by TSA, in coordination with CBP, to be comparable to those of the U.S. and therefore sufficiently effective to enable passengers to deplane into sterile areas of airports in the United States.

This bill does not diminish aviation security but, rather, streamlines the security process and allows TSA to expend resources on baggage that has not already been screened to U.S. security standards. It also supports TSA's ongoing efforts to implement risk-based, intelligence-driven security initiatives.

TSA Administrator Pistole requested the new authority provided in this bill in order to go beyond our borders in establishing robust security measures and improving efficiency. I commend Administrator Pistole for his leadership and efforts to improve aviation security.

In addition to streamlining security, this bill will incentivize our foreign partners to improve the technology that they use to screen checked baggage, which ultimately should increase the level of security of inbound flights to the United States. The legislation will reduce the number of missed connections and other hassles with redundant baggage screening that can become barriers to international travel and tourism. It's a win-win for passengers, the airline industry, and TSA by shortening the time necessary for transit and transfer.

I urge the adoption of this bipartisan and commonsense bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 3542, the No-Hassle Flying Act of 2012. I support this legislation because it represents a commonsense proposal to make air travel more convenient and has the potential to enhance efficiencies.

Currently, all baggage arriving at U.S. airports must be rescreened prior to being loaded on a connecting flight. This is true even for travelers arriving from designated preclearance airports where the passengers themselves do not need to be screened again because DHS has verified that screening at those airports is at least as effective as our own. This dynamic places an unnecessary burden on TSA screeners, the airlines, and the flying public who, on occasion, arrive at their final destination only to find that their baggage has not.

As I stated when we considered the House companion to S. 3542 in September, where we can eliminate duplicative screening without compromising security, I will lend my support.

I commend Senator KLOBUCHAR for her work on this legislation and thank her for including important provisions I requested that require TSA to coordinate with U.S. Customs and Border Protection when determining what baggage must be rescreened in the United States.

Accordingly, I support this legislation that the Obama administration proposed, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WALSH). Let me take this opportunity to commend him for the outstanding job he's done during his time of service on the committee.

Mr. WALSH of Illinois. I thank Chairman KING.

Earlier this year, I introduced the No-Hassle Flying Act, legislation

brought to our attention by the Transportation Security Administration. Senators KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota and BLUNT of Missouri introduced my original language in the Senate, and this is the bill we're considering today.

Over the past decade, TSA has classified 14 foreign airports as “precleared” for security purposes. These airports are routinely checked by TSA to ensure their screening procedures for both people and bags meet the high standards of the United States, and, as such, passengers originating from these airports and returning to the United States are not required to go through physical security checks again. Unfortunately, their bags are not excluded and must be rescanned and rechecked. If you've ever had to do this during a layover at Chicago O'Hare; Newark, New Jersey; or even Miami International, you know it's not an easy task, especially in the middle of the night.

The bill before us allows TSA to waive the baggage screening requirements as well. Giving TSA this kind of flexibility will allow them to free up time and resources to focus on higher-risk baggage and passengers and will also make traveling easier for those coming in and out of the United States.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee—especially Chairman KING—and their staffs for the work they put into this bill, along with Senators KLOBUCHAR and BLUNT, and, of course, TSA for bringing this bill to our attention.

I urge all Members to vote in favor of this commonsense bipartisan bill.

□ 1440

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security of the Committee on Homeland Security, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank the ranking member of the committee. It's always good to be able to thank him, Madam Speaker, for his leadership and service. I think we are safer because Members of Congress like Congressman THOMPSON, the ranking member, and our chairman, Congressman KING, have, on a number of occasions, come together around the idea of America's security. I want to express my appreciation for having been able to serve on the committee for a number of years.

It gives me also a moment to say to the Speaker, or to acknowledge Congresswoman EMERSON, for her service as well and to thank you so very much for being a person who loves America. I think that should be our litmus test when we rise on this floor for those of us who love this country.

As the ranking member, and having served as the chairwoman of this committee in previous terms, I know how important it is to provide safety in the transportation modes for the United

States of America. This bill, the No-Hassle Flying Act of 2012—and I thank the sponsor both in the House and the Senate—provides a measure of recognition and acceptance of foreign countries that are making efforts to have consistent security procedures and technology to have an easier travel process for passengers who are deplaning in the United States but going on to another domestic destination. So I want to acknowledge the Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, who had this legislation passed in the Senate, and our House sponsor as well.

What the basis of this legislation is, by relieving the need to rescreen every piece of baggage arriving in the United States from countries where we have strong bonds and screening agreements in place, efficiencies will be realized and our screeners can focus more attention on those items we know least about. And the term “screeners,” let me correct that and say the Transportation Security Administration personnel. That is probably the most maligned group of American public servants, those who work in the cause of the United States and the safety and security of the United States. But at their best, when they are trained, as I have worked so hard to insist on, to increase their professional development training—and we have made great strides with Administrator Pistole and previous administrators, so much so that as I travel through airports I can see the sense of pride and respect that this group of Americans have for their job. So when we speak of screening, we’re talking about serious work that has to be done to ensure the safety and security of America.

We want to be able to work with our allies. This is not an immigration reform initiative, but it is similar to the visa waiver programs, where we have a list of countries that we feel confident that their procedures are not only equal to ours, but their policies, their alliance with us goes decades, and we believe that their citizens can come into the United States.

This particular legislation tries to get the personnel of the TSA to focus on race-based screening that many of my fellow members on the committee have been calling for, and of course that the administrator has listened to. This legislation represents the kind of commonsense security measure this Congress must focus on to make both the Department of Homeland Security and its components work more.

It is, of course, my hope that we can look forward to more work being done with transportation security, that we can look to providing, as I introduced legislation dealing with air marshals, both their funding and increased utilization on some of our flights coming into the United States; that we will have the opportunity to do a transportation authorization bill again like the one I joined with Chairman THOMPSON on and we reauthorized in the 111th

Congress that drew bipartisan support. And of course Mr. KING has worked with us on this legislation.

So this particular No Fly for me has merit to it. But as I rise to support the thought behind the legislation passed by the Senate, I also remind our colleagues that air travel is still dangerous. Whether it is the shoe bomber, whether it is the Christmas day bomber, whether it is thwarted incidences that we will never hear about, whether it is the constant reporting of intelligence and classified information that suggests how vulnerable our airlines and airports are, whether it is an accidental or incidental intrusion on the tarmac or the perimeters of the airport, whether it is the accidental entry of a public person, either visitor or traveling public, that goes into an unauthorized area that causes airports to be shut down—incidences that occurred in Newark and other places—we have to realize that we have to be particularly sensitive to this question of securing the traveling public, and particularly Americans. That is why, in the wisdom of the Congress and others, we created the Transportation Security Administration that had a mandated and Federalized workforce of security screeners to inspect airline passengers and their baggage. It gave them broad authority to assess the vulnerabilities in aviation security and take steps to mitigate these risks. I’m glad that they exist.

So I have an acute understanding of TSA’s role in aviation security, and I also appreciate congressional oversight. But I further appreciate that, even with that broad discretion, we have to be keenly aware that in the best of all circumstances some loophole, some misstep can occur.

I represent one of the largest systems, George Bush Intercontinental Airport, the William Hobby system. As I would want for that airport system, I would want a system of security for everyone. So this idea of allowing unfettered transfer of your bags coming from a nation that has been an ally, but that has put into place procedures that we can document that are in fact adequate, accurate, and superior, I’m going to raise it to that level, because adequacy is not a basis for fighting the dangers of terrorism.

I only raise a flag of caution—and maybe a red flag—that it is important that the Department of Homeland Security study this carefully. Make sure that they look at the technology and look at the process that in essence will be put in place. Because, again, all good things are meant for good, but we know what can happen if in some way we are in error. I don’t want this to be a basis for error, I want this to be a basis for good. I want this to be the intention of the bill, which is to ameliorate some of those delays associated with the rescreening of bags transported on commercial flights from international locations.

I want those traveling to the United States to be welcomed with a smile

who are here to do good, and I want them not to miss their connecting flight—and it might be one of us. But our main focus is to secure the homeland.

So to my colleagues, to the chairman and ranking member, I join you in supporting this legislation, but I ask that the Department of Homeland Security, the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, who is to give this discretion to waiving rescreening pursuant to a preclearance agreement between the United States and a foreign nation, that seeks to ensure this process works, be very keen and careful of reviewing the process, having the resources to ensure that the technology is superior and that we are constantly reviewing how this is working.

I’m sure that we will see many smiles of our traveling public. They will welcome that convenience. In the course of the convenience, I also argue for security. I know that that will be the case.

I will ask my colleagues to support this legislation, and as well, we continue to secure the homeland.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. If the gentleman from Mississippi also has none, I’m prepared to close once the gentleman does.

□ 1450

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I am prepared to close.

There are areas where TSA needs to improve its performance. On that we can all agree. Just last week, GAO released a report detailing TSA’s failure to properly oversee privatized screeners and revealing that some airports with their privatized screeners do not perform as well as their federalized counterparts.

I look forward to addressing those issues with my colleagues on the Committee on Homeland Security in the 113th Congress.

Today, we have an opportunity to support legislation supported by industry, the Obama administration, and TSA that has the potential to enhance the efficiency and cost effectiveness of screening baggage.

With that, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 3542 so it can be sent to the President for his signature and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I urge the adoption of this bipartisan, commonsense bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 3542, the “No-Hassle Flying Act of 2012.” This legislation, proposed by the Obama Administration and introduced by the Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, was passed by the Senate with unanimous support and should receive the support of the House today.

By relieving the need to re-screen every piece of baggage arriving in the United States from countries where we have strong bonds

and screening agreements in place, efficiencies will be realized and our screeners can focus more attention on those items we know least about.

That is the kind of risk based screening that I and my fellow members of the Committee on Homeland Security have been calling for. Thankfully, under Administrator Pistole's leadership, are calls are being heeded.

This legislation represents the kind of common sense security measure this Congress must focus on to make both the Department of Homeland Security and its components work more efficiently and effectively.

It is my hope that in the next Congress we will see more proposals on the House floor regarding the Transportation Security Administration that can garner bipartisan support.

During the 111th Congress, during my tenure as Chair of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Transportation Security, the House considered and passed the TSA Authorization bill that I authored with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, no such legislation was produced for consideration by the House this Congress.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Committee in the next Congress to ensure we get back to the work of authorizing the critical programs of the TSA.

Our airports are a critical point of entry to our nation, and our airplanes remain vulnerable to terrorist plots as a result of their inherent potential to cause massive destruction and human casualties.

In the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 attacks, which exposed significant vulnerabilities in our airport security, the 107th Congress moved quickly to pass the Aviation and Transportation Security Act.

The Transportation Security Act created the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and mandated a federalized workforce of security screeners to inspect airline passengers and their baggage. The act gave TSA broad authority to assess vulnerabilities in aviation security and take steps to mitigate these risks.

As Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Transportation on the Committee on Homeland Security, I have an acute understanding of TSA's role in aviation security, which has been the subject of considerable congressional oversight.

Moreover, this issue is one that impacts my constituents immensely, as my district is home to the Houston Airport System, which is one of North America's largest public airport systems and includes George Bush Intercontinental Airport, William P. Hobby Airport, and Ellington Airport.

In 2010, the Houston Airport System served more than 49.5 million passengers, including more than 8.5 million international travelers.

The American people expect Members of Congress to ensure that when they board a plane for business or pleasure, all passengers and their accompanying baggage have been thoroughly screened so as to prevent terrorists and their tools of destruction from posing a danger to passengers.

This issue is something that we understand as Members of Congress; many of us, including myself, fly on commercial airlines when we travel to and from our respective districts. Like the rest of the public, we expect that when we board a flight, it is secure and that we will safely arrive at our destinations within a reasonable amount of time.

While we should balance the need for thorough screening with the ideals of speed and convenience, we must continue to ensure that we are doing whatever is necessary to protect passengers on commercial flights from the dangers of terrorism. We know that many Americans and others traveling to our country are often frustrated by the time it may take to have themselves and their baggage processed through airports.

This bill intends to ameliorate some of these delays associated with the rescreening of baggage transported on commercial flights originating from international locations.

This would be achieved by giving the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security the discretion to waive rescreening pursuant to a preclearance agreement between the United States and a foreign nation that seeks to ensure that adequate screening procedures were undertaken at the point of origin.

The idea is that baggage that has already been adequately screened by one airport does not need to be screened again once it arrives at one of our airports.

As Members of Congress, we should continue to look for areas in our airport security procedures that we can modify in order to make travel more convenient for passengers that do not compromise their safety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3542.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DHS AUDIT REQUIREMENT TARGET ACT OF 2012

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1998) to obtain an unqualified audit opinion, and improve financial accountability and management at the Department of Homeland Security.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1998

*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 "DHS Audit Requirement Target Act of 2012" or the "DART Act".

#### SEC. 2. IMPROVING FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND MANAGEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term "Department" means the Department of Homeland Security;

(2) the term "financial management systems" has the meaning given that term under section 806 of the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996 (31 U.S.C. 3512 note);

(3) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

(4) the term "unqualified opinion" mean an unqualified opinion within the meaning given that term under generally accepted auditing standards.

(b) REACHING AN UNQUALIFIED AUDIT OPINION.—In order to ensure compliance with the

Department of Homeland Security Financial Accountability Act (Public Law 108-330; 118 Stat. 1275) and the amendments made by that Act, the Secretary shall take the necessary steps to ensure that the full set of consolidated financial statements of the Department for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and each fiscal year thereafter, are ready in a timely manner and in preparation for an audit as part of preparing the performance and accountability reports required under section 3516(f) of title 31, United States Code, (including submitting the reports not later than November 15, 2013, and each year thereafter) in order to obtain an unqualified opinion on the full set of financial statements for the fiscal year.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON PROGRESS OF MEETING AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.—In order to ensure progress in implementing the Department of Homeland Security Financial Accountability Act (Public Law 108-330; 118 Stat. 1275), and the amendments made by that Act, during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date on which an unqualified opinion described in subsection (b) is submitted, each report submitted by the Chief Financial Officer of the Department under section 902(a)(6) of title 31, United States Code, shall include a plan—

(1) to obtain an unqualified opinion on the full set of financial statements, which shall discuss plans and resources needed to meet the deadlines under subsection (b);

(2) that addresses how the Department will eliminate material weaknesses and significant deficiencies in internal controls over financial reporting and provides deadlines for the elimination of such weaknesses and deficiencies; and

(3) to modernize the financial management systems of the Department, including timelines, goals, alternatives, and costs of the plan, which shall include consideration of alternative approaches, including modernizing the existing financial management systems and associated financial controls of the Department and establishing new financial management systems and associated financial controls.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1998, the DART Act, introduced by Senator SCOTT BROWN of Massachusetts. This important legislation will improve financial accountability and management at the Department of Homeland Security.

Since the Department opened its doors on March 1, 2003, financial management of all 22 merged agencies has

been one of the most significant challenges. Fiscal year 2012, over 9 years since DHS was created, was the first time the Department was able to complete a financial audit and receive a qualified opinion on all five financial statements covering the entire Department.

Unfortunately, DHS has been unable to get an unqualified, or clean, opinion stating that there are no material weaknesses in its financial systems. Until such time as there is confidence in the DHS financial structure, questions will remain on how DHS accounts for taxpayer money. This important legislation is needed because it will require the Department to create a plan to meet the audit requirements to reach an unqualified opinion.

Specifically, the bill requires the Secretary to take all necessary steps to ensure that all financial statements of the Department are consolidated and ready in a timely manner in preparation for an audit.

Second, the DHS CFO is to report to Congress on its efforts to reach an unqualified opinion. This legislation requires this reporting requirement until such time as the Department is able to reach an unqualified opinion.

Also, DHS is to report to Congress on its progress, including resources needed, plans to eliminate material weaknesses, deadlines for addressing deficiencies, and efforts to modernize DHS' financial management systems.

It is essential that DHS obtain control over its financial systems and address the identified weaknesses. This legislation sets the Department on the right path to obtain an unqualified opinion.

I would also like to thank Chairman ISSA and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for working with the Committee on Homeland Security in getting this important legislation to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 1998 and reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

*Washington, DC, December 7, 2012.*

Hon. PETER T. KING,  
*Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On November 28, 2012, the Senate passed S. 1998, the "Department of Homeland Security Improved Financial Accountability Act of 2011." Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with regard to S. 1998 on those matters within the committee's jurisdiction. I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to the consideration of S. 1998.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of S. 1998, I will forego consideration of the bill. However, I do so only with the understanding that this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future.

I respectfully request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,  
*Washington, DC, December 7, 2012.*

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,  
*Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA: Thank you for your letter regarding S. 1998, the "DHS Audit Requirement Target Act of 2012." I appreciate your willingness to support expediting floor consideration of this legislation.

I agree that while you are waiving formal consideration of this bill, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is in no way diminishing its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this measure or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to your Committee in the future.

I will include our letter on S. 1998 in the Congressional Record during House floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation.

Sincerely,

PETER T. KING,  
*Chairman.*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1998, the DHS Audit Requirement Target Act of 2012 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, since it was established nearly a decade ago, the Department of Homeland Security has been unable to obtain a "clean" or unqualified audit of its financial statements. This is simply unacceptable.

When I was chairman last Congress, the Committee on Homeland Security conducted significant oversight of the deficiencies that have plagued the Department's financial management efforts since its creation.

While we understand that DHS has taken many of the steps necessary to obtain a clean audit, more remains to be done. S. 1998 would direct DHS to take the necessary steps to obtain a clean audit by the end of fiscal year 2013. It also requires DHS to report to Congress on its plans to strengthen its financial controls and modernize its financial management systems.

Madam Speaker, S. 1998 helps put DHS on a path toward sound financial management, and for that reason, I plan to support the bill today.

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

Mr. KING of New York. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman, and I rise to support S. 1998 and commend the basis of this legislation, which will look for a clean audit report and in particular as it relates to Congress submit a report on

the plan to obtain an unqualified opinion annually until an unqualified opinion is submitted, and submit to Congress and the Comptroller General a report on DHS' plans and resources needed to modernize DHS' financial system.

Let me be clear that we know that it takes resources to secure the homeland, but this is a Department that has \$40 billion in the annual budget and 200,000 employees. DHS is the Nation's third-largest Federal Department. It demands a clean audit.

I would also indicate that one of the issues that we have continued to work on in the committee is to ensure the access of small, minority, and women-owned businesses to the vast contracting needs that DHS is engaged in. In particular, when there are natural disasters, we are often seeing where those who live in the area who would benefit from being able to be the contractors or to be able to work on the restoration and remove the debris cannot access DHS in a fair way to be able to secure a contract to put people to work.

So even as we are talking about audits, I'm talking about management processes, as well. And I would hope that this legislation, as it begins to look at audits and making sure that we have an unqualified audit, will also look at process as we go forward in the 113th Congress, because as we secure the homeland, we want to make sure that we have a Department of Homeland Security that has had very fine leadership in Secretary Napolitano to be able to assure that the infrastructure that runs this agency is parallel to the infrastructure that is securing America. I think that will be a perfect system.

So I do support this legislation, and I hope the comments about small, minority, and women-owned businesses are taken to heart and that we will find a way to ensure that our resources, tax dollars, are utilized by the American people in the right and appropriate way.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. If the gentleman from Mississippi has no further speakers, I am prepared to close.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I am prepared to close.

In summary, S. 1998 is another step in Congress' effort to put DHS on a sound financial path.

Speaking of a path, Madam Speaker, this is probably the chair's last official act on the floor, and I want to just say to him today that I have enjoyed his chairmanship on the committee, and I'm certain whatever the future holds in Congress, he will be a worthy participant in the process.

I would like to personally say that I have enjoyed working with him.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I yield to the gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Ranking Member, I knew that Mr. KING would have other opportunities to be on the floor. We are going to be here through Christmas, but if that is not the case, then he has kind of a smile of Santa Claus, but I just want to say to Chairman KING, as well, just to thank you for your service. There is no doubt of your commitment to America's security, and I have enjoyed having the opportunity to work with you on the committee.

□ 1500

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I urge my colleagues to support the bill and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank Senator BROWN for introducing this legislation to address the ongoing DHS financial management challenges. Also, let me thank the ranking member, Mr. THOMPSON, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, Ms. JACKSON LEE, for their kind words. This probably will be my last appearance on the floor as chairman of the committee.

I want to thank the ranking member. It has now been over 7 years we have worked together as chairman and ranking member. I enjoyed working with you. I enjoyed it a lot more when I was chairman, and I'm sure you enjoyed it a lot more when you were chairman. But no matter what our capacities were, I always found it a privilege to be able to work with you. When we could cooperate, we did. When we had honest differences, I think we expressed them in a very gentlemanly way. I certainly know that you did, and I want to thank you for that.

I want to also thank the committee staff, especially Mike Russell, Mandy Bowers, and Kerry Ann Watkins, for the tremendous job they did, and all the members of the staff of both the majority and the minority. And, Madam Speaker, I would like to thank you for your years of service in the House here as well.

Again, it's been a great privilege being chairman. I believe we achieved a lot. I think most importantly what the ranking member has tried to do and what I've tried to do is establish the significance of this committee and to prove that on major issues affecting the country, that both parties can work together in a bipartisan way. And I thank the gentleman for his cooperation on that.

Going back to business, I urge support of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1998, the "DART Act," the purpose of which is to obtain an unqualified audit opinion, and improve financial accountability and management at the Department of Homeland Security.

The DART Act will permit Congress to effectively perform its oversight duties with respect to the Department of Homeland Security.

As a Member of the Committee on Homeland Security and Ranking Member of its Subcommittee on Transportation, tasked with oversight of the Department, I am a strong supporter of the work that the Department does on behalf of the American people.

It is important that the public understand the vital work that the Department has done and continues to do to assess and counter threats and to maintain the security of our homeland.

S. 1998 directs the Secretary of Homeland Security, in order to comply with the Department of Homeland Security Financial Accountability Act, to ensure that the balance sheet of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and associated statement of custodial activity for FY2012 and FY2013, and the full set of consolidated financial statements of DHS for FY2014 through FY2016, are ready in a timely manner and in preparation for an audit as part of preparing required performance and accountability reports.

Furthermore, S. 1998 directs the Chief Financial Officer of DHS to:

(1) Submit a report on the plans to obtain an unqualified opinion annually until an unqualified opinion is submitted, and

(2) Submit to Congress and the Comptroller General a report on DHS's plans and resources needed to modernize DHS's financial systems.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) was created in 2003, with the vital mission of ensuring that, in the wake of the September 11th, 2001 attacks, the American homeland is safe, secure, and protected against terrorists who would do us harm.

Our domestic security is our nation's top priority; a mission that includes terrorism prevention and security enhancements, border management and security, immigration administration and enforcement, cyberspace security, and disaster response.

With a \$40 billion annual budget and more than 200,000 employees, DHS is the nation's 3rd largest federal department.

Consequently, this Congress must pay close attention and give careful consideration to the activities of the Department of Homeland Security as we assist it in becoming a more sound, lower-risk, more efficient, and more effective department.

Given the relatively new nature of the Department, along with the fact that it originated as an amalgamation of 22 federal agencies, it is no surprise that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has consistently designated—as recently as December 2011—the implementation and transformation of the Department as high-risk with respect to waste, fraud, abuse mismanagement, or needing reform.

Unfortunately, since its inception, the Department has been unable to obtain what is known as a "clean" or "unqualified" audit of its financial statements (i.e. a finding by an objective reviewer that the Department's finances are in conformity with generally accepted accounting standards). The DART Act seeks to address this issue by directing the Department to take the steps necessary to obtain a clean audit by the end of fiscal year 2013.

In order for Congress to be able to effectively monitor and oversee DHS's efforts in this area, S. 1998 also requires DHS to provide Congress with specific details on its plans to achieve a clean audit, through eliminating material weaknesses in its internal financial

controls and by modernizing its financial management systems.

While DHS has previously stated that it can obtain an unqualified opinion on all of its financial statements by the end of fiscal year 2013, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has noted that "there is no clear plan for how auditability will be achieved" by the end of 2013.

As we evaluate the progress of the Department, I want to ensure that the Department has sufficient funding and its finances are managed and structured properly such that our nation is safe and secure from all threats.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1998.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FRANK BUCKLES WORLD WAR I MEMORIAL ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6364) to establish a commission to ensure a suitable observance of the centennial of World War I, to designate memorials to the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I, including a National World War I Memorial on the National Mall in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6364

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Frank Buckles World War I Memorial Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Findings.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.
- Sec. 4. Establishment of World War I Centennial Commission.
- Sec. 5. Duties of Centennial Commission.
- Sec. 6. Powers of Centennial Commission.
- Sec. 7. Centennial Commission personnel matters.
- Sec. 8. Termination of Centennial Commission.
- Sec. 9. Designation of National World War I Museum and Memorial in Kansas City, Missouri.
- Sec. 10. Establishment of National World War I Memorial in the District of Columbia.
- Sec. 11. Prohibition on obligation of Federal funds.

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) From 2014 through 2018, the United States and nations around the world will mark the centennial of World War I, including the entry of the United States into the war in April 1917.

(2) America's support of Great Britain, France, Belgium, and its other allies in

World War I marked the first time in United States history that American soldiers went abroad in defense of liberty against foreign aggression, and it marked the true beginning of the "American century".

(3) Although World War I was at the time called "the war to end all wars", in fact the United States would commit its troops to the defense of foreign lands 3 more times in the 20th century.

(4) More than 4,000,000 men and women from the United States served in uniform during World War I, among them 2 future presidents, Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower. Two million individuals from the United States served overseas during World War I, including 200,000 naval personnel who served on the seas. The United States suffered 375,000 casualties during World War I, including 116,516 deaths.

(5) The events of 1914 through 1918 shaped the world, the United States, and the lives of millions of people.

(6) The centennial of World War I offers an opportunity for people in the United States to learn about and commemorate the sacrifices of their predecessors.

(7) Commemorative programs, activities, and sites allow people in the United States to learn about the history of World War I, the United States involvement in that war, and the war's effects on the remainder of the 20th century, and to commemorate and honor the participation of the United States and its citizens in the war effort.

(8) While the other great conflicts of the 20th century, World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War, have national memorials on the Mall in Washington, DC, there currently exists no national memorial honoring the service of the United States and its citizens in World War I.

(9) In 1921, the people of Kansas City, Missouri, dedicated a site in that city for a memorial to the service of Americans in World War I, a ceremony attended by General John J. Pershing and military leaders of Great Britain, France, Belgium, and Italy. In 1924, the cornerstone of the 217-foot Liberty Memorial Tower was laid. On Armistice Day 1926, President Calvin Coolidge delivered the key note address at the Memorial's dedication ceremony. The Memorial and surrounding grounds were completed in 1938, with an inscription that reads "In Honor of Those Who Served in the World War in Defense of Liberty and Our Country."

