



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2012

No. 161

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

In the waning days of this 112th Congress, we ask Your blessing, O Lord, upon the Members of this people's House, and most especially upon the leadership. It is on their shoulders the most important negotiations of our time have been placed.

They have been entrusted by their fellow Americans with the awesome privilege and responsibility of sustaining the great experiment of democratic self-government. Give them wisdom, grace, insight, and courage to forge an agreement that allows us all to move forward toward an encouraging future.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WOMACK 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.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### COMMENDATION FOR GOVERNOR HASLAM'S BUSINESS DECISION

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Governor Bill Haslam of my home State of Tennessee for his decision not to set up a State-run health care exchange. Governor Haslam was exactly right when he said this was a business decision, not a political one.

After 2 years, the Obama administration has failed to provide States with sufficient guidance as to how State exchanges would function, yet President Obama expects States to make that decision this week. That's like asking a business to sign a contract that is still being written.

Further, there is evidence that the Federal Government will ultimately control exchanges no matter who creates them. The only difference is if a State sets up an exchange, it will pay for it. No business would take a deal like that.

Finally, Tennessee has seen what experimental health care reform looks like in TennCare. This program almost collapsed and bankrupted our State. What business would risk its finances on a proposal modeled after a failed plan?

I applaud Governor Haslam and thank him for his business-like approach.

### THE ENVIRONMENTAL FISCAL CLIFF

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise because whether you call it a fiscal cliff or a slope, there's no denying the environmental wreckage hitting a metaphoric ledge will have.

Under the sequester, the National Park Service would likely have to close national parks, campgrounds, and visitor centers. Under the sequester, widespread rural job loss, weaker wild-fire management, closure of trails and campgrounds, poor maintenance of forest roads, unprocessed recreational permits, and greater invasive species growth is forecasted.

Under the sequester, \$148 million would be taken away from the U.S. Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy program, which would be equivalent to cutting the solar energy program in half or equal to eliminating the entire wind and geothermal energy programs.

Fiscal cliff or slope, the environment knows no difference. We must act and act now.

### IN TRIBUTE TO AMERICA'S LONGEST-SERVING MAYOR, HILMAR MOORE OF RICHMOND, TEXAS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the legendary mayor of Richmond, Texas, Hilmar Moore.

Mayor Moore passed away last week after 63 years as Richmond's mayor. He was a true Texan, a straight shooter who loved his family, good conversations, quail hunting, ranching, and Texas Longhorn football.

The last time I talked with Mayor Moore was Richmond's 175th anniversary. My speech was interrupted by trains rolling by. The trains did not dare to interrupt Mayor Moore. I asked him, "How can I do that?" He said, "Give it time. Give it time."

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.

H6767

Hilmar Moore gave Richmond time, the time of his life.

#### THE THEORY OF VECTOR BUNDLES

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the discovery of a new breakthrough in mathematics in the theory of vector bundles.

The theory of vector bundles plays a crucial role in modern mathematics. Part of the interest comes from its application to quantum mechanics, the theory that makes modern electronics possible. In quantum mechanics, a particle has a position, which is a point in space-time, as well as an internal structure, which is described by the theory of complex vector bundles.

Over the last few years, the Boij-Soderberg theory has given a new approach to vector bundles in several important areas. Just yesterday, the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in Berkeley, California, announced that several young scientists collaborated to discover how to extend this theory into new places, such as spheres.

The discovery is a significant accomplishment, and I commend these young scientists for their hard work and dedication. It's because of efforts like this that the U.S. continues to be a leader in innovation.

#### A HOLIDAY GIFT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, time is counting down, the holidays are upon us, and Congress still hasn't come together to spare hardworking middle class families from the tax hike rushing towards them.

We know we agree on this. We know what this tax increase would mean for these families. Why aren't we voting on that? Why won't we have a vote on protecting the middle class from this tax hike?

We know that every minute we delay is more stress, more anxiety for mothers and fathers looking at the holiday season, worried about what's waiting for them on the other side. What are we waiting for?

I know Members of Congress might stay here through Christmas, but let's make sure that our holiday gift to the American people is a Congress that doesn't hold the middle class families hostage. Let's bring the middle class tax cuts to the floor for a vote today.

#### IN MEMORY OF DAVE BRUBECK

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, this month we lost a giant in the music industry. Dave Brubeck was a legendary jazz and classical pianist and composer who helped to define jazz.

A fellow Mills College graduate in my district in Oakland, California, Dave served in a crucial role as a jazz visionary who first began his iconic musical experimentation as a student. He subsequently grew to become a world-renowned musician and composer, writing more than 200 compositions and making over 115 recordings, including the jazz piece "Take Five," which became one of The Dave Brubeck Quartet's best known records.

Throughout his long career, Dave has received many national and international honors, including the National Medal of Arts from President Clinton and a Lifetime Achievement Award from the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences. In 2007, he received the Living Legend Jazz Award from the Kennedy Center and a Lifetime Achievement Award from the London Symphony Orchestra.

I had the privilege to meet Dave a couple of years ago during one of the amazing musical events held at the Library of Congress. What an amazing, gentle man of such strength and vision.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife and his family during this very difficult period.

□ 0910

#### BUILDING FOR A CLEAN ENERGY FUTURE

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Sequestration would be a huge blow not only to middle class families but also to our clean energy innovators and entrepreneurs.

According to the Office of Management and Budget, sequestration would impose an across-the-board cut of nearly 10 percent to critical clean energy and innovation programs. That would mean a \$148 million cut to the Department of Energy's Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Program alone. These cuts would tremendously damage our ability to develop the clean energy technologies of tomorrow, technologies that lead not only to lower energy bills for our constituents but also to new businesses and middle class jobs. I see it every day in my congressional district, where cutting-edge companies like LaunchPoint Technologies and Transphorm use Federal funding to develop exciting new ideas that would otherwise languish on the drawing board.

Mr. Speaker, the threat of sequestration and the fiscal cliff is very real. It's time for us to come together and pass a balanced package that continues building for a clean energy future.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). 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.

#### IMPROPER PAYMENTS ELIMINATION AND RECOVERY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2012

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4053) to intensify efforts to identify, prevent, and recover payment error, waste, fraud, and abuse within Federal spending, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4053

*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 "Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012".*

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

*In this Act—*

(1) the term "agency" means an executive agency as that term is defined under section 102 of title 31, United States Code;

(2) the term "improper payment" has the meaning given that term in section 2(g) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note), as redesignated by section 3(a)(1) of this Act; and

(3) the term "State" means each State of the United States, the District of Columbia, each territory or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian tribe.

#### SEC. 3. IMPROVING THE DETERMINATION OF IMPROPER PAYMENTS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 2 of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) through (g) as subsections (c) through (h), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) IMPROVING THE DETERMINATION OF IMPROPER PAYMENTS.—

"(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall on an annual basis—

"(A) identify a list of high-priority Federal programs for greater levels of oversight and review—

"(i) in which the highest dollar value or highest rate of improper payments occur; or

"(ii) for which there is a higher risk of improper payments; and

"(B) in coordination with the agency responsible for administering the high-priority program, establish annual targets and semi-annual or quarterly actions for reducing improper payments associated with each high-priority program.

"(2) *REPORT ON HIGH-PRIORITY IMPROPER PAYMENTS.*—

"(A) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to Federal privacy policies and to the extent permitted by law, each agency with a program identified under paragraph (1)(A) on an annual basis shall submit to the Inspector General of that agency, and make available to the public (including availability through the Internet), a report on that program.

“(B) CONTENTS.—Each report under this paragraph—

“(i) shall describe—

“(I) any action the agency—

“(aa) has taken or plans to take to recover improper payments; and

“(bb) intends to take to prevent future improper payments; and

“(ii) shall not include any referrals the agency made or anticipates making to the Department of Justice, or any information provided in connection with such referrals.

“(C) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY ON CENTRAL WEBSITE.—The Office of Management and Budget shall make each report submitted under this paragraph available on a central website.

“(D) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION TO INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B)(ii) shall not prohibit any referral or information being made available to an Inspector General as otherwise provided by law.

“(E) ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Inspector General of each agency that submits a report under this paragraph shall, for each program of the agency that is identified under paragraph (1)(A)—

“(i) review—

“(I) the assessment of the level of risk associated with the program, and the quality of the improper payment estimates and methodology of the agency relating to the program; and

“(II) the oversight or financial controls to identify and prevent improper payments under the program; and

“(ii) submit to Congress recommendations, which may be included in another report submitted by the Inspector General to Congress, for modifying any plans of the agency relating to the program, including improvements for improper payments determination and estimation methodology.”;

(3) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection), by striking “subsection (b)” each place that term appears and inserting “subsection (c)”;

(4) in subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection), by striking “subsection (b)” and inserting “subsection (c)”;

(5) in subsection (g)(3) (as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection), by inserting “or a Federal employee” after “non-Federal person or entity”.

(b) IMPROVED ESTIMATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide guidance to agencies for improving the estimates of improper payments under the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note).

(2) GUIDANCE.—Guidance under this subsection shall—

(A) strengthen the estimation process of agencies by setting standards for agencies to follow in determining the underlying validity of sampled payments to ensure amounts being billed, paid, or obligated for payment are proper;

(B) instruct agencies to give the persons or entities performing improper payments estimates access to all necessary payment data, including access to relevant documentation;

(C) explicitly bar agencies from relying on self-reporting by the recipients of agency payments as the sole source basis for improper payments estimates;

(D) require agencies to include all identified improper payments in the reported estimate, regardless of whether the improper payment in question has been or is being recovered;

(E) include payments to employees, including salary, locality pay, travel pay, purchase card use, and other employee payments, as subject to risk assessment and, where appropriate, improper payment estimation; and

(F) require agencies to tailor their corrective actions for the high-priority programs identified under section 2(b)(1)(A) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321

note) to better reflect the unique processes, procedures, and risks involved in each specific program.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-204; 31 U.S.C. 3321 note.) is amended—

(1) in section 2(h)(1), by striking “section 2(f)” and all that follows and inserting “section 2(g) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note).”; and

(2) in section 3(a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 2(f)” and all that follows and inserting “section 2(g) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note).”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “section 2(b)” each place it appears and inserting “section 2(c).”; and

(ii) by striking “section 2(c)” each place it appears and inserting “section 2(d).”.

#### SEC. 4. IMPROPER PAYMENTS INFORMATION.

Section 2(a)(3)(A)(ii) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) is amended by striking “with respect to fiscal years following September 30th of a fiscal year beginning before fiscal year 2013 as determined by the Office of Management and Budget” and inserting “with respect to fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter”.

#### SEC. 5. DO NOT PAY INITIATIVE.

(a) PREPAYMENT AND PREAWARD PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each agency shall review prepayment and preaward procedures and ensure that a thorough review of available databases with relevant information on eligibility occurs to determine program or award eligibility and prevent improper payments before the release of any Federal funds.

(2) DATABASES.—At a minimum and before issuing any payment and award, each agency shall review as appropriate the following databases to verify eligibility of the payment and award:

(A) The Death Master File of the Social Security Administration.

(B) The General Services Administration’s Excluded Parties List System.

(C) The Debt Check Database of the Department of the Treasury.

(D) The Credit Alert System or Credit Alert Interactive Voice Response System of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(E) The List of Excluded Individuals/Entities of the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(b) DO NOT PAY INITIATIVE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Do Not Pay Initiative which shall include—

(A) use of the databases described under subsection (a)(2); and

(B) use of other databases designated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in consultation with agencies and in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) OTHER DATABASES.—In making designations of other databases under paragraph (1)(B), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(A) consider any database that substantially assists in preventing improper payments; and

(B) provide public notice and an opportunity for comment before designating a database under paragraph (1)(B).

(3) ACCESS AND REVIEW BY AGENCIES.—For purposes of identifying and preventing improper payments, each agency shall have access to, and use of, the Do Not Pay Initiative to verify payment or award eligibility in accordance with subsection (a) when the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines the Do Not Pay Initiative is appropriately established for the agency.

(4) PAYMENT OTHERWISE REQUIRED.—When using the Do Not Pay Initiative, an agency shall recognize that there may be circumstances

under which the law requires a payment or award to be made to a recipient, regardless of whether that recipient is identified as potentially ineligible under the Do Not Pay Initiative.

(5) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress an annual report, which may be included as part of another report submitted to Congress by the Director, regarding the operation of the Do Not Pay Initiative, which shall—

(A) include an evaluation of whether the Do Not Pay Initiative has reduced improper payments or improper awards; and

(B) provide the frequency of corrections or identification of incorrect information.

(c) DATABASE INTEGRATION PLAN.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide to the Congress a plan for—

(1) inclusion of other databases on the Do Not Pay Initiative;

(2) to the extent permitted by law, agency access to the Do Not Pay Initiative; and

(3) the data use agreements described under subsection (e)(2)(D).

(d) INITIAL WORKING SYSTEM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish a working system for prepayment and preaward review that includes the Do Not Pay Initiative as described under this section.

(2) WORKING SYSTEM.—The working system established under paragraph (1)—

(A) may be located within an appropriate agency;

(B) shall include not less than 3 agencies as users of the system; and

(C) shall include investigation activities for fraud and systemic improper payments detection through analytic technologies and other techniques, which may include commercial database use or access.

(3) APPLICATION TO ALL AGENCIES.—Not later than June 1, 2013, each agency shall review all payments and awards for all programs of that agency through the system established under this subsection.

(e) FACILITATING DATA ACCESS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES AND OFFICES OF INSPECTORS GENERAL FOR PURPOSES OF PROGRAM INTEGRITY.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “Inspector General” means any Inspector General described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (I) of section 11(b)(1) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) and any successor Inspector General.

(2) COMPUTER MATCHING BY FEDERAL AGENCIES FOR PURPOSES OF INVESTIGATION AND PREVENTION OF IMPROPER PAYMENTS AND FRAUD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this paragraph, in accordance with section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Privacy Act of 1974), each Inspector General and the head of each agency may enter into computer matching agreements with other inspectors general and agency heads that allow ongoing data matching (which shall include automated data matching) in order to assist in the detection and prevention of improper payments.

(B) REVIEW.—Not later than 60 days after a proposal for an agreement under subparagraph (A) has been presented to a Data Integrity Board established under section 552a(u) of title 5, United States Code, for consideration, the Data Integrity Board shall respond to the proposal.

(C) TERMINATION DATE.—An agreement under subparagraph (A)—

(i) shall have a termination date of less than 3 years; and

(ii) during the 3-month period ending on the date on which the agreement is scheduled to terminate, may be renewed by the agencies entering the agreement for not more than 3 years.

(D) **MULTIPLE AGENCIES.**—For purposes of this paragraph, section 552a(o)(1) of title 5, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting “between the source agency and the recipient agency or non-Federal agency or an agreement governing multiple agencies” for “between the source agency and the recipient agency or non-Federal agency” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A).

(E) **COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.**—A justification under section 552a(o)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, relating to an agreement under subparagraph (A) is not required to contain a specific estimate of any savings under the computer matching agreement.

(3) **GUIDANCE BY THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and in consultation with the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Commissioner of Social Security, and the head of any other relevant agency, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(A) issue guidance for agencies regarding implementing this subsection, which shall include standards for—

(i) reimbursement of costs, when necessary, between agencies;

(ii) retention and timely destruction of records in accordance with section 552a(o)(1)(F) of title 5, United States Code; and

(iii) prohibiting duplication and redisclosure of records in accordance with section 552a(o)(1)(H) of title 5, United States Code;

(B) review the procedures of the Data Integrity Boards established under section 552a(u) of title 5, United States Code, and develop new guidance for the Data Integrity Boards to—

(i) improve the effectiveness and responsiveness of the Data Integrity Boards;

(ii) ensure privacy protections in accordance with section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Privacy Act of 1974); and

(iii) establish standard matching agreements for use when appropriate; and

(C) establish and clarify rules regarding what constitutes making an agreement entered under paragraph (2)(A) available upon request to the public for purposes of section 552a(o)(2)(A)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, which shall include requiring publication of the agreement on a public website.

(4) **CORRECTIONS.**—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish procedures providing for the correction of data in order to ensure—

(A) compliance with section 552a(p) of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) that corrections are made in any Do Not Pay Initiative database and in any relevant source databases designated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under subsection (b)(1).

(5) **COMPLIANCE.**—The head of each agency, in consultation with the Inspector General of the agency, shall ensure that any information provided to an individual or entity under this subsection is provided in accordance with protocols established under this subsection.

(6) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the rights of an individual under section 552a(p) of title 5, United States Code.

(f) **DEVELOPMENT AND ACCESS TO A DATABASE OF INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress recommendations for increasing the use of, access to, and the technical feasibility of using data on the Federal, State, and local conviction and incarceration status of individuals for purposes of identifying and preventing improper payments by Federal agencies and programs and fraud.

(g) **PLAN TO CURB FEDERAL IMPROPER PAYMENTS TO DECEASED INDIVIDUALS BY IMPROVING**

**THE QUALITY AND USE BY FEDERAL AGENCIES OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION DEATH MASTER FILE.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—In conjunction with the Commissioner of Social Security and in consultation with relevant stakeholders that have an interest in or responsibility for providing the data, and the States, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish a plan for improving the quality, accuracy, and timeliness of death data maintained by the Social Security Administration, including death information reported to the Commissioner under section 205(r) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(r)).

(2) **ADDITIONAL ACTIONS UNDER PLAN.**—The plan established under this subsection shall include recommended actions by agencies to—

(A) increase the quality and frequency of access to the Death Master File and other death data;

(B) achieve a goal of at least daily access as appropriate;

(C) provide for all States and other data providers to use improved and electronic means for providing data;

(D) identify improved methods by agencies for determining ineligible payments due to the death of a recipient through proactive verification means; and

(E) address improper payments made by agencies to deceased individuals as part of Federal retirement programs.

(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit a report to Congress on the plan established under this subsection, including recommended legislation.

#### **SEC. 6. IMPROVING RECOVERY OF IMPROPER PAYMENTS.**

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “recovery audit” means a recovery audit described under section 2(h) of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010 (31 U.S.C. 3301 note).

(b) **REVIEW.**—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall determine—

(1) current and historical rates and amounts of recovery of improper payments (or, in cases in which improper payments are identified solely on the basis of a sample, recovery rates and amounts estimated on the basis of the applicable sample), including a list of agency recovery audit contract programs and specific information of amounts and payments recovered by recovery audit contractors; and

(2) targets for recovering improper payments, including specific information on amounts and payments recovered by recovery audit contractors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

#### **GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to 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. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Federal agencies made an estimated \$108 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2012, and that is the esti-

mate from the Office of Management and Budget. Many programs maintain an alarming rate of improper payments—some programs above 8 percent. This is an unacceptable waste of taxpayer dollars.

I appreciate my colleague, the departing gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS), for sponsoring this piece of legislation because here we are fighting for fiscal sanity in this country, and we have \$108 billion estimated in improper payments.

These improper payments occur when Federal funds are paid out that should not be paid out. In many instances, Federal funds are going out to ineligible recipients. Last year, the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management found that Federal retirement and disability benefits totaling \$600 million were paid out to deceased individuals over a 5-year period.

The Oversight Committee and its subcommittees have held a series of hearings in this Congress on the issuance of improper payments, and I thank Chairman ISSA for his leadership in holding these hearings and in encouraging this piece of legislation to be brought to the floor. The legislation introduced by Mr. TOWNS will help to address the concerns identified at those hearings. H.R. 4053 builds on prior legislation to reduce and prevent improper payments.

A decade ago, the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 was signed into law, compelling agencies to identify payment errors in specific programs. That 2002 law was updated again in 2010 by the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act, which required the better identification and estimation of improper payments. The bill before us today goes even further, primarily by harnessing improved information technology to reduce improper payments. It requires the administration to implement a do-not-pay initiative, and it enables Federal agencies to enter into multilateral data-sharing agreements.

I commend Mr. TOWNS for offering this important piece of legislation and for helping to advance the effort to reduce waste in the Federal Government.

I urge the passage of H.R. 4053, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, I would like to thank the Members who worked very hard to make this a reality, and I want to take the opportunity to applaud the leadership and its commitment to the Members of Congress who have worked so hard on this legislation—Senator CARPER and Senator COLLINS and, of course, Congressman ISSA and Congressman CUMMINGS from Maryland. They have all worked very closely with us, along with my good friend Congressman PLATTS, to make this day a reality.

Through its stewardship, the Subcommittee on Government Organization, Efficiency and Financial Management has conducted a series of hearings on the problems of improper payments, and this legislation is the result of our findings on those hearings.

I also want to thank the staff who worked very hard on H.R. 4053. Of course, it is a proud accomplishment when you listen to the stories of people who are in the military and when you hear how they go months and months without their families getting paid, that they are transferred from one base to another and, as a result, the families do not get paid because they're saying they cannot locate where they are. Of course, many times when soldiers are transferred from one base to another, you'll find that they are not able to get paid. I think that that's something that we should abort because here they are defending this country in a magnificent way, and we cannot find a way to get them paid. This legislation points out how important it is to be able to get them paid.

On that note, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE), who is very interested in this and who has expressed over and over again how important it is to make certain that our military people are paid and are paid on time.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman, my good friend from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act, a bill that will help the Federal Government better protect taxpayer dollars against waste, fraud, and abuse.

According to the Government Accountability Office, as my friend from Utah just said, the Federal Government made \$108 billion in improper payments during fiscal year 2012 alone, which is unacceptable. This bill will increase transparency while eliminating and recovering these improper payments through the creation of a government-wide do-not-pay list. This list will prevent improper payments, such as Social Security checks for deceased Americans, before that payment ever goes out.

The national deficit remains one of the biggest challenges facing this country, and I am proud to cosponsor this bill because it protects taxpayer dollars by forcing the Federal Government to scrutinize every dollar spent—just like every American family does. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, but I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOWNS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, in closing, first let me just thank and commend my colleague Mr. TOWNS. This very well might be the final bill that he will introduce and that will pass this body. He is a good and decent

gentleman. When I came here 4 years ago as a freshman, he was one of the most gracious and great people to work with. He was the chairman of our committee. I was a fresh newbie there; yet he helped me in every way while showing a great deal of respect across the aisle.

I congratulate him on an amazing experience here in the Congress. This is another example of a good bill that this gentleman is putting forward. I wish him nothing but the best with the rest of his career and life and everything else. We need more good people like Mr. TOWNS participating in this Congress. So I congratulate him on this bill, urge the passage of this bill, and thank him for his great work.

Mr. TOWNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TOWNS. Let me just say, too, that you're right, this is probably my final bill, and it has been great serving here in this Congress for 30 years. You've taught me a lot, too, and let me just tell you the latest thing that you taught me.

We were having a hearing with all of these professional football players in terms of how they performed on the field and regarding enhancement drugs and all of that. When they turned to you—because we were saying that you were the only football player on the committee—you said that you were not a football player but that you were a kicker. I thought that that was a very interesting comment because I'd just assumed all of these years that you were a football player since you set all those records.

I want to thank you so much for your kind words. It has been a delight to work with you as well.

□ 0920

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Reclaiming my time, again I commend the gentleman for this bill and his great career, and I urge passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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. 4053, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. TOWNS. 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.

#### GAO MANDATES REVISION ACT OF 2012

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3315) to repeal or modify certain

mandates of the Government Accountability Office.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3315

*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 "GAO Mandates Revision Act of 2012".

#### SEC. 2. REPEALS AND MODIFICATIONS.

(a) CAPITOL PRESERVATION FUND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—Section 804 of the Arizona-Idaho Conservation Act of 1988 (2 U.S.C. 2084) is amended by striking "annual audits of the transactions of the Commission" and inserting "periodic audits of the transactions of the Commission, which shall be conducted at least once every 3 years, unless the Chairman or the Ranking Member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate or the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate, or the Clerk of the House of Representatives requests that an audit be conducted at an earlier date."

(b) JUDICIAL SURVIVORS' ANNUITIES FUND AUDIT BY GAO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 376 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (w); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (x) and (y) as subsections (w) and (x), respectively.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 376(h)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "subsection (x)" and inserting "subsection (w)".

(c) ONDCP ANNUAL REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Section 203 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (21 U.S.C. 1708a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "of each year" and inserting "2013, and every 3 years thereafter,"; and

(2) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "at a frequency of not less than once per year—" and inserting "not later than December 31, 2013, and every 3 years thereafter—".

(d) USERRA GAO REPORT.—Section 105(g)(1) of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-275; 38 U.S.C. 4301 note) is amended by striking "and annually thereafter during the period when the demonstration project is conducted."

(e) SEMIPOSTAL PROGRAM REPORTS BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.—Section 2 of the Semipostal Authorization Act (Public Law 106-253; 114 Stat. 636; 39 U.S.C. 416 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(f) EARNED IMPORT ALLOWANCE PROGRAM REVIEW BY GAO.—Section 231A(b)(4) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703a(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

(g) AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION'S FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND AUDITS.—Section 2103(h) of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "of paragraph (2) of this subsection" and inserting "of section 3515 of title 31";

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking "(1)"; and

(3) by striking paragraph (2).

(h) SENATE PRESERVATION FUND AUDITS.—Section 3(c)(6) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2004 (2 U.S.C. 2108(c)(6)) is amended by striking "annual audits of the Senate Preservation Fund" and inserting "periodic audits of the Senate Preservation

Fund, which shall be conducted at least once every 3 years, unless the Chairman or the Ranking Member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate or the Secretary of the Senate requests that an audit be conducted at an earlier date.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material 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. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Government Accountability Office is a great aide to the United States Congress. They help by auditing and examining government programs and reporting its findings to Congress. They serve a valuable position in the work that we do.

The GAO is responsible for 102 recurring annual statutory mandates and receives over 700 additional requests each year. It's quite a demand on the resources that we've given them.

This bill eliminates or decreases the recurrence of several GAO reports and auditing requirements for eight Federal programs or commissions. In recent years, we've been asking GAO to do more with less, as we should; but GAO will become more efficient by reducing obligations that once served an important purpose but now needlessly consume its limited resources. Eliminating these mandates will also allow GAO to more quickly respond to Congressional requests for assistance. GAO handpicked these reports as overly burdensome with modest benefits, and the related committees of jurisdiction concur.

Senator CARPER introduced Senate bill S. 3315, the GAO Mandates Revision Act, in June of this year, and the measure passed the United States Senate by unanimous consent in September. We urge all of our colleagues to support this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of the bill before us today. S. 3315 amends certain statutes which require the Government Accountability Office to submit annual audits or reports to Congress. While the annual reporting requirements previously mandated are no longer necessary, this bill will require GAO to report its findings to Congress on issues covered by the reports every 3 years. This requirement will provide GAO

with a more streamlined approach in reporting to Congress and will reduce the unnecessary costs and time spent to conduct annual audits or reports on these particular issues.

It is important to know that all the committees affected by this legislation have been consulted and have agreed to these changes. At a time when constituents are rightly demanding a more efficient government, now is the time to enact this legislation.

I thank the majority for bringing this bill to the floor and the Senate for passing the underlying measure. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, we urge passage of S. 3315 introduced by Senator CARPER. It is a good, common-sense piece of legislation. The committees of jurisdiction concur. It is bipartisan in its approach. We urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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, S. 3315.

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.

#### D.C. COURTS AND PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE ACT OF 2011

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1379) to amend title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, to revise certain administrative authorities of the District of Columbia courts, and to authorize the District of Columbia Public Defender Service to provide professional liability insurance for officers and employees of the Service for claims relating to services furnished within the scope of employment with the Service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1379

*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 “D.C. Courts and Public Defender Service Act of 2011”.

#### SEC. 2. AUTHORITIES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS.

(a) PERMITTING JUDICIAL CONFERENCE ON BIENNIAL BASIS; ATTENDANCE OF MAGISTRATE JUDGES.—Section 11-744, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “annually” and inserting “biennially or annually”;

(2) in the first sentence, by striking “active judges” and inserting “active judges and magistrate judges”;

(3) in the third sentence, by striking “Every judge” and inserting “Every judge and magistrate judge”; and

(4) in the third sentence, by striking “Courts of Appeals” and inserting “Court of Appeals”.

