United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 2011 No. 59

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 4, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE FITZPATRICK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

DEVELOPING A SENSIBLE, NON-INTERVENTIONIST FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, Osama bin Laden applauded the 9/11 attacks. Such an act of deliberate killing of innocent lives deserves retribution. It is good that bin Laden is dead and justice is served. Targeted retribution is far superior to wars of aggression and nation-building.

In 2001, I supported giving the President authority to punish those responsible for the vicious 9/11 attacks. Using this authority and opportunity to pursue nation-building and remaking the Middle East was cynical and dangerous, as the past 10 years have proven. The sad tragedy is that it took 10 years, trillions of dollars, tens of thousands of American casualties and many thousands of innocent lives to achieve our mission of killing one evil person.

A narrow, targeted mission under these circumstances is far superior to initiating wars against countries not involved in the 9/11 attacks. This was the reason I emphasized at the time the principles of marque and reprisal, provided to us by the Constitution for difficult missions such as we faced. I am convinced that this approach would have achieved our goal much sooner and much cheaper.

The elimination of Osama bin Laden should now prompt us to bring our troops home from Afghanistan and Iraq. Al Qaeda was never in Iraq, and we were supposedly in Afghanistan to get Osama bin Laden. With bin Laden gone, there is no reason for our presence in this region, unless indeed it was all about oil, nation-building and remaking the Middle East and Central Asia.

Hopefully, bin Laden does not get the last laugh. He claimed the 9/11 attacks were designed to, number one, get America to spread its military dangerously and excessively throughout the Middle East; two, to cause political dissension within the United States. Seventy percent of the American people now believe we should leave Afghanistan, yet both parties seem destined to stay; and number three, to bankrupt America through excessive military spending, as he did to the Soviets. The best thing we can do is prove bin Laden to be a false prophet.

We must learn from this recent history. Tragically, one result may be the acceptance of torture as a legitimate tool for pursuing our foreign policy. A free society calling itself a republic should never succumb to such evil.

With regard to foreign aid to Pakistan, the fact that bin Laden was safely protected for 10 years in Pakistan should make us question the wisdom of robbing American citizens to support any government around the world with foreign aid. Our failed foreign policy is reflected in our bizarre relationship with Pakistan. We bomb them with our drones, causing civilian casualties, we give them billions of dollars in foreign aid, and she protects America's enemy number one, bin Laden, for a decade.

It is time to consider a sensible, non-interventionist foreign policy as advised by our founders and authorized by our Constitution. We would all be better off for it.

PROPOSED PUERTO RICAN PIPELINE A THREAT TO MOUNTAINS AND RAINFORESTS

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, last weekend I had the honor of participating in a remarkable event in the mountain town of Adjuntas, Puerto Rico. There, thousands braved a torrential downpour to demonstrate against a proposed natural gas pipeline that the current ruling party in Puerto Rico is threatening to build across the mountains and rainforests of the island.

While I was there, I met with Rosanna Lopez Leon, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico's Ombudsman for the Elderly. As ombudswoman, she has unusual latitude for a public servant in the current government to speak the truth about what she hears and sees from senior citizens across the island. Her term is 14 years, longer than that of the Governor's, and the money to her office comes mainly from the Federal Government, from the Older

Printed on recycled paper.

Americans Act, so that she is incorruptible, unassailable, and, thank God, untouchable.

She presented me with a series of letters she wrote to Attorney General Eric Holder and to other Federal agencies and Puerto Rican officials. They are based on sworn affidavits from senior citizens residing in four towns in the path of the proposed pipeline in Puerto Rico, describing how local seniors are being pressured and intimidated into signing over their property for the pipeline's supposed unapproved right-of-way.

Mrs. Lopez Leon believes that ''repetitive violations of the Older Americans Act have become a danger to the lives, health, rights, and property of the elderly population of Puerto Rico.''

She describes illegal trespassing into properties of the elderly under the false pretext of measuring a nonexistent right-of-way, illegal trespassing into the homes of the elderly with the fraudulent pretense to generate a written authorization from the elderly to allow and permit a consented purchase of the property to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the energy company well below market value of the property without granting the elderly the opportunity to seek counsel, a recent appraisal, or to contest the eminent domain procedure which they are threatened with if they do not grant ''a voluntary consent to sell their properties.''

These 41 affidavits are from four towns on the route of the proposed gasoline; Adjuntas, Penuelas, Utuado and Toa Baja. I would like to first talk about one of them, because I will read some short translations from some chilling stories that we have gathered here.