(10) The 106th Congress recognized the Liberty Memorial as a national symbol of World War I.

(11) The 108th Congress designated the museum at the base of the Liberty Memorial as "America's National World War I Museum". The museum preserves the story of World War I, and educates and enlightens people about this significant event.

### SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) **AMERICA'S NATIONAL WORLD WAR I MUSEUM.**—The term "America's National World War I Museum" means the Liberty Memorial Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, as recognized by Congress in section 1031(b) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375; 118 Stat. 2045).

(2) **CENTENNIAL COMMISSION.**—The term "Centennial Commission" means the World War I Centennial Commission established by section 4(a).

(3) **MEMORIAL FOUNDATION.**—The term "Memorial Foundation" means the World War I Memorial Foundation authorized to establish the National World War I Memorial in the District of Columbia under section 10.

(4) **VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATION.**—The term "veterans service organization" means

any organization recognized by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code.

### SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a commission to be known as the "World War I Centennial Commission".

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **COMPOSITION.**—The Centennial Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(A) Two members who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(B) One member who shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(C) Two members who shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate.

(D) One member who shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

(E) Three members who shall be appointed by the President from among persons who are broadly representative of the people of the United States (including members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and representatives of veterans service organizations).

(F) One member who shall be appointed by the executive director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

(G) One member who shall be appointed by the executive director of the American Legion.

(H) One member who shall be appointed by the president of the Liberty Memorial Association.

(2) **TIME FOR APPOINTMENT.**—The members of the Centennial Commission shall be appointed not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) **PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.**—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Centennial Commission.

(4) **VACANCIES.**—A vacancy in the Centennial Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) **MEETINGS.**—

(1) **INITIAL MEETING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Centennial Commission have been appointed, the Centennial Commission shall hold its first meeting.

(B) **LOCATION.**—The location for the meeting held under subparagraph (A) shall be the America's National World War I Museum.

(2) **SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Centennial Commission shall meet at the call of the Chair.

(B) **FREQUENCY.**—The Chair shall call a meeting of the members of the Centennial Commission not less frequently than once each year.

(C) **LOCATION.**—Not less frequently than once each year, the Centennial Commission shall meet at the America's National World War I Museum.

(3) **QUORUM.**—Seven members of the Centennial Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(d) **CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.**—The Centennial Commission shall select a Chair and Vice Chair from among its members.

### SEC. 5. DUTIES OF CENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The duties of the Centennial Commission are as follows:

(1) To plan, develop, and execute programs, projects, and activities to commemorate the centennial of World War I.

(2) To encourage private organizations and State and local governments to organize and participate in activities commemorating the centennial of World War I.

(3) To facilitate and coordinate activities throughout the United States relating to the centennial of World War I.

(4) To serve as a clearinghouse for the collection and dissemination of information about events and plans for the centennial of World War I.

(5) To develop recommendations for Congress and the President for commemorating the centennial of World War I.

(b) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **PERIODIC REPORT.**—Not later than the last day of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than the last day of each 3-month period thereafter, the Centennial Commission shall submit to Congress and the President a report on the activities and plans of the Centennial Commission.

(2) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Centennial Commission shall submit to Congress and the President a report containing specific recommendations for commemorating the centennial of World War I and coordinating related activities.

### SEC. 6. POWERS OF CENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

(a) **HEARINGS.**—The Centennial Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Centennial Commission considers appropriate to carry out its duties under this Act.

(b) **POWERS OF MEMBER AND AGENTS.**—If authorized by the Centennial Commission, any member or agent of the Centennial Commission may take any action which the Centennial Commission is authorized to take under this Act.

(c) **INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—The Centennial Commission shall secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Centennial Commission considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Upon the request of the Chair of the Centennial Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Centennial Commission.

(d) **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.**—Upon the request of the Centennial Commission, the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall provide to the Centennial Commission, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Centennial Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

(e) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Centennial Commission is authorized—

(A) to procure supplies, services, and property; and

(B) to make or enter into contracts, leases, or other legal agreements.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The Centennial Commission may not enter into any contract, lease, or other legal agreement that extends beyond the date of the termination of the Centennial Commission under section 8(a).

(f) **POSTAL SERVICES.**—The Centennial Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(g) **GIFTS, BEQUESTS, AND DEVICES.**—The Centennial Commission shall accept, use, and dispose of gifts, bequests, or devises of services or property, both real and personal, for the purpose of covering the costs incurred by the Centennial Commission to carry out its duties under this Act.

### SEC. 7. CENTENNIAL COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) **COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.**—Members of the Centennial Commission shall serve without compensation for such service.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Centennial Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with the applicable provisions of title 5, United States Code.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chair of the Centennial Commission shall, in consultation with the members of the Centennial Commission, appoint an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Centennial Commission to perform its duties.

(2) COMPENSATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Chair of the Centennial Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and any other personnel appointed under paragraph (1).

(B) LIMITATION.—The Chair of the Centennial Commission may not fix the compensation of the executive director or other personnel appointed under paragraph (1) at a rate that exceeds the rate of payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(C) WORK LOCATION.—If the city government for Kansas City, Missouri, and the Liberty Memorial Association make space available in the building in which the America's National World War I Museum is located, the executive director of the Centennial Commission and other personnel appointed under paragraph (1) shall work in such building to the extent practical.

(d) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Upon request of the Centennial Commission, the head of any Federal department or agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any employee of that department or agency to the Centennial Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties under this Act.

(e) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The Chair of the Centennial Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(f) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Gifts, bequests, and devises of services or property, both real and personal, received by the Centennial Commission under section 6(g) shall be the only source of funds to cover the costs incurred by the Centennial Commission under this section.

#### SEC. 8. TERMINATION OF CENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Centennial Commission shall terminate on the earlier of—

(1) the date that is 30 days after the date the completion of the activities under this Act honoring the centennial observation of World War I; or

(2) July 28, 2019.

(b) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall apply to the activities of the Centennial Commission under this Act.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Section 14(a)(2) of such Act shall not apply to the Centennial Commission.

#### SEC. 9. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL WORLD WAR I MUSEUM AND MEMORIAL IN KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Liberty Memorial of Kansas City at America's National World War I Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, is hereby designated as the "National World War I Museum and Memorial".

(b) CEREMONIES.—The Centennial Commission may plan, develop, and execute ceremonies to recognize the designation of the Liberty Memorial of Kansas City as the National World War I Museum and Memorial.

#### SEC. 10. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL WORLD WAR I MEMORIAL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.—The World War I Memorial Foundation may establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to consist of an appropriate sculptural or other commemorative elements to serve as the National World War I Memorial.

(b) LIMITATION ON SIZE OF MEMORIAL.—The National World War I Memorial may not exceed 0.5 acres in size.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code, shall apply to the establishment of the National World War I Memorial in the District of Columbia and its environs.

(2) EXCEPTION FROM PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL COMMEMORATIVE WORKS IN RESERVE.—Section 8908(c) of title 40, United States Code, does not apply with respect to the selection of the site for the National World War I Memorial.

(3) NO INFRINGEMENT UPON EXISTING MEMORIAL.—The site selected for the National World War I Memorial may not infringe upon or adversely impact the District of Columbia War Memorial.

(d) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST.—The total cost to design and construct the National World War I Memorial may not exceed \$10,000,000.

(e) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—

(1) UPON ESTABLISHMENT OF MEMORIAL.—If, upon payment of all expenses for the establishment of the National World War I Memorial (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the memorial, the Memorial Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to the account provided for in section 8906(b)(3) of such title.

(2) UPON EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMORIAL.—If, upon expiration of the authority for the National World War I Memorial under section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the memorial, the Memorial Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to a separate account with the National Park Foundation for memorials, to be available to the Secretary of the Interior or Administrator of General Services (as appropriate) following the process provided in section 8906(b)(4) of such title for accounts established under section 8906(b)(3) of such title.

(f) CEREMONIES.—The Centennial Commission may plan, develop, and execute ceremonies to recognize the establishment of the National World War I Memorial.

(g) MEMORIAL AREA DEFINED.—In this section, the term "District of Columbia and its environs" has the meaning given that term in section 8902(a)(2) of title 40, United States Code.

#### SEC. 11. PROHIBITION ON OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

No Federal funds may be obligated to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days within which 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 Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, we're about to come up on a very important date regarding World War I, and this bill, sponsored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), H.R. 6364, is a very worthy undertaking that the Congress, I believe, should enact.

So in the spirit of that, I would like to actually recognize and yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I appreciate the gentleman from Utah yielding time.

Madam Speaker, Frank Buckles was the epitome of an American hero and a man who would do anything for this great United States of America.

This is a photograph of him recently taken after he joined the United States Army. Frank Buckles wanted to be in the United States Army. He volunteered. No one would take him because, you see, he wasn't 18. He finally continued to lie about his age, convinced a recruiter he was 21, and at the age of 16 joined the United States Army in the great World War I.

He wanted to get to France as soon as he could, so he volunteered to be in the ambulance service. What he did when he got to Europe was rescue and pick up other doughboys in Europe out of those trenches and take them back behind American lines so their wounds could be taken care of. He also picked up many of our Americans—114,000 to be exact—that died in the great World War I.

He was able to come back to America alive. He made it through the war, although many, as I mentioned, did not. Many Americans when they came home from the great war over there, as Mr. COHEN said, died of the flu they picked up in Europe. In fact, a great number of them died from the Spanish flu, almost as many as died in Europe itself.

Frank Buckles then went to work. During his work, it took him to the Philippines; but when he was in the Philippines, the Japanese invaded in World War II and Frank Buckles again was captured by the Japanese in the Philippines and put in a prisoner-of-war camp for 3½ years. He was about to be executed, and the Americans came and liberated the camp; and he, along with the other prisoners of war, came back to America. Frank Buckles then went back to West Virginia where he worked his farm and drove the tractor until he was 107.

Madam Speaker, it was his decision and his life goal that he would be instrumental in helping build a memorial on the Mall for all of the veterans who served in the great World War I. I met him in 2007, and this project has been going on now for 5 years to try to get approval to build this memorial for all

veterans of World War I on the Mall, almost as long as the war took.

He came to Washington, D.C., a few years ago. This is a picture of him that was taken recently before he died at the age of 110 at the D.C. memorial on the Mall. That is a monument and a memorial to all of the veterans from the District of Columbia that served in World War I. I went with him to this memorial where we talked about expanding our honor of all veterans and having a memorial for everybody in the great World War I.

That was his goal, and he worked with many Members of Congress on this issue. Although he lived to 110, he didn't live long enough to see the memorial created. Madam Speaker, he was the very last American doughboy that lived in the great World War I. They're all gone, every one of them. So it is up to us, Members of Congress and the public, to speak for them and honor them on the Mall right across the street as would be appropriate. In the Mall, we have three of the four great wars of the last century that we honor. We honor those in World War II, the Korean war, and Vietnam. Now it's time to honor all of those who served in the great World War I.

I must compliment a little school down in Texas, Creekwood Middle School, and Jan York, who works there. It was the project of eighth graders years ago to find all of the World War I survivors and do a history project on them throughout the world from all countries; and they did a project, of course, on Frank Buckles, as well. In fact, we were able to get him on the phone, and the eighth grade class at Creekwood Middle School on one of his birthdays sang happy birthday to him.

Those kids who are seniors in high school now will be able to hopefully see this memorial built and the approval of it to be built on the Mall. But I want to thank her and her eighth graders for the history project concept and delving into American history in depth and finding out what had happened in our great American Nation.

I also want to thank my friend, EMANUEL CLEAVER from Missouri, for his help on this legislation; the gentlelady from D.C., Ms. NORTON; also the subcommittee chairman, Mr. BISHOP; and the committee chairman, DOC HASTINGS, as well.

It is important that we pass this legislation. If we get this legislation passed, it will do three things: it will build a memorial on the Mall, it will set up a commission to honor World War I; as this Nation is approaching the 100th year; and it will also recognize—which my friend, Mr. CLEAVER, will talk about—the work of the museum and the national work of the World War I memorial in Kansas City. It's time we passed this to honor those great World War I veterans.

□ 1510

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to

the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate my friend from Utah for yielding.

I'm glad we could keep this photograph up. Here is how I got involved and engaged in this. It's very personal. Actually, the man who took this photograph, David de Young, is a constituent and a friend of mine back from west Michigan. He was actually part of a project that went out to try to then photograph all of the remaining World War I survivors. He traveled to Europe, to Australia, and then had met Frank Buckles along the way and had gotten to know him very well.

Unfortunately, I was not able to meet him in person, but I attended his funeral in Arlington, where we said good-bye as a Nation. I can tell you that it was his desire—Frank's desire—and David's desire, his family's desire, my desire, and I think now, finally, this body's desire to properly say thank you.

The other reason this is very personal and very important to me is that I get to talk about a man named Bill Huizenga—not I, BILL HUIZENGA, but my grandfather, Bill Huizenga—who happened to fight in World War I. He was part of a group called the Polar Bears. They were men who were chosen from Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan because they figured they'd be used to the cold, so they sent them all the way up around Norway to Archangel, Russia, to fight in an undeclared portion of World War I. In fact, Grandpa Bill was there after Armistice Day and where British, Canadian, and American troops remained well into the spring of that following year after Armistice. It wasn't until much, much later that we were actually even officially recognized as being part of that. I can tell you that one of my prized possessions is in having my grandfather's old doughboy helmet, which hangs in our family's home.

It's just a fitting, timely thing that we finally say thank you and that we finally recognize this group of men who fought a terrible war, who fought a war that so many had hoped would be the war to end all wars. Unfortunately, we know that isn't the case.

I would like to commend our friends across the aisle—the gentlelady from the District and the gentleman from Missouri—for working on this and led by my friend from Texas (Mr. POE) to get this done. This is an important statement for us and is a fitting tribute to that generation.

Frank, we thank you for your service, and we thank all of those families.

Ms. NORTON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, may I say that we will miss seeing you occasionally in that chair, and I know I speak for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say we will espe-

cially miss you sitting in the chair as chair of Financial Services of the Appropriations Committee and as a Member of this body, which you have so graciously served.

I rise in support of this important legislation. H.R. 6364 establishes a commission to ensure the suitable observation of the centennial of World War I. It further provides for the designation of a memorial to the service of the members of the United States Armed Forces throughout the United States who participated in World War I, and it finally protects the District of Columbia World War I Memorial on The Mall.

This bill had to do three things, and I want to express my appreciation to all of the Members who were party to the agreement that finally resulted in this bill—my colleagues Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER of Missouri, Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona—for working with me to preserve the District of Columbia World War I Memorial. In particular, the bill that is before us, Madam Speaker, is an example of what can be done when Members work together to achieve a resolution of their individual concerns.

Earlier in this Congress, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) introduced H.R. 938. It would have, among other things, nationalized the DC war memorial by designating it as the District of Columbia and National World War I Memorial. We were all in agreement that there should be a suitable memorial on Federal land as we now approach this extraordinary anniversary in 2014; but of course, I had to oppose altering the integrity of the DC war memorial. That memorial was built with not one Federal dollar but, rather, with the blood and treasure of DC residents, including funds from school children. Of the more than 26,000 DC residents who served in World War I, the 499 who died—more than the number from three States—have their names individually carved on that memorial. Our memorial is deeply symbolic of the historic and continuing concerns of District residents, particularly of our veterans, who continue to serve without equal representation in the Congress, equal rights as citizens, and equal local government control.

I am very happy this afternoon to report that H.R. 6364 protects the integrity of the DC war memorial and goes further. It meets the concern for a World War I memorial here for all veterans, which is the concern that Mr. POE spoke of; and it meets Mr. CLEAVER's concern and the concern of Members from Missouri—like you, Madam Speaker—for a designation of that extraordinarily beautiful memorial there as a national World War I memorial.

The bill establishes a commission to ensure a suitable observance of the centennial of World War I, and it designates memorials to the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I, including a national World War I Memorial.

H.R. 6364 protects the DC memorial because it complies with the provision of the Commemorative Works Act, which prohibits a new memorial from “interfer[ing] with or encroach[ing] on, an existing commemorative work.” The bill goes further by saying that the site of the national World War I Memorial on Federal land may not “infringe upon or otherwise adversely impact the District of Columbia World War I Memorial.” This preservation is, of course, critical to DC residents, who deserve to have a memorial dedicated to their veterans as, I might mention, every single State has as to its World War I veterans because, at that time, most Americans thought it preferable to have memorials in their own States, so each and every State has a World War I Memorial. Today, in contrast, people insist on memorials to their veterans on Federal land here.

It has always been our position that a national memorial dedicated to all Americans who served in World War I should be located in the Nation’s Capital, and I have been committed and remain committed to working with my colleagues to find suitable locations in the District of Columbia for a national World War I Memorial. I am happy that H.R. 6364 allows for such a memorial, that it does not interfere with the DC war memorial, and that it appropriately commemorates the beautiful memorial in Missouri.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER), who has worked so hard on this bill and has been so creative and diligent and committed.

Mr. CLEAVER. We are here today in an unprecedented show of bipartisanship with this piece of legislation. H.R. 6364 is the product of both sides of the aisle working together to do what is right to honor the memory of our veterans.

I especially want to thank Representative TED POE for his efforts in bringing this bill to the floor today as well as to thank Representative ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for her work on the legislation. Of course, I’d also like to thank Majority Leader CANTOR for his support along the way.

□ 1520

Frank Buckles, who was on the stage of the Liberty Memorial in Kansas City just 4 years ago during the Veterans Day program, was the last surviving veteran from World War I, and he was from the State of Missouri. Unfortunately, he passed away during the drafting of this very bill. However, even with Mr. Buckles’ passing, our commitment remains strong as it is never too late to demonstrate our appreciation to the veterans of the Great War for their service and sacrifices.

This bill will honor that service by establishing a centennial commission that would see to it that the 100th anniversary of the Great War did not slip away, as many things slip away in this place where there is sometimes more partisan bickering than is necessary. Not only does this bill serve to honor the memory of our great veterans; but it stands, I think, as a symbol that bipartisanship and cooperation are, indeed, possible.

The United States formally joined the war in April of 1917; and during that time, more than 4.7 million Americans served. Now it’s our job to serve their memory.

The Fifth District of Missouri, which I proudly serve, includes Kansas City, the home of the Liberty Memorial. This is the Liberty Memorial. I think it is always important for people to see it because I think when people hear Liberty Memorial, if they are not from the area, if they are not visiting Kansas City, they may think it’s just some little something. You can see it in terms of the Kansas City skyline, and I would also take this opportunity to remind people that this is the largest city in the State of Missouri.

This Liberty Memorial is one of the great treasures of our community and our State. It sits atop the World War I Museum. In 1919, the people of Kansas City raised \$2.5 million, mainly through children, in 10 days to create the Liberty Memorial. The dedication ceremony was the only time in history that the Supreme Allied Commanders were together in one place. The dedication of this memorial was held on November 1, 1921.

In 1994, during my first term as mayor of Kansas City, the museum added greater majesty to the site with the construction of a municipally funded restoration project. The Liberty Memorial operates the only American museum solely dedicated to preserving the objects, history, and personal experiences of a war whose impact still echoes today. This bill would also redesignate this facility as the National World War I Memorial and Museum and give it the distinction it richly deserves.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER), one of the cosponsors of the bill.

Mr. YODER. I thank the gentleman from Utah, and I want to echo the comments of my friend and colleague from Missouri, across the Kansas City border, who so eloquently described the majesty and beauty of the World War I Museum and Memorial that we have in Kansas City. It is truly a national tribute. And to spend time today on the House floor, to take a moment to pay tribute to the men and women who sacrificed in World War I and to designate this World War I museum the National World War I Memorial is a wonderful moment that I have a chance to take part in, and I want to thank my col-

league from Missouri, Mr. CLEAVER, and my colleague from Texas, Mr. POE, and others who have put so much time and work into this legislation.

As has been said, 2014 will mark the 100th anniversary, the centennial anniversary of the Great War. The Frank Buckles World War I Memorial Act establishes this centennial commission to ensure that those who served and sacrificed to promote the ideals of liberty and freedom are properly honored for their bravery, and to honor the World War I hero Frank Buckles that TED POE and others have so appropriately described today.

It’s sometimes difficult for Kansas City and Missouri, as Madam Speaker knows, and my colleague from Missouri, Mr. CLEAVER, knows to agree on many things. But it’s a nice opportunity for a Kansan to come down and join with my colleague from Missouri, Mr. CLEAVER, and others, to take this moment to honor the World War I Museum and Memorial in Kansas City which does such a great job of paying tribute to the service and sacrifice of the men and women in World War II.

I actually had a chance recently to join Mr. CLEAVER on Veterans Day when we addressed veterans from multiple wars to talk about the service and sacrifice and, really, the legacy that has continued on for generations in this country of serving our country and many people paying the ultimate sacrifice.

So to have a chance to take part in that on Veterans Day with Mr. CLEAVER was great, and to be here today to recognize the Kansas City memorial and museum as the National World War I Memorial is a great opportunity. And I want to encourage all of my colleagues to take the time to go out to Kansas City and see this museum. It is top-notch quality; I think you all will be very impressed. I’m pleased to support this legislation today and to recognize that museum and memorial and to ultimately recognize the service and sacrifice of the men and women who served in World War I.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I am not only pleased with the outcome of this bill; I am proud of the way it was achieved. This bill about war dead, about war heroes, had emotional content. But the Members reasoned together and in a collegial fashion agreed upon an outcome that is satisfactory to all of us.

There are going to be three ways in which World War I heroes are remembered: for sure here in the District of Columbia with the existing memorial, and now in Kansas City with the majestic memorial that is there, and of course this bill authorizes a second memorial here in the District of Columbia, the Nation’s Capital.

The Members cooperated and achieved the kind of resolution that we hope will, during this lame duck session, become a model for how to reach the ultimate agreement this year and start off next year.

Without any more speakers, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate Ms. NORTON and Mr. CLEAVER for this very bipartisan approach to something that should live in the memories of all Americans, the sacrifices that were given in this country to provide so much for us. As you know, the United States entered World War I in April of 1917 to support Great Britain, France, Belgium, and other allies. It was the first time that American soldiers went abroad in defense of liberty against foreign aggression. More than 4 million men and women served in uniform during the Great War. There were 375,000 American casualties during World War I, including 116,516 fatalities.

The upcoming centennial is an opportunity for the United States to honor the sacrifices of these great Americans. H.R. 6364 creates a World War I commission to commemorate the upcoming centennial. The bill would establish a memorial in the District of Columbia to honor those who fought during the Great War. I would also note that there are no Federal funds that are attached to the building of this. H.R. 6364 was favorably reported by unanimous consent in the Committee on Natural Resources last week, and I again want to thank Congressman POE from the State of Texas for introducing this piece of legislation and the numerous individuals on both sides of the aisle. It is a very bipartisan approach, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, H.R. 6364 would authorize the World War I Memorial Foundation to create a commemorative work on federal land in the District of Columbia. From 1914 to 1918, World War I took 116,516 American lives. However, despite the existence of memorials to the fallen of World War II, the Korean War and the Vietnam War on the National Mall, a national WWI memorial has never been authorized.

The author of this legislation, Mr. POE, has worked for many years to construct a proposal that adequately recognizes Americans who served in the Great War and addresses the concerns of a multitude of stakeholders.

This proposal is modest, will have a minimal footprint, and expressly prohibits federal funds. The memorial needs a specific exemption from current law to be permitted on the National Mall. This is not something this Congress should take lightly. The Natural Resources Committee held two hearings on this specific memorial and another hearing on the overall future of the National Mall to better understand the short-term and long-term implications of granting this authorization.

As with other commemorative works, the World War I Memorial will pass through a rigorous, public approval process which may place it on the National Mall. However, it is not the intention to undermine the current prohibition under the Commemorative Works Act, but instead close the book on the collection of war

memorials and proceed with a careful examination of what the future holds for the mall.

To reiterate, approval of this legislation is not a signal that the Mall should be opened up for construction. The existing prohibition has served us well for the last decade and will serve us in the future. With this authorization we will raise the bar higher, even beyond the standard of the Great War.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6364, the Frank Buckles World War I Memorial Act, as amended. I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives TED POE, EMANUEL CLEAVER, RAUL M. GRIJALVA, and Chairman ROB BISHOP for working with me to preserve the District of Columbia War Memorial.

Earlier this Congress, Representative TED POE introduced H.R. 938, which would have nationalized the D.C. memorial by re-designating it as the "District of Columbia and National World War I Memorial." While I very much support commemorating all of the service men and women who fought in World War I, I had to oppose altering the integrity of the D.C. memorial. The D.C. memorial was built with the blood and treasure of D.C. residents, including funds from school children. Of the more than 26,000 D.C. residents who served in World War I, the 499 who died, more than the number from three states, have their names engraved on the memorial. Our memorial is deeply symbolic of the historic and continuing concerns of District residents, particularly our veterans, who continue to serve without equal congressional representation, equal rights as citizens, and equal local government control.

I am happy to report that H.R. 6364 protects the integrity of the D.C. memorial, and I believe it identifies the desires of the other members involved. The bill establishes a commission to ensure a suitable observance of the centennial of World War I and designates memorials to the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I, including a National World War I Memorial. H.R. 6364 protects the D.C. memorial because it complies with the provision of the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. §9505 (b)(2)) that prohibits a new memorial from "interfere[ing] with, or encroach[ing] on, an existing commemorative work," and the bill goes further by saying that the site of the national World War I memorial on federal land may not "infringe upon or adversely impact the District of Columbia War Memorial." This preservation is critical to D.C. residents, who deserve to have a memorial dedicated to their veterans.

It has always been my position that a national memorial dedicated to all Americans who served in World War I should be located in the Nation's capital, and I have been committed to working with my colleagues to suggest suitable locations in D.C. for a national World War I memorial. I am happy that H.R. 6364 allows for such a memorial while not interfering with the integrity of the D.C. memorial.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the House Amendment to H.R. 6364, the "Frank Buckles World War I Memorial Act," which establishes the World War I Centennial Commission to oversee projects and programs which commemorate the centennial of World War I and to establish a commemorative work

in the District of Columbia to serve as the National World War I Memorial.

As an experienced legislator representing the people of Houston I have fought hard to protect the honor and the rights of our veterans. I hold our men and women of the armed services in the highest regard. As one of the bloodiest wars of the 20th century, World War I represented the entrance of the United States onto the international stage as the champion of the West, western ideals such as security, liberty, and democracy.