(b) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY TO TOLL OR DELAY JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS.—

(1) PROCEEDINGS IN SUPERIOR COURT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of Chapter 9 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

#### “§ 11-947. Emergency authority to toll or delay proceedings.

“(a) TOLLING OR DELAYING PROCEEDINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event of a natural disaster or other emergency situation requiring the closure of Superior Court or rendering it impracticable for the United States or District of Columbia Government or a class of litigants to comply with deadlines imposed by any Federal or District of Columbia law or rule that applies in the Superior Court, the chief judge of the Superior Court may exercise emergency authority in accordance with this section.

“(2) SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.—(A) The chief judge may enter such order or orders as may be appropriate to delay, toll, or otherwise grant relief from the time deadlines imposed by otherwise applicable laws or rules for such period as may be appropriate for any class of cases pending or thereafter filed in the Superior Court.

“(B) The authority conferred by this section extends to all laws and rules affecting criminal and juvenile proceedings (including, pre-arrest, post-arrest, pretrial, trial, and post-trial procedures) and civil, family, domestic violence, probate and tax proceedings.

“(3) UNAVAILABILITY OF CHIEF JUDGE.—If the chief judge of the Superior Court is absent or disabled, the authority conferred by this section may be exercised by the judge designated under section 11-907(a) or by the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration.

“(4) HABEAS CORPUS UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize suspension of the writ of habeas corpus.

“(b) CRIMINAL CASES.—In exercising the authority under this section for criminal cases, the chief judge shall consider the ability of the United States or District of Columbia Government to investigate, litigate, and process defendants during and after the emergency situation, as well as the ability of criminal defendants as a class to prepare their defenses.

“(c) ISSUANCE OF ORDERS.—The United States Attorney for the District of Columbia or the Attorney General for the District of Columbia or the designee of either may request issuance of an order under this section, or the chief judge may act on his or her own motion.

“(d) DURATION OF ORDERS.—An order entered under this section may not toll or extend a time deadline for a period of more than 14 days, except that if the chief judge determines that an emergency situation requires additional extensions of the period during which deadlines are tolled or extended, the chief judge may, with the consent of the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration, enter additional orders under this section in order to further toll or extend such time deadline.

“(e) NOTICE.—Upon issuing an order under this section, the chief judge—

“(1) shall make all reasonable efforts to publicize the order, including, when possible, announcing the order on the District of Columbia Courts Web site; and

“(2) shall send notice of the order, including the reasons for the issuance of the order, to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

“(f) REQUIRED REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the expiration of the last extension or tolling of a time period made by the order or orders relating to an emergency situation, the chief judge shall submit a brief report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration describing the orders, including—

- “(1) the reasons for issuing the orders;
- “(2) the duration of the orders;
- “(3) the effects of the orders on litigants; and
- “(4) the costs to the court resulting from the orders.

“(g) EXCEPTIONS.—The notice under subsection (e)(2) and the report under subsection (f) are not required in the case of an order that tolls or extends a time deadline for a period of less than 14 days.”.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of chapter 9 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subchapter III the following:

“11-947. Emergency authority to toll or delay proceedings.”.

(2) PROCEEDINGS IN COURT OF APPEALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 7 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end of the following new section:

“§ 11-745. Emergency authority to toll or delay proceedings.

“(a) TOLLING OR DELAYING PROCEEDINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event of a natural disaster or other emergency situation requiring the closure of the Court of Appeals or rendering it impracticable for the United States or District of Columbia Government or a class of litigants to comply with deadlines imposed by any Federal or District of Columbia law or rule that applies in the Court of Appeals, the chief judge of the Court of Appeals may exercise emergency authority in accordance with this section.

“(2) SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.—The chief judge may enter such order or orders as may be appropriate to delay, toll, or otherwise grant relief from the time deadlines imposed by otherwise applicable laws or rules for such period as may be appropriate for any class of cases pending or thereafter filed in the Court of Appeals.

“(3) UNAVAILABILITY OF CHIEF JUDGE.—If the chief judge of the Court of Appeals is absent or disabled, the authority conferred by this section may be exercised by the judge designated under section 11-706(a) or by the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration.

“(4) HABEAS CORPUS UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize suspension of the writ of habeas corpus.

“(b) ISSUANCE OF ORDERS.—The United States Attorney for the District of Columbia or the Attorney General for the District of Columbia or the designee of either may request issuance of an order under this section, or the chief judge may act on his or her own motion.

“(c) DURATION OF ORDERS.—An order entered under this section may not toll or extend a time deadline for a period of more than 14 days, except that if the chief judge determines that an emergency situation requires additional extensions of the period during which deadlines are tolled or extended, the chief judge may, with the consent of the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration, enter additional orders under this section in order to further toll or extend such time deadline.

“(d) NOTICE.—Upon issuing an order under this section, the chief judge—

“(1) shall make all reasonable efforts to publicize the order, including, when possible, announcing the order on the District of Columbia Courts Web site; and

“(2) shall send notice of the order, including the reasons for the issuance of the order, to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

“(e) REQUIRED REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the expiration of the last extension or tolling of a time period made by the order or orders relating to an emergency situation, the chief judge shall submit a brief report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration describing the orders, including—

- “(1) the reasons for issuing the orders;
- “(2) the duration of the orders;
- “(3) the effects of the orders on litigants; and
- “(4) the costs to the court resulting from the orders.

“(f) EXCEPTIONS.—The notice under subsection (d)(2) and the report under subsection (e) are not required in the case of an order that tolls or extends a time deadline for a period of less than 14 days.”.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of chapter 7 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subchapter III the following:

“11-745. Emergency authority to toll or delay proceedings.”.

(c) PERMITTING AGREEMENTS TO PROVIDE SERVICES ON A REIMBURSABLE BASIS TO OTHER DISTRICT GOVERNMENT OFFICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 11-1742, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end of the following new subsection:

“(d) To prevent duplication and to promote efficiency and economy, the Executive Officer may enter into agreements to provide the Mayor of the District of Columbia with equipment, supplies, and services and credit reimbursements received from the Mayor for such equipment, supplies, and services to the appropriation of the District of Columbia Courts against which they were charged.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2010 and each succeeding fiscal year.

**SEC. 3. LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE.**

Section 307 of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2-1607, D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end of the following new subsection:

“(e) The Service shall, to the extent the Director considers appropriate, provide representation for and hold harmless, or provide liability insurance for, any person who is an employee, member of the Board of Trustees, or officer of the Service for money damages arising out of any claim, proceeding, or case at law relating to the furnishing of representational services or management services or related services under this Act while acting within the scope of that person's office or employment, including but not limited to such claims, proceedings, or cases at law involving employment actions, injury, loss of liberty, property damage, loss of property, or personal injury, or death arising from malpractice or negligence of any such officer or employee.”.

**SEC. 4. REDUCTION IN TERM OF SERVICE OF JUDGES ON FAMILY COURT OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.**

(a) REDUCTION IN TERM OF SERVICE.—Section 11-908A(c)(1), District of Columbia Offi-

cial Code, is amended by striking “5 years” and inserting “3 years”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any individual serving as a judge on the Family Court of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia on or after the date of the enactment of 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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members 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. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1379 would grant the District of Columbia courts and Public Defender Service greater administrative flexibility in several areas.

First, it authorizes the D.C. Superior Court and the Court of Appeals to hold judicial conferences either annually or biennially, eliminating the current mandate that they always hold such conferences each and every year.

It requires magistrate judges to attend these judicial conferences.

It authorizes the D.C. courts to delay judicial deadlines in certain emergency situations such as a natural disaster.

It also allows the D.C. courts to be reimbursed by the D.C. government for certain office expenses, and it gives the D.C. Public Defender Service authority to purchase liability insurance for its attorneys, and changes the term for family court judges from 5 years to 3 years.

Nearly identical legislation was approved unanimously by the House in the 111th Congress. There is no expected cost associated with the legislation.

I would like to thank Senator AKAKA for sponsoring this bill and guiding its passage in the other body. I would also like to thank our colleague, Ms. NORTON, for her work in getting this legislation to the floor today. She cares passionately about D.C. and has nothing but its best interests at heart. We listen to that, we hear that, and in part, because of that, we support this legislation and encourage our colleagues to do the same.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Utah for his kind remarks.

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. I rise today in strong support of the D.C. Courts and Public Defender Service Act of 2011. I would like to thank Senator JOE LIEBERMAN, the chair of the Senate Homeland Security Committee, which has jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, and particularly Senator DANIEL AKAKA, the chair of the Senate Subcommittee on Oversight and Government Management and the Senate sponsor of the bill, the Federal Workforce and the District of Columbia for ushering the bill through subcommittee and committee and getting it passed by voice vote.

Both Senators LIEBERMAN and AKAKA are retiring this year. They each will leave rich legacies of accomplishment to the Nation, and both Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator AKAKA have always been good friends of the District of Columbia. They will be very much missed in both Chambers by all of us, I know, but particularly by the residents of the District of Columbia.

S. 1379 is an important bill for the administration of justice in the District of Columbia. It will allow the chief judge of the superior court or the court of appeals to delay judicial proceedings in the event of a natural disaster, terrorist attack, or other emergency. It is clear that the Nation's capital is at risk to such emergencies. Most recently, Hurricane Sandy, the unprecedented storm that devastated the east coast, and was expected to hit the District much harder than what actually occurred.

S. 1379 also allows the chief judge of the court of appeals to hold judicial conferences biennially rather than annually as required by current law.

□ 0930

This option is common sense, considering the increase in the use of electronic communication today and the significant cost savings involved.

The bill also allows the D.C. courts to enter into reimbursable agreements with the D.C. government for equipment, supplies, and other services, a measure to assure that reimbursement costs do not come from congressional appropriations.

The bill reduces the term of service, from 5 to 3 years, required of judges of the family court division of the superior court, a policy aimed at easing recruitment of able judges to the family court division.

In addition, the bill authorizes the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, a federally funded government agency, to purchase professional liability insurance for its attorneys, staff, and board members, which is, of course, indispensable to all who practice law today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

I want to thank the gentleman from Utah for his work on this bill, and I particularly want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. ISSA, who went to great lengths to make

sure that this bill, in fact, made the agenda of the Congress and who has been so important to understanding and making sure that particularly minor D.C. bills like this received quick treatment and, I must say, in addition to his work on very important bills for the District of Columbia that are still in progress like our budget autonomy bill.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, we urge passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1379, the "The D.C. Courts and Public Defender Service Act of 2011," the purpose of which is to grant the District of Columbia (D.C.) Courts and Public Defender Service (PDS) greater administrative flexibility in several areas.

First, the bill authorizes the D.C. Superior Court and Court of Appeals to hold judicial conferences either annually or biennially, eliminating the current mandate that they always hold such conferences every year. Under S. 1379, magistrate judges are required to attend these judicial conferences.

Moreover, this bill authorizes the D.C. Courts to toll or delay judicial deadlines in certain emergency situations such as natural disasters, and allows the D.C. Courts to be reimbursed by the D.C. Government for certain office expenses.

Finally S. 1379 gives the D.C. Public Defender Service authority to purchase liability insurance for its attorneys and changes the term for Family Court judges from five years to three years.

Current law requires the D.C. Courts to hold a judicial conference annually "for the purpose of advising as to the means of improving the administration of justice within the District of Columbia."

Federal Courts, however, must hold a conference only every two years. The D.C. Courts have estimated that, in addition to the time spent by judicial personnel planning and attending the conference, they will spend approximately \$50,000 on the 2012 judicial conference.

We know that local governments, like D.C., are under tremendous budget constraints, and given Congress' Constitutionally-mandated duty to oversee the District, we should be solicitous to District concerns when it comes to what we require of its government, particularly where costs are concerned.

The requirement that D.C. Courts hold annual judicial conferences was enacted before 1975, long before the internet was created in addition to numerous other advances in communication.

D.C. Courts have determined that the funds, resources, and time required to prepare for and conduct such conferences would be more effectively used if the judicial conference were conducted biennially rather than annually.

With the significant improvement in the dissemination and exchange of information the D.C. Courts' judicial conference is no longer the primary means of obtaining advice pertaining to the administration of justice within D.C.

Specifically, the Courts have determined that electronic and other forms of communica-

tion, including the Courts' websites, enable them to regularly communicate with the various participants in the court system.

We should remove the burdensome requirement that D.C. Courts hold annual judicial conferences and, instead, require biannual conferences. Furthermore, despite their important role in the judicial system of the District, magistrate judges currently are not required to attend the D.C. Courts' judicial conference.

D.C. Court magistrate judges hear a variety of cases, including misdemeanor and traffic cases, criminal arraignments, small claims, child support orders, and protection orders.

The D.C. Courts have requested that magistrate judges be required to attend judicial conferences. Because of their importance to the judicial system, I believe that this request should be granted.

The D.C. Courts have also expressed concern with their inability to toll or delay judicial deadlines in the event of an emergency or terrorist attack.

For example, in recent years, snowstorms as well as Tropical Storm Sandy have resulted in devastation of the D.C. Metropolitan area, resulting in federal government closings.

To address this concern, S. 1379 authorizes the Chief Judges of the D.C. Court of Appeals and the D.C. Superior Court to toll or delay judicial proceedings in the event of natural disasters or emergency situations.

Emergency authority under this bill should be used sparingly, and only in extraordinary circumstances. Therefore, S. 1379 requires that if the emergency authority is used for 14 days or more, the Joint Judicial Committee must approve each extension and the courts must give Congress a written justification no later than 180 days after the expiration of the last extension granted.

Currently, there is no statutory authority to allow D.C. Courts, absent explicit authority from Congress, to enter into reimbursable agreements with anyone, including the D.C. government.

This is because the D.C. Home Rule Act prevents the obligation of funds without approval by an Act of Congress. To address this concern, S. 1379 modifies the D.C. Code to allow the D.C. Courts to enter into reimbursable agreements for certain office expenses.

Finally, unlike Federal public defender service organizations, D.C. Public Defender Service does not have explicit authority to purchase liability insurance for its attorneys; consequently, its attorneys are unable to protect themselves from potential lawsuits arising during the course of their official duties.

Individuals who provide professional advice and services, such as attorneys, typically carry liability insurance in order to offset the risks arising as a result of the advice or services they render.

To address this, S. 1379 provides the D.C. Public Defender Service explicit statutory authority to purchase professional liability insurance, allowing its staff to be protected from the financial risk of potential lawsuits by clients and others.

The accommodations sought by the D.C. Courts and Public Defender Service Act are reasonable and will ameliorate several deficiencies under current law. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support S. 1379.

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, S. 1379.

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.

#### 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 9 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1002

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3783. An act to provide for a comprehensive strategy to counter Iran's growing hostile presence and activity in the Western Hemisphere, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3677. An act to make a technical correction to the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973.

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2838. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2012 through 2015, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment of December 4, 2012, returned to the Senate by the House of Representatives on December 12, 2012 to the bill (H.R. 4310) "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes."; and insists upon its amendment of December 12, 2012 to the above entitled bill and requests a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. NELSON (NE), Mr. WEBB, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. UDALL (CO), Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr.

WICKER, Mr. BROWN (MA), Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. VITTER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4310, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4310) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Davis of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4310 be instructed to agree to section 1249 of the Senate amendment (relating to a plan for promoting the security of Afghan women and girls during the security transition process).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Five years ago, I led a congressional delegation of female Members to Afghanistan on Mother's Day to visit our troops and meet with Afghan women, and I've continued to participate in this trip every year since.

On that first trip, we flew to Qalat in the southwestern region of Afghanistan and met the Provincial Reconstruction Team and the women of the village they worked with. Like much of Afghanistan, Qalat is rural and impoverished. The women we met had the same aspirations of women across the globe: they seek to send their children to school and learn a trade in order to support themselves and their family.

During that first visit in 2008, the school headmaster told us stories of how acid was thrown into the faces of

several female students who attended the school. These young girls overcame enormous challenges in coming to school every day, but their desire to learn surmounted the obstacles they faced. And there, just like at home, we heard these young girls talk of being doctors and teachers and anything else that they could dream of.

Each year, we have continued to visit the women of Qalat, and their message remains clear and consistent: they need security for themselves and their families if they are going to succeed.

During these visits, we have seen slow but steady progress being made as security in the area has improved. This year, during our visit, instead of talking about wanting the kids to come to school and being fearful that their parents would keep them at home, the school headmaster spoke about the 4,000 students who are coming to school each day and the need for additional desks and supplies. What a tremendous turnaround in such a short period of time.

But, Mr. Speaker, steep challenges remain for women in Afghanistan. Security, especially for women, has been at the heart of the problem that needs to be addressed as we transition responsibility to Afghan forces. Just this week, we had a reminder of those security concerns.

On Monday, the Director of Women's Affairs was killed in the Laghman province. She replaced the previous director, who was also assassinated just 6 months ago. It is heartbreaking to hear of these female leaders being assassinated in an area that is trying so hard to move their people and their country forward. A country cannot disenfranchise nearly 50 percent of their population while seeking to achieve a strong prosperous economy.

The language included in the Senate bill is a step in the right direction. So many organizations have been active in the transformation of Afghanistan, and I would encourage my colleagues at the Department of Defense and the Department of State to ensure that this is a multi-pronged effort. We must involve all the entities, not only here in the United States and Afghanistan, but also in Pakistan and India, where women there understand the daily challenges that Afghan women face, and create opportunities for these groups to work together. It is the least that we can do to support the women of Afghanistan and leave their country with a sustainable path for stability.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is more than the security of women and their ability to prosper in Afghanistan. It is also about our military servicemembers. Women on Provincial Reconstruction Teams have worked hard to help the women of Afghanistan, and members of the Female Engagement Teams have been tremendous role models for young Afghan children.

Our brave military men and women have sacrificed so much in Afghanistan, and to leave without the ability

for continued security there would be a dishonor to all those who have served. We must ensure that the strides Afghan women and girls have achieved over the last decade do not erode.

Next year, I hope to visit Afghanistan again on Mother's Day. And I want to tell the women we meet with—again, the same group of women we have met with over the last number of years—that their security is important and that this Congress recognizes that importance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this motion to instruct the House conferees and accept this language.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1010

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

I rise to thank the gentlelady for her leadership not only on this issue, but on the leadership she helps provide to our committee. We have several women serving on the House Armed Services Committee, and they do an outstanding job.

Over the years, many of us have visited Iraq and Afghanistan, and I've had that opportunity. But I know that the trips that the women have made bring us back a different perspective. In my trip the time before last to Afghanistan, I went to the south. I went to Camp Leatherneck, where they were just setting up the Marines that had just arrived, and they were just pushing out in the desert. We were not able to visit Marja, which was one of the towns in that area. It was totally under the control of the Taliban. The Taliban flag flew over Marja.

The last time I was there, it was totally changed. The Marines had taken over Marja. And the day we were there, we opened a school. It's not like a school that we have here for our young people. They had a few classrooms in an adobe building, and then they had a few tents. It was kind of raining that day, but as we opened that school, 500 children were now going to be able to go to school, and over a third of them were young girls who could not go to school before. They were so excited, 10 teachers and 500 young people. As I said, about a third of them were young girls.

We have made some great improvements in Afghanistan. There are a lot of things we don't hear about. But when these women go on these trips on Mother's Day, they meet with the same women each year. So they give us a whole different perspective. Many of us on the trips, we go to one place, the next time we go to a different place, and we don't get a real feel as to what is actually happening with the people there. I've talked to some of these women after those trips. They've reported back and told me the things that they have seen and learned. This perspective of being able to actually see the same people and hear their perspective change from year to year is in-

valuable, and I thank you for making those trips.

We have women on both sides of the aisle, both on and off the committee, that have gone on those trips. MARTHA ROBY, one of the freshman Members on our side of the aisle, led the trip this last time, and VICKY HARTZLER and CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, our conference chair for our new Congress, and RENEE ELLMERS, another freshman Member on our side. Again, women from the other side of the aisle made that trip. I thank them for it, and I strongly support this effort on this motion to instruct.

We need to do everything we can do to ensure the safety of women. We've made lots of gains for those women and the girls who will become women in that country. When you withdraw the troops, it's a serious time and dangerous time. As we pass the effort over to the Afghan security forces to provide the protections and keep the gains that we've made, it's very important that they don't fall back into the same way that they've treated women in the past and we lose all those gains that we've made. So this is a very important addition to the bill.

I thank you for bringing this forward. I thank you for the support. It's something I hope that everyone in the Congress will support as we move forward.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

The United States' effort in Afghanistan came to us following the tragic events on September 11, 2001. And it has been critical to ensuring that United States' vital national security interests are maintained and the American people remain safe.

The successes that have been achieved in Afghanistan are the result of the noble service and tremendous sacrifice from our military and their families. Those successes include progress toward improving conditions for Afghan women and girls, respect for the rights of women, and inclusion of women in the political and security realms. However, as our commanders frequently remind us, all of our successes are fragile and can be reversed. This is no more true than in the case of Afghan women.

Therefore, I will support this motion to instruct. I believe the coming years will be critical to ensure the progress Afghan women have made cannot be easily undone. While I do not believe it is a primary mission of the U.S. military to work with the Government of Afghanistan to improve the rights of women, there is a role for the military to play as we train and advise the Afghan National Security Forces. Continuous improvements to the security situation can help set the stage for inter-agency partners and non-governmental organizations to work on women's issues.

In fact, the security of Afghanistan's women can only be damaged by hasty or ill-conceived withdrawal. The military needs to continue to be provided the resources and support that they need to conduct the mission in Afghanistan through 2014 and beyond—primarily to meet U.S. national security objectives, but also not to abandon those whose lives have improved so dramatically.

I appreciate my colleagues' advocacy for our sisters in Afghanistan. I support their ef-

forts and intend to carry a conference report back from negotiations that supports this goal, the United States' national security interests, and provides our military with the resources it needs to accomplish the missions it is given in Afghanistan and around the globe.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank Mr. MCKEON for his leadership and for his remarks this morning because this has been a bipartisan trip, and I can say that we have many hours together on these trips. To experience it with the Afghan women and with our female troops particularly has been an incredible experience. And I particularly enjoy the support and the collegiality of my colleagues that Mr. MCKEON referenced. It really has been very meaningful to all of us, and I look forward to continuing trips.

I now want to yield 3 minutes to Ms. TSONGAS of Massachusetts. Ms. TSONGAS has been with us on those trips, and I know she will share some of her experiences, as well.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct.

As we have heard, this motion supports bipartisan Senate language that would help promote the security of Afghan women and girls.

Since becoming a Member of Congress, I have had the honor of visiting Afghanistan four times, several with the Mother's Day trips that Chairman MCKEON referenced. I have been fortunate on those trips to visit in particular with some of our military moms who are serving in Afghanistan. These are female soldiers who have children back home, leaving them for months on end. Thousands of soldiers, men and women, go without seeing their family and loved ones for months on end, highlighting the extraordinary commitment that accompanies military service. This service and commitment is something that we take home with us as we learn from them and from their stories. These servicemen and -women have made very personal sacrifices for the people of Afghanistan.

The ever increasing participation of women in our military demonstrates the important contributions women are making to our effort in Afghanistan and around the world. It also stands in stark contrast to the involvement that Afghan women are able to have in their country's public life. One of the most important observations and lessons that I have learned during this trip, as well as the others, was that if this country is to become more stable and secure, women must be included in Afghan society and government.

Several years ago, I visited a school where over 1,000 young Afghan girls cycled through each day of all ages, very young, up to high school. When we asked them what they wanted to be when they grew up, the answers we heard were doctor, lawyer, teacher, even journalist. These are exactly what so many of our own young daughters

hope to achieve. These young women felt optimistic about opportunities that were previously unheard of for women in Afghanistan and represent a future of promise for this country. We should take great pride in the work that we have done to elevate their sight lines. Ensuring that these young girls continue to have access to these opportunities and more broadly ensuring that women are able to participate in Afghan society as a whole is not only good for the future of Afghanistan, it is good for the United States, as well, so that we can help ensure a more peaceful and just future there.

On Monday, we were starkly reminded of the tenuous position of women in Afghanistan when the acting head of women's affairs in an eastern province was assassinated as she traveled to work. It also reminds us of their extraordinary courage as they take advantage of the opportunities and seek to be full participants in their country's lives. As we reduce our military presence in Afghanistan, the United States must be cognizant of how we will make sure that women continue to have a seat at the table and the nascent gains for them are not abdicated.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlelady of Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. The bipartisan language in the motion before us would require that the Department of Defense produce a plan to promote the security of Afghan women and girls as it withdraws from the country. It would encourage the recruitment of women as members of the security forces. In fact, several years ago, we met with young women who were being trained to be helicopter pilots and required the Department of Defense to report back on its progress toward meeting these goals.

I strongly urge a "yes" vote on the motion and am so pleased to see our chairman's support for it.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, as I know that she has been very involved in developing democracies and working with women.

□ 1020

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank all of my colleagues. I particularly thank Congresswoman DAVIS for her persistent leadership, and I join her as a cochair of the Afghan Caucus. I thank the chairman for his support as well.

So many of us have traveled to Afghanistan and have traveled as women to Afghanistan and have begun to look at this country from the eyes of wanting its survival. Malala is a young girl who is not from Afghanistan, but she symbolizes the essence of this motion

to instruct. Malala is from Pakistan, but many of you will remember that she took more than one bullet as a young girl who fought and stood up for girls being able to be educated.

In my travels to Afghanistan and to the many provinces, you would hear stories from women, as have been evidenced, about the inability to serve, the inability to express themselves. In meeting with a group of women Afghan parliamentarians, interestingly enough, they would indicate how they wanted to serve their constituencies but how difficult it was and dangerous it was to travel as women to their particular provinces to serve their constituents.

That is not the basis of the principles for which our soldiers have fought and died. America has wonderful principles, and I am delighted that this motion to instruct focuses on providing the safety net for girls and women in leadership and in education. It is indicated, of course, that this transition will occur but with the requirement of a road map to ensure the safety and security of girls and women.

Over the period of time of our being in Afghanistan—the longest war that this Nation has ever seen—we have seen the ups and the downs but, more particularly, the tragedy of having schools burned that were particularly directed towards serving girls. Girls turn into young women and into women who want to serve. As we all know, the hand that rocks the cradle does establish the basis of civilization.

For the democracy of this great nation, I include my support for the motion to instruct, for our Nation not to leave, as it leaves a pathway of democracy, leaves a pathway of democracy for the women and girls of Afghanistan. We must provide the protection that they need to help lead this nation and to ensure its democracy, freedom, and justice.

Mr. McKEON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE), who has also been an extremely strong leader on this topic.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me first thank Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS for her tremendous leadership on this issue. I agree with Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, it has been consistent and it has been bold. I also thank my other colleagues who have joined us in this effort.

There is really no military solution in Afghanistan, and a broad bipartisan coalition of many of our colleagues has really called for an accelerated withdrawal from Afghanistan. When we inevitably leave, we must ensure that Afghan women have a place at the table and an opportunity to shape the future of their country. I stand in strong support of this amendment that calls for a plan to promote the security of Afghan women and girls during the process of transferring security responsibility to the Afghan forces.

Last week, we met with Afghan women. Let me tell you that this was their very first priority, and we heard some stories that really speak to why this is so desperately needed. Afghan women and girls carry with them the prospects for long-term growth, security, and prosperity for their country.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I yield the gentlelady an additional minute.

Ms. LEE of California. I and others also encourage the conferees to include the Casey-Hutchison amendment as well as Senator MERKLEY's amendment, which calls for an expedited withdrawal from Afghanistan; but also we must support this motion to instruct conferees and ensure that we protect Afghan women and provide for their security because they are the future of Afghanistan.

So I encourage our colleagues to support this, and I want to again thank Congresswoman DAVIS for her leadership.

Mr. McKEON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH). I want to thank him for his outspokenness and for his strong belief in peace and in the role that women play in those initiatives.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the gentlelady from California for yielding.

Mr. McKEON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY). I want to thank her, as well, for her bold leadership in preparing women for democracy.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I rise in strong support of this motion to instruct. I join my colleagues first in congratulating Congresswoman DAVIS for the enormous work that she has done to protect the women of Afghanistan, and I thank my Republican colleagues, too, for their support. This truly is a bipartisan effort.

I am committed to a peaceful transition and to a secure future for Afghanistan as U.S. troops withdraw. There is no better way to reach that goal than to involve women in the process—to ensure their voices are heard, to protect their fundamental rights. The security of women has to be a top U.S. priority.