The first one is from Antonia Santiago Cabrera, 69, from Adjuntas, Puerto Rico, who is in this picture. By the way, she was born in this home 69 years ago.

She says, ''The helicopters of the energy company constantly fly over my residence and they do so at a low altitude, disturbing my tranquility. Since my home is built of tin and wood,'' as you see in the picture, ''when the helicopters hover, my entire house trembles. That has generated much anxiety in me, and for this reason I had to visit my primary doctor and have had to take medication for my nerves and my heart condition has even worsened.''

Then there is Lucrecia Maldonado Rentas. She is 82 years old and is pictured in front of her house with her sister Gloria. She says, ''The letters I received were written to pretend to be a study to be conducted on the needs of the population and it ended up being one about natural gas, the pipeline and the expropriation process of the Barrio Portugues community in Adjuntas, Puerto Rico. In them the process of expropriation is presented, but it is not explained. I do not understand it.''

Then there is Mr. Luis Guzman. We don't have a picture of the 67-year-old farmer. Although he has been harassed since last year, Mr. Guzman does not know how to read and can barely write.

□ 1010

He does not need to fully be educated, however, to know the difference between right and wrong. If only choosing between right and wrong would come that easy to the ruling party of Puerto Rico.

I want to make it clear to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this body and to Attorney General Eric Holder that these are not powerful men and women. They are not legal scholars or real estate experts. But they have made simple pleas to the court and their complaints should be heard. They are worried that they will lose their homes and they will lose their crops which sustain them because of the laws and legal maneuvers they do not understand. They are U.S. citizens and need our help.

I plan to post all of the affidavits I have already received, along with hundreds of pages I have received from Federal agencies under the Freedom of Information Act, on my Web site. The more light that is shined on this project, Mr. Speaker, the more it reflects back a dark story of secrets, strong-arming, and shortcuts. I plan to continue shining my light and making as much information public as possible so that the voice of the people of Puerto Rico is heard.

Mr. Speaker, I will place in the RECORD the affidavits presented in court in Puerto Rico from 18 senior citizens in Toa Baja, 10 senior citizens in Adjuntas, 4 senior citizens in Penuelas, and 9 senior citizens in Utuado, along with the correspondence from the Puerto Rico Office of the Ombudsman, an office funded by the Federal Government, an official 14-year standing agency of the Government of Puerto Rico.

The forty-one sworn affidavits in Spanish and other documents in English and Spanish related to the Gasoducto pipeline project are posted on Rep. GUTIERREZ'website:http://www.gutierrez.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content &view =article&id=662&Itemid=73.

COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO,
PUERTO RICO OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN FOR THE ELDERLY,
San Juan, Puerto Rico, April 25, 2011.

Re: Complaint by the Puerto Rico Office of the Ombudsman for the Elderly Against The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and The Puerto Rico Energy Power Authority.

Hon. ERIC HOLDER,
U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, Office of the Assistant Attorney General, Main, Washington, DC.

DEAR SIR: The Puerto Rico Office of the Ombudsman for the Elderly (hereinafter OPPEA) represented by the undersigned, Hon. Rossana López León, is the ''state unit on aging of Puerto Rico'' in charge of enacting the Older Americans Act by virtue of the provisions of Act No. 203 of August 7, 2004, as well as by the ''Bill of Rights for Aged Persons in Puerto Rico,'' Act No. 121 of July 12, 1986, as amended.

OPPEA, upon attending to the needs of this specific population, acts as an enabling agent in the search for a better quality of life for these residents, who on occasion are deprived of their civil and human rights as members of our society for which it receives substantial federal funds. As a matter of fact, OPPEA receives 90% of its budget from federal sources.

The creation of this office serves the purpose of reaffirming the importance of the elderly citizens in our country, guaranteeing their full enjoyment of the rights and prerogatives which they are entitled to.

ORGANIZATION

OPPEA was created through local public Law Number 203, dated August 7, 2004, as a governmental organism responsible for establishing public policy, planning and coordinating with other public agencies the design and development of projects and programs in order to attend basic needs of the elderly population, establishing the rights of the elderly people, in order to help them attain an enjoyable and productive life and their maximum possible participation in community affairs. All funds, equipment personnel and other assets and liabilities previously managed by OGAVE (Governor's Office for Elderly Affairs) were transferred to OPPEA as a result of the above law.