We still mourn the loss of the 115,000 American soldiers who died during the war and extend our deepest gratitude to 205,000 who returned home with serious injuries. Frank Buckles was one of the fine men and women who survived the war.

Born on February 1st, 1901, Frank Woodruff Buckles was the last surviving American veteran of the First World War. In 1917, he enlisted in the Army and served with a detachment from Fort Riley. He drove ambulances and motorcycles near the front lines.

He served in both World War I and II. In World War II he became a prisoner of war (POW) and for 39 months was held captive in the Philippines.

Mr. Buckles was a quiet hero, he moved to West Virginia, married, and tended to his farm until the age of 105. In the twilight of his life, Mr. Buckles never forgot the men and women who served in World War I.

He became the honorary Chairman of the World War I Memorial Foundation. He strongly advocated for establishment of a World War I memorial in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Buckles was World News Tonight's 'Person of the Week' in 2009, in recognition for his efforts to establish the World War I memorial. This quiet hero became the oldest person to speak before Congress. On December 3, 2009, he implored Congress to honor the sacrifice of the brave men and women of World War I. He stated:

We still do not have a national memorial in Washington, D.C. to honor the Americans who sacrificed with their lives during World War I . . . I call upon the American people and the world to help me in asking our elected officials to pass the law for a memorial to World War I in our Nation's capital. These are difficult times, and we are not asking for anything elaborate. What is fitting and right is a memorial that can take its place among those commemorating the other great conflicts of the past century . . . it is time to move forward with honor, gratitude, and resolve.

Frank Buckle asked this country to honor those who fought to protect our way of life. This bill, named in his honor, will serve to ensure that these men and women will never be forgotten and will continue to receive the respect and honor they deserve from future generations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6364, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a commission to ensure a suitable observance of the

centennial of World War I, to provide for the designation of memorials to the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I, and for other purposes.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, DC, December 12, 2012.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER, Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to section 3(b) of the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 15202), I am pleased to appoint Joanne Hayes-White of San Francisco, CA, to the Medal of Valor Review Board.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1634

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

RETURNING SEVERAL MEASURES TO THE SENATE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution constituting a question of the privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 829

Resolved,

SECTION 1. (a) Each bill and amendment of the Senate specified in subsection (b)—

(1) in the opinion of this House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States and is an infringement of the privileges of this House; and

(2) shall be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

(b) The bill and amendment of the Senate referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

(1) S. 3254.

(2) The Senate amendment to H.R. 4310.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

DESIGNATING THE RANKING OF A CERTAIN NAMED MEMBER OF A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 830

Resolved, That Mr. Michaud shall rank above Ms. Brown of Florida on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on House Resolution 827; adopting House Resolution 827, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 6190.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 827) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 183, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 621]

YEAS—224

Adams	Barton (TX)	Black
Aderholt	Bass (NH)	Blackburn
Alexander	Benishek	Bonner
Amash	Berg	Boustany
Amodei	Biggert	Brady (TX)
Bachmann	Bilbray	Brooks
Bachus	Bilirakis	Broun (GA)
Barietta	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan

Bucshon	Heck	Posey
Buerkle	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Burgess	Herger	Quayle
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Camp	Huelskamp	Rehberg
Campbell	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert
Canseco	Hultgren	Renacci
Cantor	Hunter	Ribble
Capito	Hurt	Rigell
Carter	Issa	Rivera
Cassidy	Jenkins	Roby
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Coble	Jones	Rogers (KY)
Coffman (CO)	Jordan	Rogers (MI)
Cole	Kelly	Rohrabacher
Conaway	King (NY)	Rokita
Cravaack	Kingston	Rooney
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Crenshaw	Kline	Roskam
Culberson	Labrador	Ross (FL)
Denham	Lamborn	Royce
Dent	Lance	Runyan
DesJarlais	Landry	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart	Lankford	Scalise
Dold	Latham	Schilling
Dreier	LaTourette	Schock
Duffy	Latta	Schweikert
Duncan (SC)	Lewis (CA)	Scott (SC)
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin
Ellmers	Long	Sensenbrenner
Emerson	Lucas	Sessions
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
Fincher	Lummis	Shuster
Fitzpatrick	Lungren, Daniel	Simpson
Flake	E.	Smith (NE)
Fleischmann	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Fleming	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Flores	Marino	Southerland
Forbes	Massie	Stearns
Fortenberry	McCaul	Stivers
Fox	McClintock	Sullivan
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Terry
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Gardner	McKinley	Thornberry
Garrett	McMorriss	Tiberi
Gerlach	Rodgers	Tipton
Gibbs	Meehan	Turner (NY)
Gibson	Mica	Turner (OH)
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)	Upton
Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Walden
Gosar	Mulvaney	Walsh (IL)
Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	Webster
Granger	Myrick	West
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Graves (MO)	Noem	Whitfield
Griffith (VA)	Nugent	Wilson (SC)
Grimm	Nunes	Wittman
Guinta	Olson	Wolf
Guthrie	Palazzo	Womack
Hall	Paul	Woodall
Hanna	Paulsen	Yoder
Harper	Pearce	Young (AK)
Harris	Petri	Young (FL)
Hartzler	Platts	Young (IN)
Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)	
Hayworth	Pompeo	

NAYS—183

Ackerman	Cicilline	Eshoo
Altmire	Clarke (MI)	Farr
Andrews	Clarke (NY)	Fattah
Baca	Clay	Frank (MA)
Baldwin	Cleaver	Fudge
Barber	Clyburn	Garamendi
Barrow	Cohen	Gonzalez
Bass (CA)	Connolly (VA)	Green, Al
Becerra	Cooper	Green, Gene
Berkley	Costa	Grijalva
Berman	Courtney	Gutierrez
Bishop (GA)	Critz	Hahn
Bishop (NY)	Crowley	Hanabusa
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Hastings (FL)
Bonamici	Cummings	Heinrich
Boren	Curson (MI)	Higgins
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Himes
Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)	Hinchee
Bralley (IA)	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Hirono
Butterfield	DelBene	Hochul
Capps	Deuth	Holt
Capuano	Dingell	Honda
Carnahan	Doggett	Hoyer
Carney	Donnelly (IN)	Israel
Carson (IN)	Doyle	Jackson Lee
Castor (FL)	Edwards	(TX)
Chandler	Ellison	Johnson (GA)
Chu	Engel	Johnson, E. B.

Kaptur Moran Schiff  
Keating Murphy (CT) Schrader  
Kildee Nadler Schwartz  
Kind Napolitano Scott (VA)  
Kissell Neal Scott, David  
Kucinich Oliver Serrano  
Langevin Owens Sewell  
Larsen (WA) Pallone Sherman  
Larson (CT) Pascrell Shuler  
Lee (CA) Pastor (AZ) Sires  
Levin Payne Slaughter  
Lewis (GA) Pelosi Smith (WA)  
Lipinski Perlmutter Speier  
Loeb sack Peters Stark  
Lofgren, Zoe Peterson Sutton  
Lowey Pingree (ME) Thompson (CA)  
Lujan Polis Thompson (MS)  
Lynch Price (NC) Tierney  
Maloney Quigley Tonko  
Markey Rahall Towns  
Matheson Rangel Tsongas  
Matsui Richardson Van Hollen  
McCarthy (NY) Richmond Velázquez  
McColum Rothman (NJ) Vislosky  
McDermott Roybal-Allard Walz (MN)  
McGovern Ruppertsberger Wasserman  
McIntyre Rush Schultz  
McNerney Ryan (OH) Watt  
Meeks Sánchez, Linda Waxman  
Michaud T. Welch  
Miller (NC) Sanchez, Loretta Wilson (FL)  
Miller, George Sarbanes Woolsey  
Moore Schakowsky Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—24

Akin Dicks Nunnelee  
Austria Gallegly Pence  
Bartlett Griffin (AR) Pitts  
Bono Mack Holden Reyes  
Burton (IN) Johnson (IL) Ross (AR)  
Conyers King (IA) Schmidt  
Costello Mack Stutzman  
DeGette McCarthy (CA) Waters

## □ 1659

Messrs. LUJÁN, RANGEL, FRANK of Massachusetts, PETERSON, BERMAN, WELCH and SHULER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. HARTZLER changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BLUMENAUER was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF  
CLACKAMAS MALL SHOOTING

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, in my district at the Clackamas Town Center, a masked gunman with a stolen semi-automatic rifle discharged some 60 shots. He killed two people, wounded a 15-year-old girl, and then took his own life. This terrible tragedy could have been far worse, as the gunman had several fully loaded magazines and there were over 10,000 people shopping and working in the shopping center.

The police were on the scene in 1 minute. Countless lives were saved due to careful preparation, emergency procedures, and the courage and foresight of law enforcement and the General Growth Properties mall management.

My colleagues from Oregon and I would ask that the House observe a moment of silence in the memory of the victims, Steve Forsyth and Cindy Ann Yuille, and their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN). Members will rise, and members in the gallery, please rise, and the House will observe a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 178, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 622]

YEAS—226

Adams Goodlatte Myrick  
Aderholt Gosar Neugebauer  
Alexander Gowdy Noem  
Amash Granger Nugent  
Amodei Graves (GA) Nunes  
Bachmann Graves (MO) Olson  
Bachus Griffith (VA) Palazzo  
Barletta Grimm Paul  
Barton (TX) Guinta Paulsen  
Bass (NH) Guthrie Petri  
Benishek Hall Platts  
Berg Hanna Poe (TX)  
Biggert Harper Pompeo  
Bilbray Harris Posey  
Bilirakis Hartzler Price (GA)  
Bishop (UT) Hastings (WA) Quayle  
Black Hayworth Reed  
Blackburn Heck Rehberg  
Bonner Hensarling Reichert  
Boustany Herger Renacci  
Brady (TX) Herrera Beutler Ribble  
Brooks Hochul Rigell  
Broun (GA) Huelskamp Rivera  
Buchanan Huizenga (MI) Roby  
Bucshon Hultgren Roe (TN)  
Buerkle Hunter Rogers (AL)  
Burgess Hurt Rogers (KY)  
Camp Issa Rogers (MI)  
Campbell Jackson Lee Rohrabacher  
Canseco (TX) Rokita  
Cantor Jenkins Rooney  
Capito Johnson (OH) Ros-Lehtinen  
Carter Johnson, Sam Roskam  
Cassidy Jones Ross (FL)  
Chabot Jordan Royce  
Chaffetz Kelly Runyan  
Coble King (IA) Ryan (WI)  
Coffman (CO) King (NY) Scalise  
Cole Kingston Schilling  
Conaway Kinzinger (IL) Schmidt  
Cravaack Kline Schock  
Crawford Labrador Schweikert  
Crenshaw Lamborn Scott (SC)  
Culberson Lance Scott, Austin  
Denham Lankford Sensenbrenner  
Dent Latham Sessions  
DesJarlais LaTourette Sherman  
Diaz-Balart Latta Shimkus  
Dold Lewis (CA) Shuster  
Donnelly (IN) LoBiondo Simpson  
Dreier Long Smith (NE)  
Duncan (SC) Lucas Smith (NJ)  
Duncan (TN) Luetkemeyer Smith (TX)  
Ellmers Lummis Sotherland  
Emerson Lungren, Daniel Stearns  
Farenthold E. Stivers  
Fincher Manzullo Stutzman  
Fitzpatrick Marchant Sullivan  
Flake Marino Terry  
Fleischmann Massie Thompson (PA)  
Fleming McCaul Thornberry  
Flores McClintock Tiberi  
Forbes McHenry Tipton  
Fortenberry McKeon Turner (NY)  
Foxy McKinley Turner (OH)  
Franks (AZ) McMorris Upton  
Frelinghuysen Rodgers Walberg  
Gardner Meehan Walden  
Garrett Mica Webster  
Gerlach Miller (FL) West  
Gibbs Miller (MI) Westmoreland  
Gibson Miller, Gary Whitfield  
Gingrey (GA) Mulvaney Wilson (SC)  
Gohmert Murphy (PA) Wittman

Wolf Yoder Young (IN)  
Womack Young (AK)  
Woodall Young (FL)

NAYS—178

Ackerman Fudge Olver  
Altmire Garamendi Owens  
Andrews Gonzalez Pallone  
Baca Green, Al Pascrell  
Baldwin Green, Gene Pastor (AZ)  
Barber Grijalva Payne  
Barrow Gutierrez Pearce  
Bass (CA) Hahn Pelosi  
Becerra Hanabusa Perlmutter  
Berkley Hastings (FL) Peters  
Berman Heinrich Pingree (ME)  
Bishop (GA) Higgins Polis  
Bishop (NY) Himes Price (NC)  
Blumenauer Hinchey Quigley  
Bonamici Hinojosa Rahall  
Boren Hirono Richardson  
Boswell Richmond Holt  
Brady (PA) Honda Rothman (NJ)  
Braley (IA) Hoyer Roybal-Allard  
Brown (FL) Israel Ruppertsberger  
Butterfield Johnson (GA) Rush  
Capps Johnson, E. B. Ryan (OH)  
Capuano Kaptur Sánchez, Linda  
Carnahan Keating T.  
Carney Kildee Sanchez, Loretta  
Castor (FL) Kind Sarbanes  
Chandler Kissell Schakowsky  
Chu Kucinich Schiff  
Cicilline Landry Schrader  
Clarke (MI) Langevin Schwartz  
Clarke (NY) Larsen (WA) Thompson (CA)  
Clay Larson (CT) Scott, David  
Cleaver Lee (CA) Serrano  
Clyburn Levin Sewell  
Cohen Lewis (GA) Shuler  
Connolly (VA) Lipinski Sires  
Cooper Loeb sack Slaughter  
Costa Lofgren, Zoe Smith (WA)  
Courtney Lowey Stark  
Critz Lynch Sutton  
Crowley Maloney Thompson (CA)  
Cuellar Markey Thompson (MS)  
Cummings Matheson  
Curson (MI) Matsui Tierney  
Davis (CA) McCarthy (NY) Tonko  
Davis (IL) McCollum Towns  
DeFazio McDermott Tsongas  
DeLauro McGovern Van Hollen  
DelBene McIntyre Velázquez  
Deutch McNerney Vislosky  
Dingell Meeks Walsh (IL)  
Doggett Michaud Walz (MN)  
Doyle Miller (NC) Wasserman  
Edwards Miller, George Schultz  
Ellison Moore Watt  
Engel Moran Waxman  
Eshoo Murphy (CT) Welch  
Farr Nadler Wilson (FL)  
Fattah Napolitano Woolsey  
Frank (MA) Neal Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—27

Akin DeGette McCarthy (CA)  
Austria Dicks Nunnelee  
Bartlett Duffy Pence  
Bono Mack Gallegly Peterson  
Burton (IN) Griffin (AR) Pitts  
Calvert Holden Rangel  
Carson (IN) Johnson (IL) Reyes  
Conyers Lujan Ross (AR)  
Costello Mack Waters

## □ 1709

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASTHMA INHALERS RELIEF ACT  
OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6190) to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to allow for the distribution, sale, and consumption in the United States of remaining inventories of

over-the-counter CFC epinephrine inhalers, 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 Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 182, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 623]

YEAS—229

Aderholt	Garrett	Olson
Alexander	Gibbs	Palazzo
Altmire	Gingrey (GA)	Pascarell
Bachmann	Gohmert	Paul
Bachus	Goodlatte	Pearce
Barletta	Gosar	Peters
Barrow	Gowdy	Peterson
Barton (TX)	Granger	Petri
Bass (NH)	Graves (GA)	Platts
Benishek	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Berg	Green, Gene	Pompeo
Biggart	Griffith (VA)	Posey
Billray	Grimm	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Guinta	Quayle
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Reed
Black	Hall	Rehberg
Blackburn	Hanna	Reichert
Bonner	Harper	Renacci
Boren	Harris	Richmond
Boustany	Hartzler	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Rivera
Brooks	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Herger	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Huelskamp	Rogers (MI)
Buerkle	Huizenga (MI)	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Hultgren	Rokita
Calvert	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Issa	Roskam
Campbell	Jenkins	Royce
Cantoco	Johnson (OH)	Runyan
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Jones	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kelly	Sanchez, Loretta
Chabot	Kildee	Scalise
Clay	King (IA)	Schilling
Cleaver	King (NY)	Schmidt
Clyburn	Kingston	Schock
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Coffman (CO)	Kissell	Scott (SC)
Cole	Kline	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Costa	Lance	Sessions
Cravaack	Landry	Shimkus
Crawford	Lankford	Shuler
Critz	Larson (CT)	Shuster
Crowley	Latham	Simpson
Cuellar	LaTourette	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Curson (MI)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
DeFazio	LoBiondo	Southerland
Denham	Long	Stearns
Dent	Lucas	Stivers
DesJarlais	Lungren, Daniel	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	E.	Sullivan
Dingell	Manzullo	Terry
Donnelly (IN)	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Doyle	Marino	Thornberry
Dreier	Massie	Tiberi
Duffy	Matheson	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Towns
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Turner (NY)
Ellmers	McHenry	Turner (OH)
Emerson	McIntyre	Upton
Engel	McKeon	Walberg
Farenthold	McKinley	Walden
Fincher	McMorris	Walsh (IL)
Flake	Rodgers	Webster
Fleischmann	Mica	West
Fleming	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Flores	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Mulvaney	Wittman
Fortenberry	Murphy (PA)	Wolf
Foxo	Myrick	Womack
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Yoder
Frelinghuysen	Noem	Young (AK)
Gardner	Nunes	Young (IN)

NAYS—182

Ackerman	Gutierrez	Olver
Adams	Hahn	Owens
Amash	Hanabusa	Pallone
Amodei	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Andrews	Hayworth	Paulsen
Baca	Heck	Payne
Baldwin	Heinrich	Pelosi
Barber	Higgins	Perlmutter
Bass (CA)	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Becerra	Hinchev	Polis
Berkley	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Berman	Hirono	Quigley
Bishop (GA)	Hochul	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Rangel
Blumenauer	Honda	Ribble
Bonamici	Hoyer	Richardson
Boswell	Hurt	Roby
Brady (PA)	Israel	Rooney
Braley (IA)	Israel Lee	Ross (FL)
Brown (FL)	(TX)	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Capito	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Capps	Jordan	Rush
Carnahan	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Carney	Keating	T.
Carson (IN)	Kind	Sarbanes
Cassidy	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Labrador	Schiff
Chaffetz	Langevin	Schrader
Chandler	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Chu	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Cicilline	Levin	Scott, David
Clarke (MI)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Clarke (NY)	Lipinski	Sewell
Cohen	Loebsack	Sherman
Connolly (VA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sires
Conyers	Lowey	Slaughter
Cooper	Luetkemeyer	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Luján	Speier
Crenshaw	Lummis	Stark
Cummings	Lynch	Sutton
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
Davis (IL)	Markey	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Matsui	Tierney
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
DeBene	McCollum	Tsongas
Deutch	McDermott	Van Hollen
Doggett	McGovern	Velázquez
Dold	McNerney	Visclosky
Edwards	Meehan	Walz (MN)
Ellison	Meeks	Wasserman
Farr	Michaud	Schultz
Fattah	Miller (FL)	Watt
Fitzpatrick	Miller (NC)	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Welch
Fudge	Moore	Westmoreland
Garamendi	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Gerlach	Murphy (CT)	Woodall
Gibson	Nadler	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Neal	Young (FL)
Grijalva	Nugent	

NOT VOTING—20

Akin	Eshoo	Nunnelee
Austria	Gallely	Pence
Bartlett	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Bono Mack	Holden	Reyes
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Ross (AR)
Costello	Mack	Waters
Dicks	McCarthy (CA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1716

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

**APOLOGY TO MR. HENSARLING**

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I was very critical of some actions that were taken by the Republican leadership involving sponsorship of a bill. It is not

my intention to rehash that. But in the course of a discussion, which was fairly spirited, I accused the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) of having said something that wasn't accurate. I have had a conversation with Mr. HENSARLING, and I believe I said that unfairly to him.

I continue to be critical of what happened, and again I don't want to get into it, but I now believe that I inaccurately imputed the complaints that I had and the actions to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING). So I wish to apologize to him for having inaccurately accused him of doing something that he informs me that he did not do, and I believe him.

**AMERICA'S SUPPORT SHOULD LIE WITH THE SAHRAWI PEOPLE**

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

Mr. RIVERA. Mr. Speaker, like all of us in Congress, I believe in the greatness of the American people and the preeminence of our principles and rights that have made America a beacon of hope and freedom, but there are still many around the world who yearn for basic human liberties.

The Sahrawi people of Western Sahara have been trapped in oppressive conditions for over 30 years, with the support of the corrupt Algerian Government and its puppet regime, the Polisario Front.

The Polisario Front has instituted mass kidnappings of Sahrawis from their homes into the Tindouf region in western Algeria. The majority of these refugees have remained warehoused and imprisoned in Tindouf's sprawling camps for 35 years.

The Polisario collaborates with the likes of Cuba, whose military rations food in the camps in exchange for loyalty to the regime and indoctrinates children who have been stolen from their parents, all while partnering with al Qaeda and the Maghreb.

The Government of Morocco has advanced an autonomy plan, which I will submit at a later time, that addresses these issues with a clear and democratic solution to the long, drawn-out Sahara crisis. This is where America's support should lie.

Mr. Speaker, the United States can and must continue to advance fundamental human rights, freedom, and democracy as we, in this Chamber, continue to work together for peace, justice, and human dignity in the Western Sahara.

**RECOGNIZING DEPARTING MEMBERS OF THE CALIFORNIA DELEGATION**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALAZZO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 60

minutes as the designee of the minor-league leader.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues to pay special tribute to several members of the California Democratic delegation whose service in Congress is shortly coming to an end.

These six members served this House and their constituents with distinction and dedication, and they deserve our admiration and gratitude for the hard work that they have done on behalf of California and our country: Representative JOE BACA, who was elected in 2002, served for 10 years from the 43rd Congressional District; Representative HOWARD BERMAN, who was elected in 1982, served for 30 years, most recently from the 28th District; Representative Bob Filner, sworn in this month as mayor of San Diego, was elected in 1992 and served for 20 years from the 51st District; Representative LAURA RICHARDSON was elected in 2007 and served for 5 years from the 37th District; Representative PETE STARK, the outgoing dean of our delegation, was elected in 1972, and served for more than 40 years from the 13th District; and Representative LYNN WOOLSEY, who was elected in 1992 and served for 20 years for the Sixth Congressional District.

□ 1730

There is much that can be said about the distinguished careers of our departing colleagues, but I'd like to offer a few remarks about the work that I have personally joined them in during their time here in the Congress.

Representative HOWARD BERMAN has served in the House for 30 years, and I am honored to name him among my closest friends in this body. During his service, he has worked on a wide variety of issues, but he was especially known as the champion of human rights and for standing up for the middle class, for the working class, and for the poor in our country.

As the chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee from 2007 to 2010, Mr. BERMAN made great progress on behalf of the less fortunate. He was a leader in securing the reauthorization of our global HIV/AIDS program to help provide access and preventative services and treatment for millions around the globe. He also authored legislation removing Nelson Mandela and other members of the African National Congress from the U.S. terrorism list, on which they had been unjustly placed for many years. Finally, he was a leader in raising concerns about human rights abuses by autocratic governments around the world. Particularly, he was a key leader in bringing additional disclosure to the trade in conflict minerals that has financed the ongoing violence in the Congo.

Mr. BERMAN will be remembered as a strong friend of Israel. He was passionate about the need to achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East, and through his work, he forged a broader coalition on behalf of Israel in the House of Representatives.

Also, I want to recognize Mr. BERMAN's work on behalf of immigration and the treatment of those who have immigrated to this country and his work on behalf of migrant workers and farm workers all across the United States. For that effort, he received the first annual Farmworker Justice Award by the Farmworker Justice Fund in 2000.

Like Mr. BERMAN, our dean, Congressman PETE STARK, has spent his entire distinguished career in Congress advocating on behalf of those whose voices were often drowned out in Washington by the influence of the moneyed interests.

Over the last 40 years, Congressman STARK has been one of the foremost advocates in the effort to ensure that all Americans are able to access quality, affordable health insurance. I am honored to have been one of the three principal coauthors in the House of the historic Affordable Care Act, which will provide access to quality insurance for nearly every single American. I can personally attest to the critical and key role that Mr. STARK played in drafting that law and making sure that the law provides needed relief for working families.

This was a crucial accomplishment, yet it was far from Mr. STARK's only accomplishment in the field of health care. As the former chair and ranking Democrat on the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee for many years, he was a leader on health care reform.

He was the lead author of the original COBRA insurance bill, which ensured that workers faced with losing their jobs would not also immediately lose access to needed health insurance. Those of us who have gone through this recent downturn and recession in this country know from the testimony of our constituents how vital the access to COBRA health insurance is to the health security of their families and to the financial security of their families. He also pioneered the efforts to make modern IT systems available and acquired within the health care systems of this country that will help us improve the outcomes of health care and that will, hopefully, drive down the cost of health care, allowing for the provision of better care for patients.

He, I think along with Sam Gibbons from Florida, pioneered the idea that there should be Medicare for all. He beat on that drum for a very long time, and it was the right drum to beat on. It wasn't achieved, but it did lead to the improvement of health care and to the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

He has also been, obviously, a fearless campaigner on behalf of fairness in our Tax Code. It's unfortunate that he is retiring from the Congress. Since 1986, we've addressed this issue, and maybe there will finally be a chance to get something done in the next Congress, but he paved the way on so many of these issues.

Finally, in my remarks at this moment, I would like to highlight the

work of an outstanding Democrat on the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections of the Education and the Workforce Committee, Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY is a friend of working families everywhere. She knows her struggles. Four decades ago, she was a single working mother who was supporting three children. She knows what it is like to worry about the economic security of families. Later, as a human resources manager, she saw how important employee benefits were to workers in good times and in bad—things that working families are still fighting for, like paid leave, paid sick leave, a secure retirement, and health care.

Serving as chair and ranking member of the Workforce Protections Subcommittee, LYNN WOOLSEY was instrumental in helping to get the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act signed into law, and she successfully fought for new family leave protections for military families dealing with a military deployment or injury. LYNN WOOLSEY was a partner to ensure that coal miners are kept safe and healthy on the job. She even went underground in the coal mine with our late colleague Donald Payne in order to acquire firsthand knowledge of how the workplace works and the environment in which those miners go to work every day.

In the classroom, LYNN WOOLSEY continued to fight for women and working families. She was a tough advocate, making sure that women were represented in the STEM field careers and that young women had access to the sciences and to technology and to math and to engineering. LYNN WOOLSEY worked to ensure that kids had access to an early education, to a well-rounded curriculum, and to services that met their social and emotional needs.