Afghan women have made incredible advancements over the past decade, but they face enormous challenges. Just this week, the acting head of Women's Affairs in an eastern Afghan province was shot to death in broad daylight as she was traveling to work. Her predecessor in that position was killed in July when an IED exploded under her car. Particularly women who are involved in the political process or

civil society are targeted, intimidated, threatened, and even killed.

Since the 2009 trip I took to Kabul, I've kept a sky blue burqa in my office as a reminder of the responsibility that we have to the women of Afghanistan. Women's rights are essential to the long-term stability of Afghanistan. Women must feel safe participating in politics and in civil society, and they have to be free to seek education and to start businesses, and they must have the opportunity to help their country forge a peaceful future.

Mr. Speaker, the Casey-Hutchison amendment requires a three-part plan to promote the security of Afghan women and girls. By including this language in the NDAA, we show that we are serious about human rights in Afghanistan and that we are committed to a peaceful transition away from U.S. military engagement. We have the opportunity to use the NDAA to stand with our Afghan sisters, to promote the security of all Afghan women and girls, and to ensure that women have the opportunity to engage in the rebuilding of their country.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. McKEON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS). I want to thank him for all of his support as well.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

I am immensely proud of the service and sacrifice of our men and women in Afghanistan. They have done a great job in defending our country, and our hearts go out to all of them who are serving, or who have served, for the greatness of their service.

I am one who believes that the time to bring them home is a lot sooner than later. I'd like to see them all come home as soon as possible. When they do, it's important that, as we leave Afghanistan, we leave an imprint of a value that is not just an American value but, I think, a value of humanity around the world and, that is, that your opportunity to thrive in a community should not be determined by your gender. It is astonishing to most Americans, but it was the reality for most female Afghans that during the rule of the Taliban, for a young girl, a visit to a school put her life at risk. A girl who dared to try to go to school was risking a violent assault or even death.

I am very proud of the fact that our military leaders, our civilian employees, and brave Afghans have worked very hard to change that fact. Today, Afghan girls are in school, and Afghan women are serving in positions of authority and leadership and education and health care and government and commerce in Afghanistan. As we make

the transition to Afghan security in that country, let us make sure that the transition to full human rights for women and girls continues in that country.

That is the purpose of this motion to instruct, and it is gratifying that Members of both political parties have spoken up in favor of this very basic principle. Being a girl or being a woman should not subject one to violence or short-change one's opportunities. I am proud to support this motion. I certainly hope that, as we go forward with this bill, the principles of fairness and equality will be included.

□ 1030

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in support of the motion to instruct offered by my good friend Mrs. DAVIS from California.

This measure would ensure that the Afghan Women and Girls Security Promotion Act, an important and bipartisan piece of legislation, will be included in the final version of the National Defense Authorization Act. And it will require the Department of Defense to produce a detailed plan to promote the security of Afghan women and girls during the process of transferring security responsibility to Afghan forces.

For more than a decade now, the rights and security of Afghan women have been on the rise, thanks in part to the efforts and sacrifice of our brave men and women in uniform. I had the honor of witnessing this progress firsthand when I traveled to Afghanistan over Mother's Day a few years ago and got to see excited young girls attending school for the first time and accomplished women proudly serving in government office. Here in the United States, we often take liberties like this for granted. For an Afghan woman, however, they represent dramatic strides forward in basic human rights and equality.

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

Mr. McKEON. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlelady.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Like my colleagues here today, I am deeply concerned that as we begin to transition out of Afghanistan we are at risk of losing those hard-fought gains. Tragic news stories like the recent brutal murder of a young girl in northern Afghanistan over a rejected marriage proposal still occur with frightening regularity.

I believe this piece of legislation provides an opportunity for us to do that by providing a credible path forward for promoting the continued safety and well-being of these girls and women. This is absolutely essential for the future peace, stability, and prosperity of Afghanistan. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 12¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 22½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just wanted to acknowledge and thank my colleague, Mrs. BIGGERT, because she co-led with me that first trip we took to Afghanistan, to Zabul province, and we had that opportunity to observe women who had very, very incredibly difficult lives and yet were as aspirational as so many women that we meet every day. I wanted to acknowledge her for that leadership.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) and thank her for her leadership as well.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees to agree to the language in section 1249 of the Senate bill, which requires a plan for promoting the security of Afghan women and girls during the transition process.

I have been a supporter of an accelerated withdrawal of our forces from Afghanistan, but believe we must do so responsibly. Part of this responsibility lies in protecting the gains that have been made by Afghan women and ensuring that they have a role in creating the future of their country.

Since 2001, women in Afghanistan have made tremendous progress in being able to educate themselves and diversify the way they can provide for their families. They receive better health care and can move freely about within their communities.

This progress, which has come at great cost to the men and women of our armed services, must be preserved and furthered. To lose these gains would be to minimize the great sacrifices that our men and women in uniform have made.

It is undisputed that the burden of war and keeping a family together after a loss of life falls on the mothers and women of the household. It is also undisputed that war leaves many scarred physically and emotionally. Yet it is so rare that we can say out of these difficult situations that there can be a glimmer of hope for the future.

One example of hope for the future is for these women and girls to know that they will be secure in their pursuits and in the progress that has been made. We must also believe that by doing so, the foundations we have helped build will continue, and these women and girls will have a future in their Afghan nation.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. HANABUSA. As a Nation, this is one of the most positive acts that we can do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McKEON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

I want to thank the gentlelady for bringing this issue. I think it is something that we can totally support on our side, and I would encourage all Members of this body to support this issue. I thank all of the women who have made the trips over there to Afghanistan because they have really added to the cause.

Our men and women in the military that have fought for all these many years—one of the major benefits from this war is the freedoms that these women and girls are able to enjoy right now, and it's my hope that we can leave sufficient force there to complete the mission, to guarantee the safety of these women and children, young girls, going forward. To leave precipitously without having completed that mission and put these women and girls in jeopardy, after they've seen a whole new life emerge, a whole new opportunity presented to them that they never conceived of before, would be a disaster.

So I thank again the gentlelady from California (Mrs. DAVIS) for her efforts here, and all the women who have spoken on this issue and traveled to Afghanistan, and urge that we all support this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I said, I'm certainly prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to again thank my colleague for his kind words. It has been an honor and a privilege to be part of this and to have worked with our female troops, all of our troops, of course, in Afghanistan, but to see the difference that they're making. There is an approach that they have, and it seems to work. They are able to bring people along and actually make the situation safer for the families and the community in which they are serving.

I want to thank everyone who spoke today, and I also certainly want to thank everyone who has traveled on this particular trip. This is an important motion to instruct. It defines something just as basic as ensuring the mobility of women within their own country.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act, NDAA. Today, this House will send the National Defense Authorization Act, NDAA, to conference. Contrary to its title, the bill does not provide for the protection of the American people. It expands war. It further indebts our nation. It encroaches on basic rights with regards to indefinite detention. It eliminates the basic tenet that due process rights applies to everyone in this country—not just American citizens.

The legislation also includes additional sanctions against Iran despite numerous reports that our sanctions are affecting the ability of ordinary Iranians to obtain medicine and offer basic goods. Sanctions have thus far not served to solve the impasse or bring Iran to the negotiating table. More sanctions are not the answer and do not bring us closer to a diplomatic solution.

This legislation also perpetuates the myth that we are ending the war in Afghanistan. We are not leaving Afghanistan. We are deepening our commitment. This bill provides for another staggering \$88 billion for the war. The Strategic Partnership Agreement between the U.S. and Afghanistan commits us to the country for at least another decade with a \$20 billion price tag.

Finally, this legislation continues financing our bloated Pentagon. The United States maintains 1,000 bases worldwide. Some of these bases are infamous, like Guantanamo Bay. There are small bases to support our drones program. There are fortresses to support our wars.

The cost to maintain these bases is billions of dollars. Included in these costs are the costs to maintain and run 234 golf courses around the world.

The Pentagon is expanding their spy agency. The CIA has become a paramilitary organization. We are preparing to support intervention in Mali. Our government's policy in Syria is incoherent. We are expanding our military presence in Asia and in Africa.

And for what? For millions of Americans to be unemployed? For millions of Americans to go hungry? For millions of Americans not to have adequate access to education or even healthcare? For millions to lose their homes? For millions to lose their retirement security? For roads and bridges to collapse because we have no money for infrastructure?

I say it's time we pay attention to the defense of the American people's pocketbooks—The defense of the dignity of the American people—The defense of the moral authority of the United States. It's time to end this state of permanent war. We should throw out the NDAA, put an end to interventionism and begin to take care of things back home.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Davis Motion to Instruct Conferees that would include the Casey/Hutchison amendment in the final conference report on the NDAA bill.

I want to thank the gentlelady from California, Mrs. DAVIS, for her strong leadership in engaging the women of Afghanistan in their reconstruction. I first traveled to Afghanistan with Mrs. DAVIS for Mother's Day in 2009 and have returned each of the past three years.

As co-chair of the Afghan Women's Task Force, I have met with women parliamentarians and civil society members eager to achieve the common goal of a secure and stable Afghanistan.

These women and their advocates always raise security as the number one challenge to progress. The failure to ensure consideration of women in the security framework is an ongoing challenge to taking advantage of the opportunities in education, politics, and overall public life necessary for the long-term stability and prosperity of Afghanistan.

Yesterday's assassination of the acting head of women's affairs in Laghman Province less than six months after the previous head

was killed exposes not only the threats to the security of women in the country, but the deep concern about the impact the transfer of responsibilities from coalition forces to the Afghan government will have on the gains made by women over the last ten years.

The Casey/Hutchinson amendment promotes the security of Afghan women and underlines the need for the United States to strengthen its commitment to ensuring that plans to improve, monitor, and respond to women's security are imbedded in the Department of Defense's strategies. In addition, the amendment aims to establish achievable goals for the recruitment and retention of women to the Afghan National Army and Afghanistan National Police which have fallen far below expected targets.

The United States has worked hard to dramatically improve the lives of Afghan women. The greatest indicator of this progress is the 2.7 million girls who are now being educated after years of restriction by the Taliban. Afghan women and girls have stated their goals and desires for progress.

The transition process gives the United States and our international partners an opportunity to strengthen women's rights and lay the foundation for women's full participation in all aspects of Afghan society in the future. Losing those gains will have a major negative impact on all Afghans and jeopardize the future security and stability of the country.

I urge inclusion of the Casey/Hutchinson amendment to send a supportive message to the women of Afghanistan and to enhance U.S. and international efforts to create a safer, more prosperous future for the country. Vote for the Davis Motion to Instruct Conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. 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.

---

#### 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 10 o'clock and 38 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

---

□ 1100

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 11 a.m.

---

#### 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:

the motion to instruct on H.R. 4310; the motion to permit closed conference meetings on H.R. 4310, if offered; and

the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4053.

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

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 4310) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 4, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 624]  
YEAS—399

Adams	Butterfield	Denham
Aderholt	Calvert	Dent
Alexander	Camp	DesJarlais
Altmire	Campbell	Deutch
Amodi	Canseco	Diaz-Balart
Andrews	Capito	Dingell
Austria	Capps	Dold
Baca	Capuano	Donnelly (IN)
Bachmann	Carnahan	Doyle
Bachus	Carson (IN)	Dreier
Baldwin	Carter	Duffy
Barber	Cassidy	Duncan (SC)
Barletta	Castor (FL)	Duncan (TN)
Barrow	Chabot	Edwards
Barton (TX)	Chaffetz	Ellison
Bass (CA)	Chandler	Elmiers
Bass (NH)	Chu	Emerson
Becerra	Ciulline	Engel
Benishkek	Clarke (MI)	Eshoo
Berg	Clarke (NY)	Farenthold
Berkley	Farr	Fattah
Berman	Cleaver	Fortenberry
Biggert	Clyburn	Fincher
Bilbray	Coble	Fitzpatrick
Bilirakis	Coffman (CO)	Flake
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Fleischmann
Bishop (NY)	Conaway	Fleming
Bishop (UT)	Connolly (VA)	Flores
Black	Conyers	Forbes
Blackburn	Cooper	Fortenberry
Blumenauer	Costa	Fox
Bonamici	Courtney	Frank (MA)
Bonner	Cravaack	Franks (AZ)
Boren	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
Boswell	Crenshaw	Fudge
Boustany	Critz	Garamendi
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Gardner
Brady (TX)	Cuellar	Garrett
Braley (IA)	Culberson	Gerlach
Brooks	Cummings	Gibbs
Broun (GA)	Curson (MI)	Gibson
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Gingrey (GA)
Buchanan	Davis (IL)	Gohmert
Bucshon	DeFazio	Gonzalez
Buerkle	DeGette	Goodlatte
Burgess	DeLauro	Gosar
Burton (IN)	DelBene	Gowdy

Granger	Manzullo	Royce	LaTourette	Nunnelee	Ross (FL)
Graves (GA)	Marchant	Runyan	Lewis (GA)	Pence	Sanchez, Loretta
Graves (MO)	Marino	Ruppersberger	Mack	Pitts	Stark
Green, Al	Markey	Rush	McCarthy (CA)	Reyes	
Green, Gene	Matheson	Ryan (OH)	Noem	Ros-Lehtinen	
Griffith (VA)	Matsui	Ryan (WI)			
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Sánchez, Linda			
Grimm	McCaul	T.			
Guinta	McClintock	Sarbanes			
Hanna	McCollum	Scalise			
Guthrie	McDermott	Schakowsky			
Gutierrez	McGovern	Schiff			
Hahn	McHenry	Schilling			
Hall	McIntyre	Schmidt			
Hanabusa	McKeon	Schock			
Hanna	McKinley	Schrader			
Harper	McMorris	Schwartz			
Harris	McMorris	Schweikert			
Hartzler	Rodgers	Scott (SC)			
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Scott (VA)			
Hastings (WA)	Meehan	Scott, Austin			
Heck	Meeke	Scott, David			
Heinrich	Mica	Sensenbrenner			
Hensarling	Michaud	Serrano			
Herger	Miller (FL)	Sessions			
Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Sewell			
Higgins	Miller (NC)	Sherman			
Himes	Miller, Gary	Shimkus			
Hinchee	Miller, George	Shuler			
Hinojosa	Moore	Shuster			
Hirono	Moran	Simpson			
Hochul	Mulvaney	Sires			
Holt	Murphy (CT)	Slaughter			
Honda	Murphy (PA)	Myrick			
Hoyer	Nadler	Smith (NE)			
Huelskamp	Napolitano	Smith (NJ)			
Huizenga (MI)	Neal	Smith (TX)			
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Smith (WA)			
Hunter	Nugent	Southerland			
Hurt	Nunes	Speier			
Israel	Olson	Stearns			
Issa	Olver	Stivers			
Jackson Lee	Owens	Stutzman			
(TX)	Palazzo	Sullivan			
Jenkins	Pallone	Sutton			
Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Terry			
Johnson (OH)	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (CA)			
Johnson, E. B.	Paulsen	Thompson (MS)			
Johnson, Sam	Payne	Thompson (PA)			
Jordan	Pearce	Thornberry			
Kaptur	Pelosi	Tiberi			
Keating	Perlmutter	Tierney			
Kelly	Peters	Tipton			
Kildee	Peterson	Tonko			
Kind	Petri	Towns			
King (IA)	Pingree (ME)	Tsongas			
King (NY)	Platts	Turner (NY)			
Kingston	Poe (TX)	Turner (OH)			
Kinzinger (IL)	Polis	Upton			
Kissell	Pompeo	Van Hollen			
Kline	Posey	Velázquez			
Kucinich	Price (GA)	Visclosky			
Labrador	Price (NC)	Walberg			
Lamborn	Quayle	Walden			
Lance	Quigley	Walsh (IL)			
Landry	Rahall	Walz (MN)			
Langevin	Rangel	Wasserman			
Lankford	Reed	Schultz			
Larsen (WA)	Rehberg	Waters			
Larson (CT)	Reichert	Watt			
Latham	Renacci	Waxman			
Latta	Ribble	Webster			
Lee (CA)	Richardson	Welch			
Levin	Richmond	West			
Lewis (CA)	Rigell	Westmoreland			
Lipinski	Rivera	Whitfield			
LoBiondo	Roby	Wilson (FL)			
Loeb	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)			
Loeb	Rogers (AL)	Wittman			
Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (KY)	Wolf			
Long	Rogers (MI)	Womack			
Lowey	Rohrabacher	Woodall			
Lucas	Rokita	Woolsey			
Lucas	Rooney	Yarmuth			
Lujan	Roskam	Yoder			
Lujan	Ross (AR)	Young (AK)			
Lummis	Rothman (NJ)	Young (FL)			
Lungren, Daniel	Roybal-Allard	Young (IN)			
E.					
Lynch					
Maloney					

NAYS—4

NOT VOTING—28

Amash	Massie	Galleghy
Jones	Paul	Griffin (AR)
Ackerman	Carney	Hayworth
Akin	Cole	Holden
Bartlett	Costello	Johnson (IL)
Bono Mack	Dicks	
Cantor	Doggett	

LaTourette	Nunnelee	Ross (FL)
Lewis (GA)	Pence	Sanchez, Loretta
Mack	Pitts	Stark
McCarthy (CA)	Reyes	
Noem	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1123

Messrs. CARTER, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, SESSIONS, PEARCE, SMITH of Texas, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mrs. SCHMIDT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MOTION TO PERMIT CLOSED CONFERENCE MEETINGS ON H.R. 4310, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013**

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, I move that meetings of the conference between the House and Senate on H.R. 4310 may be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information may be broached, provided that any sitting Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the motion is not debatable, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 53, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 625]  
YEAS—351

Aderholt	Capps	Donnelly (IN)
Alexander	Capuano	Doyle
Altmire	Carnahan	Dreier
Andrews	Carney	Duffy
Austria	Carson (IN)	Duncan (SC)
Baca	Cassidy	Duncan (TN)
Bachmann	Castor (FL)	Edwards
Bachus	Chabot	Elmiers
Baldwin	Chaffetz	Emerson
Barber	Chandler	Engel
Barletta	Chu	Eshoo
Barrow	Ciulline	Fattah
Bass (CA)	Clarke (MI)	Fincher
Bass (NH)	Clay	Fitzpatrick
Becerra	Cleaver	Flake
Benishkek	Clyburn	Fleischmann
Berg	Coble	Fleming
Berkley	Coffman (CO)	Forbes
Berman	Cohen	Fortenberry
Biggert	Connolly (VA)	Fox
Bilbray	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Bilirakis	Cooper	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Fudge
Bishop (UT)	Cravaack	Garamendi
Black	Crawford	Gardner
Blackburn	Crenshaw	Garrett
Blumenauer	Bonamici	Critz
Bonamici	Crowley	Gibbs
Bonner	Cummings	Gibson
Boren	Curson (MI)	Gingrey (GA)
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez
Boustany	Davis (IL)	Goodlatte
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Gosar
Brady (TX)	DeLauro	Gowdy
Braley (IA)	DelBene	Graves (GA)
Brooks	Denham	Graves (MO)
Brown (FL)	Dent	Green, Gene
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Griffith (VA)
Bucshon	Deutch	Grijalva
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart	Grimm
Calvert	Dingell	Guinta
Camp	Dodd	Guthrie
Campbell		
Capito		

Gutierrez  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
McKeon  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Herger  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchee  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holt  
Hoyer  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Long  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luján  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern

McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Pompeo  
Price (NC)  
Quayle  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Roskam  
Rothman (NJ)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes

NAYS—53

Adams  
Amash  
Amodei  
Barton (TX)  
Blumenauer  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Cansaco  
Carter  
Clarke (NY)  
Conaway  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
DeFazio  
Ellison

Farenthold  
Farr  
Flores  
Gohmert  
Granger  
Green, Al  
Hahn  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Honda  
Huelskamp  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kucinich  
Labrador

Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southerland  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Vislosky  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitefield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

Ackerman  
Akin  
Bartlett  
Bono Mack  
Cantor  
Cole  
Costello  
Dicks  
Doggett

NOT VOTING—27

Galleghy  
Griffin (AR)  
Holden  
Issa  
Johnson (IL)  
LaTourette  
Lewis (GA)  
Mack  
McCarthy (CA)

Noem  
Nunnelee  
Pence  
Pitts  
Reyes  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross (FL)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remain-  
ing.

□ 1132

Messrs. AMODEI and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.” So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROPER PAYMENTS ELIMINATION AND RECOVERY IMPROVEMENT 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. 4053) to intensify efforts to identify, prevent, and recover payment error, waste, fraud, and abuse within Federal spending, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 626]

YEAS—402

Adams  
Aderholt  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Benishke  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Boren

Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cansaco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)

Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duff  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Himes  
Hinchee  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Jenkins  
Critz  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Kucinich  
Labrador

Lamborn  
Lance  
Landy  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Long  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luján  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Markey  
Massie  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Olver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (CA)  
Price (NC)  
Price (GA)  
Ribble  
Speier  
Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Webster  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitefield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall

Ribble  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southerland  
Speier  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Vislosky  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Webster  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitefield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall

Woolsey	Yoder	Young (FL)
Yarmuth	Young (AK)	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—29

Ackerman	Griffin (AR)	Noem
Akin	Harris	Nunnelee
Bartlett	Higgins	Pence
Bono Mack	Holden	Pitts
Cole	Issa	Reyes
Costello	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Dicks	LaTourette	Ross (FL)
Doggett	Leahy	Lewis (GA)
Gallegly	Mack	Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Gene	McCarthy (CA)	Stark

□ 1142

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes No. 624, on the motion to instruct conferees regarding H.R. 4310, No. 625, on the motion to permit closed conference meetings for H.R. 4310, and No. 626, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4053, I was unavoidably detained and unable to cast my votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on all three votes.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4310, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. MCKEON, BARTLETT, THORNBERRY, FORBES, MILLER of Florida, WILSON of South Carolina, LOBIONDO, TURNER of Ohio, KLINE, ROGERS of Alabama, SHUSTER, CONAWAY, WITTMAN, HUNTER, RIGELL, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WEST, Mrs. ROBY, Messrs. SMITH of Washington, REYES, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. MCINTYRE, ANDREWS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Messrs. LANGEVIN, LARSEN of Washington, COOPER, Ms. BORDALLO, Messrs. COURTNEY, LOEBSACK, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 11 of rule X:

Messrs. ROGERS of Michigan, NUNES, and RUPPERSBERGER.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of secs. 541 and 561 of the House bill and secs. 563 and 571-73 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. PETRI, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of secs. 312, 601, 727, 3111, 3113, 3114, 3117, 3118, 3132, 3133, 3151, and 3202 of the House bill and secs. 736, 758, 914, 3118, 3122, 3152-54, 3156, and 5022 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. WALDEN, WHITFIELD, and WAXMAN.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of sec. 661 of the House bill and secs. 651-55, subtitle E of title XII, and title L of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mrs. CAPITO, Messrs. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and PERLMUTTER.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of secs. 227, 230, 335, 355, 952, 1013, 1033, 1035, 1037, 1041, 1043, 1097, 1111, 1202, 1203, 1212, 1213, 1217, 1219, 1234, 1237, 1238, 1240, 1240A, 1240B, 1240C, 1243, 1245-47, 1301, 1303, 1531-33, title XVII, secs. 3120, 3121, and 3123 of the House bill and secs. 237, 342, 873, subtitle F of title VIII, secs. 1013, 1031, 1033, 1042, 1045, 1050, 1093, 1201-04, 1212-15, 1217, 1218, 1223, 1224, 1241, 1242, 1247, 1248, subtitle E of title XII, secs. 1301, 1531, 1532, 1534, 3114 and 5023 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Messrs. ROYCE, and BERMAN.

From the Committee on Homeland Security, for consideration of sec. 1111 of the House bill and sec. 1803 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. KING of New York, TURNER of New York, and THOMPSON of Mississippi.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of secs. 564, 593, 599, 1033, 1084, 1088, 1099C, 1707, and 1709 of the House bill and secs. 653, 736, 844, 844A, 897, 899, 1033, 1092, 1096, 1099C, 5021, 5024, subtitle E of title XII, and title LI of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. SMITH of Texas, DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and CONYERS.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of secs. 316, 317, 601, 2841, 2846, and 2861 of the House bill and secs. 271, 312, 1091, 1433, title XIX, and sec. 2842 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HASTINGS of Washington, BISHOP of Utah, and MARKEY.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of secs. 313, 651, 663, 801, 812, 833, 952, 1101-04, 1111, 1616, 1683, 1702, 1704-06, and 2811 of the House bill and secs. 641, 822, 825, 844, 844A, 892, 894-96, 903, 1099A, 1101-04, and subtitle B of title LIII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. ISSA, WALBERG, and CUMMINGS.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of secs. 916, 1074, 1603, 1617, 1661, and 3158 of the House bill and secs. 271, 912, 1046, title XVIII, secs. 3153, 3159 and 3504 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. HALL, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

From the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of secs. 1611, 1621-23, 1631, 1632, 1641, 1651-58, 1661, 1671-73, 1681-83, 1691, 1693a, 1695, and 1697 of the House bill and secs. 848, 888, 889E, 1090, and 1099E of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of secs. 334, 535, 601, 704, 1074, 1078, 2801, and 3509 of the House bill and secs. 521, 1803, 1804, 3503-05, 3508, and 3509 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. MICA, COBLE, and BISHOP of New York.

From the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for consideration of secs. 355, 564, 565, 664, and 728 of the House bill and secs. 642, 755, 756, 759-64, 1044, 1087, 1090, 1097, 1099B, and title L of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BILIRAKIS, LAMBORN, and MICHAUD.

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come. At this point in time, I yield to my friend, Mr. CANTOR, the majority leader, for that purpose.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2:00 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the House will meet at 10:00 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9:00 a.m. for legislative business.

Members are advised that, due to the ongoing negotiations regarding the fiscal cliff, a weekend session is possible and, therefore, last votes for the week are not yet known.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business Friday. Additionally, we expect to consider a conference report for the National Defense Authorization Act for the Fiscal Year 2013, and a number of other expiring provisions of law are also possible.

As was announced last week and the week before, the House will not adjourn the 112th Congress until action has been taken to avert the fiscal cliff. Members are advised to retain flexibility in their travel schedules through the end of the year to the maximum extent possible.

I thank the gentleman.

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

We had originally thought that we would not be meeting on Monday. I want to make it clear to Members that the majority leader has indicated that we will be meeting on Monday and coming in at 6:30, so they take note of that and their staffs take note of that as well.

Mr. Leader, can I ask you if you know or have some pretty good sense of, on Tuesday, do you know what we might be considering on Tuesday?

I say that because a number of Members who had scheduled things Tuesday during the day have asked me that question, and I'm wondering whether or not you have any thoughts on that. My presumption is the Defense bill conference probably won't be done by that time. I don't know whether that's your sense or not.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd say to the gentleman he is correct in assuming that the Defense bill will not be ready. We don't know for sure, but probably likely by Wednesday or after, so, without complete surety, I will say to the gentleman, likely a suspension debate on the floor on Tuesday.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. The Members will find that helpful.

The majority leader mentioned last week and reiterated this week that we will not adjourn the 112th Congress until we've averted the fiscal cliff. I think the American people would share that view and would hope that was the case. I hope that's the case as well.

On the fiscal cliff, one of the things, of course, in the fiscal cliff, one of the items of concern—we had a debate on the floor today, and the majority leader and I have discussed it again last week and the week before that. Part of the negotiations are with respect to the 98 percent of Americans who fall in the category that we seem to have agreement on should not receive a tax increase.

There have been an increasing number of Republicans and Democrats who have urged us to take that issue on which we agree in the near term, and I again ask my colleague, the majority leader, whether or not there is any possibility that next week we might consider at least that segment.

And let me make perhaps a wrinkle of a suggestion to the majority leader, if I might. Obviously, we have a disagreement on that over 250. We could, Mr. Majority Leader, perhaps consider two bills—one for those under 250 or 200, the Senate bill, essentially, and another bill that you might bring to the floor which would involve extending the tax cuts on those over those limits—so that Members, even though there's a disagreement, could express themselves on both of those propositions.

□ 1200

I know the gentleman has made the point repeatedly that there are small businesses that would be hurt if we did not extend over the \$250,000 level. That would give Members an opportunity to express themselves on that point of view as well as expressing themselves on the under \$250,000 and under \$200,000 for individuals. My presumption is both of those bills would pass. And that would give the Senate two bills to consider and to send to the President to at least, to the extent we can reach agreement, have some certainty brought to some segment of the population.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

He is correct. We've had this discussion before at the end of each week, and I would say to the gentleman that suggestion that he has, has certainly been brought to me on several occasions this week.