OPPEA is the local organism responsible for planning and coordinating all matters related to federal awards received from federal laws for the purpose of attending the problems of the elderly population.

OPPEA is also the agency designated to administer and implement the federal programs of federal public Law 89–73 dated July 14, 1965, as amended, known as ''Older Americans Act.'' It can also be designated by the Governor of Puerto Rico as the local agency in charge of any other federal awards destined for elderly programs.

Local public Law Number 203 permits OPPEA to design programs in order to provide possible work opportunities and training and re-training to elderly citizens. Also, it offers alternatives in order for elderly people to join actively in the community and, for those able to, to provide consultative or professional services to the community.

OPPEA operates under an Ombudsman named by the Governor of Puerto Rico, with the consent and advice of the Senate of Puerto Rico for a fixed term of 14 years with the responsibility of organizing and directing the functions of the Office. The current Ombudsman is appearing Plaintiff, Hon. Rossana López León whose term expires on 2014.

Other functions and duties of OPPEA are:

a. Encourage participation of citizens in the development and implementation of programs and projects for the elderly people;

b. Provide technical advice and guidelines to other public agencies and/or private institutions who request them in order for them to improve the services they render to elderly citizens;

c. Organize and prepare conferences and seminars, and perform studies and investigations, by themselves or in coordination with other public agencies or private entities, in order to develop new approaches and methods, and the development of the necessary personnel to provide services to the elderly population;

d. Compile, accumulate and analyze all statistical data necessary for the planning, coordination and the development of a public policy related to elderly affairs, that responds to the needs of the particular moment;

e. Educate the community regarding the elderly affairs in order to create a positive attitude towards the elderly population;

f. Provide information to elderly people regarding the services, benefits, programs and

activities that public agencies and private entities offer; and

g. Recommend to the Governor of Puerto Rico and the Legislative Assembly those procedures they believe necessary in order to attend the problems and necessities of the elderly community.

h. Attend to grievances brought by elderly citizens, including the imposition of fines and the compensation for damages.

Now, The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (hereinafter ELA) in cohort with the Puerto Rico Energy Power Agency (hereinafter PREPA) have placed into action a project, The Via Verde Pipeline, which is a planned natural gas network to supply energy from north to south in Puerto Rico, a project of Governor Luis Fortuño.

The pipeline will distribute natural gas from the Peñuelas/Guayanilla area north to the Arecibo Cambalache Plant on to Palo Seco/San Juan.

''Via Verde'' will negatively impact forest areas, hydrographic basins, lands fit for agriculture, and the all-important and endangered karstic region of northern Puerto Rico. It will also represent further dependence on another form of fossil fuel that, while less polluting than the current oil based system of electricity generation, will still contribute to global warming.

Furthermore, more than 200 elderly individuals, under the protection of the Older Americans Act are being affected and their rights under that federal statute and the Constitution being breached and violated by Commonwealth and PREPA.

These repetitive violations have become a danger to the lives, health, rights and property of the elderly population of the sector being impacted by the Via Verde project by way of illegal trespassing into the properties of the elderly under the false pretext of measuring a non existing right of way, illegal trespassing into the homes of the elderly with fraudulent pretenses to generate a written authorization from the elderly to allow and permit a consented purchase of their property to the Commonwealth and PREPA well below market value of the property, without granting the elderly the opportunity to seek counsel, a recent appraisal of their property or to contest the eminent domain procedure which they are threatened with if they do not grant a ''voluntary'' consent to sell their properties.

Furthermore, the elderly population is being targeted with a psychological ''warfare'' tactic through constant ''buzzing'' of low flying Commonwealth and Understanding that these actions and policies are an open violation of the Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, among others, we request a formal criminal and civil investigation from your Department.

After the investigation we are confident that your Department will have reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment of any of the rights secured by the law, and that the pattern or practice is of such a nature and is intended to deny the full exercise of the rights of our client and of many others numbering in the thousands.

If you have any doubts or questions, please do not hesitate to contact us at (787) 721–6121.

Cordially,

ROSSANA LÓPEZ LEÓN, MSG,
Ombudsman for the Elderly.

COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO,
PUERTO RICO OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN FOR THE ELDERLY,
San Juan, Puerto Rico, April 25, 2011.

Re: Complaint by The Puerto Rico Office Of The Ombudsman For The Elderly Against The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and The Puerto Rico Energy Power Authority.