American families have benefited from LYNN WOOLSEY's fierce advocacy. That's our advocate, LYNN. I will miss her contributions on the Education Committee in the years to come.

She has also fought tirelessly to protect the environment, most especially the Marin and Sonoma Coast and the San Francisco Bay. Hopefully, the President will follow her lead and will designate further protections of our ocean and marine habitat in that area of our very precious coast.

I, for one, am very grateful to these Members for the work that they have done for America's middle class and for those who struggle to join our middle class, for the work that they have done on behalf of their constituents and on behalf of the citizens of this country. They all came here to achieve success on behalf of their constituents and on behalf of this country, and they have succeeded. I want to thank them so very much for their service, for their sacrifice, for their ingenuity, for their innovation, and I would say, with regard to these three, for their spirited, tough, harsh, relentless pursuit of what they believed in terms of public policy.

On my own behalf, on behalf of our delegation, and on behalf of the tens of millions of constituents that we represent in California, I want to thank Representatives BACA, BERMAN, Filner, RICHARDSON, STARK, and WOOLSEY for their service and their dedication.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues to pay a special tribute to several members of the California Democratic Congressional Delegation whose service in Congress is shortly coming to an end.

These six Members served this House and their constituents with distinction and dedication and they deserve our admiration and gratitude for the hard work that they have done on behalf of California and our country.

Rep. JOE BACA, who was elected in 2002 and served for 10 years from the 43rd Congressional District; Rep. HOWARD BERMAN, who was elected in 1982 and served for 30 years, most recently from the 28th District; Rep. Bob Filner, sworn in this month as mayor of San Diego and who was elected in 1992, served for 20 years from the 51st District; Rep. LAURA RICHARDSON, who was elected in 2007 and served for five years from the 37th District; Rep. PETE STARK, the outgoing dean of our delegation, who was elected in 1972 and served for 40 years from the 13th District; and Rep. LYNN WOOLSEY, who was elected in 1992 and served for 20 years from the 6th Congressional District.

There is much that could be said about the distinguished careers of these departing colleagues, but I would like to offer a few remarks about the work that I have personally joined them in doing.

Mr. BERMAN has served in the House for 30 years and I am honored to name him among my closest friends in this body.

During his service, he has worked on a wide variety of issues, but he is especially known as a champion for human rights and for standing up for the middle class, for the working class and for the poor in our country.

As the Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee in 2007 through 2010, Mr. BERMAN made great progress on behalf of the less fortunate. He was a leader in securing reauthorization of our global HIV/AIDS program to help provide access to preventative services and treatment for millions around the globe.

He also authored legislation removing Nelson Mandela and other members of the African National Congress from the U.S. terrorism list, on which they were unjustly placed on for many years.

Finally, he has been a leader in raising concerns about human rights abuses by autocratic governments around the world. In particular, he was a key leader in bringing additional disclosure to the trade in conflict minerals that have financed ongoing violence in the Congo.

Mr. BERMAN will be remembered as a strong friend of Israel who was passionate about the need to achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East. His vast knowledge of and experience with world affairs has been an asset to Congress and the Administration and the American people and I expect that we will continue to benefit from his experience in the years to come.

Meanwhile, Mr. BERMAN has also been a leader on a number of issues through his long tenure on the Judiciary Committee. I would particularly like to call attention to his efforts to

establish a more humane immigration system. He has fought to ensure that people who come to our country in search of a better life and to achieve the American Dream are treated with respect and are given the opportunity to use their talents to better themselves and their communities.

For these efforts, he was appropriately awarded the First Annual Farmworker Justice Award by the Farmworker Justice Fund in 2000.

Like Mr. BERMAN, our Dean, Mr. STARK has spent his entire distinguished career in Congress advocating on behalf of those whose voices are too often drowned out in Washington by the influence of the moneyed interests.

Over the last 40 years, Mr. STARK has been one of the foremost advocates in the effort to ensure that all Americans are able to access quality, affordable health insurance. I am honored to have been one of the three principal co-authors in the House of the historic Affordable Care Act, which will provide access to quality insurance for nearly every single Americans. I can personally attest to the critical and key role that Mr. STARK played in drafting that law and making sure that the law provides needed relief for working families.

That was a crucial accomplishment, yet it was far from Mr. STARK's only accomplishment in the health care field. As the former chair and ranking Democrat on the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee for many years, he has been a leader on health care reform.

He was the lead author of the original COBRA insurance bill, which ensured that workers faced with losing their jobs would not also immediately lose access to needed health insurance. Additionally, his legislation to improve our health IT system was incorporated into the 2009 Recovery Act, which is already helping improve the cost and quality of health care in communities across the country.

And he founded the idea of using Medicare as a model for national health insurance for all Americans, not just for seniors. He was ahead of his time when he first proposed this idea but he was right on track.

Mr. STARK has also been a champion on the Ways and Means Committee for tax fairness. He was one of the leaders in shaping the bipartisan, landmark 1986 tax reform bill. Ever since, he has been a leader in keeping up the fight to see that our tax code does not benefit Wall Street CEOs at the expense of working families. He will be the first to admit that he has not always won those fights, and any examination of the tax code that needs to be reformed is proof of that. But he always fought for average Americans and he deserves our appreciation for doing so.

Finally, I want to highlight the work of the outstanding Senior Democrat on the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, Ms. WOOLSEY.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY is a friend of working families everywhere. She knows their struggles. Four decades ago, she was a single-working mother, supporting three children. She knows what it's like to worry about the economic security of families. Later as a human resource manager, she saw how important employee benefits were for workers in good times and bad. Things that working families are still fighting for, like paid leave, paid sick days, a secure retirement and health care.

Serving as the chair and ranking member of the Workforce Protections Subcommittee, Rep. WOOLSEY was instrumental in helping to get the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act signed into law and successfully fought for new family leave protections for military families dealing with a military deployment or injury.

Rep. WOOLSEY was a partner to ensure miners are kept safe and healthy on the job. She even went underground in a coal mine with our late-colleague Rep. Donald Payne to acquire first-hand knowledge of how that workplace works.

In the classroom, Rep. WOOLSEY continued to fight for women and working families. She advocated for women to be represented in STEM careers. And, Rep. WOOLSEY worked to ensure kids had access to an early education, a well-rounded curriculum, and services that met their social and emotional needs.

American families have benefited from Rep. LYNN WOOLSEY's fierce advocacy but I will miss her contributions on the Education and Workforce Committee in the years to come.

She has also fought tirelessly to protect the environment, most especially the Marin and Sonoma coast and the San Francisco Bay. She worked to protect our oceans and marine habitat—and to support all of the jobs that are associated with a healthy ocean and thriving fisheries. And she has been a great partner in our efforts to ensure that California's rivers and the Bay-Delta are managed sustainably.

I, for one, am grateful to these Members for the work they have done for America's middle class and for those who struggle to join it.

The wealthy and powerful have always had a lot of friends in Washington. Apparently it is not hard to be on their side. But the middle class and the working class and the poor have not always been so lucky, not always ending up on the winning side of the ledger in Washington Policy fights. But they should know that these departing Members have always fought for what is right for our economy and for our country.

On my own behalf, and on behalf of our delegation and the tens of millions of constituents we represent in California, I thank Reps. BACA, BERMAN, Filner, RICHARDSON, STARK and WOOLSEY for their service and their dedication.

It is my pleasure to recognize other members of our delegation who wish to speak this afternoon.

Now I would like to recognize other members of our delegation for the purposes of receiving their remarks.

Mr. Honda.

Mr. HONDA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart but with great admiration that I rise today to remember and to thank my departing California Democratic colleagues whose service will be concluded at the end of the 112th Congress.

PETE STARK, the outgoing dean of our delegation, is well-known for speaking his mind and for standing up for what he believes in while giving a voice to the concerns of many who often feel as though they have none.

He has helped millions of Americans keep their health insurance coverage after leaving their jobs. He ensured that people who visit emergency rooms receive help regardless of their ability

to pay, and he promoted innovations in health information technology and the Affordable Care Act. He enacted legislation to increase the number of computers in our schools. He has been a champion on broad environmental issues, such as battling ozone depletion and carbon emissions, and he has been a committed proponent of peace. I am honored to be inheriting portions of PETE's district in Newark and Fremont, and hope to continue his legacy of service to those communities.

A brief word on his son, "Fish," who wrote and had published an op-ed piece which indicated to the constituents the true side, the real side, of PETE STARK, his father.

HOWARD BERMAN is widely known as a leader on Foreign Affairs. What will stand out in my mind, however, is his help, while chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in moving through the committee and the House H. Res. 121. It was a resolution calling upon Japan to apologize and to acknowledge the tragedy endured at the hands of its Imperial Army during World War II by over 200,000 women in Asia who were forced into sexual slavery. HOWARD shares my commitment to achieving justice for those who have suffered atrocities in the past. His leadership will be missed. I also want to thank him for his leadership on the issue of Pat Tillman, a soldier who, it was said, lost his life in a firefight when, in fact, he was killed through fratricide. I appreciate that.

□ 1740

LYNN WOOLSEY came to Congress with a compelling story about how, with a helping hand from her government, she was able to raise three children by herself and have a successful career serving the people of Marin and Sonoma counties. She has been a tireless voice for family-friendly policies, for protecting the coastline of northern California, and for bringing our troops home and ending the misguided wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. LYNN was a leader of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and I call her the mom of the Progressive Caucus. With her passionate voice on progressive issues, she will be missed. Her leadership will be missed, and there will be a great vacuum for us to fill in the future.

Bob Filner played a central role in the years-long odyssey to secure a measure of justice for Filipino veterans who fought alongside U.S. troops in World War II but were denied benefits they earned through their service. After the war, the United States Congress broke the promise it had made to these veterans. For decades to follow, they struggled to secure fair treatment similar to that afforded to the men who fought alongside them. As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Bob Filner was in the middle of this fight. I wish him well as he moves on to a new phase of his service to the people of San Diego.

JOSE BACA, or JOE BACA, has been a friend of mine for a long time, since

school boards and other elected offices, but especially since we served together in the California State Assembly to the Halls of Congress. JOE was chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus while I was chairman of CAPAC, Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and we stood together to fight against harmful English-only and anti-immigrant legislation and amendments. We also share a commitment to protecting the rights of Native Americans, particularly tribal sovereignty. JOE has been a good friend, and I'll miss seeing him regularly on the House floor, but perhaps in a couple of years, we may see him again.

I will also miss LAURA RICHARDSON, whom I have had the pleasure of working with as a member of CAPAC on anti-bullying issues and in the fight to ensure that LGBT families are recognized in our immigration laws.

Dennis Cardoza, our friend who had the dubious honor of taking over my office in 503 Cannon when he first got here as I moved to slightly larger accommodations. He was a strong voice on behalf of his Central Valley constituents.

We also are bidding farewell to a large number of our California Republican colleagues who have served for many years—BRIAN BILBRAY, MARY BONO MACK, DAVID DREIER, ELTON GALLEGLY, WALLY HERGER, JERRY LEWIS, and DAN LUNGREN. While we all certainly haven't agreed on many policy issues over the years, I know that they were as committed to their constituents as I am. And I thank all of them, my California colleagues who will be leaving at the end of the 112th Congress, for their service and I wish them well.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. If I might inquire of the Chair as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 46 minutes remaining.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Thank you, and I now recognize Congresswoman LOIS CAPPs.

Mrs. CAPPs. I would like to thank my colleague, GEORGE MILLER, for setting aside this hour. He just asked about the amount of time, and I will take that to heart as I make my comments because we could all go on for great lengths about all of these dear people who won't be with us in the next Congress. And I add my congratulations for their service, Republicans and Democrats, all of us alike, but I will speak now for the six of our Democratic colleagues who will not come back.

I want to start with our dear friend, LYNN WOOLSEY, to whom I get compared. My progressive constituents often say to me, Now, LOIS, why don't you vote more like LYNN WOOLSEY?

She was one of the first people I met. Her story is compelling as a woman Member of Congress. I don't know how it would be to raise kids by yourself. She is a good voice and advocate for all mothers, all working families, and par-

ticularly those who carry extra burdens themselves. She's put her heart and soul into her work in Congress, and it shows.

As I met you early on when I came here, you were kind and befriended me. I know that you have served your constituents in the same passionate way, and I thank you for the role model you've provided me.

HOWARD BERMAN has provided another kind of role model for me. My husband, before me, came to Congress, in part, to work on Middle Eastern issues; and there's a go-to person in this Congress that I have always relied upon for advice and support in that area, and that's HOWARD BERMAN. He's a Congressperson's Congressman, in my opinion. My Human Rights Watch folks have held him in such high esteem.

It has been a very great honor to serve almost as a neighbor to him. With his district in the Central Valley, San Fernando Valley, and mine on the coast, it has been a real joy to have him as a colleague here. I will treasure always his role in getting me elected and also keeping me here.

I also came to Congress from the health care field, and so the name I heard often was Congressman PETE STARK. He's been here since the seventies, knows all about health care and through all of the intricacies.

I'm pleased, Mr. STARK, that you have been here through the passage of the Affordable Care Act. That's a crowning jewel for you and for all of us. But you've been through many health care ups and downs through the years. You've been a role model for me being on the Ways and Means Committee and in my role on the House Energy and Commerce Committee. Thank you for your service and your friendship.

It's hard to go through this list, Mr. MILLER. This is a wonderful privilege to say thank you. The countless hours that you could add up for the service to constituents and the tremendous leadership within this body and these Members who have given their all and now will not be back in the 113th, it's important to say their names and to honor them and give them credit for what they've done.

JOE BACA has been a fixture for the Central Valley and agriculture, as someone who has agriculture number one in my district as well, but we can't say his name without thinking of the baseball team. There's much to remember JOE BACA for, such as his contributions in agriculture and on the Financial Services Committee as well.

My former colleague now, Bob Filner, who has already assumed another position within our government as mayor of San Diego. When I think of Bob Filner, I think of veterans' issues, and also the fact that he was a college professor before he came to Congress, as my husband was, and they reached out to each other in that capacity. He has worked hard on veterans' issue. I have about 50,000 veterans in my district. So

the GI bill is often something I can give him credit for but also work with my veterans with.

Finally, LAURA RICHARDSON. When I think of LAURA, it's my daughter's name, but I also think of her beautiful singing voice. I know that I shouldn't say that first to my colleague who has shown tremendous leadership within Congress as well, but she'll take her beautiful voice with her. I have been able to work with LAURA on transportation issues as they relate particularly to our ports because she is known for her work with the Port of Long Beach, and I have ports in my district as well. She also will be missed on the women's softball team.

We are friends here. We are colleagues here. We bring our human qualities, and we bring our leadership skills. The California delegation makes me proud every day, and in the next Congress, it will be the memories and the service that has been given to us from these colleagues of ours. That's why I thank you, Mr. MILLER, for setting aside this hour for us to share our thoughts. Thank you.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Thank you.

Before I yield, I turned around and saw that Andrew and Fish and Hannah are here, so welcome the Stark kids.

I yield now to Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. I, too, want to thank you, Congressman MILLER, for yielding me time and for organizing this Special Order tonight.

First to Congressman PETE STARK, who's our departing dean of the California delegation, Congressman STARK represents a district right next door to my district in the East Bay of California, northern California. I have to say that I have known Congressman STARK since I was the president of the Black Student Union at Mills College in the early seventies. I'll never forget this. I wrote my then-Congressman STARK a letter on behalf of the students at Mills College with a request, and he responded so quickly and adhered and replied to that request in a positive way. So on behalf of all of those students then, Congressman STARK, and on behalf of myself today, I just want to say thank you. Thank you for demonstrating what exemplary constituent service was all about.

□ 1750

I think I've known Congressman STARK probably longer than most Members here because I had the privilege to work with the great statesman, Congressman Ron Dellums, and got to know Congressman STARK during that period.

Our districts, we're so proud to represent. We always say we have some of the most outspoken and well-informed and engaged people in this Nation. And Congressman STARK certainly has been at the forefront of making sure that his district became closer to our Fed-

eral Government and brought the government to the people of his district.

So the East Bay thanks you, Congressman STARK, northern California thanks you, and our entire delegation thanks you for so many years of great public service.

I was fortunate to be on the House Foreign Affairs Committee with Chairman HOWARD BERMAN, and I tell you, HOWARD BERMAN's understanding of global affairs is unmatched.

Also, I just have to say, he was such a tremendous asset in our global fight against HIV and AIDS, and really got it so early and helped us negotiate and put together the bills that have been so successful in moving us towards an AIDS-free generation.

I just also have to say with regard to Chairman BERMAN, I appreciate his fairness and his objectivity and his commitment to global peace and security. It's really an honor to have served with him, and I'm going to miss him because I truly honor him as my friend. And I know all of us are going to miss him, but I know that we will work with him in the future on so many issues that he cares about.

Congressman Filner is leaving a strong legacy of support for our Nation's veterans, who have benefited tremendously from his intricate knowledge and impassioned advocacy. Also, I just have to remind us that Congressman Filner was a Freedom Rider during the civil rights movement, and he brought the spirit of justice to his work here in Congress.

Congressman Filner has done an exemplary job as ranking member and chair of the Veteran's Affairs Committee, as we have heard earlier. And our entire caucus can be proud of his outstanding leadership on that committee. As the daughter of a veteran, you know, I understand very deeply those obligations that our Nation has to those men and women who have served.

I had the privilege and the honor to help Bob in his campaign, so I've been in San Diego with Bob. And I tell you, the love and the affection that his constituents have for Congressman Filner is just really unparalleled.

I want to congratulate him for his magnificent win. It was a tough campaign, but he did an unbelievable job, and that's because people in his district really knew him, and he had provided the level of services that allowed him to be elected now, as we will call him very soon, Mayor Filner.

JOE BACA, Congressman BACA really has been a voice for the poor and the underserved during his entire career, not only here in Congress, but in the California legislature. I was privileged to work with JOE on many, many issues, and he has been a consistent voice, both in the California legislature and now here in Congress, for protecting low-income families from unfair, predatory credit practices.

He's used his seat on the House Agriculture Committee and the House Fi-

nanial Services Committee to advance the needs of the most vulnerable Americans. He also consistently has played a role in raising funding levels for food stamps and nutrition programs to feed over 44 million hungry Americans.

As a member and former chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, he was a powerful voice against anti-immigrant laws and always worked to build bridges on the reality of our history as a Nation of immigrants and not based on ideology and rhetoric.

We'll all miss his principled leadership and his passion for serving as a voice for the voiceless in Congress.

And my fellow Congressional Black Caucus member, Congresswoman LAURA RICHARDSON. She has many accomplishments in her brief time here in Congress. She's worked so hard to improve our Nation's transportation infrastructure, has been an advocate for the inclusion of minority and women-owned businesses, and has opened up economic opportunities and strengthened our schools.

I know that she's going to move forward to make more contributions in public service because she's focused and a dedicated elected official.

Finally, I just have to pay tribute to my sister-in-arms, Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY. And I can't say what a bittersweet season this is in seeing you leave after so many years of working hand-in-hand on behalf of peace.

I just have to say that LYNN WOOLSEY has finally made sure that this body recognizes that peace is patriotic, and she's spoken 444 times on the floor as it relates to the need to bring our young men and women home, and I look forward to our continuing work.

She's been a role model for me, and I just have to say, finally, in conclusion, that she understands personally the importance of safety nets. And she brought the House the perspective that comes from relying on public assistance during lean times in her life.

She gave me the courage to talk publicly about my time on public assistance, which was so difficult for me before LYNN'S encouragement.

So, to all of our departing California Members, I'm going to miss all of you so much, but I know we'll see you at home, and you're going to continue to fight the good fight.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I'd like now to recognize Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI.

Ms. MATSUI. I'd like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) for yielding time to me and for bringing us together.

Mr. Speaker, when the 113th Congress starts next year we'll be greeting many new colleagues, and that means we'll have to say goodbye to some of our current colleagues, both Republican and Democrat.

The California Democratic Congressional Delegation is saying goodbye to six members: Representatives STARK, BERMAN, WOOLSEY, Filner, BACA, and RICHARDSON. While in Congress, these

Members served as strong advocates for their constituents, for California, and for our country.

For their many years of service, these six Members have amassed a depth of institutional knowledge that will be missed come next Congress.

First of all, I want to pay tribute to my good friend, Congressman HOWARD BERMAN. HOWARD BERMAN has served for 30 years. I first met HOWARD when he was living in my hometown of Sacramento. He was serving in the State legislature at the time. His daughter, Brinley, and my son, Brian, were in prekindergarten together, so we would see each other as we dropped off our kids. Little did we know then that we would end up being friends, both serving here in Congress.

You know, we've all learned a lot from HOWARD. We've learned to depend on him, his counsel, and his advice. His knowledge and leadership, particularly on foreign affairs, have been invaluable to Congress. His absence from this Chamber will be strongly felt, and he will be sorely missed, but will forever be a friend.

Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY has been a strong advocate—I wouldn't say harsh—strong, for families during her time in Congress. She was also one of the founding members of the Out of Iraq Caucus, where she acted as a leading proponent of bringing our brave servicemen and -women home from war. Congressman WOOLSEY fought for those whose voices were often not heard, and her advocacy and spirit will be very much missed.

As the dean of the California Democratic Congressional Delegation, Congressman PETE STARK has been a leader and a mentor to many Members from California over the years. He has been a champion on health care issues for a very long time, and his work on the Affordable Care Act improved the law and helped ensure all Americans access to quality, affordable health care. We'll always remember his very important contribution.

Congressman Bob Filner was the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs and dedicated his career to helping ensure our returning veterans have the services they need and were promised before serving our country. We'll miss him here in Congress, but I know he'll make a mark as mayor in the city of San Diego.

JOE BACA has been a strong advocate for California's expansive agriculture industry while in Congress. He has worked tirelessly on behalf of the workers themselves, making sure they receive the civil and legal rights they deserve.

Congresswoman LAURA RICHARDSON has worked hard to keep America safe as a member of the Homeland Security Committee. Her commitment to the safety and security of our country and her constituents was unwavering, and she will be missed next year.

California is a large State with many needs and priorities, but our delegation

is strong. During their time in office, these Members have been esteemed colleagues, and it has been an honor to work alongside of them. Their knowledge, passion, and commitment to public service will be greatly missed in these Halls. And I wish to thank each of them for their service and wish them the best in their next adventure.

□ 1800

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I now yield to Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO.

Ms. ESHOO. I want to thank the gentleman from California, my dear friend Mr. MILLER, for organizing this Special Order tonight so that we can take some time, which is the most precious thing, really, that God gives us, is time, and pay tribute to our colleagues who have spent their time being giants in terms of representation and fighting on behalf of their constituents, bringing honor to the House of Representatives and to our country—some of the best exports of the Bay Area and our State of California.

I want to start with the dean of our delegation, Congressman PETE STARK. We salute you, PETE, for all that you have given and done. It's an extraordinary record of 40 years in the House of Representatives. Your name has been synonymous with health care consistently for all of that period of time; for fighting for a place in that health care system for people that are unknown to so many in our society and rejected. You have made room for them in the emergency room and wrote a law that no one would be mistreated. In fact, they had to be treated before they were asked whether they had health insurance or not.

Your record is replete with great and good things. On behalf of your constituents, on behalf of those that so much of society has overlooked, I know that those blessings will come back to you in a very rich and meaningful way as you depart this place. We will miss you. I thank you for your personal kindnesses and for all the wonderful things that you have done. The Bay Area delegation will miss you enormously.

Next, I want to pay tribute to Congressman HOWARD BERMAN. This is really hard to do. Congressman BERMAN's name is synonymous with the following: with farm workers and their rights and with human rights around the world. Anyone that has met and worked with him respects him. It matters not what side of the aisle they have ever come from or what country they come from or what agency they have worked in. HOWARD BERMAN has been an indispensable Member of this Chamber. When he took over the leadership of the Foreign Relations Committee, we saw a new and inspired leadership there demanding a recognition of the Armenian genocide. He served as the original cosponsor of that legislation. His record is replete with distinction.

HOWARD, we will all miss you in a very, very deep and special way. This House will miss you because you brought honor to it in everything that you have done. So it is bittersweet. No, it's just bitter. There isn't any sweetness to it. When I speak of you, I really can't bring enough words to one of the most distinguished records over 30 years that any Member of Congress could ever put together, and that the American people thank you and freedom-lovers and human rights advocates around the world appreciate and bless your name. And I know that, together with Janis, Brinley, and Lindsey, you haven't seen the last of us. We're going to keep coming after you.

To LYNN WOOLSEY, my classmate, we came here and we couldn't even find our way to the credit union, we were so terrified. But together we came. LYNN has brought an exceptional voice to families and to women, so often women heading up those families. And she spoke through the prism of her own experience, which is the most powerful story that anyone can ever tell. No one could ever say to LYNN WOOLSEY, You don't know what you're talking about. Because they knew that she lived it, that she had experienced it. And she came here to change so many women's lives and the lives of families in terms of education for women and girls and for stronger family benefits.

I could go on and on. She brought great voice and vision to the unfortunate policy—the march to folly—when we invaded Iraq. She came to this floor over 100 times to speak against that invasion. We are all in her debt for her conscience, for her integrity, for her wonderful voice, for her friendship, and for her love of the environment of the coast of California, which if there is ever the magical touch of Almighty God, you see it there. She has called on the President and the Congress to make sure the protections will be there in perpetuity. We will remember you in perpetuity. I ask that every blessing you have brought to your constituents in this House will come back to you.

To Bob Filner, to JOE BACA, LAURA RICHARDSON, Dennis Cardoza, and to our Republican colleagues JERRY LEWIS, ELTON GALLEGLY, WALLY HERGER, MARY BONO MACK, BRIAN BILBRAY, DAN LUNGREN, and DAVID DREIER, we thank you. I thank you for your service to the people of this country in this, the House of the people, the magnificent House of Representatives.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I would like to now to yield to the Democratic leader, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank you for yielding, Mr. MILLER. I know that we have a time limitation so I will begin by associating myself with the remarks of Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, who spoke so beautifully and knowledgeably about our colleagues from California who are leaving.

I rise today to thank all my colleagues who are our friends and our

partners from the great State of California. The Members we honor in this Special Order demonstrate the extraordinary diversity of our great Golden State. They hale from northern and southern California, from the Bay Area to the greater Los Angeles area to San Diego. They bring California's wide range of interests and aspirations to the floor of the House every day. Working side by side with the entire California delegation, their service has strengthened the Golden State. The commitment of our departing Members has strengthened the Congress. Their achievements have advanced the character of our country. Each of these Members has brought a unique voice to the table. Yet each shares the same core values: a devotion to public service, a dedication to opportunity, a belief and a promise of America.

Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY spent her career fighting to improve the education of our children, the economic security of their families, and the protection of our workers, as well as our coastline, as Congresswoman ESHOO mentioned. With her departure—I won't say retirement, because she is not a retiring person—the Bay Area loses a powerful advocate in Congress and the Nation loses a tireless progressive leader. It was, I think, Mr. MILLER said 400 times that LYNN WOOLSEY came to the floor to speak against our involvement in the war in Iraq.

Thank you, Congresswoman WOOLSEY.

So it's about the patriotism of this Congress and of the participation as patriots of our colleagues from California, whether it's the education of our children, whether it's the health of our people, as demonstrated by Congressman PETE STARK. We all owe you, PETE STARK, a great debt of gratitude. He has been a fixture in the fight to build and strengthen the pillars of health and economic security for the American people. From his seat on the Ways and Means Committee, to the House floor, he always remained a fierce fighter for Medicare and a passionate advocate for the Affordable Care Act because he believes that health care is a right for all Americans, not a privilege just for the few.

□ 1810

His legacy will live on in stronger support for the well-being of our seniors, our families, and our middle class. I hope it is a source of pride—I know it is to your family—that so many of your colleagues respect you so much and honor your leadership and service here.

As has been mentioned, Congressman Filner left us. He is already the mayor of San Diego. He was a Freedom Rider, who fought for civil rights and equality. He was a Representative of San Diego, who never wavered in support of our veterans, and he served as the chair of that committee. We wish him well as mayor of San Diego.

Congresswoman RICHARDSON has dedicated her time in Congress to re-

building our infrastructure, advancing the dream of high-speed rail, securing our borders, and protecting our environment. We wish her well as she goes forward.

Congressman BERMAN—we go from B to W, BERMAN to WOOLSEY, and every wonderful thing in between. Congressman BERMAN's imprint can be found on legislation across the broad spectrum of issues before the House. Many of us knew him long before he came to Congress, knew of his work, working with the farmworkers, working in labor law to protect the rights of workers.

In two particular areas, his expertise is simply unsurpassed. He is a true expert on international relations, a past chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ranking member now; a champion of aid to Israel; the fight against HIV/AIDS; and the toughest Iran sanctions in the history of our country. He is a senior member of the Judiciary Committee who, it is safe to say, understands intellectual property, understands its importance. It is even mentioned in our Constitution. He understands the challenges and the opportunities it presents. In every venue and every arena, he has been a proud advocate for Los Angeles and California, a cherished leader for the entire House.

JOE BACA is a lifelong public servant. He was a paratrooper in the U.S. Army's 101st and 82nd Airborne Divisions. He served in the California State Legislature. In Congress, he made his mark in standing firm against harmful anti-immigrant measures and in leading the effort to expand food stamps and nutrition assistance for those who need it most. That is such a simple sentence, but it's fraught with meaning. He put a lot of work and leadership into the farm bill. JOE BACA came from humble beginnings, yet his accomplishments are truly significant.

The list goes on and on of our colleagues that Congresswoman ESHOO mentioned. For all of these Members, public service has been a calling, a cause, and a core facet of their character. California has been proud to have them as our Representatives in Congress. For those of us who served with them, it is an honor for each of us to call you "colleague"; for some of us a very, very special honor to be considered your friend.

We all wish each of you much success in the years ahead. We look forward to continuing our work together on behalf of our great Golden State of California. Your service in Congress added to the luster of our Golden State.

Thank you, and congratulations. Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the Leader.

If I might inquire of the Chair of the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Next I would like to recognize Congressman SAM FARR.

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, GEORGE MILLER, for setting aside this time.

You've heard from a lot of my colleagues. I think what is interesting about this moment in history is this is probably the largest retirement ever of any delegation at any one time. California is losing 25 percent of its incumbent delegation, seven Republicans and seven Democrats. That's 14 people that have been here. Of the seven Democrats, they were here for historical moments—of electing NANCY PELOSI from California, the first woman Speaker of the House of Representatives; and here to pass the first-in-history comprehensive health care bill, led by Californians, I might add, and led by the dean of our delegation, PETE STARK.

PETE STARK is one of the oldest, longest serving Members of Congress. He has been here 40 years. I think there are only two, three people that have served here longer. He's watched this delegation come and go since 1973. He is here tonight with his beautiful family.

PETE, of all the people coming into Congress, is the only one that just came right from the private sector. Most of us got elected to the local and State governments, but PETE came here with a background in MIT, in engineering, and then a degree from Berkeley in business administration. In 1963, he founded the Security National Bank of Walnut Creek, which became, during the war years, known as the progressive bank and the bank that was going to loan to people that weren't otherwise getting loans. He became a very popular leader in his community and built the bank into a \$1 billion financial institution. Having a background in the Air Force and other civic activities, he ran for Congress and got elected and has been here, as I said, for 40 years.

He is here tonight with his children. He has four daughters, three sons, and eight grandchildren. He is married to Deborah Roderick, also of California. We're going to miss PETE. He's been a fixture for this Congress through all the big issues.

He is followed by HOWARD BERMAN from southern California, with a background in UCLA, a law degree from UCLA. I was a staff member when he was a California State legislator. He came there for the background in VISTA. After the assembly, he got elected to the House and has been the leading ranking Democrat, probably the most trusted person in all of Congress for foreign affairs; and with his background in labor, in issues for farmworkers in California and the advancement they've made under Federal law. But also, as the Leader pointed out, he's one of the few persons that really understands the intricacies of patent law, copyright, trademark, all those things very vitally important to the entertainment industry, the electronics industry, and the information technology industry. He's been a senior member on all of that. We're going to miss him deeply, deeply. I feel like a son of HOWARD BERMAN. I supported his

speakership way back when he ran for the State assembly. I'm going to miss him.

LYNN WOOLSEY has served 10 terms. She is senior to me. I got elected 6 months after LYNN got sworn into office. I remember how proud I was of her background in local government, in roles that she's played in Sonoma County, in Marin County. She's been, I think, on the floor speaking more than anybody else—as pointed out, 440 times speaking for peace. She's going to leave this body known as the "lady of peace" and will be here in history forever and ever. I remember the night that Bill Clinton gave his State of the Union address and recognized the backgrounds, the humble and unusual backgrounds of people that get here, that LYNN WOOLSEY was the first woman elected to Congress who, as a single mom, had to be on welfare and how she had worked her way out of that, and was a leading role model to show that there are opportunities for you, for all people in this great country. But the lady of peace is the most important of all.

Bob Filner, he had a background in local government. He went back to local government. After being involved in school districts, he is now the mayor of San Diego. He came here with his background of being a Freedom Rider and in the civil rights movement and led the Veterans' Committee here.

As we pointed out, JOE BACA will always be known as the captain of our baseball team. He did so well in that, but he also had a proud background, as the Leader said, in the Army as a paratrooper. The list goes on and on.

LAURA RICHARDSON is leaving us. I would also mention before this, the early resignation of Dennis Cardoza.

That's seven Democrats. We're going to miss them greatly. Thank you for allowing me to speak in favor of their great service to the United States Congress.

CONGRESSMAN PETE STARK

Congressman PETE STARK has served in Congress since 1973. A senior member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, he is currently the Ranking Minority Member of its Health Subcommittee. STARK previously served as the subcommittee's Chairman from 2007 to 2010 and 1985 to 1994, and previously as Ranking Minority Member from 1995 to 2006.

Before being elected to Congress in 1972, STARK was a successful businessman and banker. Upon entering Congress, he served on the House Banking and Currency Committee. After completing his first term, STARK was named to the Ways and Means Committee, whose scope includes taxes, Medicare, Social Security, trade and public assistance.

From 1981 to 1984, STARK served as Chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures. As Chairman, STARK became known as one of the Nation's foremost advocates of tax reform. He later served a critical role in shaping the historic tax reform act of 1986. In the years since, he has been a vocal voice for tax fairness and opposed the addition of corporate loopholes to our Nation's income tax laws.

In January of 1985, STARK became the Chairman of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee. As Chairman, he presided over major reforms to the Medicare system. While cutting billions of dollars in waste, fraud, and abuse, STARK expanded benefits for tens of millions of Medicare beneficiaries, provided COBRA health continuation benefits to workers, and made numerous improvements in the quality of our Nation's care.

As Chairman of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee from 2007 to 2010, STARK helped write the health reform law that is bringing quality, affordable health care to millions of Americans.

STARK champions universal health care, and speaks out for peace, freedom of choice, and protecting our environment. He is a tireless advocate for children, families, senior citizens, and people with disabilities, as well as the residents of the 13th Congressional District.

A diverse area stretching along the east side of the San Francisco Bay, the 13th Congressional District runs from Alameda to Fremont.

STARK is a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT, with a degree in engineering and the University of California, Berkeley with a Master's degree in Business Administration, MBA.

In 1963, he founded Security National Bank in Walnut Creek. The bank grew from a small storefront operation to a \$1 billion financial institution with branches in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. STARK sold his interest in the bank after his election to Congress.

Before his business career, STARK served in the U.S. Air Force. His other civic activities have included: Director, Common Cause; Chairman, Board of Trustees, Starr King School of Ministry; Board Member, Housing Development Corporation; Board Member, Council for Civic Unity, and many others.

STARK has four daughters, three sons, and eight grandchildren. He is married to Deborah Roderick Stark of San Lorenzo.

CONGRESSMAN HOWARD L. BERMAN

Born in Los Angeles, California, HOWARD BERMAN attended U.C.L.A., where he received his B.A. in 1962 and his LL.B in 1965.

Upon his graduation from law school, HOWARD BERMAN began his career in public service with a year's work as a VISTA volunteer. From 1967 until 1973, he practiced law in Los Angeles, specializing in labor relations. In 1973, he was elected to the California State Assembly.

In his first term in the state legislature, then-Assemblyman BERMAN was named Assembly Majority leader, the youngest person ever to serve in that leadership capacity. He also served as Chair of the Assembly Democratic Caucus and the Policy Research Management Committee of the Assembly. In 1982, BERMAN was elected to Congress, where he was named to the Foreign Affairs and Judiciary Committees.

Congressman BERMAN is the Ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, meaning he is the most senior Democrat serving on the committee. During his tenure on the Foreign Affairs Committee, BERMAN negotiated a five-year, \$50 billion reauthorization of our global HIV/AIDS programs, authored legislation that removed Nelson Mandela and other members of the African National Congress from the U.S. terrorism list, and passed a bill to strengthen U.S. assistance to Israel. His top priorities include improving America's

diplomatic strength through a reauthorization of the State Department, assistance to fight terrorism in Pakistan, and improving the efficiency of U.S. foreign aid.

As the second highest ranking Democrat on the Judiciary Committee, BERMAN plays a key role in shaping the copyright, trademark, and patent laws that are of vital importance to the entertainment, biotechnology, broadcasting, pharmaceutical, telecommunication, consumer electronics, and information technology industries. BERMAN is a member of the Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition, and the Internet.

BERMAN is particularly well-known for his ability to form bipartisan coalitions. Together with Republican Henry Hyde, BERMAN wrote a law authorizing embargoes on nations that support terrorism. With Republican Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, he wrote amendments to the False Claims Act that have saved over \$20 billion in taxpayer money since 1986.

"There a few House members who have made such an imprint on legislation in so many areas as Howard Berman," says the Almanac of American Politics. The Almanac goes on to call BERMAN "one of the most aggressive and creative members of the House and one of the most clear-sighted operators in American politics."

Congressman BERMAN and his wife, Janis Gail Berman, have two daughters, Brinley and Lindsey.

CONGRESSWOMAN LYNN WOOLSEY

Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY is in her 10th term as the representative from California's 6th District, just north of San Francisco. Her district includes all of Marin, and most of Sonoma County.

As president of Americans for Democratic Action, Congresswoman WOOLSEY is a vocal and visible leader on progressive issues, particularly those dealing with education, children and families. A passionate and outspoken opponent of the Iraq war, she helped move public opinion against President's Bush's failed Iraq policy. She introduced the first resolution calling for our troops to be brought home and has been called the "the unofficial matriarch of the [antiwar] movement in Congress," by the San Jose Mercury News.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY is also active on labor and education issues. She is a senior member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections. She also serves on Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY was the author of a recent law authorizing workers six months of job protected leave in order to care for injured family members serving in the armed forces, as well as legislation to protect workers from exposure to dangerous chemicals.

One of Congresswoman WOOLSEY's top priorities is a legislative package called "The Balancing Act," which aims to help parents balance their work and family responsibilities. Her proposal calls for: paid family leave; public universal pre-school; major investments in child care; universal school breakfast; benefits for part-time workers; and telecommuting incentives.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY is also a senior member of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology, and serves on the Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment, where she works to reduce our dependence

on foreign oil and promote the use of clean, efficient energy sources. In the current Congress, she has reintroduced her legislation to add the Sonoma coastline to the National Marine Sanctuary Program, thus protecting it from oil and gas drilling.

Having lived and raised her family in California's North Bay for over 40 years, Congresswoman WOOLSEY understands the concerns of Sonoma and Marin County residents. She frequently says they are the most important voice she listens to; and she not only listens, she responds. Her Washington office alone receives and answers over three thousand letters, phone calls, and emails from constituents each week.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY dedication to family issues and her belief in a strong social safety net are rooted in her personal history. As a young mother struggling to raise three children by herself, she needed public assistance just to make ends meet, even though she was employed.

The experience of needing a helping hand from her government has shaped her commitment to family-friendly policies.

WOOLSEY was born on November 3, 1937 in Seattle, Washington. Now living in Petaluma, California, she is the mother of four grown children and a grandmother of five.

CONGRESSMAN BOB FILNER

Bob Filner's adult political career began when he was 18 years old during the Civil Rights Movement. He spent several weeks in the Mississippi State Penitentiary as a Freedom Rider. "My political optimism stems from those times. I believe by our individual involvement, we can change history! And, my commitment to a world free of racism and discrimination continues today."

Just after receiving a Ph.D. in the history of science from Cornell University, he moved to San Diego and began a 20 year long teaching career at San Diego State University. Always the activist, he challenged his college students that their "grand" thoughts were futile unless they put them into action in order to help people and make the world a better place. And it's a lesson he continues to impress on others while in the United States Congress.

In the late 1970s Filner was frustrated with the local school board after announcing that his children's school was going to close (daughter, Erin and son, Adam). He felt his children weren't getting the education and attention they deserved. This led to his first run for San Diego School Board Member in 1979.

Filner's "back to basics" approach toward education—including mandatory homework—won wide support among parents all across San Diego. During his time the board hired a more responsive Superintendent, test scores went up, and million of dollars in bureaucratic waste was eliminated.

Therefore it was no surprise that under his leadership on these issues he was selected as School Board President in 1982.

This increasing civic involvement led to his election to the San Diego City Council in 1987 where he began taking on issues such as bringing good jobs to San Diego and broadening its economic base. He created the city's first Economic Conversion Committee and wrote the city's Economic Conversion Plan. He found creative ways to fight neighborhood crime, including the introduction of Police Walking Patrols and a Citizen Graffiti Patrol with the area's first 24-hour graffiti hotline.

Recognizing his ability to work with his colleagues, the council members selected him as Deputy Mayor in 1991.

In 1992, Filner was elected to the United States House of Representatives. In his first term in Congress, he was one of only a handful of freshman legislators to get legislation passed—for example a critical law amending the Clean Water Act, allowing San Diego to save billions of dollars.

Almost immediately upon his arrival in Washington, his request for an appointment to the Veterans' Affairs Committee was granted. And in 2006 was elected by his Democratic colleagues as Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Since January 2007, Congress has increased the Veterans Healthcare budget by 60%—the largest increase since the VA was created 79 years ago. Other victories include VA Home loans increased by 50%; the G.I. Bill was reinstated to meet the same level of education benefits, adjusted for cost-of-living increases, as that offered by the original World War II-era bill; benefits for Filipino-American veterans granted and legislation is pending for Merchant Marine veterans of World War II benefits. Filner says, "This is the least we can do for our men and women in uniform who have sacrificed so much for us—we owe it to them!"

The 51st District—stretching the whole California/Mexico border, from San Diego to Yuma, Arizona—is one of the most diverse regions in the nation! It encompasses the southern portion of the City of San Diego, the South Bay cities of Chula Vista and National City, and all of Imperial Valley. The district's population is approximately 55% Latinos, 15% African-Americans, 15% Anglos and 15% Filipinos.

For 9 terms now, he has worked hard to both enhance his district's advantages while meeting its challenges. For example since many families in his district, and across the nation, suffer from sub-standard medical treatment, he has worked to provide affordable healthcare for border communities and all Americans.

While always looking for ways to embrace the opportunities the region provides, he does not back down from challenges specific to border communities.

His work on U.S.-Mexico relations led President Clinton to ask Filner to join him on an international mission to meet with former Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo. Again in 2004, with President Vicente Fox, he stepped forward to encourage increased cooperation and collaboration between the two nations. He took the lead in securing critical funding and support for the International Waste Water Treatment Plant in the Tijuana River Valley, as well as the New River in the Imperial Valley with the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

He serves on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee as the Senior Democratic Member of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, a member of the Highway and Transit, Water Resources and Environment, and Aviation subcommittees. As Congressmen, he has brought home billions of dollars to improve roads, bridges and other critical infrastructure. At the same time he is constantly looking to the future in support of high-speed rail projects that would link San Diego with other areas of the state

and Arizona and he secured funding to study suitable locations in Imperial Valley for the site of a new regional airport. Although these forward looking projects have been in the works for a long time, how appropriate they're labeled the "Jobs Train." Not only would San Diego become a major national distribution hub, thousands of jobs in San Diego and Imperial Valley would be created!

Congressman Filner has built his career by "walking his own talk"—"Grand thoughts are futile unless they are put into action in order to help people and make the world a better place." Help him to continue this work for a better California—and a better America! He cannot go it alone!

CONGRESSMAN JOE BACA

Rep. JOE BACA has represented California's Inland Empire in the House of Representatives since winning a special election in 1999. He serves on the House Agriculture Committee, and is Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Nutrition and Horticulture. He also serves on the House Financial Services Committee.

Rep. BACA served as Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, CHC, during the 110th Congress (2007–2008). During this time, he successfully blocked harmful English-only and anti-immigrant amendments offered in the House. He also guided the CHC in its efforts to ensure the contributions of Latino and Native America veterans were recognized in the PBS documentary "The War." In addition, Rep. BACA used his leadership position to pass record breaking funding levels for food stamps and nutrition programs to feed over 44 million hungry Americans; and helped secure new funding for minority serving institutions, including over \$200 million in new grant funding. He currently chairs the CHC Corporate America Task Force.

Rep. BACA continues to advocate in Congress on issues that impact the poor and underserved, including nutrition, housing, health, veterans' affairs, and issues affecting the Hispanic and Native American communities. He has used his experience in Congress to help secure over \$154 million in federal appropriations assistance for education, public safety, transportation, and water projects. Congressman BACA is also the primary sponsor of the PROUD Act, legislation that puts responsible immigrant high school graduates on an expedited path to U.S. Citizenship.

Personal History—JOE was born in Belen, New Mexico, the youngest of 15 children in a house where little English was spoken. JOE worked shining shoes at age 10 and later worked as a laborer for the Santa Fe Railroad. He served in the U.S. Army as a paratrooper with both the 101st and the 82nd Airborne Divisions from 1966–68. Following military service, JOE earned his associates degree from Barstow Community College and his bachelor's degree in sociology from California State University, Los Angeles. In 1979, he became the first Latino elected to the board of Trustees for the San Bernardino Valley College District. He was elected to the State Assembly in 1992, where he became the first Latino Speaker pro Tempore, and was elected to the State Senate in 1998.

JOE and his wife, Barbara, began their own business, Interstate World Travel, in 1989. They have four children—Rialto City Councilman Joe Baca Jr., Jeremy, Natalie and Jennifer.

Awards—Rep. BACA has received many honors for his public service. Recent awards

include the U.S. Hispanic Leadership Institute Edward R. Roybal/Henry B. Gonzalez award for Public Service, the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce President's Achievement Award, the National Farmers Union Presidential Award for Leadership, the Walter Kaitz Foundation Diversity Advocate Award, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Coalition of Minority Employees Award of Excellence. He has been listed as one of the top 100 most influential Hispanic leaders in America by Latino Leaders Magazine. He also has two local parks named after him: the Joe Baca Senior Field at the Empire Center in Fontana and the Joe Baca Field at the Rialto Boys and Girls Club. In addition, the "Joe Baca Middle School" at 1640 S. Lilac Avenue in Rialto, California, is expected to open its doors in 2013.

CONGRESSWOMAN LAURA RICHARDSON

Congresswoman LAURA RICHARDSON represents California's 37th District, which includes the communities of Long Beach, Compton, Carson, Watts, Willowbrook and Signal Hill, as well as parts of the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County. She was sworn in to Congress in 2007 and is currently serving her 3rd term.

Congresswoman RICHARDSON served the Long Beach community as a city councilwoman for six years before being elected to the California State Assembly in 2006. Following a special election in 2007, she immediately began serving in the House of Representatives, and as such, Congresswoman RICHARDSON has the rare distinction of having served in government at the local, state, and federal level in the span of less than one year.

The Congresswoman currently sits on the House Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure, where she works to improve the Nation's highways, railways, airports, and seaports while overseeing the Coast Guard, Army Corps of Engineers, and Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA. She is a member of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, the Highways & Transit Subcommittee and the Railroads, Pipelines & Hazardous Materials Subcommittee.

Congresswoman RICHARDSON is also on the House Committee on Homeland Security. In this role, she works to protect America's borders and ensure the Nation is prepared for and able to effectively respond to any disasters that may arise. She is the Ranking Member for the Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications Subcommittee and also sits on the Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies Subcommittee.

In addition to her House Committee assignments, the Congresswoman is a founding member of the California High-Speed Rail Commission, where she has worked to secure funding for a project that has the potential to create 450,000 permanent jobs statewide over the next 25 years.

In January of 2011, President Barack Obama signed into law the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act of 2010, DERA, which Congresswoman RICHARDSON authored. The legislation extends a voluntary national and state-level grant and loan program that creates jobs, saves lives and significantly improves the Nation's air quality. DERA is widely considered one of the most cost-effective federal programs in the Nation. The EPA has estimated that in California alone, the program averages more than \$13 in health and economic bene-

fits for every \$1 in funding. Without the signing of RICHARDSON's bill, the authorization for DERA would have expired at the end of the fiscal year.

Congresswoman RICHARDSON graduated from UCLA with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and received an MBA from the USC Marshall School of Business. She spent 14 years working in the corporate sector at Xerox.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

I want to, also, as Congresswoman ESHOO and Congressman FARR acknowledged, that there's others in our delegation from the other side of the aisle who will also be leaving after this session of Congress: BRIAN BILBRAY, MARY BONO MACK, DAVID DREIER, ELTON GALLEGLY, WALLY HERGER, JERRY LEWIS, and DAN LUNGREN. I've been here long enough that I've fought with all of them, I've legislated with all of them, and we've had accomplishments together.

I think JERRY LEWIS and I had the longest floor debate in the modern Congress over the creation of the desert national parks, the Mojave Desert national parks. When we were all done, we immediately turned around. He was opposed to it, I was for it, but he immediately turned around and made sure that the public had access to it, that there would be improvements, visitor centers. And that's the way legislation goes.

□ 1820

I think very often the public doesn't understand, but Members of Congress do, that this isn't just a working relationship. Over time you get to know one another's families, you know their children's successes, their children's desires, their illnesses and the troubles that befall families, because we're like all other American families. It happens here. People don't think of that when they think of the Congress. And you build relationships, friendships and dependencies on one another's expertise to help guide us through all of the issues that we will confront in a congressional year.

Congressman STARK and I entered public life together by running against one another back in 1969, man against machine. You figure it out: I don't know who was the man and who was the machine, but I knew then who it was, this very popular banker and this law school dropout, but other than that I was doing well. But it's a long span and a lot of friendships, and it's about family and our ability to talk with one another.

I would like, at this moment, to yield to Congressman STARK for any remarks that he might have.

Mr. STARK. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. One of the previous Speakers, Mr. O'Neill, mentioned that, and you forgot to mention this, but Tip O'Neill said that I probably had one of the best 5-minute speeches of any new Member of Congress, and if I

could only learn to deliver it in less than 20 minutes, I'd have a great career here.

GEORGE is right: we ran against each other. And when you grow up in the Bay Area and you have people like BARBARA LEE who leads in courage in being the lone vote against one of the unpopular wars, you learn what courage is and you learn with people who fight for children, for minorities, for all of the people in our area who need help. I'm just proud to have worked with them.

They've said that I'm the fifth oldest Member of Congress. That's absolutely wrong. I am the 430th youngest Member of Congress, and I just want to make sure that you get that straight in the RECORD.

Thank you, GEORGE. I'm honored, and I am particularly honored to be part of this great Bay Area delegation. In our 10 districts surrounding the Bay Area, we have, I think, the finest legislative group in the United States. Thank you very much.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Thank you very much. I know, as we all know in this life, Members leave the Congress, they don't leave public policy, they don't leave public life, and I expect we will be hearing from them as they leave the Congress in their future endeavors. I know that Mr. BILBRAY still wants to clean up the salt in the Salton Sea, and I know that DAN LUNGREN probably still wants to take down Hetch Hetchy. I'll be glad to join him on both efforts on that one, and I know WALLY HERGER still brings the concerns about the watersheds of the great northern parts of our State. So this relationship goes on, their advocacy goes on, and that's true on both sides of the aisle.

Ms. WOOLSEY, if you would like to say anything.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, GEORGE, for doing this. Thank you for honoring those of us that have been here and now are leaving.

I arrived feeling very green and feeling very good 20 years ago. I had no idea how little I knew about how to get something done in the Congress. I knew where I had burned in my belly, I knew what issues were important to me, and those issues have stayed important to me for the last 20 years. But I had the advantage of working with some very wonderful senior Members who generously helped me along, and I had the privilege of having very talented staff who built the stage that I could dance on. You can't do that unless it's teamwork, and I thank everybody that has been a part of these last 20 years. It's been quite a ride, and I'm glad I did it. Thank you very much, GEORGE.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Thank you so much. Thank you for your service.

Mr. Speaker, that brings to a conclusion our delegation's honoring those Members who are leaving. I would just say, and this is not news to Members of

the House, but on a bipartisan basis, this is a very, very spirited and ram-bunctious delegation on both sides of the aisle, and a lot of seniority is leaving the Congress with this delegation, a lot of expertise. But I'm very proud to have served with all of them and for their contributions and the sacrifices they made in public office on behalf of public policy that they strongly believe in and became advocates for.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time. I want to recognize Mr. BERMAN who is here and thank him again for his service.