I would say to the gentleman I know that he joins me in the desire to try and address all the aspects facing this country in terms of the fiscal cliff, namely, to try and actually put us on a path to managing down the deficit and the debt; and, as the gentleman knows, we are trying, in terms of negotiating with the White House. And the Speaker has been very earnest in his desire to want to address the spending problem, not just the revenue problem, and the gentleman's suggestion would not go to that.

And I would say to the gentleman his proposal would leave the issue of increased taxes on small businesses making over \$200,000 a year. And if the concern is to try and focus on generating more jobs and helping heal the economy, I'd ask the gentleman, in return, what is his suggestion about helping those businesses because, as we know, the preponderance of the jobs created come from those small businesses making \$200,000 and up.

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

Of course, we have this discussion on a regular basis. I'm sure everybody in America looks forward to this discussion.

Obviously, when the gentleman talks about small businesses, he is essentially talking about 3 percent of the small businesses in America, because 97 percent of the small businesses, those job creators of which the gentleman speaks, 97 percent of them make less and would be positively affected by the bill that affects those under \$200,000 individually and \$250,000 collectively. Of course, 100 percent of the small businesses would be assured—let's say they make \$350,000—would be assured that the first \$250,000 would not get a tax increase.

So I tell the gentleman I am concerned about those small businesses, and small businesses will be included in the under \$250,000 and under \$200,000 as well. One hundred percent of America, no matter how much they make, would have the assurance that the first \$250,000, or \$200,000 if they are individuals and not families, that they would not get any tax increase.

The gentleman, particularly in the election cycle of 2010, talked a lot about—and I agreed with him—about bringing confidence, certainty of what the tax structure and what the rules would be. I suggest to the gentleman small businesses, whether they be in the 97 percent or the 3 percent—the 97 percent being affected by the bill that I would like to see passed, that the Senate has passed, but the other 3 percent, as I say, would be positively affected, knowing full well that the first \$250,000 of income would not see any increase in their taxes. I think that would be a positive step for those small businesses and the small businesses above and below those figures.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again.

I think, as the gentleman has heard me say before, the majority of business income comes from those small businesses with incomes over \$200,000; and the higher the percentage of income derived from a small business, the more jobs are created by that individual. And that is the point.

We also know, and the gentleman has heard me recite these figures before, there was a third-party outside study conducted which would indicate that if the gentleman's proposal is passed, that we are going to see the reduction of 700,000 jobs going forward. Again, if

the focus is on jobs, as it should be, it raises certain concerns.

I would also remind the gentleman, he and I both feel very strongly about trying to do something about the fiscal health of the Federal Government in attempts to try and heal the economy, and the fiscal health of the government has much more to do about getting control of the spending rather than bringing more revenue in. More revenue in can come if we grow the economy, but just by statically increasing tax rates without doing anything to try and address the spending problem will actually make the problem worse and will leave that mountain of debt untouched.

As the gentleman knows, our Speaker has tried and tried to get the White House engaged in actually discussing specifics the way those specifics were discussed a year-and-a-half ago. These kind of things that we all know need to be done on the entitlement programs, the White House needs to come forward and say that they'll join us in trying to fix the problem, and that is what we have not seen.

We have seen, Mr. Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER go forward and put revenues on the table, and we asked the White House to join us in trying to fix the problem on spending. And that's where things have stopped, and hopefully we can resolve that. As the gentleman knows—and I'm committed—and as we have announced in the schedule, we will stay here until we can resolve the problem.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I agree with him, as he knows, to staying here until we get this problem solved. America expects it. America, more importantly, needs it.

The economy needs the confidence of a resolution of this stalemate, so I agree 100 percent with the gentleman. But let me say in terms of, again, one of the disquieting factors is we can't even act on that on which we agree.

Now, the gentleman and I disagree on a proposition, and that is the gentleman believes and cites a study, which we think is of questionable validity, that says we're going to lose jobs if we raise taxes on those above \$250,000. We don't share that view, and most economists that I talk to don't share that view. But there is a study that the gentleman refers to that says that, I understand that. And what I'm saying is we can vote on that and some of us will agree and some of us will disagree.

But if we can't vote on it—let me call the attention to somebody who's certainly not a Democratic spinmeister, but I think the perception will be that what we are doing is holding the better off, if we can't help them, we can't help those who are not making as much money. I'm sure you're aware of David Brooks' column in The New York Times. He's not a liberal Democrat—or not a Democrat. I don't think he's a Democrat or Republican, but a more

conservative columnist. He says this, and I quote from *The New York Times* just a few days ago:

Sometimes you have to walk through the desert to get to the Promised Land. A budget stalemate on these terms will confirm every bad Republican stereotype. Republicans will be raising middle class taxes in order to serve the rich—shafting Sam's Club to benefit the country club. If Republicans do this, they might as well get Mitt Romney's "47 percent" comments printed on T-shirts and wear them for the rest of their lives.

I use that quote not to criticize but to say that the perception, I think, is, if we do not act on something on which we agree, we are not doing so because we want to make sure that the best off, if they're not helped, nobody will be helped, and I think that's not good for the country. I think, frankly, it's not good for the Congress, not necessarily Republicans or Democrats. I think we're all perceived as either having the ability to act or not act. If we're going to get this fiscal cliff resolved, it will be because we agree on that which we can agree. Here, we do.

We have 167 CEOs who have written to us saying that the Business Roundtable agrees that we ought to move in this direction. Senator CORKER said that just the other day. Others have said that as well. And I really don't think it's either a political "gotcha" or political advantage. I just think it will do what the gentleman talked about. It will give confidence to 98 percent of the American people who pay taxes that they don't have to worry on January 1 about their taxes going up. It seems to me that's a positive for our economy because it will give them confidence that they're going to have resources to do some of the things that will help our economy grow.

I understand the gentleman's position is that there will be 2 percent who won't have that confidence and 3 percent of small businesses who, as the gentleman points out, those 3 percent are relatively large businesses in the sense that that 3 percent gets 53 percent of the business income. He's correct. Those are large small businesses or, in many cases, individuals who just make a lot of money, and that's fine, but they're not the majority. I think job creators, in terms of the numbers of small businesses, are those who add one or two or three people to their rolls.

□ 1210

We can get off this, but I certainly will yield to the gentleman and hope that we can do that.

The reason you've gotten the suggestion of the two-bill strategy, or two-bill scenario, is because that gives everybody in the House of Representatives—and you talked about this particularly in 2010, but you've talked about it since then of giving the House of Representatives the opportunity to work its will. Two bills, if you move them forward, one which the President says he will sign, one which the President says he will veto—and after all,

he's going to be our President for the next 50 months—we can get something done. At the same time, all 435 Members—or 433, I think we have presently—can express their views on those issues on which we have agreement and those issues on which we have a disagreement.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I'd say to the gentleman, on issues that we have agreement on, I think the gentleman and I both have agreement on many of the spending issues. I think the gentleman has been outspoken in his commitment to say, hey, we've got to modernize, if you will, the age eligibility of some of our entitlement programs. I think the gentleman, if I'm correct, has said that he is in support of adjusting the age eligibility for Medicare.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield, what I have said is everything needs to be on the table, not that I agreed with everything that would be on the table. I have some very substantial reservations about age increase. Particularly—it was in the Ryan bill—it doesn't get you any money in the next 10 years so it will not help us get to that fiscal crisis.

What I have said, and I'll repeat, is you have the right to put everything on the table; we have a right to put everything on the table. If you're going to have an honest negotiation, we ought to consider everybody's point of view. That's what I've said.

Mr. CANTOR. I'd say to the gentleman this is exactly the kind of conversation that we should be having about fixing the problem rather than just kicking the can.

Again, the gentleman has been very upfront about, I think, his commitment to do some of those more difficult political things that I agree with him on. But, unfortunately, we're not having those conversations. We're not having those conversations because I believe there are others in his party in the House and elsewhere—certainly in the White House—that refuse to engage in the specifics about how we address the mountain of debt and the continuing spiraling upwards of spending. That is what we've got to do.

I think the gentleman would say, with running the risk of putting words in his mouth, that many folks out there who are wealthy would say, sure, I'll pay more taxes. But I would say back to those individuals: I believe that you say that because you would trust that your money is being spent to pay down the debt and the deficit. That's what we're trying to get to.

None of us on this side of the aisle believe raising taxes is good in this economy or it's something that we should do by feeding more money into the Federal Government, and certainly if the Federal Government is not fixing the problem. That's what we're trying to do, Mr. Speaker. I know the gentleman understands my point of view on this, and we've had this discussion continuously.

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

It is a discussion the country is having. It's a discussion we need to have, and we need to have it honestly with one another.

The gentleman knows my position: it's not taxes or spending; it's if you buy something, pay for it. We haven't done that. That's what creates debt. Taxing doesn't create debt; spending doesn't create debt if you pay for it. Spending creates debt only if you don't pay for it. The revenues—taxes—are what you pay for things that you buy. We are buying things and we're not paying for them, and your children and mine are being put in debt as a result.

So this debate is really about: What are we going to pay for? How much do we want to do? And if we want to do it, we need to pay for it.

The gentleman knows my side very much believes that we had two tax cuts in '01 and '03; we didn't pay for it. We had two wars, both of which I supported, as the gentleman knows; we didn't pay for it. We passed a prescription drug bill; we didn't pay for it. We are hopefully going to pass a disaster relief bill that hopefully we're not going to pay for in the short term, but that we will pay for and have a scenario to pay for in the longer term because we know owe that to our children and to our grandchildren.

I'll just make a point. The gentleman always talks about tax and spending is the problem. The problem is we vote to buy things—whatever those things are—and we haven't voted to pay for them. The discipline in any system—in the family's budget, in the country's budget—should be, if you want to buy it, have the discipline to pay for it, or at least to amortize it to pay for it over a series of years that you've planned for. We haven't done that. We're in a debate about this fiscal cliff of how to do that.

We planned this fiscal cliff. This is not a happenstance. We planned. I didn't vote for the tax bills, but they sunsetted. They sunsetted this December 31. That was planned. It was planned because of a scoring issue—not because I think your side really believes they ought to sunset, but because of a scoring issue.

The fact of the matter is the sequester was put in place as a fail-safe to make the supercommittee work. It didn't work, so on January 2 the sequester takes place. I don't think any of us believe a sequester ought to take place in the way that it's planned to do so.

So what I'm saying to the gentleman is everything that's going to happen on December 31 we've planned, we've put in place, we've sunsetted. It is our responsibility to meet that. And, yes, taxes is the way we pay for things that we buy because if we pay for them, we don't create debt.

I would be glad to yield.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, along those lines, the gentleman talked

about the '01, '03 tax cuts. He is talking about mostly the 98 percent that he refers to that continue to need that tax cut. I'd ask the gentleman, is he now saying we need to pay for that tax cut?

Mr. HOYER. I absolutely believe that we need to pay for that tax cut over the 10-year plan that we try to come up with to get us to a place that we can agree on being the objective in 2022 or 2023 as to where we want to be as a country in terms of fiscal sustainability, a credible plan that will get us from here to there, including taking cognizance of the cost of that tax cut. Yes, I am saying that over the longer term we ought to pay for it. Right now the economy is struggling. The reason I think none of us want to raise taxes on the average working men and women in this country is because the economy is still struggling.

We're going to have that issue in terms of the payroll tax. We did the payroll tax deduction, which is controversial and there hasn't been a lot of the discussion, in order to get some additional revenues, 2 percent cut in the FICA tax—actually, a third of the cut, a third of the FICA tax so that we can get additional moneys into the pockets of the consumers so they can continue to buy. The economy has been better than it certainly was. We have grown, but not to the extent that we need to. That is why our view is that for those working Americans we ought to continue that level, but not because we think that we ought to just put that on the credit card and forget about it. It's got to be part of these fiscal cliff negotiations. And your point is making sure we pay for things.

Mr. CANTOR. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd say to the gentleman I know the gentleman understands that my view is you don't have to pay for giving people back the money that they earned, but the gentleman takes that view; but that's exactly the point of these discussions. Where is the discussion about the specifics on where we are paying for things in terms of reducing spending? That's exactly the point.

If the gentleman would be so kind as to go to the White House and engage the President to say, hey, give us some specifics, because the President so desperately wants to raise those taxes and to grant the 98 percent the tax relief. If the gentleman's contention is the President's, where are the specifics on the other side of the ledger? That's exactly what we're saying, Mr. Speaker. We need to solve this problem.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, we had that discussion in terms of specifics. I pointed out to the gentleman last week, and I'll point out to him again today, the President has in his budget 23 pages of cuts, including, very frankly, with respect to Medicare, in which he cuts more—specifically identified—than PAUL RYAN's budget that passed this House reduced Medicare expenditures.

□ 1220

So I will say to my friend, I have given him this little list—he can't see it. You have five items on your proposal in the letter that you sent, five items. They're over here on the right, five line items, all conclusionary, no specifics. For instance, the gentleman refers to 800 billion—not the gentleman, but in the Republican offer—refers to \$800 billion in revenues. Now, the President has been very specific as to what he thinks we ought to do in revenues. We ought to go to the Clinton rates on those over 200,000 individually and over 250,000 family—very specific. And he has made other specific proposals that get him to his revenue number.

Frankly, your revenue number is posited on the fact that we're going to reduce, as I understand it, preference items to attain an additional 800 billion in revenue without increasing rates. I understand that general proposition.

Would the gentleman tell me which preference items he would reduce to get to 800? Now, that's a little rhetorical because I don't want to put you on the spot on that, but it is to the extent I don't think you have been specific in terms of your offer at all while I do believe the President has put forward, both on the tax side and the spending side, some very specific proposals of how to get to his numbers.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

I will say this, again, the gentleman has been very good, not in the negotiations with the Speaker and the President, but somehow knowing the state of affairs. Because this is the problem: if the gentleman says that we ought to look to the President's budget proposals as our guide as to what he would accept and propose on the specifics, just yesterday, I think, the news came that the administration has now decided not to uphold its commitment on the Medicaid reduction in spending.

So what are we to believe as far as the President's proposals in his budget from months and months ago and how that applies to the discussions and negotiations around the fiscal cliff? Which is exactly why we need the specifics now. I understand and take the gentleman's point as far as the 800 billion, but we have not dealt at all with the spending side of the ledger. And the commitment should be balanced. As the President always says, we need a balanced approach. Yet we don't have any discussion on the spending side of the ledger other than to reference a prior proposal by the administration which has now said, no, we are not sticking to that on the Medicaid piece.

So what are we to believe? Which is exactly the point. We need real specificity in terms of the spending. And I take the gentleman's point on the 800 billion. Yes, but it takes two sides, and this White House and President have refused on the spending side.

Mr. HOYER. Well, of course, again, we have a disagreement. And this list—I can't read it either, so you couldn't read it from there.

Mr. CANTOR. If the gentleman would yield, we have just seen the administration backtrack on its commitment on that list.

Mr. HOYER. I don't think he backtracked. What he said was, and what we have said continually is, on the revenue side, if you're going to have a balanced package on the revenue side—this is his specific proposal: he's made a number of proposals on the spending side already, as I said in Medicare more than the Ryan budget had in his budget. The fact is, I will tell the gentleman, you have no specificity on balance. Nor do you have any specificity, frankly, on cuts. There is no specificity on your spending cuts here. They're conclusions. So I'm not sure how you think one side ought to be specific, i.e., the President, which I think he has been specific, and the other side comes with five lines of dollars that add up to \$2.2 trillion, none of which have any specificity. As you see, there are no individual items below those five lines saying where you want to cut or raise revenues.

Therefore, we need to get to an agreement, and this argument is not very helpful, I think. We need to get to an agreement; both sides need to get to agreement. But the reason we get into this conversation is we have agreement on a part of that, which will help give confidence to our people, and that is on the middle class taxes not going up.

I would again urge, and then perhaps we can get off this subject because I don't think we're really enlightening our public very much other than the fact there are obviously disagreements; but they expect us to, and we need to bridge these disagreements. I think the President has shown—you and I participated in discussions with the President of the United States. I've been here 31 years. No President in the 31 years that I've been here has spent as much time sitting in the Oval Office discussing with you and me and others, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, and others, sitting in the office trying to get to specific agreements.

This President is willing to do that, and he has done it. He has shown that he's willing to do it in 2011, and you and I were in the room watching it happen. Now, did it result in what we wanted and that was an agreement? It did not. That's unfortunate. But this President is willing to do it. Hopefully, both sides are willing to do both sides of the ledger, which the gentleman points out are revenues and spending, a balanced package getting us to where we need to be.

Now I will move on to another subject unless the gentleman wants to make another point.

Debt ceiling. I'm very worried about the debt ceiling, Mr. Leader. I think the debt ceiling is something that you

and I have expressed publicly and privately ought not to be something that really we put at risk. I frankly think all the leaders I've talked to on the Republican side and on the Democratic side think that when you incur debts as the United States of America, the most creditworthy Nation on the face of the Earth, that you have every intention of paying those debts.

The debt ceiling theoretically says that you can't pay over a certain number, you can't go into debt anymore. You and I both know that sometime in February, maybe later, that debt ceiling will be reached.

Very frankly, both parties have played a game on the debt ceiling. When you were in charge, we played the fact that the debt was your problem because you had cut taxes and didn't pay for that. On your side, you said we spent too much money and we didn't pay for that. And so you voted against the debt ceiling when we were in charge. Neither one of us has, I think, covered ourselves with a great deal of glory on that issue.

The debt ceiling has to be raised because America will pay its bills. America will be creditworthy. And we saw the last time we had this political, I call it a charade or dance, the last time, for the first time in history, first time since you and I have served here—history is a lot longer than that—the credit of the United States of America was downgraded by one of the rating agencies, Standard & Poor's.

I would hope that the debt ceiling would not be a subject of disagreement. The President has proposed Senator MCCONNELL's proposal so that the party in charge can take responsibility for it. The McConnell proposal said that the President of the United States would say, look, in order to pay our bills, we have to raise our debt ceiling. Most countries don't have a debt ceiling, of course, and most families don't have a debt ceiling. They incur debt and they expect to pay it. I would hope that this would not be a subject of political leveraging or political disagreement.

We know as an economic fact of life that we're going to have to increase the debt limit, and I would ask the gentleman if he has any thoughts on that and when we might act on that. I yield to my friend. I don't think I finished what, for the public, for anybody who happens to be watching us who is not bored stiff by this point in time, the McConnell proposal, as the gentleman knows, was that the President would propose a level, and then if that were not rejected by two-thirds of each House, that it then would go into effect, which would mean that the President of the United States, Republican or Democrat, would take the responsibility for making that judgment on behalf of managing the finances of our country.

I'll yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I believe

that, in all fairness, looking at the credit-rating agencies and their view towards debt ceiling increase discussions, some of that certainly has to do with the continuing increasing of debt and its burden on this country, our citizens, and its economy. And if the gentleman recalls a year and a half ago when we were engaged in the discussions around the increase in the debt ceiling, we established a proposition which said that if we're going to increase the debt ceiling, we ought to be decreasing the spending in a commensurate amount.

□ 1230

That's very simply put. The difficulty was we could not get the gentleman's party and/or the White House to go along with us in terms of agreement of those spending reductions. It's an echo of the original discussion the gentleman and I just had as far as the fiscal cliff is concerned.

Our commitment is to try to reduce the mountain of debt that is strangling this country and try to stop the spending that continues to spiral out of control. So any discussion of the increase of debt for us has to be accompanied with a real commitment to the reduction in spending, otherwise those credit rating agencies are going to continue to do what they did.

In order to engender confidence in those agencies and the markets and throughout the American economy and the public, we have got to gain some credibility on the spending issue and stop the spending. That is our position. The gentleman knows that. Yes, we all agree, America is a country that pays its bills. We need to stop racking up so many of them because we've gotten to a situation where we are generating a trillion dollars of additional annual debt. We can't do that. That is why we take the position we do, to try and arrest that, to get our economy back on an even keel so we can heal that economy.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I don't think he answered my question about the debt limit, therefore, my presumption is unfortunately it will continue to be an item used as leverage, holding hostage the creditworthiness of the United States to this debate.

Mr. CANTOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. That is a mischaracterization of my remarks, Mr. Speaker. All I said was we feel this White House has a tin ear in terms of the spending problem. What we're saying is we need some balance. Just as the rhetoric comes from the White House that we need a balanced approach, we need a balanced approach on both sides, spending and revenue. That's what the whole discussion is about on the debt ceiling issue because it is accessing additional funds for the Federal Government, but instead of

through taxation, borrowing. Equally, if we are going to increase that, we better be decreasing the other side of the ledger so we don't continue to increase and mount that debt.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I hear the gentleman, and the gentleman says spending is the problem.

If spending is the problem and spending obviously is one of the challenges we confront, as is revenues, if that is the case, then let me remind the gentleman that during the time that his party was totally in charge of spending, spending increased very substantially, otherwise known as an 86 percent increase from 2001 to 2008 in the national debt, an 86 percent increase. Under Ronald Reagan, it increased 189 percent. Under this President, it has increased 41 percent, and he confronted the deepest recession as a result of the economic policies in part pursued in the last administration, which I did not support and which my party did not support.

I hear this about spending all the time. We had a pay-as-you-go bipartisan process put in place by the first George Bush and Democrats in 1990. In 1993, that pay-as-you-go was continued. In 1997, a deal between Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Clinton continued that pay-as-you-go process. And for the last 4 years in a row of the Clinton administration, we didn't borrow a single additional nickel to raise the debt limit. We didn't have to. Why? Because we were paying for what we bought.

Republicans were in charge of the House and the Senate for part of that time, so they deserve some of the responsibility for that. The President was in charge of signing bills and making sure that we made investments. He made sure we did that, and the economy exploded. Those three factors obviously resulted in the only President in the lifetime of either the majority leader and myself who ended up with a net surplus in his term. We don't need to be lectured about spending. As I said, spending does not cause debt. What causes debt is not paying for the spending you make, and that's exactly what happened.

I tell my friend his party was in charge from 2001 to 2006, totally and essentially until 2008, because we didn't change any economic policies and President Bush had to sign any bill that was passed here. So this circuitous discussion we have about, simply, spending is the problem—yes, you're right. But the problem is ultimately if we want to buy things—and what we do now, as the gentleman knows, is we are producing a product that costs \$23 to produce, and we're asking people to pay \$15 for it. Talk about small businesses; any small business that does that goes out of business pretty quickly. That's what we are doing, and we have to stop it.

The debt ceiling, however, as the gentleman knows, is about that which we've already done and whether we are going to pay those bills. All I'm saying

is we ought not to make that a part of the leveraging between our two parties.

Let me go quickly to the farm bill, the Violence Against Women Act, and the Sandy supplemental. Can the gentleman tell me which of those three, if any, might we see next week?

With that, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. As the gentleman knows, on the farm bill we are committed to trying to address the issue of the farm bill prior to leaving for the year.

As far as the Violence Against Women Act, as the gentleman knows, I'm in discussions with the Vice President. I know it is of particular interest to him. There are many Members on our side whom I've met with today, as well as Members of the other body, who are interested too. We have met, and we are trying to work out the differences. I'm committed to do all I can, as the gentleman knows, to bring this to a conclusion so we can see its passage.

As far as the supplemental bill, I know that the White House—and the gentleman has heard me say this before—has submitted its request. Our Appropriations Committee is doing its review of the request to see that that supplemental aid gets to the victims that need it, to the localities and the States that need it, and is money that will be spent directly as a result of the very catastrophic storm of Sandy, and we hope to be able to resolve that as well.

We are operating in an environment of the post-Budget Control Act where we have put in place budget mechanisms for disasters. As the gentleman knows, FEMA has indicated it has the money it needs to operate for at least a little while, but we're committed to making sure that adequate funding does get to the victims of that very catastrophic storm.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his intent there.

I would simply observe that the gentleman observed and he was correct, obviously, that FEMA indicated it has some resources to go through the beginning of the year. There are, as the gentleman well knows, a myriad of agencies that will be involved in helping the victims of Sandy that do not have those resources and need them. I appreciate, therefore, the gentleman's focusing on this and trying to bring this forth as quickly as possible.

Last, the miscellaneous tariff bill. That expires, as you know, on December 31, as well. Can the gentleman give me a view as to where that stands?

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I think the gentleman is aware, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman of the committee, Chairman CAMP, is speaking with the ranking member to try and see what it is that we can do to go forward on that issue as well.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1240

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,  
DECEMBER 17, 2012

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN  
LEONARD BOSWELL

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials for the RECORD on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, those of us from Iowa and elsewhere would like to recognize today the service of my fellow Iowan, Congressman LEONARD BOSWELL, who will be leaving the House at the adjournment of this Congress.

I first want to thank him for his 20 years of service to our great Nation in the U.S. Army. No one has done more to secure our freedom and the promise of a bright future than our veterans and military personnel. I know that LEONARD counts his efforts to secure additional support for military families and veterans among his most meaningful achievements. I also want to recognize the gentleman from Iowa for his time in public service as a legislator. His distinguished career traces back to the Iowa State Senate, where he once served as president of that body.

Although we haven't always agreed on the issues before us, LEONARD's relationships with his fellow Members have enabled him to work with colleagues of all political stripes. His work on behalf of his constituents has exemplified what Iowans expect of their Representatives in Congress—those who are approachable, thoughtful, and hard-working.

I appreciate the many years of service LEONARD BOSWELL has provided to our home State of Iowa and its people. I know that he will continue to serve his fellow Iowans faithfully beyond the conclusion of this Congress—and in that, I truly wish him and his family the very, very best.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to my remarks today, I asked Iowans to pay tribute to LEONARD by providing their comments for submission into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We do not have the luxury of time to read the numerous notes and well-wishes that came in, but I would like to highlight a few of those at this time.

Iowa Governor Terry Branstad sent the following:

I commend Congressman Leonard Boswell for his longtime dedication to public service. His selfless service to others has been demonstrated in many ways—as an officer in the United States Army, as president of the Iowa Senate, and as a Congressman from Iowa. Congressman Boswell should be proud of his public service accomplishments and for his personal achievements as a husband, father, and grandfather. I am heartened by Iowans like Congressman Boswell who have spent a lifetime serving the State of Iowa. We thank him for his service.

Iowa Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY wrote:

Representative Boswell has worked hard to represent his constituents. He did his job very well. While we disagreed politically, we never had a personal disagreement. We found plenty of common ground. I'll miss his camaraderie around Congress, but I have no doubt we'll run across each other because Representative Boswell is unlikely to avoid public service, which has been his calling for so long.

Thank you for your service, Representative Boswell.

Nancy Williams, president of AIB College of Business in Des Moines, wrote:

I wish to recognize and thank Congressman Boswell for his dedication to our country, to Iowa, and to his constituents. He has changed our world, our country, and our State with his personal service for so many years. Every life has a great purpose, and Congressman Boswell has had a wonderful calling for his. I will wait in anticipation to see what he chooses to do next. I just cannot thank him enough.

Ken Sagar, president of the Iowa Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, wrote:

Congressman Boswell was a Representative who would take the time to listen to Iowans. He paid special care and attention to all veterans. He was a friend of working people. When home visiting, he would make an effort to meet with the labor leaders in the State. He spent time listening to their concerns and would give honest answers on his positions, not always to the liking of the unions, but always honest and up front.

Then Jon Murphy, director of government affairs at PolicyWorks, sums up the assurances we all have that Leonard will continue to serve his State and Nation:

I would like to thank Congressman Boswell not only for his support of me, personally, but also for his service to our country. As a soldier and statesman, there are few people who have given more of themselves to our Nation. I wish him and Dody well as they move forward to their next adventure in life. I would ask them to take some time and get some rest, but I know that won't happen. That's not the Boswell way.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to recognize the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. Thank you, my colleague TOM LATHAM from Iowa.

This is my sixth year here in Congress. I'm just finishing it up, but this is only the third time that I've actually come to the floor to speak during Special Orders. That's how important it is for me to do this. The first time was when I was arguing for Boeing to get the tanker deal, when that was a big issue before our country. The second time was when I was pushing hard to make sure that the STOCK Act was passed so that Members could not trade on insider knowledge. Now I'm here for my good friend LEONARD BOSWELL. It's not that I don't come to the floor very much—I do speak for bills, what have you—but not during Special Orders. This is only the third time, and it's with very good reason.