Hon. YESMIN M. VALDIVIESO,
Oficina del Contralor de Puerto Rico, Estado Libre Asociado De Puerto Rico, San Juan, PR.

DEAR SIR: The Puerto Rico Office Of The Ombudsman For The Elderly (herein after OPPEA) represented by the undersigned, Hon. Rossana López León, is the ''state unit on aging of Puerto Rico'' in charge of enacting the Older Americans Act by virtue of the provisions of Act No. 203 of August 7, 2004, as well as by the ''Bill of Rights for Aged Persons in Puerto Rico'', Act No. 121 of July 12, 1986, as amended.

OPPEA, upon attending to the needs of this specific population, acts as an enabling agent in the search for a better quality of life for these residents, who on occasion are deprived of their civil and human rights as members of our society for which it receives substantial federal funds. As a matter of fact, OPPEA receives 90% of its budget from federal sources.

The creation of this office serves the purpose of reaffirming the importance of the elderly citizens in our country, guaranteeing their full enjoyment of the rights and prerogatives which they are entitled to.

OPPEA is also the agency designated to administer and implement the federal programs of federal public Law 89–73 dated July 14, 1965, as amended, known as ''Older Americans Act''. It can also be designated by the Governor of Puerto Rico as the local agency in charge of any other federal awards destined for elderly programs.

Now, The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (herein after Commonwealth) in cohort with the Puerto Rico Energy Power Agency (herein after PREPA) have placed into action a project called The Vía Verde Pipeline which is a planned natural gas network to supply energy from north to south in Puerto Rico a project of Governor Luis Fortuño.

The pipeline will distribute natural gas from the Peñuelas/Guayanilla area north to the Arecibo Cambalache Plant on to Palo Seco/San Juan.

''Via Verde'' will negatively impact forest areas, hydrographic basins, lands fit for agriculture, and the all-important and endangered karstic region of northern Puerto Rico.

Moreover, it should be public notice that the Government of Puerto Rico has not only already spent millions of dollars from state public coffers but also from federal sources like ARRA and has reauthorized multimillion dollar contracts for the purchase of land, materials (gas pipeline) and the construction of the gas pipeline itself, without the appropriate permits from the U.S. Corps of Engineers, U.S. Wildlife and Fisheries and other relevant federal agencies. Thus, this project which is being constructed is illegal for lack of appropriate permits.

This situation is not only contrary to the Law 230 of July 31, 1974 (3 L.P.R. secc. 283) as amended, also known as the Puerto Rico Accounting Law, but also in direct contrast to Law 96 of June 26, 1964 as amended. See also the Opinions of the Justice Secretary of Puerto Rico number 2010–15 and H.M.C.A. (P.R.) Inc et al v. Contralor 126 D.P.R. 478 (1990).

Furthermore, the 800,000 elderly residents of Puerto Rico, which we represent and have and are contributing to the General Fund of the Commonwealth and the budgeted funds of PREPA which are being used illegally to fund a project which has not even received the proper permits by federal agencies in order to commence the construction of the project, wish to formally file a Complaint before your agency.

Our client has sworn statements from many of the elderly population being seriously affected by the actions undertaken by Commonwealth and PREPA as well as a psychological study of the adverse effect that these actions have caused on the general elderly population of the areas impacted by the Via Verde project.

After the investigation we are confident that your Department will have reasonable cause to believe that the Commonwealth and PREPA are engaged in a pattern or practice of illegally using public funds for the Via Verde project.

If you have any doubts or questions, please feel free to contact us at (787) 721–6121.

ROSSANA LÓPEZ LEÓN, MSG,
Ombudsman for the Elderly.

COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO,
PUERTO RICO OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN FOR THE ELDERLY
San Juan, Puerto Rico, April 25 2011.

Re Complaint by The Puerto Rico Office Of The Ombudsman For The Elderly Against The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and The Puerto Rico Energy Power Authority.

Hon. J. RANDOLPH BABBITT,
U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Washington, DC.
FANNY RIVERA,
U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Washington, DC.
MARGARET GILLIGAN,
U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Washington, DC.
SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO FSDO,
San Juan, Puerto Rico.

DEAR SIR: The Puerto Rico Office Of The Ombudsman For The Elderly (herein after OPPEA), represented by the undersigned, Hon. Rossana López León, is the ''state unit on aging of Puerto Rico'' in charge of enacting the Older Americans Act by virtue of the provisions of Act No. 203 of August 7, 2004, as well as by the ''Bill of Rights for Aged Persons in Puerto Rico'', Act No. 121 of July 12, 1986, as amended.