#### PUTTING OUR NATION'S FISCAL HOUSE IN ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the designation of the time and appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor tonight and discuss the issues, the very serious issues, that are in front of us. Now, this is something that we Republicans have talked about for quite a period of time, that we had to get the Nation's fiscal house in order.

The reason we had to do this was because we had a spending issue that was in front of us. Many of us felt that running deficits of several hundred billion dollars a year was not acceptable, and we've watched what has transpired through the years as this has continued to grow. And we all know that the last few years of the Obama administration has run deficits, annual deficits, of well over \$1 trillion.

Now, I am constantly hearing from people, How did this seem to happen so quickly? Well, it's been decades in the making. And as I said, indeed, many of us have come to the floor regularly, we've talked about it, and we've offered bills that would address this. A great example of this, every year I've offered bills that call for 1, 2 and 5 percent across-the-board spending reductions. Little bits add up over a period of time.

We have the appropriations process where Members have come to the floor and they've offered amendment after amendment that would reduce what we are spending.

We on this side of the aisle also believe that you have to have a budget. Now, the President had a proposed budget, and nobody wanted to vote for that. We put it on the floor, and I think it got one or two votes from the Democrats. The country has not had a budget in over 1,300 days, and there's a reason for this. It is because the budget that we have passed out of this House has gone to the Senate each and every year, and it sits on HARRY REID's desk, and he does not take it up.

We have passed this budget, and I commend Congressman RYAN who leads our Budget Committee. We passed it

because we think you've got to tackle the drivers of the debt. You've got to bring out-of-control spending under control. You have to restore economic freedom and ensure a level playing field for everybody by putting an end to special interest favoritism and corporate welfare.

We feel as if it is imperative to reverse this administration's policies that are driving up the cost of gas at the pump, that we need to be promoting an all-of-the-above energy strategy unlocking American energy production to help lower costs, to create jobs, to reduce dependence on foreign oil, and to strengthen our health care and our retirement security by taking power away—away—from government bureaucrats and empowering patients and letting patients and doctors make the decisions that are important to them.

Now, as I said a moment earlier, so many times people will say, How in the world did we get here? Well, as I said decades—decades—in the making.

Then we went through the Budget Control Act exercise a year before last in August. We had a select committee that was put in place. That didn't work out. So we ended up with the sequesters. And many of my constituents—and I'm sure other Members are seeing this too—they are saying, Tell me what the sequester is all about.

□ 1830

This is what it is. It's going to take place on January 2, 2013, and the defense budget is going to see the brunt of these spending reductions. Most everything gets 2 percent across the board. With defense, you're going to see additional cuts of \$55 billion per year. That is going to give them a total of \$492 billion additional cuts. This is going to leave our military with the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest naval fleet since 1915, and the smallest tactical fighter force in the history of the Air Force. Medicare could see \$16.4 billion in annual cuts, leading to the elimination of 496,000 jobs in 2013. There will be 62,000 physicians that will be adversely impacted. We know that the sequester cuts are not fair to everybody.

As I said, we've been taking steps. Every year for several years, we've talked about getting the fiscal house in order and cutting spending and fighting the growth in the debt. We've also passed some bills this year. And I would like to remind the Members of the body, Mr. Speaker, of these pieces of legislation that this House of Representatives has already passed, and that are sitting on the desk over in the Senate.

On August 2 of this year, by a vote of 232-189, we passed the Pathway to Job Creation through a Simpler, Fairer Tax Code Act of 2012. That was H.R. 6169. It would provide an expedited pathway to pro-growth tax reform in 2013. To deal with the spending issues, to deal with the deficit, to deal with the debt, yes,

you have to cut spending, you have to reform your Tax Code, and you have to have a pro-growth agenda. That legislation, as I said, was passed on August 2.

On September 19 of this year, we passed the National Security and Jobs Protection Act that would deal with the sequester that I spoke about a few minutes ago. That passed with 223 votes. We also had on May 10 the Sequester Reconciliation Act of 2012, H.R. 5652, which passed with 218 votes. We then had the Job Protection and Recession Prevention Act passed on August 1, and that was H.R. 8. It passed with 256 votes. H.R. 8 is the 1-year extension of all the tax rates.

We keep hearing that the President wants to extend the tax cuts for those making \$250,000 a year and less. What that would do is catch a lot of our small businesses. About 20 percent of our small businesses have already said that this would adversely impact them to the point that they would be cutting jobs, not growing, but actually cutting jobs. So I would point out that 256 Members of this Chamber, on a bipartisan basis, voted to extend the tax cuts for everybody.

When people say, Why can't the House and the Senate get together, Mr. Speaker, our bills—as I've just mentioned, these bills are sitting on the Senate leader's desk dealing with the sequester, dealing with taxes, dealing with the reform issues that we have in front of us. These four bills are sitting there waiting for action. The House has done its job. We've agreed to not raise taxes on anybody. That's only one part of this issue.

Certainly, with the way the President is wanting to approach tax reform, his proposals would raise enough revenue to run the Federal Government for about 8 more days. He's going to raise taxes on the top 2 percent basically to pay for 2 percent of next year's spending. This is not sustainable. We do not have a revenue problem in this town, we have a spending problem. We have a crushing burden of debt. And now I've got some posters that I would like to show regarding that.

This first poster that I want to call your attention to points out exactly what we have in this crushing burden of debt. You will see that in World War II, it lays out our country's long history with this debt and shows where this burden has been passed. As I said, it's been decades in the making. Take a look at this. In 1940, the percentage of our gross Federal debt was 52.4 percent. That's where we were. By the end of World War II, the debt had skyrocketed. It was up to 117.5 percent of our GDP in 1945, and then it peaked in 1946 at 121.7 percent of our GDP. That was through the war. But you know what? We did what Americans generally do. When you have got a problem, you get behind it and you get it solved. So we doubled down on getting the spending under control, and you can see what happened. Then our Federal debt pretty much stabilized in the

mid-30 percent range. And during the Reagan administration in 1981, the gross Federal debt was 32.5 percent of GDP.

Well, those old spending habits kind of die hard around this place. The Federal Government and the bureaucracy never gets enough of the taxpayers' money. When the President took office, our gross Federal debt was 84.2 percent of the GDP. This takes us back to swearing-in day in 2009. That's the figure that neither party could celebrate, and both parties share responsibility.

This Federal Government spends too much money and has for decades. Today, according to OMB, our projected gross Federal debt is 105.3 percent of our GDP. These are just simple facts. You can see what is going to happen if you look at where we are headed. Now we are over 100 percent. Look at how quickly we're going to get to 200 percent, then 300 percent, and 400 percent.

This points out how unfair this debt is to our children and grandchildren. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think the debt that we have in this country is the ultimate cap-and-trade. What is happening? We are capping our children's futures, and we're trading it to the countries that own this debt.

Let me point out who owns this debt. I've got another chart that I want to show you on this specific issue. A lot of people will ask about this. And of course last year during the debates on the debt, we had so many discussions about this. A couple of my colleagues and I went down, and we asked who owned our publicly traded debt. We wanted to know who was buying this American debt. Of course, we've been frustrated with the Fed monetizing some of this debt and running the printing presses. We know that devalues it. We're frustrated that we are running about \$4 billion worth of debt a day, and that is adding to the annual deficit, which accrues to the Nation's debt. That frustrates us. So what we've done periodically in my office, Mr. Speaker, is to go back in and check with Treasury and see who owns our debt.

As of right now, China owns \$1.15 trillion of our debt. Then number two on the list is Japan with \$1.13 trillion of our debt. This is interesting. Out of this debt, number three on the list is OPEC. OPEC is an entity. That's the countries of Ecuador, Venezuela, India, Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Algeria, Gabon, Libya, and Nigeria. Guess what? They now are number three on the list, and they own \$267 billion of our debt. Brazil comes in at number four, \$250.5 billion. And then number five on the list—new to the top five list—the Caribbean Banking Centers, who now own \$240.4 billion of U.S. debt. By the way, the Caribbean Banking Centers are the Bahamas, Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Netherlands Antilles, and Panama. This is who owns us. This is who owns our debt. This is why on

this side of the aisle what we continue to say is the spending has to be dealt with.

We've heard from everybody. We are hearing from economists all around the globe, and they repeatedly say what we are saying, what we've been saying for years as we've come to this floor, that we have a spending problem. The spending has to be dealt with. We are drowning under a mountain of debt. You cannot continue to borrow nearly 50 percent of what you are spending. We think that it is problematic, if you will, Mr. Speaker.

It is disconcerting that the President doesn't want to talk about the spending, but is instead offering to raise enough taxes to fund additional spending for 2 percent of the year by raising taxes on the top 2 percent. I guess he's not worried about the other 98 percent of the year. This is how we have to get this under control, by reducing this spending.

I'm so pleased to be joined by my colleagues who share a passion for freedom and for economic freedom, and understand that economic freedom and political freedom are linked, and that this is a task that we are passionate about, we are given to solving this problem so that we remain a free Nation.

□ 1840

At this time, I want to recognize the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

Mr. MCKINLEY. Thank you, Congresswoman.

I rise today in a belief that America can handle the truth. Abraham Lincoln said, "I am a firm believer in the people. If given the truth, they can be depended upon to meet any national crisis. The great point is to bring them the real facts." To that end, Speaker BOEHNER has been candid about the fiscal challenges facing our Nation and has put forth a balanced plan. However, as the President continues to promote his own plan, he seems to be deliberately not sharing key details with the public.

First, the plan will hurt nearly a million small businesses by treating them the same as the wealthy Americans. Secondly, the plan ignores the central driver of our deficit—government spending. It ignores that.

On the first matter, why should we lump the owner of a hardware store together with Wall Street executives and tax them at the same rate? When the President talks about the rich paying their fair share, he fails to mention that he also raises the same rate of taxes on small businesses. Earlier this week, the President told factory workers that his plan is to "ask the wealthiest Americans to pay a slightly higher tax rate." Previously, he said, "Millionaires and billionaires can afford to pay a little bit more." But not once did the President publicly acknowledge his plan will raise taxes on owners of small family businesses.

I'd like to give you an example of a small business owner who would fill out the tax form here, a 1040. This form is for a single woman, Mary Workman, who is in software development. She makes \$50,000 in wages, and the company makes \$150,000. She picks up some dividends and capital gains, so she has a total family income of \$210,000. Under the President's proposal, Mary would be hit with the same tax rate equal to those of millionaires—at \$50,000 in wages.

Where is the fairness in that, Mr. President?

It's one thing to ask Bill Gates, Warren Buffett, or Donald Trump to pay more in taxes, but it's something else to penalize the small businesses of Main Street, like the software developer, for example.

This is not an isolated case. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, 940,000 small businesses will face higher taxes under this President's plan. These are not the wealthiest Americans, but they're proprietors of small, family-owned businesses that are located in every town across America. According to the report by Ernst & Young this summer, 710,000 jobs will be lost by these companies if they're taxed at the same rate as corporate America.

The President's proposal, curiously, would raise taxes on small businesses to as high as 39 percent, but for larger, mature corporations, the President is seeking to lower their tax rate to 25 percent. Although reforming and lowering the corporate tax rate is a worthy goal, neither Congress nor the President should give tax advantages to large corporations at the expense of the owners of small, family businesses.

Generally, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to raising taxes. However, if in the spirit of compromise Congress is forced to adopt new revenue in order to achieve reductions, then Congress should insist that personal wages be separated from small business income and taxed differently. This could be done by using the information already filed on the 1040, which is just like they do on capital gains, dividends, and interest payments.

Now on to the second matter, the spending side of the equation. Surely, the President understands that raising taxes on small businesses and Wall Street executives won't sufficiently cover the deficit. Despite this reality, he consistently confuses the public by ignoring the role that reducing government spending would and should play in deficit reduction.

According to the Office of Management and Budget, this administration's plan to raise the top rates generates an average of \$43 billion a year, yet we are faced with a deficit of \$1.1 trillion. This new revenue, as you pointed out, Madam Congresswoman, is only enough to fund the government for 8 days. During the campaign, the President proposed that there should be \$2.50 in new spending reductions for every dollar in

new revenue, but now that the campaign is over, his latest plan calls for just the opposite—an unacceptable ratio of \$4 in new revenue and only \$1 in spending cuts.

Speaker BOEHNER is right: America has a spending problem, not a taxing problem. While the President has consistently told the American public that he is merely asking the wealthy to pay just a bit more in taxes, when was the last time the President also reminded the American public that we borrow 46 cents out of every dollar we spend? Congress is chasing the wrong rabbit. Raising taxes on small businesses is no more a solution to fixing the deficit than is cutting worthy social programs. The problem lies much deeper than that.

Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke admitted that the spending levels of this administration are unsustainable. Just as President Clinton declared years ago that the era of Big Government is over, this Congress needs to man up and declare the era of taxing, spending, and borrowing into perpetuity is over as well. Now is the time for the President to provide leadership, to level with the American people, and to set aside the campaign rhetoric of class warfare, division, and envy.

Small, family-owned businesses cannot and should not be painted with the same broad brush as millionaires, billionaires, and Wall Street executives. We must protect our small businesses and stop promoting the treatment of their income to be the same as that of the wealthy.

□ 1850

At the same time, this administration needs to admit that raising taxes on businesses will not pay the excesses of spending that has occurred over the last 4 years. We must prioritize our fiscal negotiations by putting spending reductions before addressing new revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Washington 2 years ago to get something done. Speaker BOEHNER has shown that he understands the gravity of the situation and wants to find a solution that is balanced and realistic. I stand solidly behind him. Protecting small businesses and addressing our spending problems are too important to the economy to ignore. The situation demands that we deal in reality. Once again, Mr. Speaker, America can handle the truth if given all the facts.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman, Mr. MCKINLEY, for his well-thought-out presentation and for putting this 1040 form up here from the IRS. And it reminds me, we're coming up on the 100th anniversary of the income tax, the Federal income tax, which was to be a 1 percent tax on the top 1 percent for 1 year. Now the 100th anniversary of that is going to be February 25, 2013.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a grand time to say let's totally overhaul this

Tax Code here in the United States. Let's make certain that, indeed, it is fair. The gentleman talked about the small businesses that he interfaces with. My goodness, a convenience store operator, a female that runs a seven-person service shop, a medical application device creator—I've met with all of them in the last couple of days. They can't afford to stay in business because, guess what, they will not be able to make a profit by the time they pay escalated tax rates and are treated, as the gentleman said, like they're some Wall Street business.

Also the \$63 per health insurance fee that goes on this next year, driving their health care cost up, the \$3 medical device fee that is going to be applied to our mobile medical applications. You know, they're taxing every single thing they can find to tax. There are 21 new taxes in ObamaCare, plus all of this we have. This is why we are so passionate about solving this spending issue.

I want to welcome to the floor the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) who has been a stalwart in making certain that we cut what we are spending. Cut, make some cuts, so that we're wise stewards of the taxpayers' money. I yield to the gentlelady.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentlelady from Tennessee for organizing this group to talk about this essential issue that is coming before the people of this country as described to be a fiscal cliff. Quite frankly, we need to look back at Alice in Wonderland to see from whence we have come.

In the case of Alice in Wonderland, there's a line that says if you don't know where you're going, any road will get you there. Certainly in the case of Congress, the Republicans have laid out a road. It's a road map for America's future. It was designed by our House Budget Committee chaired by Congressman PAUL RYAN from Wisconsin, and it lays out a plan for spending. It lays out a plan to sustain the viability and vitality of Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid into the future, to make sure that seniors now can enjoy the benefits that they've earned through Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. And the young people who are paying for it now will have those benefits available to them when they retire or when they need them.

That is our road map to America's future. That is our budget. It passed this House unanimously through Members of Congress who are of the Republican persuasion.

By contrast, the Democrats have not tendered or put forward a budget for over 1,300 days. Now, Tim Tebow was a quarterback at the University of Florida 1,300 days ago before his career at the Denver Broncos, before his career now in New York. So many things have happened in those 1,300 days in America. How could one important political party in this country not put forward a budget, a road map, to where we want

to go with our spending and to retire our debt?

Something that our budget, the Paul Ryan/Republican budget, put forward is a pathway to eliminate our debt and our deficit without raising taxes and while preserving America's social safety net. And yet the other side of the aisle put forth nothing in response. And the answer is because, I believe, they don't know where we're going so any road will get them there.

The President's budget was presented by Timothy Geithner to the House Budget Committee. We asked him: When does it balance? At what point out in the future does it eliminate our debt and our deficit? And the answer was, Never. Never.

Our country needs direction right now; and the people who are here tonight want to make sure that the people of America know where we're going and yet our President put forward a budget that never balances. And his answer now on this road to however and wherever we're going is, I want to tax people who can provide enough income for our Nation to fund it for 8 days. That's not a budget. That's not an answer. That's not an American value. That is not where we should be going.

Our own Government Accountability Office has put together three volumes of reports that contain in them ways that we can consolidate spending, create efficiencies in government, save money, and make our government smaller, more robust, serve the people, and yet save \$900 billion a year. Now, that is three-fourths of the way to solving our entire deficit, and yet why aren't we grabbing that and running with it? Why are we talking about raising taxes on the American people, on our small businesses?

I come from a State where there are no big cities, Madam Chairman. I come from a State where the largest town has less than 60,000 people. I come from a State where there are no Big Four, too-big-to-fail banks. A place where you go to your local Main Street banker if you want to borrow money and present a plan to pay it back, a secured loan that comes to you and that you do pay back, from people who know you, that know your reputation and your ability to repay. And yet laws like Dodd-Frank and this mysterious creation called Basel III will put global banks and my little banks on Main Streets in Wyoming on the same capital plan. That was never intended. That's so irrational.

Let's work together, Republicans and Democrats, to help our country rationalize and put things back on the right track and focus on our spending problems.

□ 1900

Use the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office reports to eliminate even half of the items that we're overspending. It would be a stunning victory for the American people, and we know how to get there.

Mr. Speaker and Madam Chairman, you are leaders in this caucus, this conference, this country. We, in this House, know how to solve these problems. What we lack is gumption. What we lack is the relationship with the President of the United States to sit down and talk to him about these issues.

One more thing, Madam Chairman. I realize we have very important remarks to be made from others here tonight, but I want to tell you a story. There is a group here in the House that gets together once a week. And one day we had Bob Schieffer come in and speak to us, Bob Schieffer of CBS News, a long time, highly respected journalist.

And I had the chance to ask him, When you look at the crises in negotiations that are occurring now, between Members of Congress and the President, why are we having so much trouble communicating? Who have you witnessed in your lengthy, illustrious career that did it better? Who would you hold up as an example?

Well, Bob Schieffer first started covering Lyndon Baines Johnson in Texas many years ago, and he told a story about how LBJ would have handled this. He mentioned that LBJ would religiously watch the Sunday morning talk shows. He would watch "Meet the Press," and he would watch the shows that were on the networks because that's all we had back then was networks.

He would watch the Speaker of the House on those programs. And if the Speaker would give an avenue for compromise, he had him on the telephone before the Speaker of the House left the studio. And he'd say, Mr. Speaker, why don't you come over to the White House tonight?

Lady Bird and I'll put on some fried chicken and we'll just sit around in the kitchen and talk this over. I see an avenue for us to agree on 10 percent or 20 percent of where we need to go to solve this Nation's problems.

He would connect, on a personal level, and on a level that found that crack in the armor of failure to communicate. And that's how he solved the problems.

What we find now is that if the Speaker goes on television and leaves a crack in the armor, say an offer to come up with \$700 billion or \$800 billion in new revenue, something that this President campaigned on, instead of having the President call the Speaker and say, Mr. Speaker, I think we're getting somewhere. Why don't you come over. We'll get together around the kitchen table and just talk about this. I think we're getting somewhere. Instead, the Speaker is blasted by the press shop at the White House within hours of his making a presentation on the Sunday morning talk shows. And people wonder why we can't solve these problems?

There is a way to solve these problems. We know what to do to solve these problems.

I compliment the gentle lady from Tennessee for her hard work to solve these problems, to illustrate for the American people that there's room for compromise in Washington. And I salute your efforts to reach out to everyone, to the American people, and across the aisle to make that happen.

Madam Chairman, I yield back with my compliments.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the lady for yielding back, and I have to tell you, I loved her Alice in Wonderland example. Sometimes I feel like we should read the "Emperor Has No Clothes" because we're spending money we don't have, or maybe "Goldilocks and the Three Bears" because it's never quite right what seems to be presented.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I know our colleagues appreciate Mrs. LUMMIS and what she does; but when she talks about the Nation's Treasurer coming forward and having something that never comes into balance, she knows what she was talking about. She was a State treasurer in Wyoming before she came to Congress. She knows these issues. She knows how you balance a governmental budget. She's an expert in these issues.

And to have a budget where you say you never plan for it to balance? Well, when my children were growing up and they were struggling and something was going to be too much of a heavy lift or too hard, I would say, if you fail to plan, then you plan to fail.

For this great Nation, for the endurance of freedom, failure is not an option; and it is imperative that the fiscal house of this great Nation be put in order.

Someone who knows how to do that so very well, who has done it as a wife, a mother, a State legislator and a small business owner is Mrs. HARTZLER from Missouri, and I yield to you.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you. I sure appreciate your leadership on this issue and drawing attention to the very real crisis that we have in this country and the very real opportunity we have.

You know, the real issue that is before us today is that it's time for Washington to stop spending money it doesn't have and the fact that Washington has a spending problem, not a taxing problem.

The President's proposal is a non-starter, and it's a red herring. It might sound good to some, but it doesn't solve the problem, and we are problem solvers and that's what we're here to do.

Even if we gave the President what he wants and raised taxes on family business owners in America, it would only generate enough revenue to fund the government for 8 days. It would not make a dent in our yearly deficit or reduce our national debt.

Only by creating jobs and reducing spending will we balance our budget, and the American people understand that.

I would love to share with you a few comments that I received. I don't know

about you and your office, but I've received hundreds of emails and phone calls from people at home who want to weigh in on this very important issue, and I love their commonsense advice. You know, the best knowledge and expertise on these issues is from the people. It's not from the bureaucrats here in Washington, D.C.

Here's just a few of the comments that I've received this week from people back home. Mike in Sedalia says: The issue is not the raising of taxes, but good solid budget cuts.

Curtis from Lebanon said: There are still a bunch of us out here that do not want a spend and tax government. New taxes mean new spending.

And I thought that was a great comment, especially with the President's proposal that he brought forth the other day when he wanted more stimulus spending. So the cuts that he was proposing, just like Curtis said, were just going to be immediately funneled over to new wasteful stimulus spending. They would have nothing to do with reducing the debt or the deficit. I thought Curtis was right on.

We have Lawrence from Pleasant Hill. He said: Good morning Representative HARTZLER. I know we are being told we are at the edge of a fiscal cliff. We did not arrive there by not paying enough taxes. The Federal Government spends insane amounts of money, and even by reducing us all to serfs, the taxes will not cover the spending.

Well said.

Here's Jerri from Lamar. She said: Please stop spending our money. Walk away from the table if they are not willing to stop wasting our hard-earned money. Reform the entitlements and lower the taxes. Nothing else, in my opinion, is acceptable. Do not go back to the Clinton era. That administration led us into a recession. And do not raise the inheritance tax.

And then listen to this. She said: I am from a family of farmers. That will kill our family and many others and make it impossible to keep farms that have been in our family for generations. That is the most unfair tax there is. This country will not survive more blows to small business and the middle class. Stop the insanity and stop it soon.

And finally, from Patricia in Jefferson City, she said: I want to voice my opinion on what has happened in Washington right now. Politicians have put us in this mess with excessive spending. I want to see huge spending cuts out of the Federal spending before I see any taxes.

Now, that's common sense. That's the voice of the American people.

You know, Missouri is the Show Me State, and I believe it's time for Washington to show the hardworking taxpayers of my State and every State that they understand it's time for Washington to do what we do at home, and that's live within our means by cutting spending, tightening our belts, and not raising taxes on any American.

□ 1910

Washington would be better off focusing on job creation to raise revenue rather than taking more money from its citizens.

So that's the common sense from Missouri I wanted to share tonight, gentledady, and I sure appreciate your leadership on this issue.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentledady. And I know that you're doing a telephone town hall with your constituents tonight. I know you'll probably hear some of the same things that you've said. I've heard from my constituents, too.

I heard from one lady who is a small business owner, and she said, I wouldn't mind if my taxes went up and it helped pay down the debt; but she was astounded when she found out that the President wanted to spend this much, and more, and that her taxes would not go down. The money raised from the tax hike would be spent, plus another trillion dollars, and she was not going to see the debt paid down. She was very concerned about that.

Well, coast-to-coast we're hearing the same thing. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) is also on the phone with his constituents, and we appreciate that you're on the floor with us.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the gentledady from Tennessee for this time and for her leadership on this important issue for every American.

I'm glad to hear my colleagues continue to talk about the real issue that we face in this country. We did not tax our way to a \$16.3 trillion debt in this Nation. The Federal Government spent its way into that debt. The responsibility that we need to have that comes from the Show-Me State of Missouri in terms of commonsense proposals is something that needs to be heard in Washington, D.C.

This President has been focused on raising taxes. He is implying that Washington, D.C., needs the money more than our people at home. Well, if you come into my district, the Third Congressional District of Colorado, we go to Pueblo, and the real unemployment rate is now at better than 20 percent. My second largest community, Grand Junction, Colorado, the real unemployment level is at 19.5 percent.

My folks aren't looking for an unemployment check. They're looking for a paycheck. They're looking for responsibility out of Washington. And when we are looking at this fiscal challenge that we face, this fiscal abyss, a fiscal black hole which is engulfing the economy of the United States, we need that responsibility out of Washington.

But how are our dollars being spent? Are they being spent wisely or does Washington continue to waste the efforts and the hard-earned capital of the American people? Let me give you a few examples.

We had \$700,000 that came out of the pockets of hardworking Americans to

be able to conduct a study on methane gas from dairy cows. Now, the gentledady from Tennessee, you've got a few dairy operations in your State. I think we could have saved \$700,000. It comes naturally. We need common sense when it comes to handling the American taxpayers' dollars.

We had another \$137,530 of American taxpayer dollars that was used to be able to create a video game called "Layoff." That's what the policies of this administration have literally yielded. We are not growing the economy, putting people back to work.

As we approach this Christmas season, we have families across the country right now that are hoping to be able to provide for their children. We can create that certainty by addressing an unwieldy regulatory process that's inhibiting our ability to be able to create jobs. And if Washington needs revenues—and we know that government needs revenue to carry out specific functions—let's get the American people back to work, those folks in Pueblo and Grand Junction, Colorado, who actually want to be able to have a job.