I want to note at the outset here, too, how many Members of the Iowa delegation are here, including a former Member, Jim Nussle.

It is really fantastic that you're here today, Jim. This is really an honor for LEONARD. To think that you're here is just absolutely very special.

When you say "Special Orders," Mr. Speaker, it applies in this case.

I didn't know LEONARD BOSWELL very well when I first got elected in 2006. I knew him but not very well. I was not an elected official before I got elected in 2006, but I'd been involved in Democratic Party politics for a number of years in helping other folks get elected. I think it's fair to say that, when I got elected, neither Leonard nor I—and I think he would say this, I think he would admit this—had any idea what good friends we would become over the years.

LEONARD has been very helpful to me in sort of helping me navigate the ways of this Chamber, the ways of Washington, the ways of Congress—something that, I think, everybody knows is a challenge. Whether you've been in the State legislature or in any kind of legislative body prior to coming to the Congress, it is a challenge to get to know how to operate in this environment. LEONARD has been very, very good for me, and I appreciate everything he has done.

I could talk about his military service and all of these other things that Congressman LATHAM just mentioned, but I'm not going to go through that except to say that I'm on Armed Services. I've never served in the military myself. I have two marine children with whom we're going to be spending Christmas again this year. No matter what the Congress decides to do and what the President and Speaker BOEHNER decide to do, we're with them to honor them and to honor our military this Christmas. LEONARD has a distinguished past in the military, and there is absolutely no doubt about that.

There is one other thing I'll say about LEONARD BOSWELL. We talked about a lot of us being from Iowa, but I often refer to LEONARD BOSWELL as being "of" Iowa. He's an Iowan true and true in every possible way, and I think those of us who are from Iowa

know exactly what I'm talking about. The rest of you, I'll explain it to you at some point if you so desire, but it is very important that LEONARD BOSWELL is "of" Iowa.

I've had a wonderful time serving with him these 6 years. We're not going to lose touch. I do have six of his former counties, including his home county of Decatur, and I look forward to staying in touch with him and getting more advice from LEONARD as we go forward. He is a font of wisdom and advice for those of us who need it here in this body.

Thank you very much for having me, and thank you especially, Congressman LATHAM, for organizing this. I think that tells us something about what can happen if we put our minds to it on the larger issues of getting this country back on its feet. Thank you, TOM. I appreciate it.

Thank you, LEONARD BOSWELL, for your wonderful service.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman.

I, too, want to recognize Congressman Nussle here on the floor in honor of Congressman BOSWELL, and we have the distinguished minority whip, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I'll be brief.

I had the privilege many years ago to get on the telephone and call LEONARD BOSWELL. LEONARD BOSWELL was then presiding over the State senate. He tells the story about how his executive assistant came on the floor and said, "There's a guy named Congressman HOYER on the phone. Shall I tell him you'll call him back?"

Fortunately, for me, President BOSWELL at the time said, "No, I'll talk to him now." He turned the podium over to one of his colleagues, and came on the phone and talked to me.

And I said, "Senator, this is STENY HOYER. I would very much like you to run for Congress. We think you'd be an excellent Member of Congress, we think you'd be a great candidate for Congress, and we think you could win this seat."

He said, "Well, what does Mr. Gephardt think about that?"

It so happened Dick was about 4 feet from me, so I said, "Well, let me turn this over to him, and he'll tell you what he thinks about it."

Of course, he echoed my comments.

□ 1250

Now, I didn't know LEONARD BOSWELL at the time, but I'd heard wonderful things about LEONARD BOSWELL, not only about his skill as a legislator, but of his decency and his character as a human being; not only his experiences in war, but his service at home as a farmer, as a businessman, as a public representative and as a Senate leader in Iowa. And I want to say that nothing that has transpired over the years that he and I have served together in this body have disabused in any way the extraordinarily positive things

that were told to me of LEONARD BOSWELL and why I ought to ask him to come to the Congress of the United States.

He has been a dear and close friend of mine every day he has served. He will remain a dear and close friend of mine until he and I pass from this Earth. He is a salt-of-the-Earth human being. He is someone that the American people, if they knew personally, would say is the kind of person they wanted representing them in the Congress of the United States; or, frankly, in any other body.

LEONARD BOSWELL, thank you. Thank you for serving our country so well, so courageously, so ably, so conscientiously with so much character and decency. You have brought a greater degree of civility and understanding to this institution. It is better for your service. Godspeed.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LATHAM. I would now like to recognize the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for leading this discussion to have an opportunity to say some things about my friend, LEONARD BOSWELL, across the floor.

I have reflected on a number of things. In 1996, I aspired to run for the Iowa Senate. I got there just as LEONARD BOSWELL was elected to come here to the United States Congress. I got to know a little bit about the area that he came from and traveled down to that area a good number of times. Little did I know that a few years later I would arrive here in this United States Congress, some 6 years later, representing not Congressman BOSWELL, not Lieutenant Colonel BOSWELL, but his cows.

I have stopped a number of times and looked across the landscape and wondered what makes a man the man that he is. Coming from Iowa, especially rural Iowa and growing up in the hills like I did, and walking through those hills and working in that soil and having my hands on a lot of things that are the origins of new wealth, you understand what makes a man who he is when you see the landscape that he came from.

And that landscape down there in Decatur County, it's a little hilly. It raises a lot of grass. We, where I come from, don't always think it's the best corn ground, but they're doing better down there with the new hybrids. Now I'm seeing the character of the man who served in this Congress these years, these 16 years, and served in the United States Army for I believe 20 years, the character of the man who took the controls of helicopters time after time as an assault helicopter pilot in Vietnam, was formed and shaped in the hills that today I have the privilege to represent and that feed those cows that wander out there in that pastureland and won't probably as often go down in that neighborhood to check on them, but I'm glad to know that Congressman LEONARD BOSWELL

will have some time to check on those cows because I know he loves them and takes care of them.

I also had the privilege to go to Vietnam as Congressman BOSWELL was going back to Vietnam for the first time since the end of his second deployment there. And he asked me if I would sit in front behind the glass with him as we went all around Vietnam, through Saigon, out through the streets of Saigon, out into the countryside, out on a boat on the Mekong River. And we looked at how the country had changed, how the population of Saigon had gone from 1 million to 7 million during that interim period of time since LEONARD so nobly, bravely, and patriotically flew over that landscape. Everybody that he served with didn't come back, but more people came back because of LEONARD BOSWELL, and I know that.

I heard some of those stories because I pulled a few of them out; but it is not something that he's brought out front, not something he's worn on his sleeve, as something within the character of the man that sits here with us today. It's part of the character of the man who served Iowans and Americans in the United States Congress these 16 years.

For this time I have had the privilege to serve with him, a decade for me, I'm grateful for those times. We've always been able to work together. We served on the Ag Committee together all of that time. There has been a certain communication that has gone on that was often unspoken even in committee when we'd look over across at each other, and somehow LEONARD BOSWELL would know what I was thinking and I think I knew what he was thinking. And that worked pretty good for Iowans, and it worked pretty good for Americans, and it worked pretty good for agriculture.

So I congratulate you, LEONARD BOSWELL, on your service to our country all of these years. It's been a stellar career, and it's not over. There's a future also of service that I know will continue every day, and I certainly will keep you in my prayers and in our memories here as I thank you for serving the United States of America and serving here in the United States Congress and serving Iowans the way that you have.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to recognize the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY).

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for organizing this well-deserved tribute to my friend, my colleague, my mentor, and my hero, LEONARD BOSWELL.

Now, we've been talking about how LEONARD is Iowa through and through. But, LEONARD, the secret is out: you were born in Missouri. That was a great day for America, but I think it has also been part of shaping the person you are because you know that we are much more than the State we come

from, the region we come from; and everything about your life of public service has reflected that.

LEONARD grew up on farms in both Ringgold and Decatur Counties and, amazingly, was drafted into the Army on his 22nd birthday. Quite a birthday present.

He served with distinction for 20 years, but the people who know him best can tell you that one of the things that made LEONARD BOSWELL unique was he went from a draftee serving at the lowest levels of the Army, to being encouraged to go to officer candidate school. What happens when you get commissioned, you actually have to resign from the United States Army in order to be commissioned. LEONARD did that and was commissioned as a second lieutenant on February 19, 1957. It seems like a long time ago.

After his commissioning as an officer, you've heard how LEONARD served two tours as a helicopter assault pilot in Vietnam. LEONARD, I know from doing a lot of interviews with Vietnam veterans for the Library of Congress's oral history project that everyone remembers that first day when they arrived in Vietnam. And for you, that was on April 12, 1965. I'm sure that you can tell us the sights, the sounds, the smells, the feelings you had when you arrived there.

One of the things that LEONARD never talks about because he's too modest of a person is the fact that he was awarded not one but two Distinguished Flying Crosses for his bravery and heroism serving our country in Vietnam. On November 1, 1968, on his second tour of duty, LEONARD became the assault helicopter company commander for the 336, and led that unit with distinction until he finally retired and came back to the State that he loved and started pursuing other things.

But LEONARD has always been about service to country, service to family, and service to his faith. So when an opportunity presented itself, he ran for office in Iowa. He was elected to the Iowa Senate, became senate president in Iowa in 1992, and then continued his career here, and we've heard the minority whip talk about how that all came about. And we're so glad that it did.

LEONARD has always been a strong advocate for military families. He has a lot of proud achievements in this body. But, LEONARD, your proudest moment was when the Joshua Omvig Suicide Prevention Act was passed in the House, passed in the Senate, and signed into law by the President. And the reason why that was so meaningful to me personally is I knew Joshua Omvig's family long before he took his life.

□ 1300

And for you to take up that cause and to give voice to the thousands of Americans who were losing loved ones to suicide who had served this country with honor and distinction was the cause you were meant to lead. And to me, that day when we passed the bill

on the House floor was one of the highlights of my career in Congress, because one miraculous thing happened that day.

After you stood and talked about why we needed to do more for veterans like Josh Omvig to help them before they got to that point of taking their own lives, an extraordinary thing happened. After you spoke, Members on both sides of the aisle came down to the well and told the stories of constituents from their district who did the same thing that Josh Omvig did and put a human face on this crisis that was damaging our country. That happened because of you, LEONARD, and I have never been prouder of you. I've never been prouder of your leadership than the day that happened. And America owes you a grateful thanks for leading the charge and giving voice to that problem.

But LEONARD's courage and heroism just doesn't apply to his service to his country. Not long ago, when an intruder attacked his home and his family, LEONARD was there to stand up and protect them as well. And you shrug it off, LEONARD, but everybody who knows you knows that the outcome of that horrible moment was inevitable, that truth and justice were going to triumph because you were the one who was there at the right time and the right place.

We are honored to have the privilege of serving with you. We wish you and Dody and your entire family the best. Don't be a stranger. We're counting on you to continue to inspire us. And may God go with you.

Mr. LATHAM. Thank you, Mr. BRALEY.

I'd like to now recognize the Representative from northern Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the distinguished service of my neighbor to the north, Congressman LEONARD BOSWELL. And as was just pointed out, he was born in Missouri's Sixth Congressional District, which is the district I represent, in Harrison County. I think that's a fact that has probably dogged him throughout his career in Iowa politics, but we're very happy to have him actually born there.

But I got to know LEONARD through his hard work on matters related to aviation. And as has been pointed out today, LEONARD is obviously a former military helicopter pilot, but he later got his fixed wing license, and most recently he's been flying a Comanche and a Zenith, but he's been a great advocate for all of general aviation.

I've worked with him on countless pieces of legislation, large and small, to advance the interests of general aviation. In the FAA reauthorization, which we just finished this year, or parts of last year, there was an important provision in it to allow residential through-the-fence agreements at general aviation airports, and this provision would not have survived the process without LEONARD's efforts.

He's been a leader in opposing user fees, which is one of the number 1 issues to those of us in general aviation and to general aviation pilots, and ensuring the continuation of programs such as the Block Aircraft Registration program.

He has been an instrumental voice and established something that's very important to me, and that's the General Aviation Caucus. He's been very instrumental in the process of getting over 190 members, which is one of the largest caucuses here in the House of Representatives. And whenever I needed somebody to have courage to stand up for good policy even when it wasn't necessarily good politics, LEONARD was always there, and I could always count on him to stand with me on those issues.

I was also thrilled that Congressman BOSWELL attended the greatest little air show in the country, which is in my hometown of Tarkio, Missouri. And he has come there as a friend and, obviously, an aviation enthusiast, but I am hopeful he will join us again this year, July 13, for the show.

LEONARD has served his country in uniform and, obviously, as a Member of this House of Representatives, and he's served capably and very honorably. And on behalf of general aviation enthusiasts across this Nation, I want to thank you for everything that you have done to help those folks out. It's been an honor to work with you, and it's an honor for me to be able to call you my friend.

Thank you very much, LEONARD.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman.

I'd like now to yield to my good friend from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Thank you, Mr. LATHAM. I appreciate your yielding, and do want to join today in paying tribute to the illustrious career of a colleague, a very good friend, the gentleman—and I mean gentleman in every sense of the word—the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. LEONARD BOSWELL.

As the ranking member on the Surface Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on which Mr. BOSWELL has served, I can tell you that his expertise in so many issues that we've already heard discussed today have been critical to us in passing much-needed legislation.

Much has been said already, but not enough can be said to say thank you to LEONARD BOSWELL for his serving our country as he has in the U.S. Army, to have risen, like he did, from private to lieutenant colonel. To have run as many missions as he did as a helicopter pilot in Vietnam and to have won two Distinguished Flying Crosses is something that this Nation can never say thank you enough for what LEONARD BOSWELL has done, even before he came to the illustrious Halls of the U.S. Congress.

In the real world, LEONARD BOSWELL has truly combined a midwestern farm-

er's common sense with practical, everyday living. And it has been that experience that has proven so invaluable to us on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, his work to draft critical legislation.

As a pilot, LEONARD BOSWELL knows very well the tremendous issues facing our aviation community, and he served on that Subcommittee on Aviation for each of his 16 years in this body. And during the hearings and markups, LEONARD often spoke about the critical importance of aviation safety and as an advocate for his fellow general aviation pilots.

It was for that reason that LEONARD received an appointment to the conference committee that wrote the FAA bill that we passed last year. He served as a conferee, providing very valuable firsthand experience about what some of the irresponsible cuts being proposed at the time in FAA funding would have meant. And it's thanks to his deep, deep knowledge of these issues that we were able to get what we did, and that we were truly on the right side of this fight and came out in what circumstances at the time would call a true victory for our side.

As a strong advocate of veterans, of independent truckers, and agriculture interests, LEONARD BOSWELL brought that same experience to us as a conferee when we considered the MAC 21 transportation legislation of last year as well.

It was his amendment that was offered in committee that ended up in the final legislation that gave veterans preference for jobs with highway and transit contractors, again, putting his past experience to work, ensuring that our veterans, after they have put their life on the line for our country, that they have a job to come back home to when they return home.

And in addition, he's one of the few members of our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure who has a commercial driver's license. LEONARD BOSWELL knows very well the very intricate, the very complex and critical issues involved in motor carrier safety regulations. And he put that experience, along with his agriculture experience, to tremendous work for our colleagues.

I know that on our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, when LEONARD BOSWELL spoke, every member listened. You could hear the conversations, the side bars, the side conversations stop, and everybody listened to what LEONARD had to say when he spoke on our committee.

He played an instrumental role in the Midwest Regional Rail Initiative, establishing a new Amtrak route between Chicago, the Quad Cities, and Iowa City. This \$30 million project will be completed in 2015 and is creating more than 500 family-wage jobs each year. And that's just the start.

Whether Mr. BOSWELL's been advocating for high-speed rail or for ethanol pipeline, he's always been focused on

what is best for Iowa and for the transportation needs of this Nation. He's been an invaluable resource to our committee. I know we will miss him speaking on the committee, but we certainly will look forward to continuing to profit from his experiences and advice to us in whatever capacity he may follow in his many years left.

I would note that, again, before I conclude, as has already been noted, that it is the gentleman from Iowa that beat Mr. BOSWELL that is bringing this Special Order today. And I think that is worth special recognition, as well, because it shows the greatness of both of these individuals, how they can fight a very hard battle, political battle, yet both remain true gentlemen.

I would even submit that, in this day of critical fiscal cliff negotiations, that if Mr. LATHAM and Mr. BOSWELL were conducting negotiations, we'd be going home for Christmas by sundown today.

□ 1310

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to now recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. I thank my colleague from Iowa.

I actually want to echo the words of NICK JOE RAHALL in commending both of you gentleman—especially TOM—for organizing this Special Order. I think it says something about each of your character and your respect for the process and for this institution. We hear a lot about how the camaraderie or the goodwill has deteriorated in this body, but I think, at least so far as Iowa politics is concerned and a lot of us from the Midwest, that's not the case. There's strong differences, but there's also strong respect and a recognition that we're working on something that's greater than all of us and we're trying to do our best for the American people and for our country.

I got to know LEONARD BOSWELL and his wife Dody—I don't know if you remember this, but I think it was in Hershey, Pennsylvania, in 1979. A new freshman Member of Congress, my wife and 8-year-old daughter and I went up to Hershey. They had a bipartisan conference there for a couple of days. It was really fun. We got to go on tours and had different sessions. They broke us down into different groups, and my wife and I happened to be the same group with LEONARD and Dody, and we hit it off right away, feeling that here was someone who was not your typical idea of what a politician is but someone who is in it for the right reason and doing public service and was a decent person.

LEONARD is, I think, a very, very low-key, very proud, and very tough person. Some people say you've got to be a firebrand and you've got to yell and holler and all that. I was raised with the idea that it's the empty can that makes the most noise. Sometimes the most noise is not the way you get things done or you make a contribution.

LEONARD has always been a strong, steady, responsible, honorable, honest participant in the process and someone I have looked up to. I have served with him for many years on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. He's honored us in Wisconsin by coming with his true love of aviation. I think he actually graduated first in his class back when he was taking both helicopter and fixed wing aviation back in the fifties. So he's been a good pilot of all sorts for a very long, long time. A couple of Bronze Stars and a lot of the other awards that he has received during his service in the military, there's a story behind each one of those, an important one. I know that a lot of people are very grateful for what you did during those 20 years in the military representing our country.

He's a natural leader. He was selected by his friends and neighbors to be a leader in a co-op movement in Iowa, and then elected to the State senate and became president of the State senate. He's always shown, as I have had the opportunity to work with him, a real concern for his constituents and their problems and personally has gone to bat to make sure that they're getting a fair deal and a hearing and not just going through the motions. His knowledge of aviation has been a great resource for this Congress and for the Transportation Committee.

I don't normally participate in these sort of things, but I did want to come down here today to just say, LEONARD, I respect you. You're the salt of the Earth, the kind of person that I think we would all like to be. I'm sure your family is proud of you and your neighbors are proud of you. We thank you for your service to our country.

Mr. LATHAM. I would like to now recognize the person who's the subject of all this, my colleague, Congressman LEONARD BOSWELL.

Mr. BOSWELL. Thank you, Congressman LATHAM.

This is the first day we've actually talked, except for election night when I called to say congratulations. Our little conversation we had a few moments ago before this started was kindly, and I think I appreciated you coming to me and saying what you did in this event that took place last November. So I wish you well, and I appreciate the cordial treatment you have given me today.

Some suggest to me, You may not want to do this; he was your opponent. I said, No. We're from Iowa. We don't do things like that. That's protocol. You made me proud today, and I thank you for it.

I've said this on other occasions, as you've heard me, I have a regret. I'm sorry my mother couldn't have heard this discussion today.

I owe a lot of appreciation to those of you left in the room. I realize most people had to flee for the airport, as we normally all do. Thank you for staying and doing this.

I do want to pay tribute to my wife, Dody. I think she's probably watching.

Sweetheart, I hope you have enjoyed this, as well as my children—Terri, Diana, Cindy, and Joe—and their families and many friends. I hadn't planned on this all coming to this kind of a closure, but it's caused me to reflect back over life, and I feel very blessed.

TOM, you heard it too many times. I started out in a tented farmhouse. You did hear that a time or two, I'm sure, in days past. But look what I've gotten to do, as you've heard about here today, when we talk about the American Dream and the opportunities that exist in America. It's been very rewarding to me. I can't say enough about that, but enough has been probably said.

I realize as I reflect back on what's happened over the last years that I couldn't have done it without the help of great staff. And some names—I shouldn't do this—but just to hit a few of them. A gentleman named John Norris—I think you knew him, TOM, at one time—we started out together. He's on the FERC Board now, and doing a good job.

I think back over many others. Sandy Carter, you're probably watching over there in our cube. Sandy, thank you for your service and your dedication to the people of Iowa in the Third District. I could go on and on. Back in Iowa, there's Jay Byers, Sally Bowzer, Grant Woodard, and all the rest. Frequently, I would stand before a group and invite Ted Tran to come and stand with me as a surrogate son from Vung Tau, Vietnam. He was one of those refugees, and what he went through to get to be an American and have the American Dream is very special. So the list is long, and I will stop. It's getting long for some of you. I know you've got travels to do.

But those here in the room, Bruce, thank you for your attributes. Jim Nussle, it's great to see you again. Tim, thank you for your remarks and the service we've had together. TOM, I wish you continued success. I know that you'll give your heart to what you believe in for our State. We both kind of come from the soil, really. That's probably a good thing.

So with that, I want to say a fond farewell. I will continue to respond to our constituents until we finally close this down, if no sooner, at least by the 2nd of January, when we change from the 112th to the 113th.

I'll just say it's been my pleasure and my good fortune to live this much of my life in the United States of America and to serve our country. It's the right thing to do. We've got lots on our plate, but we can do this because that's who we are. We can, and I'm sure we will.

Thank you and God Bless.

□ 1320

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say thank you to Congressman BOSWELL. I wish him and Dody the very, very best in the future.

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

Mr. Speaker, in addition to my remarks today, I asked Iowans to pay tribute to Congressman BOSWELL by providing their comments for submission into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which follow.

REMARKS OF SENATOR CHUCK GRASSLEY ON REPRESENTATIVE LEONARD BOSWELL

Representative Leonard Boswell is a strong advocate for his constituents and many other categories of individuals who are not necessarily constituents but important members of our society, including veterans and farmers.

He saw the world as a 20-year veteran of the United States Army, returned home, and applied his broad perspective to public service, first in the Iowa state legislature, then in the U.S. Congress.

He made a big impression on me in the 1990s when he was president of the state Senate. When he had an issue on his mind, he tracked me down at my town meetings or whatever it took. At times, he rode with me from one town meeting to the next so we could talk. That persistence on behalf of Iowans is something I greatly admired.

His decorated military service, including two tours of duty in Vietnam, made him a natural for looking out for veterans' needs.

Representative Boswell did a tremendous amount to raise awareness of veterans' suicide and promote preventive services. He championed and shepherded through Congress the Joshua Omvig Veterans Suicide Prevention Act. This act, signed into law, is named for a soldier from Grundy Center, Iowa, who took his own life after returning from Iraq.

As the operator of a farm in Davis City that has been in his family for generations, Representative Boswell understands the challenges facing family farmers. He's been a vocal advocate for an updated farm bill and other policies critical to the nation's farmers.

Policy work to support economic growth in Iowa is another signature for Representative Boswell. He has promoted legislation that rebuilds the highways and other infrastructure that are necessary for job creation.

In closing, Representative Boswell has worked hard to represent his constituents. He did his job very well. While we disagreed politically, we never had a personal disagreement. We found plenty of common ground. I'll miss his camaraderie around Congress. But I have no doubt we'll run across each other because Representative Boswell is unlikely to avoid public service, which has been his calling for so long.

Thank you for your service, Representative Boswell.

STATEMENT FROM GOVERNOR TERRY BRANSTAD ON REPRESENTATIVE LEONARD BOSWELL

I commend Congressman Leonard Boswell for his long-time dedication to public service. His selfless service to others has been demonstrated in many ways—as an officer in the United States Army, as President of the Iowa Senate, and as a congressman from Iowa. In the United States House of Representatives, Congressman Boswell was a great ally for rural development, transportation infrastructure, and agriculture, and he championed legislation to help veterans across the nation. I enjoyed working with Leonard in a bipartisan fashion during his time in State government—just one example came in our joint work to bring IPSCO Steel to Iowa in 1994 which has provided hundreds of high-quality jobs for Iowans. Congressman Boswell should be proud of his public service accomplishments and for his personal achievements as a husband, father, and grandfather. I am heartened by Iowans, like

Congressman Boswell, who have spent a lifetime serving the State of Iowa. We thank him for his service.

On behalf of the Waukee City Council and myself, I would like to extend a heartfelt thank you to Congressman Leonard Boswell for his many years of service in the Iowa Senate and for the past 16 years, his service to the people of Iowa in the United States House of Representatives.

It has been a pleasure to work with Congressman Boswell over the years. In my communications with Congressman Boswell, he has always been friendly, receptive, and eager to work with and for his constituents. In particular, Congressman Boswell has been very supportive and helpful in the City's efforts to obtain funding and necessary approvals related to the Alice's Road/105th Street Interchange.

Congressman Boswell's many years of service in the military and in the halls of Congress are a testament to his love of home, state and nation. He is a true friend of Waukee and I wish him the very best in his future endeavors.

—Honorable William F. Peard,  
Mayor of Waukee

One of Representative Leonard Boswell's most significant and enduring accomplishments during his long political career was the critical role that he played in bringing the World Food Prize to Iowa and in helping ensure that it would have a permanent home in Des Moines.

The World Food Prize, known around the world as "The Nobel Prize for Food and Agriculture," was created by Iowa's and America's greatest agricultural hero, Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Dr. Norman E. Borlaug. However, when the prize's original sponsor on the east coast was lost and the Prize was about to go out of existence, then State Senator Boswell was part of a critical bipartisan effort, with Republican Governor Terry Branstad and John Ruan Sr. to rescue the World Food Prize and relocate it to Dr. Borlaug's home state of Iowa.

Since then, thanks to the highly supportive role Representative Boswell has played, The World Food Prize has grown in stature and now annually welcomes more than 1,500 people from more than 70 countries for an award ceremony and symposium which has been called "the premier conference in the world on global agriculture."

In addition, Representative Boswell worked hand in hand with all of the members of the Iowa Congressional Delegation on a bipartisan basis to help attain approval of Dr. Borlaug receiving the Congressional Gold Medal, America's highest civilian honor. For this achievement Representative Boswell has our heartfelt appreciation, as well as for all he has done to preserve and enhance the legacy of Dr. Norman E. Borlaug.

On behalf of the World Food Prize Foundation, we extend our warmest congratulations to Representative Boswell on his dedicated career of public service, in the US Army in Vietnam, as well as in the Iowa State Legislature and the US House of Representatives.

—Ambassador Kenneth M. Quinn, President of  
the World Food Prize Foundation

#### CONGRESSMAN BOSWELL

On behalf of the Iowa Federation of National Active and Retired Federal Employees (NARFE), thank you for your years of support and service to not only Federal employees and retirees but all Iowans.

When first becoming an officer in NARFE, I was not knowledgeable about legislation and you took the time to visit with me and bring me up to speed. I will always be grateful for this guidance.

It has been a pleasure knowing and working with you.

—Darlene Freeman, Past President and  
Legislative Chair of the Iowa Federation of  
NARFE

COUSIN LEONARD: Congratulations on your successful careers of service in the Armed Forces, State Senate, and U.S. Congress. We wish you and Dody a happy retirement.

—Eldon and Marilyn Boswell

CONGRESSMAN BOSWELL: We want to thank you for your years of service and we admire and respect your views/contribution to all of us!

I know we have not heard the last from you and we encourage you to stay involved. We need you! Again, thank you so much for helping all of us!

—Tom and Nancy Courtney of Burlington

CONGRESSMAN BOSWELL: I admire your service to our country, from your time in the military to the halls of Congress. You have always been fair and willing to compromise for the overall benefit of Iowans and Americans. I appreciate that you always make efforts to hear from constituents and to work hard on our behalf. Your work will enrich Americans lives for years to come.

Thank you for your service to the people of Iowa.

—Michael Worrell

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOSWELL: Thank you so much for your years of service. Roxy and I are from Burlington and are now in the 2nd District, but we appreciate your work so much.