OPPEA, upon attending to the needs of this specific population, acts as an enabling agent in the search for a better quality of life for these residents, who on occasion are deprived of their civil and human rights as members of our society for which it receives substantial federal funds. As a matter of fact, OPPEA receives 90% of its budget from federal sources.

The creation of this office serves the purpose of reaffirming the importance of the elderly citizens in our country, guaranteeing their full enjoyment of the rights and prerogatives which they are entitled to.

OPPEA is also the agency designated to administer and implement the federal programs of federal public Law 89–73 dated July 14, 1965, as amended, known as ''Older Americans Act''. It can also be designated by the Governor of Puerto Rico as the local agency in charge of any other federal awards destined for elderly programs.

Now, The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (herein after Commonwealth) in cohort with the Puerto Rico Energy Power Agency (herein after PREPA) have placed into action a project denominated The Vía Verde Pipeline which is a planned natural gas network to supply liquefied gas from north to south in Puerto Rico, a project of Governor Luis Fortuño.

The pipeline will distribute natural gas from the Peñuelas/Guayanilla area north to the Arecibo Cambalache Plant on to Palo Seco/San Juan.

''Via Verde'' will negatively impact forest areas, hydrographic basins, lands fit for agriculture, and the all-important and endangered karstic region of northern Puerto Rico.

Furthermore, more than 200 elderly individuals, under the protection of the Older American Act are being affected and their rights under that federal statute and the Constitution being breached and violated by Commonwealth and PREPA.

These repetitive violations have become a danger to the lives, health, rights and property of the elderly population of the sector being impacted by the Via Verde project by way of illegal trespassing into the properties of the elderly under the false pretext of measuring a non existing right of way, illegal trespassing into the homes of the elderly with fraudulent pretenses to generate a written authorization from the elderly to allow and permit a consented purchase of their property to the Commonwealth and PREPA well below market value of the property, without granting the elderly the opportunity to seek counsel, a recent appraisal of their property or to contest the eminent domain procedure which they are threatened with if they do not grant a ''voluntary'' consent to sell their properties.

Furthermore, the elderly population is being targeted with a psychological ''warfare'' tactic through constant ''buzzing'' of low flying Commonwealth and PREPA helicopters, some of which ''sit'' on top of the elderly individuals residences for a prolonged period of time without any apparent reason or motive, but to scare and cause fear in people of 80 or 90 years old with cardiac and hypertensive medical conditions which, in many cases have never been outside the rural areas and therefore never been exposed to a helicopters noise and ''buzzing''. These ''buzzing'' flights are being conducted day and intermittently at night under the 500 feet limit without any cause or reasonable explanation.

Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 91.119 of the General Operating and Flight Rules specifically prohibits low-flying aircraft, except when necessary for takeoff or landing, over any congested area of a city, town, or settlement, or over any open air assembly of persons, an altitude of 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within a horizontal radius of 2,000 feet of the aircraft, over other than congested areas, over an altitude of 500 feet above the surface except over open water or sparsely populated areas. In the latter case, the aircraft may not be operated closer than 500 feet to any person, vessel, vehicle, or structure. This rule of thumb applies to Helicopters which may be operated at less than the minimums prescribed above, if and only if, the operation is conducted without hazard to persons or property on the surface.

OPPEA has sworn statements from many of the elderly population being seriously affected by the actions undertaken by Commonwealth and PREPA as well as a psychological study of the adverse effect that these actions have caused on the general elderly population of the areas impacted by the Via Verde project.

Identification: The civilian helicopters involved in the ''buzzing'' flights are readily identifiable since they bear the markings of PREPA or are being rented by PREPA or its agents or subcontractor, New Star Acquisitions. The ''buzzing'' flights are being performed under the 500 feet limit as per the above mentioned CFR, by aircraft number N5800, N5854, and N5842.

These flights have been occurring since the last six months almost every Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

These flights have been occurring in the area of Adjuntas, Orocovis and Penuelas, Puerto Rico. The aircrafts have been flying in no particular direction since they are ''buzzing'' the residents within the area or sites where the Via Verde gas pipeline project is to be constructed.

The color of the aircrafts are plainly visible in the photographs attached.