But we need to be very concerned, once again, about where's that waste of the Federal dollars going. The gentledady from Tennessee noted that \$1.5 trillion of the debt of this country is owed to China. So what did the United States do? We sent 17.8 million American dollars for China to be able to study environmental programs and social programs in China. So effectively, what we did, we borrowed money from China to be able to send it back to China to be able to study problems there. Let's get Americans back to work.

We took another \$2.6 million to be able to train Chinese prostitutes not to drink too heavily. I think we have a better use for American dollars.

Right now, America is facing a fiscal challenge, a fiscal abyss. The problem resides not with Americans being taxed too little but government spending too much. We have a caucus that's dedicated to getting Americans back to work, to bring fiscal sanity into the process, and to never, ever forget it is not Washington, D.C.'s money. It's the American people's money. Let's stand up for them first rather than for more and bigger government.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman. So well said—jobs, the economy, economic growth. We have to have economic growth. And continuing to raise tax rates, continuing to escalate spending doesn't do that. What we want to see is a healthy economy for our future because we know a healthy economy is going to give us jobs growth. Jobs are going to give us the economic growth and prosperity that is necessary for today, for tomorrow, for a healthy economy in this Nation.

We know that a healthy economy is going to lead to continued economic freedom and, thereby, political freedom. We know that freedom leads to brighter futures for our children and

our grandchildren, and that's what we want. We want these children to dream big dreams and to live in an America where they can come true.

Someone who shares the passion on this issue is STEVE SCALISE, a Congressman from Louisiana, who has recently been elected as chairman of the Republican Study Committee for the next Congress.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank the gentledady from Tennessee for her leadership and for hosting not only this hour, but for being so passionate about the need to control spending and to get our economy back on track. I know she was on one of the Sunday talk shows just this weekend talking about this issue and talking about conservative solutions to avert this so-called fiscal cliff. And if you look at how we got here and what American families are facing starting January 1, if nothing gets resolved out of Washington, it's an abyss that doesn't need to happen.

If you just go back and look at some of the promises made by President Obama when he was running for office, when he was running for reelection, he talked about working across the aisle. He talked about bipartisan solutions. He talked about it a lot, and the American people expected that the President would keep that promise. But before the ink was even dry, before some of the States had even confirmed and finalized their vote totals for this last election, the President comes out with a hyperpartisan solution. That's his approach.

First of all, when the President comes out with his plan to raise taxes on some and to not renew others and to threaten, literally, middle class families with a tax increase if some people don't get their taxes raised—there already was a bipartisan solution to avert this cliff.

Just a few months ago, here in this House, we passed a bill with 19 Democrat votes—a strong bipartisan vote—to make sure nobody sees their taxes go up, completely avoiding this coming crisis. We passed that bill and sent it over to Senate. Of course, the Senate has refused to take any action on it because President Obama, and his Treasury Secretary I think has confirmed this, they're eager to go off the cliff. They think they'll get political points by doing this. This is a political calculation by them to try to blame the other party, and let's have this crisis and then go and push more taxes on the American people.

I think if you look at what the message of this campaign was—there were a lot of messages. One was people wanted us to work together on bipartisan solutions. And we've got those bipartisan solutions to avert this crisis but also to avert so many of the other crises facing our Nation.

But another thing they said—and probably the loudest thing people said—is they wanted us to focus on the

economy and creating jobs. That's the biggest concern for most families across this country. People I talk to in southeast Louisiana, they're concerned about a sluggish economy, and, in many cases, it's some of the policies coming out of Washington that are creating all of these problems.

□ 1920

If you want to say, will tax increases solve any of these problems, first of all, let's go back and look at history. We've gone and combed through and there has never been a time in modern history where raising taxes got you to a balanced budget. Never. It's never happened. The last time that a Republican House has balanced a Federal budget was back in the year 2000. Not that long ago. It seems like a long time ago. Washington has balanced its budget. We were living within our means back then, and we weren't doing it through tax increases. It was done through controlled spending.

The last time a Democrat House has balanced a Federal budget was 1969. So maybe there aren't many people around here on the Democrat side that know how to balance a budget. But you don't do it by raising taxes. In fact, John F. Kennedy when he pushed through his economic plan that got growth going in the mid-1960s, it was through tax cuts. Go back and look at the quotes. Some of the best quotes against growth in government, against tax increases were made by John F. Kennedy when he pushed for a tax cut that ultimately was passed by President Johnson.

So where do you get economic growth? Go back and look at those years. In the 1960s when they cut taxes, there was tremendous economic growth. A lot of jobs were created. In the 1980s when Ronald Reagan cut taxes, there was tremendous economic growth, one of the greatest times in history. Ultimately, if you look at the deficits in those periods, it came because you had a Congress that didn't control spending even with more money.

And then you look at the Bush tax cuts, because that's what we're talking about here today: the expiration of the 2001 and 2003 tax rates. When those tax cuts were put in place in 2003, after that happened, within 3 years of tax cuts, the Federal Government took in 40 percent more money. Now, you wouldn't believe that if you listen to some of the mainstream media. You would think that cutting taxes takes money away from government and you need to raise taxes to bring in revenue. The opposite is true when you look at history. Forget about what politicians in Washington tell you who want to take more of your money to go and spend it on Big Government. When they cut taxes in 2003, within 3 years the Federal Government took in 40 percent more money.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman would yield, I think that is such an im-

portant point to make, that when you raise the rates, which is a regressive action as you look at tax policy, what you do is to drive down the revenues. If what the President says, Mr. Speaker, is that he wants more revenue, the way to get to more revenue is to clean up the Code, to actually lower your tax rates and to generate more economic activity and growth so that we can begin to grow and reshape our way out of this. You're never going to tax your way out of it. You can't spend your way out of it.

I want to invite the gentlelady from New York into this because she is a physician. She knows, with all the ObamaCare taxes, that you're not going to be able to deliver health care with escalating the taxes that are on the books pertaining to ObamaCare.

I yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for leading this session and our chairman of the RSC. Indeed, it's true: as of January 1, 2013, in fact, Congresswoman, there will be five new burdens, new tax burdens, on the American people related to the enormous cost of the Federal takeover of our health insurance and in certain respects of our health care.

For one thing—and this is really, really a sad thing—right now, families with special needs children can use pretax dollars. They can protect those dollars to spend them on care and even education for their special needs children in flexible savings accounts. As of January 1, 2013, one of the new tax burdens on those families and on every family that relies on a flexible savings account will be that they will be limited to \$2,500 per year. That's it.

Now, tuition at some of the schools for our special needs children run to many thousands of dollars a year, \$10,000 or more. It used to be that families could use those dollars for their special needs children. Now they won't be able to. Does that seem fair? It certainly doesn't to me.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. You said there are five taxes that go on January 1. If our colleagues want to look at this list of taxes, are they listed on your Web site?

Ms. HAYWORTH. We will post a link, because I'm not sure they are right, but we will post a link. Dividend taxes are going to go up on our seniors, on our fixed income families, on our savers. That's another burden, the new taxes that are going to be related to health care, and there are three others other than the flexible savings.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. As the gentlelady yields back, to the gentleman from Louisiana, I would think that the Republican Study Committee has this linked on their Web site so people can see the taxes that are already going to go up on them because of ObamaCare. We reiterate that what we want to do is lower the spending and get the fiscal house in order.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee again for yielding and the gentlelady from New York for pointing those important facts out, because if you look at an important point that was just brought up, under ObamaCare, there were more than 20 different tax increases in ObamaCare, many of which, by the way, hit the middle class. Sure, in ObamaCare the President went after those rich people that he despises so much. He's happy to take their campaign cash during elections, but he went after them in ObamaCare with tax increases. But he also went after middle class families. This medical device tax that hits January 1 hits every single American that has medical procedures.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. To the gentleman from Louisiana, I hate to interrupt, but the Speaker is telling me that our time has expired. We have so much to cover. We were joined by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS) who's been on the phone. I regret that we are out of time. He has been doing a telephone town hall.

We have solutions. The fiscal house has to be brought into order. I thank my colleagues for joining me on the floor tonight to help make the point to the American people. We are going to stay with this fight and solve the problem. Our children and grandchildren deserve it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### INVESTING IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We hear a lot of the rhetoric on debt and deficit, and I think it requires a recent review of history.

Less than 12 years ago, the United States had a \$258 billion budgetary surplus, meaning that we were taking in \$258 billion more each year than we were spending. That budget surplus 12 years ago was a direct result of having created 22 million private sector jobs in the previous 8 years, underscoring the fact that the best tax policy is bringing back lost taxpayers to productivity, more people contributing to the Federal Treasury and less people dependent on governmental programs.

That \$258 billion budgetary surplus was used as justification to enact tax cuts in 2001 and in 2003. Those tax cuts disproportionately benefited the wealthy. The supply side theory, if you ascribe to it, says that if you give large tax cuts to the very wealthy, that money will find its way back into the economy in new business investment and job growth. Eight years later, we had the worst recession in the history of this Nation, and we had the worst job loss in 60 years.

This economy is not growing to the extent that it needs to in order to

produce employment. It's growing at about 1½ to 2 percent, which is not enough to sustain the current level of employment today, meaning that without additional growth in this economy, we will have increases in unemployment in this Nation.

So what do we need to do? We need to invest in the American economy. We need to nation-build, not in Iraq, not in Afghanistan but right here at home, in America. After the tragedy of September 11, 2001, we were chasing the losers of globalization, al Qaeda, bin Laden, two bad elements that had to be dealt with.

□ 1930

But we should have been also chasing the winners of globalization, those economies like China and India that were investing in their own economies and their own people to produce job growth. That's what's needed here.

Those who do all the complaining about spending around here are those who are responsible for all the spending. In fact, in fiscal year 2013, we will have a \$900 billion budget deficit attributable to the Bush tax cuts, \$137 billion for the cost of war, and \$354 billion in the lingering impact from the recession.

What we need to do is invest in America, in infrastructure, in scientific research and in education. It's a different world. We need to compete more effectively and do what other countries are doing. Why is it that Germany, a country that has one-fourth of the population of the United States, exports more than what the United States does? Because if you look at our Tax Code, it's broken and it needs reform. Industries in the United States that are employing Americans are given 2-year tax credits, and we expect those American companies to make generational commitments on a 2-year tax credit. Look at places like Germany. They're providing 10-year tax credits. That sends a signal, a signal of certainty and a signal of clarity to businesses in Germany that there is a commitment to embrace innovation and technology to remain competitive in the manufacturing economy.

Manufacturing today is not labor intensive. It's capital intensive. You always have to be in a continuous improvement mode. But that requires one thing. It requires a confidence in the American people, a confidence in the American worker in making the kind of commitments that are necessary to compete with China. I often hear people on this floor every day whining about China. Yeah, China cheats on their currency. They treat their workers poorly, and they destroy their environment. But the best response to China's growth is to stand up and compete with China and not whine about China.

Most American jobs are not outsourced to China. They're outsourced to the past because we failed to make the kinds of investments that are necessary to keep the economy growing.

So what's the answer to all of this? Every economist that you talk to, regardless of their political persuasion, will tell you that we have a growth problem. So how do you grow your economy? You invest in it. The New America Foundation, a centrist, prestigious think tank here in Washington, says that we should spend—that's right, we should spend—and invest \$1.2 trillion in a 5-year nation-building program right here in America. That nation-building program will create 27 million jobs over the next 5 years, adding 5.2 million in the first year alone—5.2 million jobs in the first year alone, or 433,000 jobs each month.

Can you imagine if in the spring of 2013 that we had jobs reports that were showing that we were adding 400,000 to 500,000 jobs each month? This economy would soar. Unemployment would be reduced in the first year alone to 6.2 percent and in the second year to 5.6 percent. This added growth in the economy would return \$592 billion to the Treasury in increased tax receipts.

So the \$1.2 trillion that you invest in rebuilding this Nation, that you invest in putting unemployed people back to work, returning veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan, will produce almost \$600 billion in economic growth while we're rebuilding the infrastructure of this Nation. And I will tell you, we need to rebuild the infrastructure of this Nation.

The American Society of Civil Engineers gives us a D rating for the quality of our infrastructure. The World Economic Forum says that we are 24th—24th—in structurally deficient infrastructure. In 2001, when we made all those investments in the American economy, we were number two in the quality of our infrastructure.

Transportation for America says that there are 63,000 structurally deficient bridges in this Nation. In New York State alone, there are over 2,000 bridges that are structurally deficient. In my hometown in western New York, there are over 99 bridges that are structurally deficient. Every second of every day, seven cars drive on a bridge carrying our families that is structurally deficient. This is pathetic.

The electricity grid in this Nation ranks 32nd in the world in reliability—an embarrassment. The United States Chamber of Commerce, which should be leading this effort, which should be leading this effort to invest in American infrastructure by investing in American businesses and investing in American workers, says that we lose because of the poor quality of our infrastructure—\$336 billion in lost growth over the next 5 years alone.

The United States Department of Transportation says that freight train bottlenecks cost our economy \$200 billion a year, or 1 percent of our economy. The Federal Aviation Administration says air traffic delays cost \$33 billion last year. We need to double spending on ports by the year 2020 or lose another \$270 billion in exports.

China—keep complaining about China. But do you know what? They spend about 9 percent of their economy on infrastructure, on roads and bridges, on doing nation-building right in their home. Europe spends 5 percent. The United States spends less than 3 percent of its economy on infrastructure improvements.

So the need is very clear. So is this Congress, is Washington responding to the need? Well, not really. Not really. Think about this for a moment: This Congress will spend \$105 billion next year on rebuilding the roads and bridges of this Nation, a nation of 300 million people, where every objective observer understands the need for infrastructure investment. So less than \$53 billion in each of the next 2 years. You can't spend any more, right? Well, wait a minute. You just spent \$89 billion rebuilding the roads and bridge of Afghanistan. You just spent \$67 billion rebuilding the roads and bridges of Iraq. Those nations are 30 million and 26 million respectively. Yet, for a nation of 300 million people, you could only come up with less than \$53 billion in each of the next few years?

When the American Society of Civil Engineers says just to bring your infrastructure to a state of good repair it will cost you \$2.2 trillion, it's weak. In fact, it's pathetically weak.

So, the lessons about economic growth are found in our recent history. And the lessons of austerity, unfortunately, are right in front of us. In 1937, when the American economy was coming out of the Great Depression, we showed signs of anemic growth, and as opposed to spending more to invest in that growth, the President and Congress pulled back in 1937, and what happened? The economy went back into recession again. In the 1990s in Japan, they tried extensive austerity measures only to put that economy into a recession for an entire decade. In Europe today and over the past 2 years, austerity measures have prolonged, not taken that area out of recession. In Greece—we often hear Members of this House who say the United States economy is going to be like Greece.

□ 1940

Oh, really? Greece is not growing. Greece has lost 25 percent of its economy in the past 5 years. Greece's economy shrunk by 7 percent this year alone. There is a 20 percent unemployment rate in Greece, and it's even higher for younger people. Greece doesn't make anything that the rest of the world wants. The American economy is dynamic, but the American economy always needs to be improving with education, scientific research, and infrastructure investment.

A rational political system would respond much differently than what is going on here in this Congress. We're talking about spending cuts and tax cuts to be extended that haven't produced economic growth. All the people that are talking about spending did all

the spending. They're the debt and deficit creators. If we want to experience economic growth, we have to invest in this economy. It is critically important to the future of this Nation.

Medical research. We need to enhance, not cut, funding to the National Institutes of Health and the National Cancer Institute. Thirty years ago if you were diagnosed with cancer, fewer than 50 percent of those who were diagnosed lived beyond 5 years of their diagnosis. Because of a robust commitment to cancer research in the 1990s, under a Democratic administration, the survival rate now beyond 5 years for adults is 60 percent and for kids it is 80 percent. You're investing into medical research, into scientific research to create the jobs of the 21st century. I know that for my community in Buffalo in western New York, that gave the Nation and the world cancer research, that gave the Nation and the world chemotherapy in 1904. Making those investments has created a dynamic new economy in downtown Buffalo, which used to be a manufacturing economy. It's called the Buffalo-Niagara Medical Campus. The Roswell Park Cancer Institute, the first comprehensive cancer institute in the entire Nation, is leading the job growth there with 12,000 new jobs and is projected to grow another 4,000 over the next 5 years because you had a Nation that had the confidence in our scientific community to make the kinds of investments that create a diversified and strong economy so that we're not outsourcing jobs to the past but investing to create jobs for the future.

Manufacturing in this Nation is not dead. It will die if you continue to simply whine about China. You need to make the investments in worker training, in new technology, in innovation to ensure that the workers that will require 20 years, that go four or five on one piece of machinery—now you've got one worker on four pieces of machinery. This is what you have to do in order to remain competitive in this world economy.

All the books have been written. In Fareed Zakaria's "The Post-American world," he doesn't argue that the American economy is slipping quickly or deeply. He calls it "the rise of the rest," that other economies are investing in their people and in their future. Tom Friedman and Mike Mandelbaum, who wrote the book "That Used to Be Us: How America Fell Behind the World it Invented," say that because of information technology, regardless of size, distance, and increasingly language, every country now can participate in a global platform to realize the great economic benefits of globalization. You can't compete in the new world, in the new economy without making investments in your people, your infrastructure, and the scientific research that's important.

China over the next couple of years will catch up to us in terms of the number of patents it produces. Patent

production is an indication of future economic growth. For the past 75 years, we've lead the world in the number of patents that we produced. China will overtake us. That is a direct result of not investing in your own people and in scientific research.

As I have said throughout this discussion tonight, there are many other areas that we can go into. The bottom line is this: all this talk about debt and deficit—12 years ago we had a budgetary surplus in this Nation of \$258 billion. Now we have record deficits. That surplus was created because we had the confidence to invest in the American people, to do nation-building right here at home.

A strong prosperous America is the best America in terms of our foreign policy, as well. We become the aspiration for the rest of the world when America is doing what it ought to be doing, when it doesn't fear its own people, when it seeks not to divide the Nation, but bring it together. Hubert Humphrey once said that the greatest foreign policy initiative of the Johnson administration was the Civil Rights Act. Although it was a domestic policy, what he was saying was that when America acknowledges its mistakes, when America lives up to its ideals, it becomes an inspiration for the rest of the world.

All of those areas of the economy that Tom Friedman writes about in "That Used to Be Us" and "The World is Flat," America used to lead. We don't any more. We cultivated great artists, but we also cultivated the greatest economy in the history of the world. People that couldn't demonstrate—Rostropovich couldn't conduct an orchestra in his motherland. He came to America because we are a free Nation that celebrates and embraces the arts, and at the same time produces economic growth and opportunity for generations of people.

Tonight, I challenge my colleagues in the United States Congress to stand up for America, to do nation-building right here at home by investing in our own people, not \$89 billion in rebuilding the roads and bridges of Afghanistan, but a trillion dollars to rebuild the roads and bridges of America; not \$67 billion to rebuild the roads and bridges of Iraq, but a trillion dollars to rebuild the roads and bridges of America.

Everybody here talks a great game about thanking our veterans for their service, but you know what the problem is? We have returning veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan who are experiencing an unemployment rate of 30 percent. If you want to say thank you on behalf of a grateful Nation, you create an economy that gives them an opportunity to realize their full potential as individuals.

□ 1950

Sixty-seven percent of the deaths of American soldiers in Afghanistan are attributed to improvised explosive de-

vices. Sixty-four percent of the deaths in Iraq are attributed to improvised explosive devices. Do you know how you defeat an IED? Don't be there. So we need to do nation-building right here at home. We need to grow this economy by investing in it in order to reduce debt and deficit and create employment and opportunity for future generations.

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

#### IN THE CLOSING OF THE 112TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 30 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this institution, the United States House of Representatives, enjoys a rich heritage that continues to inspire. Through these magnificent Halls and this great Chamber, celebrated American leaders have walked. Presidents have rallied a Nation, and monumental policy debates have echoed throughout the night to forge America's great history. This building right here is the fulfillment of what our Founding Fathers sought when skirmishes first broke out on the fields of Lexington and Concord nearly two-and-a-half centuries ago. It's what each succeeding generation of Americans has stepped forward to safeguard in its own way, and it is what we have been entrusted to build on and ultimately gift to our children. Here we are, working each and every day, to prove ourselves worthy of the country we inherited, the people we are here to represent, and the limitless future we hope to build.

Mr. Speaker, I decided to run for Congress just over 3½ years ago, the basement of my home serving as our team's first office. We didn't have much space or even a sign on the street, but we were all driven by the idea and firm belief that our country's best days are in front of us, that we can get our economy roaring again, that we can continue confidently as the best hope for leading the world. It has been quite a journey from that humble start to working here in the United States Capitol each and every day. But the great thing about America is that this story isn't so unique. Since our Nation's very inception, we have always been a place where what starts out as small gatherings of concerned citizens, of individuals getting together to discuss and plan how to make our country even better, can grow with hard work and dedication to actually achieve some of those very things.

I first ran for Congress, not because I wanted to be somebody, but because I wanted to do something. In fact, I wanted to do a great many "big" things. With so many millions of Americans struggling to find a job and economic security, I wanted to get this

economy growing and get our country back to work. With so many small businesses finding it harder and harder to keep their doors open each and every day, I wanted to fight for small business owners, like myself, and make sure that the Federal Government did a better job of helping to create an environment where small businesses and entrepreneurs can succeed.

With our country buried in debt and the problem only scheduled to get worse, I wanted to rein in the reckless overspending in Washington, D.C., and advance big solutions so that my children, so that our children, could be free to reach their potential without previous generations' debt obligations holding them back.

With threats to our national security growing by the day and with an Iranian regime defiantly pursuing its nuclear ambitions, I wanted to be not just a vote in the United States Congress but a leading voice. I wanted to be a true champion, advancing vital measures to keep our Nation and our allies strong and secure.

With the 10th District serving as home to so many great communities, great businesses, great schools, passionate leaders throughout our communities, bright people, and treasured natural resources, I wanted to provide the thoughtful, independent leadership in Congress that our district has had and so richly deserves. Then with our Nation seemingly torn apart by hyperpartisan politics and gridlock, I wanted to prove that we could still get things done if we were serious about working together in good faith and finding common ground solutions to move our country forward.

We've certainly gone through tough times recently, but I've always believed in the resiliency of the American people to make things better. We have been able to achieve great things because our natural instinct is to aspire to achieve great things. This is why I am here, and this is what I have worked to accomplish each and every day while I've been in office.

Now, these past years, we've made sure to hit the ground running because that's what the 10th District expects. Stretching north along Lake Michigan from the New Trier Township, Wilmette, Kenilworth, Winnetka, and Glencoe to North Chicago and Waukegan, from Libertyville south to Glenview and Wheeling, Arlington Heights and Palatine east to Lake Forest and Lake Bluff, and Highland Park west through Deerfield, Buffalo Grove, and Long Grove, I've been fortunate to represent a diverse congressional district that asks its leaders in Washington to tackle a wide-ranging and ambitious agenda. With the help of so many good people and coalitions both at home in the 10th District and here in the United States Congress, we've been able to achieve a number of things that I will forever be proud of.

In the House of Representatives, we've kept a sustained focus on job cre-

ation and on creating a climate that better helps the private sector grow. I believe that this represents the best path to ensuring sustained economic opportunity and upward mobility for millions of Americans. The House has passed over 30 bills that have focused on job creation, and I am pleased that the House unanimously passed a job-focused initiative that I introduced, the Global Investment in American Jobs Act. This bill earned strong bipartisan support, and I look forward to its, hopefully, getting signed into law before year's end. But our efforts to help get people back to work most obviously don't start and end with legislation in Washington, D.C. Washington doesn't create jobs. The private sector, entrepreneurs, and small businesses do.

That's why, over the course of the last 2 years, we've put together a 10th District task force that is focused on jobs and have also hosted several highly successful jobs fairs back at home. These jobs fairs brought together local hiring employers with hundreds of job seekers and made a real impact on people's lives. We also organized and hosted educational events with local exporters and manufacturers, exposing them to how they can leverage the Export-Import Bank and new markets opened up by the passage of new trade agreements so as to grow their businesses and create new jobs right here at home.

I supported these things because I want to do everything I can to help businesses and workers in the 10th District and around the country succeed. I've been proud that my time in Congress has allowed me to continue to champion the cause of small business growth, to make sure that small businesses know that they always have a strong advocate for their issues with me in the United States Congress. Over the past few years, I've had the pleasure of touring and visiting literally thousands of small businesses in the 10th District of Illinois. I do this so that I can hear directly from our local business community, and more importantly from the thousands of constituents who work in these businesses, about what Washington can do better to help them.

We did employee town halls in places like the DoALL Company in Wheeling, at the Colbert Packaging in Lake Forest, and at Hollister in Libertyville. We talked ideas with business leaders like Steve Capp of Laserage Technology, Richard Zic of Dynamax, Inc., Jerry Larsen of Larsen Marine, and Matt Eggemeyer of Keats Manufacturing; and I always enjoyed visiting with our community's many storefront business owners, whether on Milwaukee Avenue in Libertyville, in downtown Arlington Heights, or on one of the many beautiful main streets throughout the district.

To some, the big issue was making sure that we had smarter, better crafted regulations that take into account the unique nature of a particular in-

dustry. On this front, we've passed regulatory reform bills to improve the quality of this process and have written letters directly to Federal agencies to ensure that the rules are responsible and not excessively burdensome. We need regulation. We just want that regulation to be smart regulation and tailored regulation, not simply more of it.

Many employers talked to me about the importance of increasing manufacturing and trade opportunities. I've been very happy to advance these issues in Congress as part of a trade working group. I know that the trade agreements we passed with South Korea, Panama, and Colombia are already having and will continue to have a positive impact on manufacturers in the 10th District and around the country. I am also pleased that we recently made progress on improving opportunities with Russia, but we have much more work to do in order to level the playing field regarding trade.

Other small businesses talked to me about the need to have a highly skilled workforce that is better trained and prepared to take jobs in the 21st century. Out of this grew my legislation, the Back to Work Blueprint Act, which would inject a new idea into improving the Federal workforce training program and would ensure that skills developed by workers match with the needs of the employer.

These conversations with small business owners also strengthened my belief that we need to continue the promotion of STEM education in America's schools—science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—skills necessary to make sure students are prepared to take jobs in the 21st century.

Nearly every business owner shared the importance, Mr. Speaker, of access to capital and credit for their businesses. Capital is the lifeblood of our economy, and I am pleased that we focused in on this in this Congress with the passage of the JOBS Act and other legislation that came out of the Financial Services Committee. Of course, many employers and small business owners and individual workers talked with us about the importance of keeping the tax burden low and about making sure that our Tax Code was fairer and simpler. Over the past 2 years, I've been proud to champion this through my active support for comprehensive reform that is focused on low rates, eliminating the lobbyist loopholes, broadening the base, and focusing on economic growth.