—John and Roxy Riessen, West Burlington

Congressman Boswell has been my representative personally, as well as the representative for AIB College of Business in Des Moines, where I serve as the President.

In his time in DC, Congressman Boswell has been a huge supporter of Education, from K-12 through private and public colleges and universities. He believes in students and recognizes that young people are the future for our nation. He is also very supporting of our active duty military personnel and our Veterans.

I wish to recognize and THANK Congressman Boswell for his dedication to our country, to Iowa, and to his constituents. He has changed our world, our country, and our state with his personal service for so many years. Every life has a great purpose and Congressman Boswell has had a wonderful calling for his. I will wait in anticipation to see what he chooses to do next! I just cannot thank him enough!

—Nancy Williams, AIB President, Des Moines

Leonard Boswell was truly a gracious man and a class act.

I retired from teaching in 2010, after 38 years. A number of years ago, I had a group of 5 or 6 students that competed in a Citizenship Competition in Des Moines while Mr. Boswell was the President of the State Senate.

We presented a plan for the public library in our home town—Creston Iowa—and how it needed to be remodeled, updated, made handicapped accessible, and just made safe in general. We had to present an action plan along with pictures before a group of judges. Our presentation won the competition and Mr. Boswell made himself available to present the award to my group of students.

He then invited us upstairs in the Iowa Capitol and took the students through different parts of the Capitol and showed us his

offices. He spent precious time with the group and throughout it was generous and patient and made it a very special day for some eighth grade students and their teacher. Mr. Boswell went above and beyond to be kind to us, when he could have easily either ignored the occasion, or made it a quick event.

I will always remember Leonard Boswell for his support for education and the time he took to support it.

Character is what you do when no one is looking and I felt that this experience with Leonard Boswell was a shining example of the true strength of his character.

We will miss him.

—Mrs. Lauris Heinzel, Creston

Leonard Boswell has a long and distinguished career of service to his state and to his country. He is a humble servant of the people, and we are going to miss him greatly in Congress. Congressman Boswell is a committed statesman, a dedicated family man, a courageous and decorated veteran, and a most trusted friend.

We extend our sincere and best wishes to Congressman Leonard Boswell and hope that the people of Iowa continue to enjoy his gifts of time, talent, and leadership in retirement.

—Myron R. Linn, Pella Corporation

CONGRESSMAN BOSWELL: We want to thank you for the years of dedicated service to our country, serving in Vietnam; and in the US House of Representatives. You did a great job of representing your District in Southern Iowa and voted your thoughts on the various issues. Your service in Vietnam as a helicopter pilot was far and away your greatest achievement, facing death on every mission. Your service to America should never be forgotten. Again, Thanks.

—Jerry and Beverly Wetzel, Indianola

Congressman Leonard Boswell . . . a quiet and thoughtful voice of reason, someone who saw the big picture, someone who always opened his door and his ear to his constituents, someone who sincerely worked for the betterment of his state and country, and someone who played his role as a servant leader with unparalleled dignity, honor and integrity.

I was so very fortunate to work with this dedicated public servant for more than 3 decades at the state and national level. I always left his presence with a keen sense of appreciation for the sincere commitment he had to our state, nation and the American people. Thank you Congressman Boswell for your friendship, service, and spirit of professionalism. Your legacy of leadership will live on through the lessons you taught to us while serving your country.

Thank you.

—Thomas R Temple, Former CEO of Iowa  
Pharmacy Association, Des Moines

CONGRESSMAN BOSWELL: I appreciate the opportunity to thank you publicly for your service to our nation and state and for your friendship. The bond initially sparked by our common Vietnam aviator experience has led to a longstanding personal friendship that has endured despite our different political affiliations. I continue to hold your key leadership in the Iowa General Assembly in highest regard. In all of the capacities that you have served, you have put the greater good ahead of your self interest, beginning with your willingness to risk your life in military service. I honor your great record of public service!

I am retiring at the end of this year and hopefully we will have occasion to spend some time together. I have missed your presence at the statehouse, Leonard! There is a

lot of hangar flying yet to be done, my friend!

Best personal regards.

—Keith E. Luchtel, Nyemaster Goode, Des Moines

I served as a Congressional Page for the 108th Congress in 2003–2004 during my junior year of high school. Despite being a conservative Republican from southern Iowa, Congressman Boswell nominated me for this position and I cannot thank him enough for this amazing opportunity. During my year of service, I learned an incredible amount about the House of Representatives and the legislative process. This experience jump started my life in ways hard to imagine.

Congressman Boswell served with dignity and represented Iowa well in a place that seems foreign and out-of-touch to many Iowans. While I disagreed with him on most of his positions, I valued his working-man approach to representing ordinary folks in the U.S. Congress.

Again, thank you for your service. I know you will enjoy returning to your farm and family in southern Iowa—A place I will always call home.

Best wishes,

—Blake Yocom, Chariton

I owe Congressman Boswell a lot. In 1998, Congressman Boswell gave me an opportunity to work for him as a legislative assistant in his Washington, D.C. office. That opportunity evolved into other career opportunities throughout my career. Any of the successes I have achieved in my professional life are due in large part to Congressman Boswell. His willingness to place his trust in me to do an important job for the people of Iowa's Third Congressional District is something I will never forget.

I would like to thank Congressman Boswell not only for his support of me personally, but also for his service to our country. As a soldier and statesman, there are few people who have given more of themselves to our nation. I wish him and Dody well as they move forward to their next adventure in life. I would ask them to take some time and get some rest, but I know that won't happen—that's not the Boswell way!

Job well done, Congressman!

Jon Murphy, PolicyWorks, Des Moines

There is no doubt that Congressman Boswell was a friend of postal workers. He supported us on every front, as he has from the anthrax incidents to the recent financial situation the USPS is facing.

The Postal Workers in Iowa, and the country, want to thank Congressman Boswell for all his support and years of service.

On behalf of all the American Postal Worker Union Local in Iowa, thank you.

—Lance Coles, Iowa Federation of Labor AFL-CIO

CONGRESSMAN BOSWELL: The first time we met was in the year 2000 when the National Institute of Health asked me to contact the Iowa Congressmen to request their support of the Lupus Research and Care Amendment Act. Whereas most Congressmen were very polite, but spent no more than 10 minutes with me, you took me into your private office and spent more than 30 minutes asking me numerous questions about the disease and the prospective legislation. As it turned out, you were the only Congressman to co-sponsor the bill that would affect 15,000+ Iowans afflicted with the disease, lupus. At that point I knew we would be friends for life.

When my husband served on the Des Moines City Council, you were always the

first Iowa Congressman he would contact when he needed advice and assistance on an issue. He knew that he could always count on you. Not only were you the most accessible, but also the one who would truly "listen" to what he had to say.

These "friendships" have continued throughout your term of office. Whether it was a problem or concern with social security disability, immigration, social security, medicare, or numerous other topics, you and your staff were always prompt in addressing our concerns.

We shall truly miss your smiling face at the community events, as we always knew that we could count on you being there. We wish you the very best in the next phase of your life, and we hope that you, and your lovely wife Dody, will be blessed with good health and happiness.

Your friends,

—Sophie and Tom Vlassis

Leonard Boswell has been my friend for 20+ years and as I write this message my thoughts go back to all the roads we've traveled, the adventures we've shared, the laughter and tears we shed I just want you to know you are my brother.

To you and Dody my love and best wishes.

—John Flannery

CONGRESSMAN BOSWELL: I wanted to take this opportunity to thank you for your support for diabetes issues. I am proud that I have gotten to work by your side over the past 7 years to increase funding for diabetes research and on stem cell research. I will never forget the time when I was 13 and at an event listening to you speak. You pulled me up on stage and talked about how we needed to work to find a cure so that I wouldn't have diabetes anymore. That meant the world to me. Because of all you have done for me, you will always have a special place in my heart. You have taught me so much and I hope to someday impact my community as much as you have.

Thanks again!

—Karli Borcharding, Ankeny

Congressman Leonard Boswell is a name well recognized in Iowa. After years representing the issues important to Iowans in the U.S. Congress, many years addressing the concerns of Iowans at the state capitol, and twenty years defending the freedoms and rights that Americans hold dear as a member of the U.S. military, Congressman Boswell deserves the thanks of Iowans and Americans for his commitment to this country. This congressional recognition is well earned.

Congressman Boswell was a representative who would take the time to listen to Iowans. He paid special care and attention to all veterans. He was a friend of working people. When home visiting, he would make an effort to meet with the labor leaders in the state. He spent time listening to their concerns and would give honest answers on his positions—not always to the liking of the unions—but always honest and upfront.

The labor movement in Iowa has lost an ally in Congress, but we are grateful for all the years he was there for us. We hope he will not be a stranger to Iowa politics and will continue to support veterans and workers.

—Ken Sagar, President of Iowa Federation of Labor AFL-CIO

—Charlie Wishman, Secretary/Treasurer of Iowa Federation of Labor AFL-CIO

Leonard Boswell was my representative for 11 of the past 15 years he was in the U.S. Congress. Prior to that he distinguished him-

self as he represented Iowans for many years at the state capitol. Leonard has dedicated the majority of his life to public service and he is more than worthy of this congressional recognition.

Leonard was a decorated veteran of the Viet Nam war which has special meaning to me as I too had the privilege to serve during that time. I truly believe Leonard would have been just as caring for the Veterans of this land even if he hadn't served. Leonard is just that kind of person.

I have had the privilege of representing Union members in South Central Iowa for over three years and had the opportunity to partner with the congressman on numerous issues that affected working people. I can confirm that Leonard was receptive to all my concerns and he made my concerns his concerns in regard to working people and the citizens of Iowa.

I count Congressman Boswell as one of most trusted and beloved friends and look forward to partnering with Leonard in the future in whatever capacity.

Thank you,

—Mark Cooper, South Central Iowa Federation of Labor AFL-CIO

#### MEMBERS OF CONGRESS,

The Iowa Corn Growers Association would like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude and extend special recognition to Congressman Leonard Boswell for his many years of service to his country, his home state of Iowa, and to agriculture. His background as a family farmer and his service in the Iowa Senate greatly prepared him to represent corn farmers in the U.S. Congress.

Because Congressman Boswell values the family farmer, our goals have often been lock step with one another's. He has served the agriculture community well with representation on the House Agriculture Committee and as Chair and Ranking Member of the General Farm Commodities and Risk Management Subcommittee. In these roles, he has worked to; protect and strengthen corn farmer's risk management, build a secure and stable crop insurance program, and build realistic farm commodity programs. Congressman Boswell also served Iowa and its farmers on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee where his work on numerous highway bills as well as the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) impacted Iowa's critical transportation systems.

During his years of service, the corn ethanol industry was developed. Congressman Boswell was instrumental in promoting the ethanol industry and shaping policies that allowed the industry to grow. From the Renewable Fuel Standard, to the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit, to leadership on the Renewable Fuels Pipeline legislation, the ICGA could be confident that Congressman Boswell would work to support and defend one of the corn industry's top markets.

In closing, on behalf of the farmer members of the Iowa Corn Growers Association, we would like to again thank Congressman Leonard Boswell for his long standing support of Iowa agriculture and the corn industry. We are sincerely grateful for his tireless work to serve our state and our industry.

Sincerely,

—Bruce Rohwer, President of Iowa Corn Growers Association, Johnston

—Craig Floss, Chief Executive Officer of Iowa Corn Growers Association, Johnston

#### CONGRESSMAN BOSWELL,

On behalf of the Greater Des Moines Partnership, we extend our deepest thanks and appreciation to you for your service to the

citizens of Greater Des Moines, the State of Iowa, and United States of America.

First and foremost, thank you for the 20 years of service to our country as a member of the United States Army. And, thank you for your excellent work in representing Central Iowa in the United States House of Representatives over the many years. You and your dedicated staff have been a tremendous asset to our community.

Your leadership and efforts in securing federal funding for transportation projects, quality of life priorities, and other economic development initiatives have played a critical role in the rapid growth and prosperity of the Greater Des Moines Region. We cannot thank you enough for being such an important partner in these efforts.

And thank you for helping accommodate our group and taking the time to address our participants during our annual visits to Washington, D.C. We appreciate the great work in helping set up meetings, coordinating schedules, lining up speakers, and advising and meeting with trip participants.

Again, thank you for your efforts on behalf of the Greater Des Moines Partnership in our nation's capital. We truly appreciate your leadership and all the work you have done on issues important to Central Iowa's business community. We hope for, and wish you, the best in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

—Jay Byers, Chief Executive Officer of Greater Des Moines Partnership  
—Eugene Meyer, President of Greater Des Moines Partnership

We residents of your hometown—Lamoni, Decatur County, Iowa—are privileged to join in paying tribute to you for your years of service to our community, our state, and our country. We can't list all of your achievements, but can mention a few:

Active sports player in High School  
Farmer  
Pilot in the skies of Vietnam  
Senate President—Iowa Legislature  
Father and Grandfather  
President of Farmers' Coop  
Member of U. S. House of Representatives  
Problem solver for people immersed in "Red Tape"  
Pastor of Lamoni Community of Christ  
Devoted Husband  
Thank you for your many years of selfless service.

—Lamoni Lions Club and the Town of Lamoni

Leonard Boswell has worked for his country, his state, and his community throughout a lifetime of public service. Lieutenant Colonel Boswell had a distinguished 20-year career in the United States Army. His service in the Iowa Senate, as President of that body from 1993 to 1996, was where he first took the lessons he brought from his military life, and brought them to bear in the political arena. Those lessons included focus on the mission at hand, and get the job done. Trust your team, and let them know they can trust you. And perhaps most importantly, leave no comrade behind. In 1997, Leonard brought those values to work for Iowans, and their neighbors across the country, in the United States House of Representatives. His work on transportation issues has changed the face of Iowa. But it has been his advocacy for his fellow veterans and their families, that has changed the heart of Iowa.

We are grateful to his wife, Dody, and his family, for sharing him with us these many years. We are proud of the work he has done, and we welcome him home with open arms.

—Sue Dvorsky, Chair of the Iowa Democratic Party

CONGRESSMAN BOSWELL: All Iowans stop from what they are doing today to say thank

you to Representative Leonard Boswell who has represented us well during his tenure as U.S. House Representative. We thank him for his leadership and courage dealing with issues of importance to the people of Iowa.

—Mary L. Madison

LEONARD: It is with gratitude that we thank you for being our Congressional Representative in the 90's and good friend in support of the issues that matter in middle Iowa. You always treated us with respect and desire to make things better for Iowans.

Thank you for your support of the Affordable Care Act. And we also thank you for always meeting with our delegation of Orthopedic Surgeons when we came to visit you each spring when Bob was on the Academy's Board of Councilors. We also appreciate your strong support for Israel, and your personal stories of facing the tragedies after the Holocaust. And thank you for serving in the US Army for many years. And also thank you for your support for women's reproductive rights and health care issues. I knew that you would always listen to us at Planned Parenthood and would do as much as you could to support us in Congress. And that was not an easy task these past few years.

All the best to you and Dody. We know that you will always be there for a good chat on issues and will always stand up for Iowans no matter what!!

—Debbie and Bob Gitchell, Ames

CONGRESSMAN BOSWELL: Your campaign this fall was full of energy, which is representative of your years of support. It is a privilege to honor your many years of serving Iowans both locally and in Washington, DC.

As advocates for working on behalf of vulnerable Iowans, we have found you to be loyal to these issues. I am appreciative of your willingness to listen to concerns from constituents and advocacy groups. I was especially delighted when you provided your support and signed on to the Social Work Reinvestment Act upon listening to our issues.

You have dedicated your time to working on behalf of Iowans and assuring policies were in place to support your constituents. Thank you Congressman Boswell for your years of service!

—Kelli Soyer, National Association of Social Workers, Iowa Chapter

#### REMEMBERING AN AMERICAN HERO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) is recognized for 19 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOSAR. Today, I'm here to remember the sacrifice of an American hero and the bravery of those who served with him.

Two years ago this Saturday, our Nation lost one of our own who was serving to protect our country by securing the Arizona-Mexico border. On December 14, Border Agents Brian Terry, William Castano, Gabriel Fragoza, and Timothy Keller began patrolling an area west of the town of Rio Rico, Arizona, tasked with interdicting violent criminals sneaking into the United States.

At 11 p.m. on the following day, December 15, the team was alerted to five suspects in their interdiction zone.

After identifying themselves, they were fired upon and Agent Terry was struck and killed. The men who fought beside him that night were heroic in their efforts to provide aid and to protect Agent Brian Terry.

After the dust settled, that horrific night's details were brought to light about our government's role in supplying weapons found at the scene of the crime. Through Operation Fast and Furious—a fundamentally flawed gunrunning operation ran by the U.S. Department of Justice—weapons like those found at the scene nearly 2 years ago were allowed to be purchased by middlemen and passed along to some of the most dangerous cartels in Mexico without proper law enforcement interdiction and justice.

Subsequently, numerous hearings have been held to demand answers as to how this program came to be, who authorized it, and who knew about it. My goals are simple: justice and accountability, not just for Brian Terry, who lost his life, and the brave men serving him that night, but also justice for the hundreds of Mexicans who also lost their lives from the weapons from the Fast and Furious scheme.

As I close, please join me in a moment of silence for those lives who have been lost and the loved ones that they leave behind.

For my part, I will continue to demand answers from the Department of Justice. I will continue to stress the need for bipartisan support for getting those answers. I look to leadership not to relent. I also look to the Hispanic Caucus to break their silence and to take up this issue affecting everyone in Mexico.

Finally, I will not rest until we are certain that justice is served and that this atrocity can never happen again.

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

#### PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be here representing the Progressive Caucus and talking about our fiscal situation now that I think a lot of people out there are worrying about, confused about, don't know how it's really going to affect them, wondering what the heck we're doing. Sometimes Members of Congress who aren't part of the negotiations are wondering what's going on too. But what I want to talk about today are the things that are at stake for ordinary people in our country, the things that are on people's minds as we deal with these economic issues that face our country.

I am Congresswoman JANICE SCHAKOWSKY, and I represent a district, a

very diverse district, in Illinois, diverse in every way—economically, certainly by race and ethnicity—and I think in many ways a microcosm of the country. I know that we're getting a lot of calls from our constituents. The calls that I'm getting were reaffirmed by a poll that I saw on Tuesday in our National Journal Daily on page six that says: "Poll: Entitlement cuts feared most in cliff talks." It goes like this:

As President Obama and congressional leaders race to avert the fiscal cliff, Americans remain concerned that whatever budget deal they strike will cut too much from Medicare and Social Security, according to the poll. More of the Americans surveyed are worried about such cutbacks than seeing their tax bills rise, the latest United Technologies/National Journal Connection poll has found.

I was looking at who was involved in the poll. In total, 35 percent of Americans are worried it will cut too much from government programs like Medicare and Social Security; 27 percent—that's eight points less—that it will raise taxes on people like you; 15 percent, it won't meet its target for reducing the Federal deficit and debt; 13 percent, it will allow for too much Federal spending. Only 13 percent were worried it will allow for too much Federal spending in the next 2 years.

But when I looked at, for example, women, 40 percent of women are most worried about those cuts in Social Security and Medicare and other government programs. Forty-six percent of people whose income is \$30,000 or less, that's what they're really, really worried about; that's the thing they're worried about most.

So most Americans, that is their top concern—not really so much that their taxes are going to go up and not really so much about the deficit. They're worried about the cuts in the programs that mean so much to their lives.

So that's really what I wanted to talk about today. If any Members are listening in their offices and they want to come down and talk about the fiscal cliff, as it's called—many of us don't see it as a cliff, nor as a slope, that we actually have time to set the problem straight. That's what most economists are saying, that if we go a few weeks into January, it's not the worst thing so that Americans shouldn't panic about this. But if you want to come down and talk about that, I am really happy to do that.

I wanted to welcome one of my colleagues, HANK JOHNSON, here to the floor today to add his thoughts. I know he had another something he wanted to talk about this afternoon, and I welcome you. Thanks for coming down, Congressman JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Always my pleasure, Representative SCHAKOWSKY, to be with you. You are such a staunch advocate for the middle class, the working poor, the poor. You are a champion for the people, so I'm happy

to be here with you and happy to share some time with you.

But first I wanted to express the fact that last night I came in to do a Special Order on the situation happening in Michigan where a surprise attack, a sneak attack, by the right-wingers resulted in the passage of legislation which I won't refer to as right-to-work legislation, it's more appropriately named crush-the-union legislation. I came up last night to the floor to speak on that issue.

□ 1330

As I am prone to do, I use a lot of analogies, and so last night I used an analogy that some find offensive. And I certainly was not meaning to be offensive or use a derogatory term. Everybody knows what the N word is. The N word, Mr. Speaker, is used to describe a group of people. And the N word used to be fashionable, or it used to be socially acceptable to use the N word. But, now, we don't say the N word. We refer to that word as "the N word."

I had never heard of the M word, Representative SCHAKOWSKY. The M word is a word also that describes a group of people. It, at one time, had been commonly used as a descriptive term. It was, at one time, socially acceptable. But to my discovery, just within the last 12 hours or so, I have found that the use of the M word is no longer socially acceptable.

Now, the M word refers to a group of people, the little people. But when we say "little people" I'm not talking about the Leona Helmsley little people. I'm not talking about the 47 percent. I'm not talking about the takers instead of the makers, as some would describe them. I'm not talking about the middle class, working people, poor people, working poor people. That's not what is meant by the "little people" term. It really refers to a medical condition. "Dwarfism" is the name of that medical condition. And sometimes I guess one can even say "abnormally small people." I like that term better than "dwarfism."

So, I wanted to say to all of those who may have been offended by my use of the "M word," I want you to know that it was out of ignorance and not spite or hatred that I used that term. And please know that I will never use that term again. I will never use that term again.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I think, actually, you have done a service to make people understand that there are those who are deeply offended by it and that we should all learn what to say so as not to offend people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. That's correct. It is a learning moment for me and perhaps many others out there.

But I'll tell you, if you want to find out more about little people or abnormally small people or unusually small people, there is a Web site, there is a group actually called the Little People of America, and their Web site is at [lpaonline.org](http://lpaonline.org). I went to that Web site

this morning and looked through it, and I have been awakened to the sensitivities involved. And so anyone who I offended has my deepest apology.

But, the analogy that I used, even though it used the wrong wording, was a great analogy in my personal opinion. And it is understood that when you put a big fish, a predatory fish, into a bowl with a small fish, that small fish has to learn how to get along with that big fish or else they'll get eaten.

That's what the organization known as ALEC is all about, because it puts the legislators, individual legislators, in a group setting with the corporations, the big fish. And those legislators who are members of ALEC, the American Legislative Exchange Council, they get together, and they do the work of the corporate big fish who are members of that organization.

So last night, that's what we were talking about, and I'm going to yield back to Representative SCHAKOWSKY to resume this discussion, and I will participate as I can.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you very much. I appreciate both—you know, sometimes as legislators we like to think we're always right, and sometimes we make mistakes, inadvertent mistakes. And coming to the floor to actually clear the air I think is really commendable, and I appreciate that.

And also, your talk about the decisions that were made in Wisconsin—you know, government is to serve the people, the best interests of the American people. And right now, we're trying to figure out how are we going to, in a fair way, ask Americans to be able to fund the programs that we need, to fund the services that we need as a country, to make sure that our roads are there and drivable, to fund our military so that we can be safe and strong, to help States to fund their law enforcement, et cetera, all those things that are important to Americans, and as I mentioned earlier, including things like Medicare and make Medicaid.

Budgets aren't just a bunch of numbers on a piece of paper, and government policies aren't just documents. But, in many ways these are moral statements about who we are as a country. I think we have to ask, are we really a poorer country today than we were 70 years ago when Social Security went into effect, when Social Security went into effect to say that we're not going to let older people end up in the poorhouse or out on the street, that we're going to have an insurance policy that they pay into, that everyone pays into during your working life, so that we can ensure that when people reach the age of 62, 65, 67, that they're going to be able to retire with some level of dignity?

At the time that Social Security was passed 70 years ago, there was a three-legged stool. One was this new program, Social Security, to provide retirement benefits that you paid for; two, private pensions, that was kind of

the common normal then. Many of those private pensions were won because workers were able to collectively bargain and get pensions for their family. The third were savings, savings for people.

So between all of that, we thought we'd be able to see a country now where the elderly were lifted out of poverty and they had some semblance of security.

Well, are we really poorer today than when we made that decision that we're not going to let old people end up in the poorhouse? That was a decision on how to fund a program that has never once missed a monthly check ever. In the 70 years plus, never ever has Social Security missed a monthly check. So it's been a program that works really, really well.

□ 1340

And I just want to point out that Social Security helps middle class families, not just older people. I have two grandchildren who get a Social Security benefit. Why? Because, tragically, their mother died. So it is an insurance policy for all families.

The other great thing about Social Security is that unlike many pension programs, there's actually a cost-of-living adjustment. You don't get it every year, as seniors know. There really hasn't been an increase in the economy so much in certain years, but it has been a success, a treasure to our country.

Some people want to put Social Security on the table as part of this discussion to reduce the deficit that we face.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Social Security is one of the hallmarks of American civilization. It civilizes us where we can have a mechanism where we all come together to contribute our money into a pool as we work; and when we retire, we have a way of avoiding the poorhouse; we have a way of living out our lives with dignity and with comfort. You've paid your dues, you deserve to live out your retirement in a comfortable way. You put the money in, and you will get the money out. And as you say, we've never missed a payment and never will.

It being a hallmark of our civilization, it is something that many other countries have yet to put in place for their people. They have yet to see the wisdom, as our past leaders have seen, that you lose and your society weakens in accordance with how you treat your elderly and how you treat your children and how you treat the disabled. They also are able to get Social Security benefits. So it helps people. It's our social safety net. This is a collective. It's a mechanism whereby the whole supports each other, the weakest of these, if you will.

Social Security is not broke, nor is the Federal Government. The Federal

Government is not broke. It has had to borrow money. And when we say borrow money, we really mean we offer Treasuries out to the public to purchase, and we pay interest on those instruments. When an investor feels good about how solid the American system is, they want to put money into it. They want to put money into it because they know that this is the safest place to invest money. They know that they'll be able to get their money out when they want to take it out. They know that they will get their money back with the interest that has been promised to them.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Let me just say that right now we're paying very low interest because people do have confidence in our American economy and in those Treasury notes and it is a good, safe, and solid investment.

And I yield to the gentleman.  
Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. People have confidence in America. It's because of our civilization, and it's because of the forward thinking of our past leaders. It is our responsibility to continue that sense of responsibility to the people—not to the leaders, not to the chosen few, but to the people. We the people established this government, and it's ironic that people have now been turned against government as an institution. They believe that government is the problem. They've been led to believe that government is the problem. Sometimes government does have problems or causes problems; but I can tell you that in the history of this country, the American Government has been phenomenal. That is why we're the greatest country in the world. That is why we are the freest country in the world and we are the most prosperous Nation in the world.

We are not broke. Our Social Security trust fund is not broke. It's solvent. And the bills that we have to pay, we will definitely pay as we always have. It makes sense to borrow money now, by the way, if you can get it for 1 percent or 2 percent, and you can then use those funds to put people back to work in this economy, which is in need of a shot in the arm. I might point out, though, that unemployment is down to 7.7 percent, the first time since between 2007 or 2008 and despite the vigor that has been used in trying to suppress it by politicians in this body, despite their efforts to keep the economy from moving forward so that they could elect a President that they wanted to elect. They wanted to make our current President look bad, so they did everything they could to thwart action to make the economy better, but it has gotten better despite their efforts.

I was really hoping that post-election we would see a change in the direction of my friends on the other side of the aisle in terms of being responsible about government and our responsibility to make sure that government works of, by, and for the people. I was hoping that we would see a difference. We still have time, Representative

SCHAKOWSKY. We still have time. It's not the end of the year. I, myself, I would like to be home for Christmas like everyone else, but my highest duty and responsibility is to be here and to help this Nation move away from this dangerous fiscal cliff that is coming up.

The fiscal cliff is actually here, and there is a lot that we agree on in terms of avoiding that fiscal cliff. But it seems like the thing that is holding it up is the top 2 percent, just wanting to preserve the expiring tax cuts for those top 2 percent. They would do that at the expense of the 98 percent that we all agree that we need to extend the tax cuts for. I just don't understand why it's going to take so long for us to—

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Let's talk about that for a minute.