The altitude in which these flights regularly occur are below the 500 feet tarmac limit imposed by the CFR cited above. The flight below the limit was estimated on the remaining distance between the roof of the houses in which the ''sitting'' and the ''buzzing'' was being performed by the pilots of the aircrafts operated by the Commonwealth and PREPA.

Some of the witnesses submitted sworn statements which are at your disposal for inclusion in the investigative process. The names, addresses and telephone numbers are included in this Complaint for your perusal.

More photographs and statements will be made available to you as soon as they are obtained from our clients.

We understand that some elderly residents in the towns of Penuelas, Utuado and Adjuntas did file complaints before the Puerto Rico Police Department and therefore the criminal complaints will be submitted as soon as we obtain a certified copy from the Police Department.

Understanding that these actions and policies are an open violation of the Civil Rights Act, the Older American Act and the federal statutes and regulations of which you are particularly in charge of administering, we request a formal criminal and civil investigation from your Department.

After the investigation we are confident that your Department will have reasonable cause to believe that the Commonwealth and PREPA are engaged in a pattern or practice of violating the FAA regulations and the rights of the elderly population impacted by the Via Verde Project and that the pattern or practice is of such a nature that it is intended to deny the full exercise of the rights of our client and of many others numbering in the thousands.

If you have any doubts or questions, please do not hesitate to contact us at (787) 721–6121.

Cordially,

ROSSANA LÓPEZ LEÓN, MSG,
Ombudsman for the Elderly.

COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO,
PUERTO RICO OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN FOR THE ELDERLY
San Juan, Puerto Rico, April 26, 2011.

Re Complaint by the Puerto Rico Office of the Ombudsman for the Elderly Against the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Puerto Rico Energy Power Authority.

Mr. GENE L. DODARO,
Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR SIR: The Puerto Rico Office of the Ombudsman for the Elderly (hereinafter OPPEA) represented by the undersigned, Hon. Rossana López León, is the ''state unit on aging of Puerto Rico'' in charge of enacting the Older Americans Act by virtue of the provisions of Act No. 203 of August 7, 2004, as well as by the ''Bill of Rights for Aged Persons in Puerto Rico'', Act No. 121 of July 12, 1986, as amended.

OPPEA, upon attending to the needs of this specific population, acts as an enabling agent in the search for a better quality of life for these residents, who on occasion are deprived of their civil and human rights as members of our society for which it receives substantial federal funds. As a matter of fact, OPPEA receives 90% of its budget from federal sources.

The creation of this office serves the purpose of reaffirming the importance of the elderly citizens in our country, guaranteeing their full enjoyment of the rights and prerogatives which they are entitled to.

ORGANIZATION

OPPEA was created through local public Law Number 203, dated August 7, 2004, as a governmental organism responsible for establishing public policy, planning and coordinating with other public agencies the design and development of projects and programs in order to attend basic needs of the elderly population, establishing the rights of the elderly people, in order to help them attain an enjoyable and productive life and their maximum possible participation in community affairs. All funds, equipment, personnel and other assets and liabilities previously managed by OGAVE (Governor's Office for Elderly Affairs) were transferred to OPPEA as a result of the above law.

OPPEA is the local organism responsible for planning and coordinating all matters related to federal awards received from federal laws for the purpose of attending the problems of the elderly population.

OPPEA is also the agency designated to administer and implement the federal programs of federal public Law 89–73 dated July 14, 1965, as amended, known as ''Older Americans Act''. It can also be designated by the Governor of Puerto Rico as the local agency in charge of any other federal awards destined for elderly programs.

Local public Law Number 203 permits OPPEA to design programs in order to provide possible work opportunities and training and re-training to elderly citizens. Also, it offers alternatives in order for elderly people to join actively in the community and, for those able to, to provide consultative or professional services to the community.

OPPEA operates under an Ombudsman named by the Governor of Puerto Rico, with the consent and advice of the Senate of Puerto Rico for a fixed term of 14 years with the responsibility of organizing and directing the functions of the Office. The current Ombudsman is appearing Plaintiff, Hon. Rossana López León whose term expires on 2014.