□ 2000

I am confident that this will better help small businesses compete and create additional jobs.

We also heard from many small business owners—like Rick Woldenberg of Learning Resources in Vernon Hills—on the need to repeal the expensive and burdensome 1099 provision, which would have placed another unwelcome hardship on small businesses. I was

proud to get behind this issue very early on and was a cosponsor of the legislation and saw its passage through into law.

And finally, something that we've frequently heard from both workers and employers is the need for payroll tax relief. This is something which I proposed in legislation of my own, and which I was pleased to support in a different piece of legislation, to put more money into the pockets of hardworking Americans.

In essence, what we heard from our local businesses over the past few years developed into what was my Main Street Jobs Agenda, which I've talked at length about in this Chamber. With its focus on pro-growth tax reform, increasing exports in manufacturing, access to capital for small businesses, making investments in infrastructure, utilizing domestic energy resources, STEM education, and implementing smarter regulations, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this remains the best recipe for getting our country back to work.

Beyond our job creation efforts, I'm also proud of our leadership on confronting the Nation's debt crisis. Though not always popular, I refuse to accept the status quo of no budgeting, skyrocketing debt, and a sustained indifference to the reality that ignoring the problem only makes it worse.

With over 40 cents now borrowed on every dollar spent by the Federal Government, this is both a current crisis and a future one as well. Last year alone, we spent more paying the interest on the debt than we spent on the domestic priorities of education, transportation, and natural resource protection combined. This is unequivocally unsustainable, which is why I have dedicated much of my time and effort into reining in spending in Washington and championing a big, bipartisan debt reduction agreement.

I'm very proud of our efforts to introduce the first bipartisan budget in a generation. I want to thank STEVE LATOURETTE and JIM COOPER for their efforts and leadership on this. I also want to thank Congressman QUIGLEY for working with me to cosponsor and advance this legislation, which is based on the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles framework. Mr. Speaker, this budget ultimately failed to pass the House, but I remain proud of our bipartisan effort—for which the USA Today called us the "Brave 38"—and I believe this type of thoughtful, independent leadership, this is the type of leadership that the 10th District deserves.

I also believe that the courage and leadership shown by the House to take on the difficult but necessary position of reining in entitlement spending deserves recognition. We know that Medicare stands out as a primary driver of our debt in the future. And, unfortunately, this future is not so far off. With one of Medicare's key programs scheduled to go bankrupt in the next 10–12 years, sustaining the status quo

unavoidably means dramatic cuts down the road on those vulnerable Americans who need the program the most, crippling increases to the debt, and most likely both.

Instead, I believe we have a generational obligation to ensure that our children's potential is not crushed by a debt burden born out of the inability to govern responsibly. Ultimately, something as big as Medicare reform requires broad bipartisan support, so we're not there yet. We're not, but I do want to express my appreciation to Democratic Senator RON WYDEN and the House Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN for recognizing that a solution must be found if we ever want to get this country on stable financial ground.

While many can find fault and issues with any proposal, we as Americans must applaud and encourage bipartisan solutions. We must strengthen our social safety net and ensure its long-term viability.

Of course, getting our debt under control impacts more than just what we do domestically. It impacts our ability to keep our homeland safe and free, and it impacts our power to provide leadership on the international stage.

The 10th District has a history and tradition of thoughtful global outlook and a special appreciation for the positive role American leadership can and must play in the world. This is a responsibility that I fully embrace and advanced.

I have been honored to work with the Armenian-American community to advance the Armenian Genocide Recognition Resolution here in this Congress. I want to especially thank Ken Kachigian, Ari Killian, and Greg Bedian, and all the people at All Saints Church and the Armenian Cultural Center in Glenview, Illinois, for their support in educating me about their key issues and concerns.

I also want to recognize the Bahai community in the 10th District, which helped me build support for the resolution I introduced bringing attention to the horrible mistreatment and atrocities of the Bahai people persecuted in Iran.

We put together a Human Rights Advisory Board which allowed us to better speak out about the mistreatment of religious minorities in Pakistan and Bangladesh, especially in the Hindu community. And we supported numerous initiatives aimed at addressing human rights abuses taking place in Africa. I especially want to thank Dr. Richard Benkin for his commitment and help with regard to this area.

And of course we also focused on human rights and democracy promotion inside of Iran. But our work on Iran obviously did not stop there.

Mr. Speaker, in my very first speech on this House floor, I said that Iran posed the number one security threat to the United States. And thanks to the advice and counsel of so many good

people in the 10th District of Illinois—community leaders like Sandy Perl, Keith Shapiro, the late Richard Schoenstadt, Janet and Gadi Cohen, Caryn Garber, Morrie Silverman and Lori Komisar, Richard Stein, Andy Hochberg, Steve Lavin, Rick Bachrach, Rabbi Aaron Melman, Peggy Shapiro, Rabbi Victor Weissberg, Marc Sacks, Steve Heffer, Andy Lappin, and so many more. Thanks to their passion, we continue to work on preventing this Iranian regime from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability. We advanced many vital measures in this Congress on this issue, and I've been pleased to have the opportunity to act as a leading voice and a champion in Congress for strengthening the sanctions on Iran. So much energy has gone into these efforts, not just from me, but from many Members, and I will continue to urge that the United States ratchet up the pressure on Iran's nuclear ambitions until the threat is affirmatively and effectively dismantled.

Another focus of mine has been finding ways to strength the United States-Israel relationship. Whether it has been delivering speeches from the floor of the House Chamber, drafting and introducing resolutions affirming Israel's right to a secure border, traveling to Israel and meeting with Israeli officials, authoring letters and recruiting other Members to sign on in support, such as an early effort we led to show the commitment of House freshmen to fully fund our foreign aid commitment to Israel, including Iron Dome, in a tough budget climate, or cosponsoring and voting for critical legislation, I have looked to provide true leadership in support of our ally Israel's long-term security.

Finally, I've looked to provide the 10th District with thoughtful, independent leadership in Congress which it has had and I believe deserves. Our district is bound by deep-rooted characteristics—namely, a desire for pragmatic, effective leadership, vigorous independence, and the ability to work with the other side of the aisle in a civilized and bipartisan manner.

On this, I'd like to especially recognize my two most recent predecessors for this seat, Senator MARK KIRK and John Porter. These men have served as valued mentors and friends. I've worked to carry on the proud legacy that they burnished for the 10th District. John Porter and now-Senator KIRK have helped me in ways greater than they even know, and I'm deeply honored to consider them my friends. To this day, they continue to care deeply about the people of the 10th District of Illinois. The quality of who they are and what they achieved is reflected in the appreciation that our area still has for these two incredible men. They set the standard by which the 10th District leadership is measured, and I cannot thank them enough.

The thoughtful, independent leadership that John Porter and MARK KIRK embodied are the same virtues that I

pledged to advance as I began my service to the people of the 10th District. I'm proud to stand here today and say that I believe that I've made good on this commitment.

On a number of issues, ranging from the environment, education, stem cell research, title X funding and women's health, gun control, and transportation infrastructure, I've never been afraid to break from any party and do what I believe is best for my constituents and district.

□ 2010

This is why I've consistently been ranked and considered as one of the most independent and bipartisan Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, as an Eagle Scout, my Scoutmasters, Lee Getschow, Charlie Barnes and Artie Bergman, taught me to respect and love the outdoors, which is why I especially want to highlight our work to protect Lake Michigan.

Beginning with the first bill I introduced in the House, the Great Lakes Water Protection Act, along with my good friend, DAN LIPINSKI, Senators MARK KIRK and DICK DURBIN, I'm proud of our efforts to keep Lake Michigan clean. This legislation would prohibit wastewater pollution from running into the Great Lakes, but our work to protect the 10th District's most cherished natural resource did not stop there.

We focused on supporting the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative through authoring and supporting funding amendments and advocating for the GLRI's importance in testimony before the House Budget Committee, all to make sure that this important program to protect the Great Lakes is adequately funded.

On a more local level, I'm proud that we've finally been able to facilitate the clean-up of Waukegan Harbor. The Superfund site which our community has been trying to restore and clean up for more than 20 years has finally started under our watch. So much work that went in to getting this accomplished has happened, and I particularly want to highlight and thank Susie Schreiber, Gerry Larsen and Cam Davis for their dedicated service to cleaning up Waukegan Harbor, getting, finally Lake County's gateway to the Great Lakes delisted as an area of concern by the EPA.

I also want to quickly highlight another cause which I've been proud to champion, and that's STEM education. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, these are critical educational fields that we need to make sure our young students are not only exposed to but have the tools to excel and compete in the global marketplace. This means giving these core areas extra attention.

And on that, I'd like to highlight the great work and dedication that Dr. Laz Lopez has given. As the principal of Wheeling High School, Dr. Lopez is ahead of the curve in advancing STEM

education among his student, and I believe he's a model for students around the country. He's helped me greatly and has taken on the task of heading up my Educational Advisory Board, and for that I will forever be grateful.

In closing, it has been one of the greatest honors of my life to represent the people of the 10th Congressional District in the 112th Congress. I've never forgotten where I came from and what I came here to accomplish and the importance of governing for the people.

And while I'll miss many things, Mr. Speaker, I will miss most of all the many friends that I've made on both sides of the aisle, and my dedicated and talented staff, some of whom are here this evening: Eric Burgeson, my chief; Kelley Folino; Kim Brisky; Philippe Melin; David Stern; Kris Denzel; Eric Disilvestro; Heb Siam; Eric Miller; Daniel Serota; Mona Dooley; Stefani Zimmerman; Mike Traikovich; Jack Heyden; and Bryan Reed. They all worked tirelessly for the constituents of the 10th District, and I'm proud to call them my friends.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing this next Congress address some big things, some big issues because there's simply too much at stake. As I think about our Nation's future, I'm reminded of a Winston Churchill quote: Success is not final; failure is not fatal. But it is the courage to continue that counts.

Each Congress brings a new opportunity to write the next chapter in America's exceptional story, but we must always remember that nothing is given. America's greatness must continue to be earned.

Our Nation has been built, generation by generation, through hard work and resiliency of the American people; and our generation must do our part to live up to this awesome responsibility. We must always be a country that stands for freedom and liberty, economic growth and opportunity for every American. And I remain optimistic that we can continue to make this country even better if we stay committed to these principles.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the people of the 10th District for the opportunity and honor to represent them in the United States Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### THE GIANT VS. THE MIDGETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was thinking to myself earlier today, what happens when you put in a cage fight a giant with a midget?

Well, the midget will not win the fight. I'm going to tell you that. Why?

He just doesn't carry enough weight to do so. But if you put 30 midgets in with that giant, then the midgets have a chance.

Now, they have weight classes in cage fighting, so you're not going to find a situation where you have two or three against one. You'll just have equal weights. You'll have equally weighted combatants, and then they will go at each other, and the best man will win, or woman.

But we don't have that kind of set up when it comes to relations between employers and employees. There are no weight classes. And so what generally happens is whoever's paying the workers is usually the giant.

And so giants are in business to make a profit. That's how they became big and muscular. But they need those midgets, they need the midgets out there, they need the workers to actually produce the goods or service that is traded in return for the money, which strengthens the giant.

So in an employment relationship, employer/employee, you've got the giant, you've got the midget. Because there are no weight classes in that situation, you have an inherent imbalance. Whoever has the most money has the most clout. They can give you a job, or they can decide that they don't want to hire you. That's not your call. You don't have a right to work. You can offer yourself out for employment, but you don't have a right to work.

So with no weight classes in this employment relationship, where the employer is the giant and the worker is the midget, how do you go about making it a fair fight?

Well, that's where you put the midgets together. You put 30 midgets in with the giant, and the midgets then have a chance, collectively. And so that is how the situation has unfolded here in America.

Seventy-five years ago, almost 75 years ago, Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act, which helps to protect American workers' rights to organize and negotiate the terms of employment with corporations. The midgets get a chance to speak with one voice to the giant. The midgets collectively have the ability to stand somewhat equal to the giant. They have a possibility of winning.

It's never going to be an employee win everything and employer goes down in defeat.

□ 2020

No. The thing is the workers get together. The midgets get together to try to get as strong as they can so that they can then deal with that giant in a more productive way. And the giant, wanting to avoid the fight, decides to speak eye-to-eye with the midgets—with the workers—and work it out to where everybody can win. That's what it's all about.

So the National Labor Relations Act, which protected American workers' rights to organize and negotiate the terms of employment, this actually leveled the playing field between the giant and the midget. It leveled the playing field.

Now, how was it set up that the collective body of workers could stand together and negotiate fair wages and fair employment conditions; things like paid holidays, things like health care benefits, things like retirement, things like number of days off, things like how much do you make, pay? So workers stood together. They had the ability to stand together, and they were protected by Federal law in standing together to be able to bargain with the mighty giant, the employer, to bring about some equity and a balance to that inherently unfair relationship. I won't say "unfair," but inherently unbalanced, out-of-balance relationship.

So we passed that law. It's been working well almost 75 years. But, ladies and gentlemen, in the course of just 7 days, what has happened in Michigan is a blow to crush unions, to crush collective bargaining, and to crush the power of individual workers to stand together, pool their resources so that they can support public policy workers—in other words, politicians—so that they could support those politicians who support their interests. It's been working that way for almost 75 years.

During that time, we went from a Nation where so many people were in poverty, lived in poverty, had no benefits, made slave wages, worked 20 hours a day, and went from that kind of situation into where most workers had obtained middle class status, where workers could afford to go out and buy the house, buy the two cars, send the kids to college and take a vacation and have nice clothes and all of the things that middle class people want. That's what the union movement produced for America by being in a strong position to be able to demand fairness and equity from the employer.

So the employers, let's say General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, the automobile manufacturers, since we're talking about Michigan, they all made lots of money and the workers who work for those companies were middle class and their children went to college and became lawyers and doctors and accountants, and some of them even went back to work in the factories. But now, 7 days it took to crush the ability of workers to stand together financially. They'll never crush the spirit of the workers. But they have used the law with no public hearings, no committee action, no regular course of action during the legislative session—which is a lame duck legislative session, by the way—no regular order, just a sneak attack.

Thursday morning, the 6th of November, 1 month after the landslide election in Michigan and throughout this country that turned back the corporate money that was a raid against the Democrats and a raid against President Obama, it turned that back. A resounding victory on November 6. On December 6, a sneak attack during a lame duck session, with no public hearings,

no committee action. A sneak attack. They announced it that Thursday morning, the 6th, and by 8 p.m., action to crush the union laws had passed both houses, house and senate, in Michigan. Less than 10 hours it took to bring down 75 years of prosperity for all.

Now, why would anyone want to crush the union? And I'm not calling them right-to-work laws because, as I told you earlier, there is no right to work. So let's get rid of that misnomer and let's call the legislation what it is. It's not right-to-work legislation. It is crush-the-union legislation. Who would want to crush the unions? It certainly wouldn't be the union members themselves. It must be, by process of elimination, the folks that they work for.

Now, in Michigan, who did they work for? They used to work for GM and Ford and Chrysler, but due to all of those hefty bonuses and corporate greed that consumed the corporate leaders, they were so busy getting those bonuses and million-dollar bonuses, multimillion-dollar bonuses and salaries and whatnot, that they took their hand off of the wheel and they allowed competition from foreign automakers to overtake their competitive position. And so, as a result, they ended up needing a bailout.

Ford didn't need a bailout. They went and borrowed some money. They did it the right way. They also did some things to make their business more competitive in terms of the products, and so they were able to weather the storm without a government bailout. But Chrysler and General Motors took money from the people to be able to sustain themselves.

□ 2030

Both corporations were close to being crushed themselves, and the workers would have gone down with them. So we did the right thing here and we provided funds to bail out GM and Chrysler.

As a result of that, and as a result of the workers' union getting together with the fallen giant to help pick that giant back up, what they did was they reached a deal, they cut back on some of the vacation days and some of the benefits, they lowered the wages. They did a lot to pick the giant up. The giant was awakened and ended up getting back on his feet, and now General Motors has become, once again, the number one automobile manufacturer in the world. That shows you the American spirit, and it was those workers who were instrumental in making it happen.

Where were the auto manufacturers on December 6? Where were they? I've seen reports that say that, well, you know, they are just kind of staying in the background, but they really don't support this legislative effort to crush the unions. They say that we don't really need that right now. But there's nobody from the company getting up in front of the microphone and saying,

"Don't pass this law. This is wrong. Governor, don't sign this law."

So in the absence of any manifestations of support for the workers, I've got to suspect that General Motors, Chrysler, Ford, are feeling pretty good about how things have worked out so far. In the absence of somebody telling me different, I've got to believe that they see where that level playing field has now been tilted in their favor, and despite the fact that the midgets helped them get up when they had fallen, now they're going to crush the midgets. That's what it looks like to me.

Especially when I think back on this organization which is known as ALEC. ALEC is the American Legislative Exchange Council. That's ALEC. When I look back and think back on the history of that organization, and when I ponder who their corporate members have been, I'm brought to the realization that those auto manufacturers are longtime members of ALEC.

Now, what is ALEC? ALEC is an organization that brings public officials, mainly State legislators, together for quarterly meetings at luxurious locations throughout the country. About 80 percent of the State legislators in America belong to ALEC. They pay dues. It used to be \$50 a year. Now I understand it's \$100. You pay dues, \$100. The citizens actually pay the dues for the politicians. That comes out of the State treasury. They join ALEC and they go to the quarterly meetings and they participate in the legislative efforts of that organization, which also includes, in addition to legislators, corporations, big business, some small businesses, but it's basically an organization of big business. They wished that they could pay only a hundred dollars. They might pay \$25,000 or more for a year as a member of ALEC.

You've got corporate members, you've got legislators who are members, you've got individuals and you've got corporations. You've got midgets against giants, who are not against giants but with giants in ALEC. And the giants take real good care of the midgets, as long as the midgets do what the giants want them to do.

So, what am I talking about? At these quarterly events, the legislators are invited, as well as the representatives of the corporate interests. They come together. They talk about the concerns of the business community. The business community has the legislators there who make the laws. So they talk to those legislators. They're being wined and dined the whole time. And you're able as a legislator to join a committee of ALEC. That committee could be the public safety committee. It could be the committee that deals with voting issues. It could be the criminal justice committee.

Now, why would ALEC be involved in criminal justice? Well, you have private prisons. The private prison industry is booming. They are members of ALEC. They get those captive legislators to introduce bills or legislation,

such as, let's say, let's target the undocumented immigrants. Let's target them. Let's create some State laws, and Federal laws, also, to make it convenient, make it attractive for law enforcement to go in there and bring those folks to the private detention center and house them down there and pay them government money, \$70, \$80 a bed.

Why would ALEC have a committee dealing with voting rights? Well, to produce legislation that makes it more difficult for people who support the opposition, makes it easy to deny those folks their right to vote. And so you have those voter suppression laws. They came out of ALEC.

□ 2040

Then you have the commercial committee, let's call it, of ALEC. They produce legislation such as crush-the-union legislation, also misnamed right-to-work legislation. It is not right-to-work, it is crush-the-union.

So the bill, or the bills, that have been passed out of the Michigan assembly in both their house and senate are products of ALEC, the American Legislative Exchange Council, almost word for word. I challenge anyone to go look on the Internet, look at, if you will, go look up prwatch, PR, Paul Robert, prwatch, W-A-T-C-H.org, prwatch.org.

Go there and put in the letters A-L-E-C in their search button. Go there and find out about ALEC. Find out. Go look at the draft legislation that was produced by the corporations who are members of ALEC which then, after wining and dining the legislators, the legislators then went back home and introduced that legislation which benefits the very corporations that wined and dined them and gave them the legislation.

And guess what? Those corporations, pursuant to Citizens United, can participate in the campaign process. They can do electioneering. They can influence elections. They can give money to organizations that support candidates. And so it's an ugly lobbying situation when you put corporations with legislators in a wining-and-dining setting with added benefit of campaign contributions. They can't lose. That's what ALEC is all about is putting legislators with businesses. And then those legislators, who tend to be Republican, then carry out the wishes of the big business.

Who suffers? The middle class. So just 30 days after, the middle class, the people, rue the day we still have ALEC and the corporations that fund it out there trying to destroy the middle class by crushing the union.

How do they crush the union? Because they know that the union doesn't have a situation like ALEC where you are putting the legislator with the corporation or the corporate interests. You're putting them together, you're wining and dining the legislators, and then you are also pushing your legislation on them; and as an added bonus,

you're giving them campaign contributions so that they can get reelected. You got it going on.

Unions don't have that kind of set up. There is no ALEC of unions. But unions do participate in the political process. They get behind candidates who support working people.

I see my time has come to an end, and I would love to discuss this more. In fact, I believe that I will because this time last year I was on the floor for an hour talking about the Koch brothers. I want so much to be able to bring the Koch brothers into this discussion to see how Sheldon Adelson and Karl Rove come into this equation going all the way back to the Lewis Powell memo. So we will be back. We will talk about those things as soon as possible. Thank you very much.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for the week of December 11 on account of illness.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3564. An act to extend the Public Interest Declassification Act of 2000 until 2014 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3187. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the March of Dimes Foundation.

H.R. 6582. An act to allow for innovations and alternative technologies that meet or exceed desired energy efficiency goals, and to make technical corrections to existing Federal energy efficiency laws to allow American manufacturers to remain competitive.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 13, 2012, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8707. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clodinafop-propargyl; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0202; FRL-9371-6] received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8708. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Picoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0458; FRL-9370-8] received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8709. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dodine; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0743; FRL-9364-7] received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8710. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, and William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program [Docket ID: ED-2012-OPE-0010] (RIN: 1840-AD05) received December 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8711. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Uniform Compliance Date for Food Labeling Regulations [Docket No.: FDA-2000-N-0011] received December 3, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8712. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval, Disapproval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Regional Haze Rule Requirements for Mandatory Class I Areas under 40 CFR 51.309 [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0114; FRL-9751-6] received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8713. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Washington; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan [EPA-R10-OAR-2012-0078; FRL-9722-9] received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8714. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for California [EPA-R09-OAR-2004-0091; FRL-9750-6] received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8715. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; South Coast Air Quality Management District; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gases [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0513; FRL-

9749-6] received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8716. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Eastern Kern, Imperial, Placer, and Yolo-Slano; Prevention of Significant Deterioration [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0732; FRL-9739-5] received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8717. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0876; FRL-9736-6] received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8718. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0808; FRL-9750-4] received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8719. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, OET, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 27 of the Commission's Rules to Govern the Operation of Wireless Communications Services in the 2.3 GHz Band; Establishment of Rules and Policies for the Digital Audio Radio Satellite Service in the 2310-2360 MHz Frequency Band [WT Docket No.: 07-293; IB Docket No. 95-91] received December 3, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8720. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc. [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0342; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-028-AD; Amendment 39-17216; AD 2012-21-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8721. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0491; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-265-AD; Amendment 39-17207; AD 2012-20-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8722. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0588; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-017-AD; Amendment 39-17210; AD 2012-20-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8723. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney (P&W) Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0060; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-02-AD; Amendment 39-17123; AD 2012-14-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8724. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0589; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-189-AD; Amendment 39-17199; AD 2012-19-04] received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8725. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30858; Amdt. No. 3493] received December 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8726. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0639; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-016-AD; Amendment 39-17169; AD 2012-17-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8727. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BRP-Powertrain GmbH & Co KG Rotax Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0603; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-17-AD; Amendment 39-17160; AD 2012-16-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8728. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0633; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-018-AD; Amendment 39-17170; AD 2012-17-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8729. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0488; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-20-AD; Amendment 39-17126; AD 2012-14-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8730. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lycoming Engines Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2006-24785 Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-23-AD; Amendment 39-17196; AD 2012-19-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8731. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0217; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-23-AD; Amendment 39-17194; AD 2012-18-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8732. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Goodyear Aviation Tires [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0881; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-029-AD; Amendment 39-17164; AD 2012-17-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8733. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; M7 Aerospace LLC Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0917; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-030-AD; Amendment 39-17177; AD 2012-18-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8734. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1017; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-17203; AD 2012-19-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8735. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0115; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-40-AD; Amendment 39-17195; AD 2012-18-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8736. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0996; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-040-AD; Amendment 39-17202; AD 2012-19-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8737. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0724; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-043-AD; Amendment 39-17215; AD 2012-20-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8738. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0338; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-51-AD; Amendment 39-17172; AD 2012-17-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8739. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1018; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-052-AD; Amendment 39-17204; AD 2012-19-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8740. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0638; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-266-AD; Amendment 39-17201; AD 2012-19-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8741. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1095; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-40-AD; Amendment 39-17104; AD 2012-13-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8742. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1167; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-058-AD; Amendment 39-17189; AD 2012-18-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8743. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Univair Aircraft Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0360; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-061-AD; Amendment 39-17023; AD 2012-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8744. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0659; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-061-AD; Amendment 39-17101; AD 2012-12-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8745. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0896; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-070-AD; Amendment 39-17173; AD 2012-17-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8746. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to Stormwater Regulations to Clarify that an NPDES Permit is not Required for Stormwater Discharges from Logging Roads [EPA-HQ-OW-2012-0195; FRL-9758-9] (RIN: 2040-AF42) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under Clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 6364. A bill to establish a commission to ensure a suitable observance of the centennial of World War I, to designate memorials to the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I, including a National World War I Memorial on the National Mall in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. 112-701, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

#### 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. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 6650. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to allow the United States Postal Service to provide nonpostal services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 6651. A bill to impose requirements with regard to border searches of digital electronic devices and digital storage media, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. NADLER:

H.R. 6652. A bill to authorize assistance to United States independent music label companies to facilitate exports of recorded music by such companies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 6653. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide standards for determining employment status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. Res. 829. A resolution returning several measures to the Senate; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 830. A resolution designating the ranking of a certain named Member of a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

#### 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. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 6650. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7, which empowers Congress "To establish Post Offices and post Roads

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 6651. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 6652. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 6653.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 111: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 493: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1546: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 2069: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2775: Mr. NADLER and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 2931: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3102: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 3269: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3510: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 3600: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 3769: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3790: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 4209: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 6256: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. \* \* \*: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 6446: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 6572: Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LATHAM, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 6590: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 6615: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 6616: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 6628: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 6632: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 6633: Mr. PAUL, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 6646: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WEST, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BERG, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RIVERA, and Mr. MARINO.

H. Con. Res. 141: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HOLT, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. MORAN.

H. Con. Res. 143: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. HARPER.

H. Res. 732: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. Res. 736: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Res. 760: Mr. COHEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H. Res. 824: Mr. OLSON and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H. Res. 826: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. STUTZMAN.