It seems that there are those on the Republican side of the aisle who are willing to go to the mat to protect tax cuts for the very wealthiest Americans, people who make \$250,000 and more. Of course, our proposal is to say that the first \$250,000 of income for everyone, even if you make \$500,000 a year, on the first \$250,000—I think we all agree that we should extend those tax cuts. It's for the dollars above \$250,000 that some of our colleagues are saying, no, we are not going to ask those people even to pay a penny more than they were.

□ 1350

Yet they're saying the only way that we will consider that, the only way that we will consider taking a little bit more from the wealthiest, is to go to the poorest.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Into that Social Security.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I'm not talking about children. The poorest adults are people over 65 years of age and persons with disabilities. Their median income is \$22,000 a year. The median income for older Americans is \$22,000 a year. Really? Somehow this is a fair balance to ask the wealthiest Americans—the top 2 percent—to pay a little bit more, but darn it, we're not going to do it unless we get those poorest people through their Social Security, through their Medicaid, through their Medicare to pay a bit more? It doesn't seem right to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Representative SCHAKOWSKY, I think it's wrong that we would tell people who have paid into the Social Security system throughout their lives that now you're going to move the goalpost and put a couple of years more on there before eligibility, that you're going to up the age of eligibility.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Especially for Medicare. They're talking about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. They want to do that for Medicare as well. That PAUL RYAN budget would actually decimate the Medicaid system. They just want to whack off a third of the Federal funding and then turn it into a block grant program.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I think it's something like \$850 billion that would come out of the Medicaid fund. I know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Then as to Medicare, they want to turn that into a voucher program and put a 1 percent cap, I think, on the cost-of-living increase and then give that in the form of a voucher to people so that they can go out and purchase insurance on the open market.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Yes, and go to private insurance companies.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Yes. It seems to be a concerted attack on that social safety net that has made us such a great civilization, which is that we take care of each other. It's an attack on that. It's in accordance with a philosophy of laissez-faire economics.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Let me just say one area in which I disagree a bit with you. Most Americans support these programs. I'm talking about huge percentages of Americans—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—who say, no, we don't think that Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid ought to be cut. We don't think so.

So I think, in terms of the role of government, most Americans see that it's important that when it comes to education, when it comes to infrastructure, when it comes to public safety, when it comes to health care, government cannot do it all. Americans aren't saying, just take care of me. From cradle to grave, I want you to take care of me. No. Americans are willing to work hard and play by the rules, but they see an important role for government. If we cut government too much, in some ways, we kill the goose that laid the golden egg. Here is what I mean:

It is true that the Internet really did come from research that was done by government. Look at the billions and billions—I don't know—maybe trillions of dollars, and then look at the advance of the Internet and everything that led from that—bio research, talking about curing diseases. Then, of course, the money that comes from that for the pharmaceutical industry, et cetera, mostly comes from the National Institutes of Health, the Cancer Institute, et cetera, in coming up with the cures and the medications. That's government research. I mean, look at NASA and the space research. It was really the Federal Government, in many ways, that developed the aviation industry. So we'd better be careful about cutting government too much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. We definitely do. I think we've spent about 1½ percent per year of the Federal budget on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from 1958 up until a few years ago.

Can you imagine if the United States Government had left it up to private industry to achieve what happened in 1969, which was that we landed a spaceship, with men inside, and stepped foot on the Moon? Now, some who are not particularly scientifically astute will say, Well, what do we get out of going to the Moon?

I, not being the most astute scientist myself, wouldn't be able to explain all

of the benefits that society has enjoyed as a result of that victory and as a result of the space program that has continued, but I will tell you that, at this point after 50 years of investment, we've now entrusted the private sector to continue the exploration of outer space, and private industry is going to take us further than we have been.

So that is the role of government. It's a support structure. It's an investment in the lives of the people.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Think about the potential in the energy industry if we just help to promote some of these clean, renewable energy technologies.

One of the things on this cliff is the end of the wind energy production tax, which has been so incredibly successful in helping build this wind industry that is ready to take off but still needs a bit more support. This means clean energy to my State, Illinois, and the Middle West, where we've got lots of wind—it's free. And investing in wind energy—if that expires, we're going to lose 7,000 jobs in Illinois alone because of the failure to help invest in the wind energy industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. It's not profitable at this time for private industry to invest in such a new way of producing energy. There's no profit in it, so they won't do it. Government has the leadership and the vision to understand where we need to go, how we need to take our people into the future. We—the public policy apparatus, the government, we the people, the government being of us—have a responsibility not just to enhance short-term profits; we have a responsibility as a government to plan and prepare for the future of this great Nation.

We also have an inherent responsibility to lead the world. We're all in this world together. We all are going to breathe the same air. We're all going to drink from the same pool of water that exists on this planet. So we being the greatest Nation in the world are really shirking our responsibility by reducing government down to the size where you can drown it in a bathtub. I think that's the analogy that Grover Norquist used.

□ 1400

If you did that, where would America be? How would we have built the Interstate Highway System?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. That was Eisenhower; wasn't it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Yes. A Republican, by the way, 1958, I believe it was, decided that this country needed an interstate highway system. Where would we be if we had not committed the dollars to get that done?

When we did that, it was an investment in the future prosperity of this Nation to link cities, towns, and States with a way, a mode of transportation. They did that in the 1800s with the railroad system, another situation where the Federal Government supplied the seed money and gave away the land to help it become a profitable industry.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Along rail lines, along highways, of course, that's the engine of commerce that keeps not only our wheels turning, but the stores—everything going, all of the infrastructure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. That's what it's all about. Government is the entity which primes the economic pump through which prosperity then flows.

So we're now at a point, though, where: Are we going to turn everything over to the big businesses, and are we going to reduce the ability of people to be able to come together in a workplace and bargain collectively? Are we going to take steps to eliminate people from voting so that those who are the chosen ones can elect the people of their choice, and all of the rest of the people are just supposed to expect to be treated benevolently by those who are seeking to exploit the capital, the human capital, and make as much money as they can? At whose expense is that?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. You were talking about how government helps to prime the pump. So government spends money, and it spins out and often becomes commercialized. There are three ways that we can really deal with our economy right now to make it stronger: We can raise revenue, that's raising taxes; we can cut spending; and the third—that's not talked about enough—is the issue of growth in the economy, jobs. Jobs, jobs, jobs. That's what grows the economy.

I am so proud that our President, as part of this overall deficit reduction plan, has recommended spending about \$50 billion on jobs. They would spend money on infrastructure, infrastructure spending that's supported by both business and labor because it is so important. And it's kind of a no-brainer. If you spend money that will create jobs, you now have people, one, who are not having to get unemployment insurance or food stamps. They are working and can support their families, so we get them off public support. And, two, now they're paying taxes. They're going out and they're buying stuff, and businesses are going to have to hire more people because they're buying holiday presents for their kids. They're buying winter coats now. So there is an economy through growth. That is an underrated portion when we talk about how do we save our economy.

I have been circulating a letter among our colleagues, Representative JOHNSON, saying we ought to encourage investment, that we ought to encourage spending on jobs in this deficit reduction, this economic growth package.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. We have to stimulate, as government does, economic vitality. We can do that. It has been done repeatedly throughout the history of this country. A great example is the recent \$787 billion stimulus that was passed back in, I think, 2007.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Some people say it didn't create any jobs. Well, I think

□ 1410

the testimony is that many of our colleagues, almost all of our colleagues, showed up at the ribbon cuttings.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Yes, with the big checks. And they were actually clamoring for that Federal money, and it made an important difference. It allowed States and local governments to retain teachers and firefighters, police officers, construction workers. You know, the whole nine. That's, in part, the reason why we have such an uptick in our economy, however modest it might be right now. That \$787 billion stimulus has made a difference, and I'm glad.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. It actually created millions of jobs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Yes, it sure did.

And so I readily signed on your letter that you're circulating, your "Dear Colleague" letter. And I'm glad to know, as well, that the President has included a modest \$50 billion stimulus aspect in his proposal to strike a grand bargain and avoid the fiscal cliff. So all of these things are a part of what is hopefully being negotiated now.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. You were talking about a difference in philosophy and even economic philosophy. There are those who call that top 2 percent the job creators. Well, if that's true, then where are the jobs? Because most of the growth, almost all of the growth in income over the last many years has gone to the wealthiest Americans where, for ordinary Americans, their income has remained flat.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Actually, since 1979, the income, or the after-tax income, of the top 2 percent has increased by about 372 percent, if I recall the correct number, 372 to 378, while, as you say, regular working people, the middle class, their incomes have remained flat. It's actually a redistribution of the wealth of the country.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. When we have a situation in this country where the top 1 percent of Americans, 1 percent, control as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent, that's not a healthy situation. I don't want to moralize about it. It's just not a healthy situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. No, it's not healthy. And it's amoral. Greed, when you've got to get more, more, more and you're not willing to share, you're not willing for everyone to prosper; and when you think that a person is poor because they don't want to get out and work, they have bad habits, they didn't do this, they didn't do that and, therefore, they deserve to be where they are now. But me, I did it the old-fashioned way, I inherited my money. And so don't blame me. I'm going to make more money and I don't care about you, I'm going to make money off of you, that is rather immoral, rather shortsighted.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I have to tell you, I introduced legislation that actually would increase the taxes on people starting at a million going up, ratcheting up, different tax brackets up to a billion dollars.

And I've got a lot of very rich people who say, yeah, that's fair. That's right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. It's only a few, like Sheldon Adelson, the Koch brothers, who want to control the public policy apparatus. They want to control government so that they can have government to make them more money. That's all they're interested in is themselves, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. But let me just say this: the other philosophy, though, is that if you have a robust middle class of consumers who will actually have enough money in their pockets, middle class people, hopefully even including those who aspire to the middle class have more money in their pockets, that that is what's going to drive the economy. They're going to go out, and they're going to spend the money, and that's going to spread throughout the economy.

Whereas, the wealthiest Americans may buy another yacht, but probably are just going to accumulate that kind of money and really don't do nearly what the middle class does to make a robust economy for everyone. When we all do better, we all do better.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. We all do better when the money is circulating. Those on the top end, they're going to continue to make money; but those who are just working people, regular working people, and those who aspire to the middle class, when that money is circulating, then we can all, collectively, become more wealthy, and we will all spend more dollars, and that means more goods and services have to be produced, and that means you have to have people employed to service the needs of those with the money.

So it's just really common sense. Instead of trying to break the unions, we should be trying to solidify the relationships that the unions have established with their employers.

Detroit is a fine example of how the greatest, richest union, the Auto Workers Union, came to the table with the corporate bosses, after the corporate bosses had run the business into the ground, and needed a bailout from government, and President Obama made a determination that we're going to invest money in GM and in Chrysler, and we're going to not let those companies go bankrupt.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. That was a lot of jobs that would have gone down.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. And so we spent \$700 billion. And it was the United Auto Workers union that sat down at the negotiating table with Big Business, worked out what some may call give-backs. It actually gave up some of the benefits that it had signed contracts for with the employer.

These are things that actually created the middle class, things like working days, working hours, wages, benefits, retirement, those kinds of things that people would not have had unless they had been represented by a union and we had strong unions.

So those things workers gave back in part to make sure that the corporations could maintain or regain stability. And so now, just a short, 3, 4, 5 years later, GM is back to being the number one car maker in the world.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. And all the money's been paid back to the United States Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I think they still owe us a little bit. We still have some GM stock. The Federal Government still owns some GM stock, which they're going to have to repurchase those shares from us. So we are still involved, but that's another example of the role of government.

And I, myself, I'll never be one to hate government. And I try to explain to people why government is not the problem. Government is a part of the solution.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Part of the solution.

Can I just ask, Mr. Speaker, how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The gentlewoman from Illinois has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I want to say a few things about organized labor.

I'm old enough, Congressman JOHNSON, when I was growing up, one person could work in the steel mills on the south side of Chicago, tough job, but you could not only make a decent wage that put you in the middle class; you could buy a car, you could have a little house, modest house, and you could even afford to send your kids to college. You had health care benefits. You had a pension, a private pension. And that was the normal. That was the normal in the United States. You worked hard, often really hard, but you could, you know, make a wage that would afford you a good, middle class life.

I think there's a lot of people who think that, well, unions, that is so 20th century. You know, that was yesterday. We don't need them anymore today. But I want to say that if we have a low-wage economy—you know, some of the companies that are coming back to the United States, you know what they're saying, that the differential in wages between the United States and Bangladesh is insignificant enough that they might as well come back and make their products in the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. You've got an educated work force, relatively speaking. You've got enhanced transportation abilities here to get your goods and services to market quickly, as opposed to the expense and the security of coming across the water. And I'm happy that businesses are looking to re-establish their production facilities inside of America. That's good corporate consciousness.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Let me end with this since we just have a couple of minutes. As we face all these negotiations that are going on, I think there's a couple of bottom lines. One—and the President has been very clear—we are

going to have to ask the wealthiest Americans to pay a bit more.

And, number two, I think we ought to say that those programs that help people have a decent retirement—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, as well—that that is the wrong place to go in order to balance our budget. We don't have to go to the poorest people. We can make those programs more efficient. We can cut the costs of those programs, but we don't have to reduce the benefits and further impoverish people who aren't making a lot of money right now.

For me, those are sort of bottom lines for the deal that we want to make. All of us are in this together. We should all see each other as our brother's and sister's keepers. With that kind of philosophy in mind, I think we can come up with some sort of an agreement that serves our country, that serves its people, that is just and fair and helps us go forward.

Do you have a final word?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. No, that's enough said. Let me say how much I enjoyed our colloquy today, and I look forward to continuing to work with you to ensure that America remains the great Nation that it has always been.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1420

#### TAX BURDEN IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate my colleagues for their take on where we are, and I wanted to offer kind of an alternative view on that. And it's not an alternative view in that it is one that's not commonly shared. It's a bipartisan view. But we hadn't heard it much in this particular debate.

I want to take you back, Mr. Speaker, to John F. Kennedy. He's a revered President for a whole variety of reasons. I come from a rock-solid, hard-core conservative district in the State of Georgia, but I absolutely see the wisdom of so much of what President Kennedy was trying to do for the country. He said this:

It's a paradoxical truth that tax rates are too high and tax revenues are too low, and the soundest way to raise the revenues in the long run is to cut the rates now. The purpose of cutting taxes now is not to incur a budget deficit but to achieve the more prosperous, expanding economy which can bring a budget surplus.

John F. Kennedy, November 20, 1962. Those words are as true today as they were then, Mr. Speaker. But we have a different kind of budget challenge today than we had then. The largest budget deficits in your and my lifetime, Mr. Speaker, were run up during the George W. Bush administration. Again, I come from a hard-core

red State, Republican through and through in our part of the world, and I can tell you the largest budget deficits in the history of this country were run up during a Republican Presidential administration. And those record-setting deficits have now been surpassed.

We're not running 100 percent of those deficits today. We're not running 200 percent of those deficits today. We're not running 300 percent of those deficits today. Mr. Speaker, the deficits today are almost four times larger than what was formerly the largest budget deficit in American history. We've got to get a handle on that.

There are revenue components, there are spending components, but it seems like this town is obsessed with the tax side of that ledger. I want to talk about that because, for Pete's sake, I didn't come to Congress to be a Congressman; I came to Congress to make America better. I came to Congress to solve the problems that plague my family and my neighbor's family and the families surrounding us in the community. I came to Congress to make a difference.

So it's whatever we need to do here, Mr. Speaker, to make a difference. And I don't mean just to change things. Change for change's sake has no constituency with me. I mean to make a difference so that our children's lives and our grandchildren's lives are better than they would be otherwise.

Let me go again to John F. Kennedy and how he was trying to make a difference. He said this:

Lower rates of taxation will stimulate economic activity and so raise the levels of personal and corporate income as to yield, within a few years, an increased—not a reduced—flow of revenues to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, he was right. He was right then. Ronald Regan was right when he said it. President Clinton was right in the tax cuts that he presided over, as was President Bush. It's absolutely true. I'll say it again:

Lower rates of taxation will stimulate economic activity and so raise the levels of personal and corporate income as to yield, within a few years, an increased—not a reduced—flow of revenues to the Federal Government.

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

Why do I bring this up? Is there anybody in Washington, D.C., who's talking about cutting tax rates? And the answer is no. There's really not. There's not one person in this Chamber who comes to the floor and talks about cutting tax rates. We might like to, but we're in a tough economic crisis right now and folks are concerned about the revenue side of the equation. What folks are talking about, though, is not raising tax rates. And for some reason, for reasons that I can't understand, Mr. Speaker, the President has gotten wrapped around the axle on an insistence that actual rates go up. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER offered him revenue. He said, If you just want the money, we'll find a way to get the

money through taxes. It doesn't have to be through higher rates. We can do it by broadening the base, by reducing exceptions and exemptions, by eliminating loopholes and deductions. The President said, No, I want actual higher rates.

President Kennedy talked about the damage of those higher rates, Mr. Speaker. It's as true today as it was then. When we're not talking about higher rates from the White House, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about fairness.

And I've got to tell you, Mr. Speaker, you and I are freshmen in this body. We came with the largest freshman class in modern times. And we came not from folks who had dreams of being a Congressman one day, but folks who were from families back home that were struggling and people were running for Congress then because they wanted to find a better way. Folks did not come to be Congressmen; they came to be agents of change, to make a difference for America, to make sure the promise of America continues for another generation. And yet we find ourselves in this debate about whether now is the right time to raise taxes on family-owned businesses, whether now is the right time to raise taxes on American job creators.

Milton Friedman is one of my favorite economists. He's a Nobel Prize-winning economist. He passed on from this Earth, but his words remain with us today. He said this about taxes, and I think it's profound. He said:

There is all the difference in the world, however, between two kinds of assistance through government that seem superficially similar.

Two kinds, superficially similar.

The first, when 90 percent of us agree to impose taxes on ourselves in order to help the bottom 10 percent.

That happens all the time. It happens all the time. I love the generous spirit of the United States of America. And I've got to tell you I know, Mr. Speaker, folks are from all parts of the world—I'm from Georgia and you're from California—but the people in Georgia, their generosity is second to none, and I love being part of that community. And Milton Friedman says it's one thing when 90 percent of us in America agree to tax ourselves, agree to bear the burden ourselves in order to help 10 percent who are struggling, that's one thing. Or, second, he says:

The other thing is when 80 percent vote to impose taxes on the top 10 percent to help the bottom 10 percent.

Hear that. It's one thing when 90 percent of us agree that we need to bear the burden such that the least fortunate among us can prosper—that's the American way, and I love that about this Nation—but it's something else altogether, Milton Friedman says, when 80 percent decide they want to tax the top 10 percent so that they can help the bottom 10 percent. That is not who we are in America. That is not who we have ever been in America, where we let someone else carry the burden.

What makes this country great is the shared burden. I heard the words “shared burden” from my friends on the other side of the aisle. I hear the words “shared sacrifice” from my friends on the other side of the aisle, and I see proposal after proposal after proposal that exempts most of America from bearing any part of that burden and continuing to place the burden on someone else.

Milton Friedman goes on to say this: “The first way may be wise or unwise”—talking about the 90 percent of us taxing ourselves to help the 10 percent—“that could be unwise, it just depends on why you’re doing it and what the purpose is you’re doing it for. It could be effective or ineffective as a way to help the disadvantaged. But it is consistent with the belief in both equality of opportunity and liberty.”

The second way, Milton Friedman says—that’s the way where 80 percent of the folks agree that they’re going to tax the top 10 percent so that they can help the bottom 10 percent—that second approach seeks equality of outcome and is entirely antithetical to liberty. When we all come together to agree to help one another, that is consistent with a belief in equality of opportunity and liberty, but when we try to amass enough votes in this Chamber or enough votes across the Nation so that we can take from one group to give to another group, that is entirely antithetical to liberty.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today not as a defender of the 1 percent. I’m not in the 1 percent. I do hope one day I’ll be fortunate to have those opportunities. I think that’s what all kids do in America; you try to work hard, apply yourself, good work ethic, good ideas, you want to be successful one day. But I’m not in the 1 percent. But I recognize the immorality of passing on bills to our children and our grandchildren in the form of debt because we, the 80 percent, refuse to take on that burden and, instead, we try to thrust that burden off on someone else.

□ 1430

We have burdens in this country, and it falls to every citizen of this country to shoulder those burdens.

Mr. Speaker, because I do think it’s a moral case, I think folks need to understand what it is the President is proposing and why he’s proposing it. I have two sets of figures here, Mr. Speaker. One is the percent of the income that each kind of strata of American income earner earns. I’ve got the lowest 20 percent of income earners, the second 20 percent, the middle 20 percent, the fourth 20 percent, and the highest 20 percent—in fact, I have the top 1 percent pulled out on the side because they seem to attract so much attention these days.

I also have the share of the individual income tax burden that each of these groups are paying. How many times, Mr. Speaker, have you heard the

President of the United States say he just wants the top 1 percent to pay a little bit more; he just wants the top 1 percent to do their fair share? How many times have you heard “fair share,” Mr. Speaker? I’ve heard it more times than I can count.

This is what I see: For the most recent year for which the Congressional Budget Office has numbers, the top 1 percent of all income earners earned 13.4 percent of all the income in America. I’ll got to tell you they’re doing well, there’s no doubt about it. They are 1 percent of the population and they are earning 13 percent of all the income in America. That’s impressive. They can afford to pay. They can afford to pay. You won’t get any argument from me.

But today, Mr. Speaker, again, with the most recent numbers the Congressional Budget Office has available, that top 1 percent—that’s earning 13.4 percent of the income in this country—is paying 38.7 percent of all the burden. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what incarnation of fairness leads you to believe that when you earn 13 percent of the money and you’re paying 38 percent of the bills that you need to do more to do your fair share? Mr. Speaker, if you think for a moment that you might fall into that category let me take you to the other end of the spectrum, where the “we” are. I’m not trying to put the burden on someone else, I’m trying to take the burden on myself.

Mr. Speaker, we passed a bill in this Congress that gave a payroll tax break to every single Member of Congress—well, in fact, it gave it to every single member of America. Every citizen in America got this payroll tax break. This was a payroll tax break. As you know, payroll taxes are dedicated to Social Security and Medicare. All they do is fund those important programs. Every man, woman, and child in America knows those two programs are going bankrupt, but this President and this Congress, in their wisdom, passed a bill to give every American a tax break in that category, reducing the amount of tax dollars going into that trust fund. I voted no, but I lost and I got a tax break—didn’t want one, didn’t need one. I have obligations to contribute to the survival of this economy and this Republic, but I got one anyway.

Look at what’s happening here, Mr. Speaker. If you’re in the bottom 20 percent of all income earners, we want you to succeed. Mr. Speaker, if you’re in the bottom 20 percent of all income earners, we develop every single Federal program around the idea that if you apply yourself, if you put your ideas to work, if we can give you enough of a helping hand here, a hand up there, that you will be able to change your economic future, you will be able to improve your income lot tomorrow relative to today.

In the Tax Code, Mr. Speaker, today, if you’re in the bottom 20 percent of all income earners—in fact, if you’re in

the bottom 40 percent of all income earners the Tax Code pays you money. You get every penny of your pay back. It pays you money. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what’s becoming of our Republic? How are we defining “fair share?”

There is no, no, no constituency in this Nation that wants to extend a helping hand more than my constituency does back home. And you know where that comes from—and you see it right now in the tax rates, Mr. Speaker—folks are saying let me give away all the money I can right now because the Tax Code is going to change. I’m not going to give away money next year because I’m going to get punished for it; I’m going to give away money this year instead. Folks who can give do give. Folks who can support this country do support this country.

Mr. Speaker, the top 20 percent of all income earners in this country earn 50 percent of all the income. The top 20 percent of all income earners earn 50 percent of all the income. We can talk about whether or not that’s right, we can talk about where those jobs come from, we can talk about why we can’t get more high-paying jobs, why the highest corporate tax rate in the world is driving all those high-paying jobs overseas, we can talk about all of that. But the fact is that 20 percent of Americans earn 50 percent of all the money. So, what’s a fair burden of the bills for them to pay, Mr. Speaker? Top 20 percent earn 50 percent of the money, so they should certainly pay 50 percent of the bills. In fact, they should pay more than their fair share, right? They should pay 60 percent of the bills—maybe even 70 percent of the bills.

Mr. Speaker, the top 20 percent of income earners today in America pay 94 percent of all the bills—94.1, in fact. What that means, Mr. Speaker, then is that the other 80 percent of us, the other 80 percent of us, families here in this Chamber, 80 percent of America is only paying six percent of the bills.

When you’re in a Republic, Mr. Speaker—a lot of folks say democracy; of course we’re not a democracy, we’re in a Republic—but when the people rule, what becomes of you when 80 percent of the people are only paying 6 percent of the bills. What kind of decisions do I make? I know the answer to that, Mr. Speaker, because I love things that are free with rebate. I don’t know if you read the CVS and Walgreens ads on Sunday like I do, Mr. Speaker—in fact, I look them up online on Saturday night just so I know what to pick up on the way home from church. If toothpaste is free with rebate, I don’t care if I have 12 tubes of toothpaste in the closet at home, I’m going to go by and pick it up because it’s free. We make decisions based on how much things cost us.

Right now, if you think government is too big in this country, if you think we waste government dollars in this country, if you think we tax you too much in this country, understand that

when we go to the voting booths, I get to vote for 100 percent of government benefits and I only have to pay for 6 percent of it. That's true for everybody in the 80 percent, Mr. Speaker. Is it American, is it who we are as a people that 80 percent of us who all get to vote are not asked to shoulder the burden of today's bills?

The thing is, Mr. Speaker, it's not as if they're getting a free ride, it's not as if we're getting a free ride. We are passing the burden on to our children and our grandchildren. You may not have to pay the bill today, your family might not have to pay the bill today, but your children and your grandchildren are going to have to pay that bill tomorrow. It's immoral. It's immoral.

I say that to my conservative colleagues back home in Georgia. I say if someone is willing to spend your money and they're not willing to raise your taxes, don't you dare applaud them because you're just going to have to pay those taxes later when the debt comes due. We either need to stop the spending or we need to pony up the money to pay the taxes. But Mr. Speaker, don't you dare let it be said, the top 1 percent, they earn 13 percent of the income, they're paying 40 percent of the bills, and the President of the United States thinks that's not enough, they need to pay more.

Be very careful, Mr. Speaker, about changing who has skin in the game in this country. When we don't have skin in the game as voters, we make bad decisions. What has always made America great is there has been more that unites us than that divides us, and one of the things that has always united us is that we all have skin in the game. The changes that have been made to the Tax Code are changing that, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I'm not the first one to come up with this idea. A man much wiser than I am, much earlier in this country's history, Benjamin Franklin, observed that very same thing. He's cited to have said this: "When the people find that they can vote themselves money, that will herald the end of the Republic." One of the great thinkers of his time, Mr. Speaker. What he observed is not rocket science, it's common sense, but it's worth restating. That is, when you're in a Republic, when you're in a democracy, 51 percent of the people can get together and say I don't want to shoulder any of the burden, I want to put it all on the 49 percent and let's live life that way. That signals the end of the Republic. It's always been true, it always will be true. What unites us as a country is that we are not shirkers of responsibility, we are acceptors of responsibility, and we want skin in the game.

□ 1440

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to let it be said that the President today, President Obama, is the first President to have ever come up with the idea that

wouldn't it be neat if none of the voters have to pay for anything except for the top 1 percent, wouldn't that be a good plan.

That has actually been the plan of every American President in my lifetime and every Congress in my lifetime. Why? Because folks want to get elected. Folks want the voters back home to think nice things about them. And guess what. When I go home and I tell people they have to actually pay for government, they're less excited than when I tell them it's free.

In 1979, the last President from the great State of Georgia, Jimmy Carter, when he took office, the bottom 80 percent, most of us, 80 percent of Americans paid 35 percent of the bills. Eighty percent of us paid 35 percent of the bills in 1979. The top 1 percent at that time were paying 18 percent of the bills.

Look what's happened in my adult lifetime, Mr. Speaker. This red line represents the burden that we placed on the 1 percent. The blue line represents the burden that we placed on the 80 percent. And it is so changed today that, again, the bottom 80 percent of us, middle class America, the bread and butter of this country, are paying 6 percent of the bills.