Other functions and duties of OPPEA are:

a. Encourage participation of citizens in the development and implementation of programs and projects for the elderly people;

b. Provide technical advice and guidelines to other public agencies and/or private institutions who request them in order for them to improve the services they render to elderly citizens;

c. Organize and prepare conferences and seminars, and perform studies and investigations, by themselves or in coordination with other public agencies or private entities, in order to develop new approaches and methods, and the development of the necessary personnel to provide services to the elderly population;

d. Compile, accumulate and analyze all statistical data necessary for the planning, coordination and the development of a public policy related to elderly affairs, that responds to the needs of the particular moment;

e. Educate the community regarding the elderly affairs in order to create a positive attitude towards the elderly population;

f. Provide information to elderly people regarding the services, benefits, programs and activities that public agencies and private entities offer; and

g. Recommend to the Governor of Puerto Rico and the Legislative Assembly those procedures they believe necessary in order to attend the problems and necessities of the elderly community.

h. Attend to grievances brought by elderly citizens, including the imposition of fines and the compensation for damages.

Now, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (hereinafter ELA) in cohort with the Puerto Rico Energy Power Agency (hereinafter PREPA) have placed into action a project, The Vía Verde Pipeline, which is a planned natural gas network to supply energy from north to south in Puerto Rico, a project of Governor Luis Fortuño.

The pipeline will distribute natural gas from the Peñuelas/Guayanilla area north to the Arecibo Cambalache Plant on to Palo Seco/San Juan.

''Via Verde'' will negatively impact forest areas, hydrographic basins, lands fit for agriculture, and the all-important and endangered karstic region of northern Puerto Rico. It will also represent further dependence on another form of fossil fuel that, while less polluting than the current oil based system of electricity generation, will still contribute to global warming.

Furthermore, more than 200 elderly individuals, under the protection of the Older American Act are being affected and their rights under that federal statute and the Constitution being breached and violated by Commonwealth and PREPA.

These repetitive violations have become a danger to the lives, health, rights and property of the elderly population of the sector being impacted by the Via Verde project by way of illegal trespassing into the properties of the elderly under the false pretext of measuring a nonexisting right of way, illegal trespassing into the homes of the elderly with fraudulent pretenses to generate a written authorization from the elderly to allow and permit a consented purchase of their property to the Commonwealth and PREPA well below market value of the property, without granting the elderly the opportunity to seek counsel, a recent appraisal of their property or to contest the eminent domain procedure which they are threatened with if they do not grant a ''voluntary'' consent to sell their properties.

Furthermore, the elderly population is being targeted with a psychological ''warfare'' tactic through constant ''buzzing'' of low flying Commonwealth and PREPA helicopters, some of which ''sit'' on top of the elderly individuals' residences for a prolong period of time without any apparent reason or motive, but to scare and cause fear in people of 80 or 90 years old with cardiac and hypertensive medical conditions which, in many cases have never been outside the rural areas and therefore never been exposed to a helicopter's noise and ''buzzing''. These ''buzzing'' flights are being conducted day and intermittently at night under the 500 feet limit without any cause or reasonable explanation.

These repetitive violations have become a danger to the lives, health, rights and property of the elderly population of the sector being impacted by the Via Verde project by way of illegal trespassing into the properties of the elderly under the false pretext of measuring a nonexisting right of way, illegal trespassing into the homes of the elderly with fraudulent pretenses to generate a written authorization from the elderly to allow and permit a consented purchase of their property to the Commonwealth and PREPA well below market value of the property, without granting the elderly the opportunity to seek counsel, a recent appraisal of their property or to contest the eminent domain procedure which they are threatened with if they do not grant a ''voluntary'' consent to sell their properties.

Furthermore, most of the elderly population residing in the impacted areas receive their water supply from private or public reservoirs that are a huge part of the underground karstic region. It has been evidenced by the detractors of the Via Verde project that the underground water supply will be contaminated by bentonite, polymers, surfactants and dye tracers which would render the underground water supply contaminated and useless for human consumption. The Corps must be aware that there is no other source of water for these elderly residents of the region since in many parts of the rural regions where they reside the Commonwealth does not provide a source of water.

Moreover, it should be public notice that the Government of Puerto Rico has not only already spent millions of dollars from state public coffers but also from federal sources like ARRA and has authorized multimillion dollar contracts for the purchase of land, materials (gas pipeline) and the construction of the gas pipeline itself, without the appropriate permits from the U.S. Corps of Engineers, U.S. Wildlife and Fisheries and other relevant federal agencies. Thus, this project which is being constructed is illegal for lack of appropriate permits.

This situation is not only contrary to the Law 230 of July 31, 1974 (3 L.P.R. secc. 283) as amended, also known as the Puerto Rico Accounting Law, but also in direct contrast to Law 96 of June 26, 1964 as amended. See also the Opinions of the Justice Secretary of Puerto Rico number 2010–15 and H.M.C.A. (P.R.) Inc et al. v. Contralor 126 D.P.R. 478 (1990).