Mr. Speaker, we owe America better than that. Folks need to make informed decisions at the voting box, and government isn't free. We spend \$3.8 trillion—trillion dollars—a year in this government. When you are paying 6 cents out of every dollar, you may think you're getting your money's worth, but if you were paying 10 cents out of every dollar, or 50 cents out of every dollar, or even \$1 out of every dollar, you begin to view your responsibilities for ensuring that government dollars are spent wisely differently.

I just asked you, we are in control of our own destiny. I tell the kids I talk to in schools all the time that what's so great about this country is they're going to run it one day, and it's going to look however it is they want it to look within the bounds of the United States Constitution.

Is this the kind of country you want to live in where, when times get tough, when burdens have to be carried, when bills have to be paid, more and more often we say, Do you know what? Don't tax me; tax him. He's the one who should shoulder the burden.

It's a dangerous, dangerous precedent.

There's no question that the wealthy should pay more in this country. They earn more; they should pay more. They have more disposable income. I've never had a wealthy man or woman come to me and say, ROB, I don't want to pay my fair share. In fact, folks come to me all the time and say:

ROB, I'm willing to pay more, except I think you're going to throw it down a rat hole like you threw the last bit I sent to you down a rat hole. And if you guys in Congress ever get your act straight and put us on a path to a bal-

anced budget, I'll be happy to pay a share in order to make that happen. I love this country—love this country.

This is not the country that you and I grew up in, Mr. Speaker. So, why is it, then, if we're talking so much about taxes, why aren't taxes the problem or the solution? The truth is, and you know this, Mr. Speaker, if we tax everything in America not at 10 percent, not at 20 percent, but at 100 percent, if we took everything from every family in America, if every man, woman, and child had all of their income confiscated, if we sold your clothes, your house, and your possessions on the auction block, if we liquidated every single company in America and we put all that money into a bank account in present value, we still wouldn't have enough money to pay for all the promises that this Congress, past Presidents, past Congresses, and this President have made.

This is what I have here, Mr. Speaker. I have a chart of revenue versus spending. This green line is revenue in this country. As a percentage of the size of our economy, it turns out that wealthy people are pretty smart. And so if you start taxing part of their income at 90 percent and part of their income at 20 percent, they just move all their income from the 90 percent category to the 20 percent category. That's what happens here. No matter what the tax rates have been over the history of this country, the modern history of this country, Americans are willing to give about 18 percent of GDP in tax revenue. It's just the way it's been. Tax rates have been as high as 90 percent; we were only paying 18 percent. Tax rates have been as low as 28 percent; we were paying 18 percent.

The red line represents spending. And that's what I want to point out, Mr. Speaker. Spending, historically, has been flat, as well. The red line comes up above the green line, which shows you all the budget deficits that we've been running. It's been a common occurrence in the history of this country. But we are spending today—these are the promises. If we close Congress today, Mr. Speaker, if we never make one new promise, not one new promise in this country, this red line represents the costs of all the promises we've already made.

Spending, not taxes, is the problem. We are in a spending-driven crisis. If you don't believe it, Mr. Speaker, I have another chart here.

The green line, again, this one only goes from 2006 out to 2041, but the green line represents the current taxes that are on the books. The red line represents the spending that we've already promised out of this body. And the blue line represents the tax increase that the President is proposing, the tax increase on small businesses, on family-owned businesses, a tax increase that economists agree is going to lead to slower growth in the jobs market and less hiring. This blue line represents the sum total of that tax increase.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know enough to know that if I'm bringing in this much money and I'm spending this much money, when I add this blue line to it, I still don't have enough money. This chart is labeled #SpendingIsTheProblem, Mr. Speaker. Folks can tweet it out. Spending is the problem. It's not a revenue problem. We're bringing in about the same revenue that we've always brought in in this country. The President can raise taxes all he wants to; he'll never be able to pay for the spending promises that he has made—never. There is not enough money to do it. Spending is the problem.

Current taxes, the President's tax increase and the President's spending plan don't come to balance.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. In fact, here's the President's 10-year budget plan, Mr. Speaker. The President raises taxes by \$2 trillion in his 10-year budget plan, and he doesn't lower the projected debt by one penny, not by one penny from its projected levels in 2013 or 14 or 15, not in 16 or 17 and 18, not in 19 or 20, but just a little bit—and I blew it up so everybody could see it because you can't see it, Mr. Speaker, as it is on the chart. If you raise—if you agree to the President's budget and you raise taxes by \$2 trillion, he predicts that way out in 2021, things will be just a little bit better for America—just a little bit better. Not \$2 trillion better, just a little bit better.

It's not the right plan, Mr. Speaker. Do you know what is the right plan? The one that we've passed here in the House. And by the one that we've passed here in the House, I mean the one we've passed here in the House in a bipartisan way. And by the one that we've passed here in the House in a bipartisan way, Mr. Speaker, I mean the only budget in the entire city of Washington, D.C., that has been passed. It doesn't just make a little bitty change that you can't see 10 years from now, Mr. Speaker. It takes us from this red path, our current spending path, our current debt and deficit path, and it puts us on the road to balance, on the road to balance; not just on the road to eliminating our annual deficits, but on the road to finally paying all the bills back.

Taxes can't do it, Mr. Speaker. They can destroy the economy, but they cannot pay the bills.

Spending is the problem. We can take that challenge on, Mr. Speaker. We have, in this House, with our budget, passed in a bipartisan way, we have taken on those tough challenges.

I say to the President again, Mr. Speaker, I know he wants to raise taxes. He's been talking about it for 2 years. Where are his spending cuts? They asked the folks in the Presidential debate, Mr. Speaker, Republicans, would you agree to a \$1 tax increase if we'd cut spending by \$10, and everybody said no.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the President to give that a whirl. Take all

these tax increases he wants to create, the ones that have absolutely no chance at all of solving the problem, take those tax increases and couple them 10 to 1 with spending cuts, couple them 9 to 1 with reforms and programs, couple them 8 to 1 with things that will actually matter to American families and send that bill to the Congress. Send that bill. Call our bluff. Are we serious about solving the problem or are we not? The budget that we passed in this United States House says that we are, Mr. Speaker, and I challenge the President to be equally serious.

In 4 years of his budgets, we've never once seen him introduce one that was balanced. We've never once seen him introduce one that ever comes to balance. We've never once seen him introduce one that pays back even a penny of our national debt.

The bipartisan budget we passed in this House does all of those things. And I would love to see the President's proposal for achieving that very same goal, which is absolutely critical for the American economy, for American families, and, I dare say, Mr. Speaker, for the American way of life.

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

□ 1450

#### PRESIDENT MOHAMED MORSI'S ALLEGIANCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. As most anyone can tell you, it's important to know who your friends are and who your enemies are. That's absolutely true when it comes to knowing who to deal with favorably and unfavorably when it comes to foreign relations, when it comes to gifts to foreign nations.

An article from December 11, by Maxim Lott says the following:

Key lawmakers are expressing concerns about the Obama administration's plan to send 20 F-16 fighter jets to Egypt, where new President Mohamed Morsi's allegiances are as uncertain as his grip on power.

Under a foreign aid deal signed in 2010, when Morsi's U.S.-friendly predecessor Hosni Mubarak was in charge, the U.S. is giving the planes to Egypt's air force, which already has more than 200 of the aircraft. The first four jets are to be delivered beginning January 22, a source at the naval air base in Fort Worth, where the planes have been undergoing testing, told FoxNews.com. But the \$213 million gift is raising questions on Capitol Hill as Morsi is under fire for trying to seize dictatorial powers and allegedly siccing thugs and rapists on protesters.

That's the allegation.

The article goes on:

Florida Representative Vern Buchanan, who recently called for ending foreign aid to Egypt altogether, said the Muslim Brotherhood-backed Morsi government has been sending increasingly troubling signals to Washington, and giving it state-of-the-art fighter jets is a dangerous idea.

It quotes VERN as saying:

American tax dollars must not be used to aid and abet any dictatorial regime that stands with terrorists.

Representative Mac Thornberry from Texas, vice chairman of the House Armed Services Committee told FoxNews.com Egypt is a wildcard under Morsi. At this point:

We don't know where Egypt is headed, Thornberry said. We should be cautious about driving them away, but we should also be cautious about the arms we provide.

The article says:

Just last week, vigilante supporters of Morsi captured dozens of protesters, detaining and beating them before handing them over to police. According to human rights advocates, Morsi-backed groups have also been accused of using rape to intimidate female protesters who have gathered in Cairo's Tahrir Square to protest a sharia-based constitution and Morsi's neutering of the nation's legal system.

The U.S. Government ordered and paid for the fighter jets for Egypt's military back in 2010. But since Mubarak's ouster, the democratically elected Morsi has sent mixed signals about whether he wants an alliance with Washington, even meeting with leaders in Iran earlier this year.

The Morsi-led Muslim Brotherhood government has not proven to be a partner for democracy, as they had promised, given the recent attempted power grab, a senior Republican congressional aid told FoxNews.com.

Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen from Florida, who chairs the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, recently criticized U.S. military aid to Egypt. She said:

The Obama administration wants to simply throw money at an Egyptian Government that the President cannot even clearly state is an ally of the United States.

The package had to be approved by lawmakers in Washington. While the basic F-16 has been a military workhorse for top Air Forces for more than 25 years, the cockpit electronics are constantly updated and the models Egypt is getting are the best defense contractor Lockheed Martin makes.

This is a great day for Lockheed Martin and a testament to the enduring partnership and commitment we've made to the government of Egypt, said John Larson, vice president, Lockheed Martin F-16 programs. We remain committed to providing our customer with a proven, advanced fourth generation multirole fighter.

In an air combat role, the F-16's maneuverability and combat radius exceed that of all potential threat fighter aircraft, the U.S. Air Force description of the plane reads.

The F-16 can fly more than 500 miles, deliver its weapons with superior accuracy, defend itself against enemy aircraft, and return to its starting point. An all-weather capability allows it to accurately deliver ordnance during nonvisual bombing conditions.

A Pentagon spokesman said the United States and Egypt have had an important alliance that is furthered by the transfer:

The U.S.-Egypt defense relationship has served as the cornerstone of our broader strategic partnership for over 30 years, said Lieutenant Colonel Wesley Miller. The delivery of the first set of F-16s in January 2013 reflects the U.S. commitment to supporting the Egyptian military's modernization efforts. Egyptian acquisition of F-16s will increase our military's interoperability and enhance Egypt's capacity to contribute to regional mission sets.

But Malou Innocent, a foreign policy analyst at the Cato Institute, warned that Egypt's murky intentions could lead to the prospect of U.S. ally Israel facing an air assault from even more U.S. made planes.

Should an overreaction by Egypt spiral into a broader conflict between Egypt and Israel, such a scenario would put U.S. officials in an embarrassing position of having supplied massive amounts of military hardware to both belligerents. Given Washington's fiscal woes, American taxpayers should no longer be Egypt's major arms supplier.

□ 1500

There was an article that came out in September of 2012 after the 9/11 horrific killing—murdering—of our Ambassador and three other Americans and of the wounding of other Americans who, apparently, this administration is keeping under wraps so that Members of Congress cannot interview them and find out what really went on. Even after the administration sent out Ambassador Rice with false talking points, we can't find out who created the false talking points. It apparently started out being more correct, but it became false in the way they were used, so they provided such false information to numerous networks and to people in America and around the world.

One thing we do know is that we have the President on video and accurately quoted with this quote. He gave an interview with Telemundo on September 16, 2012, during which President Obama said and, I believe, used the pronoun "them":

I don't think we would consider Egypt an ally, but we don't consider them an enemy. They are a new government that is trying to find its way.

Yet we've still got people in our Air Force at the incredibly able Lockheed Martin facility who are not aware that Egypt is no longer an ally or that the Muslim Brotherhood won the election and that they are about to push through a sharia-based constitution that will further persecute Christians and Jews.

You have a leader in Morsi who, yes, helped to temporarily suspend the altercation in the Gaza Strip with the massive number of rockets that were being flown out of the Gaza Strip into Israel—a constant death threat hanging over Israel. We haven't learned of anything that would indicate that he is slowing the growing importation, through tunnels and otherwise, into the Gaza Strip of more and bigger rockets that threaten Israel, and the President of the United States does not know if Egypt is an ally. He wouldn't say they're an enemy yet, even though they didn't stop the protesters, as they are required to do, from climbing up on our Embassy walls, which is American property, or stop them from bringing down the American flag and running up the Muslim Brotherhood flag.

Mr. Speaker, I'd humbly submit that, until we know for sure that Egypt is not an enemy, we should not be sending 20 F-16s—the most advanced generation of F-16s—to a country which many of its leaders have made clear they want Israel gone off the face of the Earth.

Now, Lockheed Martin relied on the representations of the United States

Government that we were going to buy these planes and give them to our ally Egypt. Perhaps it would have been good if this administration had remembered that the Mubarak administration in Egypt was an ally. They were an ally according to the agreement that this administration made with their friend and ally Hosni Mubarak, as the head of Egypt, to send them a gift of 20 F-16s; but they forgot that, and they supported the removal of Mubarak, who at least made some pretense of trying to keep the peace there on the border of Israel.

Morsi, on the other hand, in coming from the Muslim Brotherhood, doesn't seem so inclined. Simply engaging Gaza in asking them to hold up on sending rockets in to mock, hit, potentially kill Israelis was a nice gesture; but it's hardly evidence of a substantial nature that this is an ally. That's why the President hasn't made clear we're absolutely certain now that they're our ally. Until we are absolutely certain they're an ally, we don't need to be sending them the means and methods to kill Israeli friends. The Israelis are suffering enough and, in part, due to bad judgment here in the United States.

When others outside the United States asked us to go in and get rid of Qadhafi, despite this administration's alliances and relationship with Qadhafi, this administration decided to provide air cover and enable al Qaeda-backed revolutionaries to take out Qadhafi. Qadhafi was not a good man; he had blood on his hands. But after 2003, the Bush administration, followed by the Obama administration, was working with Qadhafi, and he was completely transparent about all the weapons he had. Not so with what's going on in Libya today.

At some point, instead of the President of the United States trying to nullify the Constitution and saying, You know what, I disagree with that marriage law that Congress did, so we're going to ignore it, and as I speak, so it shall be the new law—that's what kings do and that's what pharaohs do. So it would seem a little bit hypocritical if you have someone from an administration who said, You know what, we don't like the immigration law, and so, as I speak it, so shall it be. I will make—I will pronounce—new law because I don't like what was duly passed by Republicans and Democrats in both the House and Senate and was signed by a prior President. So, as I speak new law, so shall it be. It just seems a little hypocritical if an administration like that were to turn around and say, You know, Morsi is just suspending civil rights in Egypt, and we're not sure that he's a good guy for doing that.

That's very interesting because what you have in Egypt is a leader who is taking away civil rights, who is ignoring the existing law. He has backed off of some of the abuses of the law, but he just makes law as he sees fit.

It's time that the people in America, Mr. Speaker, made it clear to the

White House that it's the United States that your allegiance is owed to. It's not to NATO. It's not to the OIC. Yes, we have alliances with them. It's not with the U.N., though we have agreements with them. Your number one alliance is to the people of the United States of America. When anyone is not a supporter—is not an ally—or is someone we're not sure of their ally status, it should not be a country that we start giving planes to even when the alliances are made with a prior administration, because this administration had a good working relationship with Mubarak sufficient to cause President Obama to work this deal with Hosni Mubarak, the leader of Egypt, and sufficient to make them want to just give Egypt under the leadership of Mubarak 20 F-16s. Once that leadership changes and we no longer know whether they're an ally, it is outrageous to send them, or to even contemplate sending them, planes.

What you do with those 20 planes that we already agreed to buy as the U.S. Government and give away is you give them to someone you know is an ally. If you want to give them to somebody, give them to Israel. Israel believes in the same value of life as we do here in the United States. They believe in the equality of women. They believe in the value of children. They do not believe women and children are the property of some man. They have our values and they have had our back, so the best defense money we can spend is in providing a defense to Israel because any nation—look it up—any nation that has said they want to destroy the little Satan of Israel normally follows it up by wanting to destroy the big Satan, the United States. So, according to these wild-eyed radical terrorists, if they see Israel as the little Satan and want to hit Israel, we will be next. We're next on their agenda.

□ 1510

So it is good defense for the United States when we help protect our friend Israel. And the thought that this administration would even still entertain the possibility of sending 20 F-16s to Egypt after we supported the deposing of our ally, President Mubarak, is outrageous. And what I would hope is that somebody in the administration would say, Mr. President, we're going to look pretty stupid if we send 20 F-16s of the most advanced generation to Egypt when they're making waves about and some of their leadership thinks they ought to go ahead and get rid of Israel. And so maybe we'd better hold up on that. And you've got people like Congressman GOHMERT over on the Hill who's talking about how stupid it would be to give 20 F-16s to a potential renegade government if they continue to abuse the civil rights of people in Egypt, he's talking about how stupid it would be, why don't we go forward and say we can't believe that anybody would think for a moment that we're going to send 20 F-16s to a country

when the President has said we don't even know if they're an ally.

I would hope that somebody would tell the President: Let's go out and say people like GOHMERT need to calm down because we're not going to send them. And I would welcome that news. But until that happens, people need to be speaking up and letting the White House know this is outrageous. You don't send advanced aircraft as a gift to a country that has been less than helpful, and we're not even sure if they won't take out Israel or try when they get a chance.

It's a different government. It's not the same country, not the same administration with whom we made an agreement. It hasn't continued under the same constitution or laws. We have to make sure that we have an ally, and we don't know that. In fact, the indications are constantly to the contrary.

So as soon as Clinton goes out after Morsi, goes into Gaza, expresses great sympathy for the people in Gaza, despite the fact they took over a Gaza strip from Israel that Israel unilaterally gave away, hoping it would buy them a semblance of peace, and fully equipped with greenhouses and businesses and ways to make a living and ways to live in great sustenance there on the Gaza strip, they walked away from it, gave it away, and immediately the greenhouses were destroyed. The people are living there in poverty, and they could keep stirring up the venom of hatred among the people, although the people of Israel had just done an incredibly unilateral and generous thing, hoping to buy peace.

But what we see over and over, whether it's in southern Lebanon, whether it's in the Gaza strip, going back historically, any time Israel has given away land hoping to buy some peace, not only have they not bought peace, that land they gave away has ultimately at some point been used as a staging area from which to attack it. How sad would that be that Israel's incredibly generous gift of the Gaza strip, with ways to make a living and have full sustenance, plenty to eat, they gave that as a gift. They took the land and destroyed their ways of sustenance.

And then, the ultimate irony, on top of the irony of that being used as a staging area to launch rockets on a continuous basis into Israel, how ironic if that ends up being the flyover area for new F-16s that we give to Egypt, that Egypt uses in an effort to attack Israel once again. We cannot allow the continued attacks on our allies. Israel has been an ally. Israel is an ally. Israel is operating under the same rules of government that they have when they have been our close ally. They've made mistakes. So have we. But they're our friend. And friends, as I saw when I was down in Florida not long ago, a billboard said, "Friends don't let friends get nuked." We need to take that to heart. It is done a bit tongue-in-cheek, of course.

But this article from back in September, the day after 9/11, the President said in this article, September 12, from NBC's Shawna Thomas:

President Barack Obama said on Wednesday that while he does not believe Egypt is an ally of the United States, he also doesn't consider the country an enemy. 'I think that we are going to have to see how they respond to this incident,' Obama said in an interview with Telemundo anchor Jose Diaz-Balart, host of Noticiero Telemundo. He was referring to Tuesday's protests in Egypt, during which demonstrators, angered by a movie trailer parodying Prophet Muhammad, breached the U.S. Embassy in Cairo.

The President continued:

Certainly in this situation, what we're going to expect is that (the Egyptian government is) responsive to our insistence that our embassy is protected, our personnel is protected, and if they take actions that they're not taking those responsibilities, as all countries do where we have embassies, I think that's going to be a real big problem.

The President is also quoted as saying:

Libya is a government that is very friendly towards us. The vast majority of Libyans welcomed the United States' involvement. They understand that it's because of us that they got rid of a dictator who had crushed their spirits for 40 years.

Those are quotes from President Obama.

The article says President Obama expressed confidence. "Our hope is to be able to capture them,"—talking about the people that attacked us in Libya—"but we're going to have to obviously cooperate with the Libyan government. And you know, I have confidence that we will stay on this relentlessly, because Chris Stevens, he's somebody who actually advised me and Secretary Clinton during the original Libyan uprising. He was somebody who Libyans recognize as being on the side of the people. And we're going to get help. We're going to get cooperation on this."

Well, that's what the President said in September. Now he said we were going to pursue the killers of Ambassador Stevens and the three others "relentlessly," is his term. We will stay on this relentlessly. And yet what we've seen, we find out that they may have the instigator, and there is no outrage that this man has not been provided, turned over to the United States. There's no outrage that this man has not been brought to justice.

Friends don't let other friends get nuked, and friends don't send 20 F-16s to the enemies of their friends. It's time that this administration began to understand history to the point that when you reward your enemies, your enemies get stronger, and they get more abusive and more threatening.

□ 1520

The best thing this administration can do is reward friendship and punish our enemies, and then our enemies cower, and our friends are emboldened, instead of what this administration has done the other way around.

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

#### 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. 3677. An act to make a technical correction to the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973; to the Committee on Financial Services.

#### 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. 2467. An act to take certain Federal lands in Mono County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Bridgeport Indian Colony.

H.R. 3319. An act to allow the Pascua Yaqui Tribe to determine the requirements for membership in that tribe.

H.R. 4014. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to information provided to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

H.R. 4367. An act to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to limit the fee disclosure requirement for an automatic teller machine to the screen of that machine.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 17, 2012, at noon for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8747. A letter from the Manager, BioPreferred Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Designation of Product Categories for Federal Procurement, Round 9 (RIN: 0599-AA15) received December 5, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8748. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenpyroximate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0514; FRL-9360-3] received December 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8749. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Buprofezin Pesticide Tolerances; Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0759; FRL-9371-3] received December 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8750. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Spirodiclofen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0326; FRL-9371-5] received December 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8751. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Zeta Cypermethrin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0472; FRL-9371-7] received December 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8752. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

8753. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Withdrawal of Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; The 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory for the Charleston Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0422; FRL-9759-7] received December 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8754. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; The 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory for the Baltimore, Maryland Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0143; FRL-9759-6] received December 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8755. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; The 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory for the Washington County, Maryland Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0154; FRL-9760-1] received December 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8756. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; The 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory for the Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0119; FRL-9759-9] received December 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8757. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; The 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory for the Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0077; FRL-9760-7] received December 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8758. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Modifications to Renewable Fuel Standard and Diesel Sulfur Programs [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0223; FRL-9758-8] received December 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8759. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-156, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8760. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-095, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8761. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-126, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8762. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-066, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8763. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-162, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8764. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, and continued by the President each year, most recently on November 1, 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8765. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Germany pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8766. A letter from the Deputy Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8767. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's semiannual report from the Office of the Inspector General during the 6-month period ending September 30, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8768. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period April 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8769. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Endowment's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8770. A letter from the Acting Director, Peace Corps, transmitting the Corps' Performance and Accountability report for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8771. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1411; Directorate

Identifier 2011-NM-074-AD; Amendment 39-17206; AD 2012-19-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8772. 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-2012-0593; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-238-AD; Amendment 39-17200; AD 2012-19-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8773. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0644; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-011-AD; Amendment 39-17193; AD 2012-18-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8774. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0192; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-225-AD; Amendment 39-17152; AD 2012-16-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8775. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0038; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-209-AD; Amendment 39-17153; AD 2012-16-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8776. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0422; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-177-AD; Amendment 39-17146; AD 2012-15-16] received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8777. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Corporation's annual financial audit and management report for the fiscal years 2012 and 2011, in accordance with OMB Circular A-136; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8778. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1326; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-177-AD; Amendment 39-17144; AD 2012-15-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8779. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0267; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-174-AD; Amendment 39-17192; AD 2012-18-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8780. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1319; Directorate

Identifier 2011-NM-143-AD; Amendment 39-17151; AD 2012-16-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8781. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1229; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-132-AD; Amendment 39-17181; AD 2012-18-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8782. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0354; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-104-AD; Amendment 39-17165; AD 2012-17-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8783. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0671; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-096-AD; Amendment 39-17197; AD 2012-19-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8784. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0337; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-090-AD; Amendment 39-17185; AD 2012-18-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8785. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Corrections to U.S. Customs and Border Protection Regulations [CBP Dec. 12-21] received December 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8786. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Fees on Health Insurance Policies and Self-Insured Plans for the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Trust Fund [TD 9602] (RIN: 1545-BK59) received December 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## 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. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 6654. A bill to provide for the exchange of information related to trade enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. REED, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 6655. A bill to establish a commission to develop a national strategy and recommendations for reducing fatalities result-

ing from child abuse and neglect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 6656. A bill to reauthorize customs trade facilitation and enforcement functions and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 6657. A bill to condition security assistance and economic assistance to the Government of Egypt in order to advance United States national security interests in Egypt, including encouraging the advancement of political, economic, and religious freedom in Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 6658. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a zero capital gains rate for certain new investments in specified areas made during a temporary period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 6659. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the recovery zone economic development bonds for certain cities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 6660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude dividends from controlled foreign corporations from the definition of personal holding company income for purposes of the personal holding company rules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BACHMANN (for herself, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KLINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota):

H.R. 6661. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Red River Avenue North in Cold Spring, Minnesota, as the "Officer Tommy Decker Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 6662. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a pilot program to study alternatives to the current system of taxing motor vehicle fuels, including systems based on the number of miles traveled by each vehicle; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. BROOKS:

H.R. 6663. A bill to permanently extend the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 6664. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of California all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain National Forest System land to facilitate the relocation of the South Operations Coordination Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 6665. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to provide certain exemptions relating to the taking of migratory game birds; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 6666. A bill to provide a comprehensive approach to preventing and treating obesity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Natural Resources, Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Agriculture, 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. KUCINICH:

H.R. 6667. A bill to establish the Financial Consumers Association to advance the rights and remedies available to consumers with respect to financial services transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KUCINICH:

H.R. 6668. A bill to require the proposal for debarment from contracting with the Federal Government of persons violating the National Labor Relations Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLAY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 6669. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide information to foster youth on their potential eligibility for Federal student aid; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SABLÁN, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 6670. A bill to amend the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991 for the purposes of extending the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991 through 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. McNERNEY (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. MOORE):

H. Res. 831. A resolution honoring and recognizing David "Dave" Warren Brubeck for his contributions in musical composition, jazz, and to the international community; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. ROBY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. CURSON of Michigan, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WATT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HASTINGS

of Florida, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H. Res. 832. A resolution observing the 100th birthday of civil rights icon Rosa Parks and commemorating her legacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### 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. POE of Texas:

H.R. 6654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 6655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 6656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 6657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 6658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sections 7 and 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 6659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sections 7 and 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 6660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BACHMANN:

H.R. 6661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 6662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding income taxes. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that "Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . . (Sec. 8, Cl. 1). Further clarifying Congressional power to enact an income tax, voters amended the Constitution by popular vote to provide that "Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived. . . ." (Sixteenth Amendment). This Act modifies U.S. income tax laws in a manner consistent with these Constitutional authorities.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 6663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 6664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 and clause 18, and Article IV, section 3, clause 2.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 6665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution as upheld by the Supreme Court of Missouri v. Holland, 252 U.S. H16 (1920)

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 6666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. KUCINICH:

H.R. 6667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause III and/or Article 1, Section 8, Clause IXX of the Constitution.

By Mr. KUCINICH:

H.R. 6668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section S, Clause III of the Constitution.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 6669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 6670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 494: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1537: Mr. HANNA and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 2669: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 2672: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 2697: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2775: Mr. CRITZ and Mr. CURSON of Michigan.

H.R. 2931: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 3098: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 5195: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 5871: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 6101: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

R. 6107: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 6388: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 6419: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 6470: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 6575: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 6588: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 6589: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 6597: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. WALBERG.

H. Con. Res. 142: Mr. LATTA and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 144: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H. Res. 193: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. WATT, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H. Res. 220: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. POLIS.

H. Res. 814: Mr. KLINE.

H. Res. 826: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. BURGESS.

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 6 by Mr. WALZ on H.R. 15: ALCEE L. HASTINGS, JOE BACA, GARY L. ACKERMAN, and EDOLPHUS TOWNS.