Understanding that these actions and policies are an open violation of the Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, among others, we request a formal criminal and civil investigation from your Department.

After the investigation we are confident that your Department will have reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment of any of the rights secured by the law, and that the pattern or practice is of such a nature and is intended to deny the full exercise of the rights of our client and of many others numbering in the thousands.

If you have any doubts or questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Cordially,

ROSSANA LÓPEZ LEOŃ, MSG,
Ombudsman for the Elderly.

COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO,
PUERTO RICO OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN FOR THE ELDERLY,
San Juan, Puerto Rico, April 25, 2011.

Re: Complaint by The Puerto Rico Office Of The Ombudsman For The Elderly Against The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and The Puerto Rico Energy Power Authority.

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
South Atlantic Division,
Jacksonville, FL.
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
South Atlantic Division,
Atlanta, Georgia.

DEAR SIR: The Puerto Rico Office Of The Ombudsman For The Elderly (herein after OPPEA) represented by the undersigned, Hon. Rossana López León, is the ''state unit on aging of Puerto Rico'' in charge of enacting the Older Americans Act by virtue of the provisions of Act No. 203 of August 7, 2004, as well as by the ''Bill of Rights for Aged Persons in Puerto Rico'', Act No. 121 of July 12, 1986, as amended.

OPPEA, upon attending to the needs of this specific population, acts as an enabling agent in the search for a better quality of life for these residents, who on occasion are deprived of their civil and human rights as members of our society for which it receives substantial federal funds. As a matter of fact, OPPEA receives 90% of its budget from federal sources.

The creation of this office serves the purpose of reaffirming the importance of the elderly citizens in our country, guaranteeing their full enjoyment of the rights and prerogatives which they are entitled to.

OPPEA is also the agency designated to administer and implement the federal programs of federal public Law 89–73 dated July 14, 1965, as amended, known as ''Older Americans Act''. It can also be designated by the Governor of Puerto Rico as the local agency in charge of any other federal awards destined for elderly programs.

Now, The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (herein after Commonwealth) in cohort with the Puerto Rico Energy Power Agency (herein after PREPA) have placed into action a project called The Via Verde Pipeline (application of reference) which is a planned natural gas network to supply energy from north to south in Puerto Rico, a project of Governor Luis Fortuño.

The pipeline will distribute natural gas from the Peñuelas/Guayanilla area north to the Arecibo Cambalache Plant on to Palo Seco/San Juan.

''Via Verde'' will negatively impact forest areas, hydrographic basins, lands fit for agriculture, and the all-important and endangered karstic region of northern Puerto Rico as your letter of December 22, 2010 sent to PREPA has underscored.

Furthermore, more than 200 elderly individuals, under the protection of the Older American Act, residing for more than 30 years in the area to be impacted by the Via Verde project are being and will be adversely affected and their rights under federal statutes and regulations breached and violated by Commonwealth and PREPA.

These repetitive violations have become a danger to the lives, health, rights and property of the elderly population of the sector being impacted by the Via Verde project by way of illegal trespassing into the properties of the elderly under the false pretext of measuring a non existing right of way, illegal trespassing into the homes of the elderly with fraudulent pretenses to generate a written authorization from the elderly to allow and permit a consented purchase of their property to the Commonwealth and PREPA well below market value of the property, without granting the elderly the opportunity to seek counsel, a recent appraisal of their property or to contest the eminent domain procedure which they are threatened with if they do not grant a ''voluntary'' consent to sell their properties.

Furthermore, most of the elderly population residing in the impacted areas receive their water supply from private or public reservoirs that are a huge part of the underground karstic region. It has been evidenced by the detractors of the Via Verde project that the underground water supply will be contaminated by bentonite, polymers, surfactants and dye tracers which would render the underground water supply contaminated and useless for human consumption. The Corps must be aware that there no other source of water for these elderly residents of the region since in many parts of the rural regions where they reside the Commonwealth does not provide a source of water.

Moreover, although alternative sites or projects have been proposed to the Commonwealth, to no avail.

Our client has sworn statements from many of the elderly population being seriously affected by the actions undertaken by

Commonwealth and PREPA as well as a psychological study of the adverse effect that these actions have caused on the general elderly population of the areas impacted by the Via Verde project.

Understanding that these actions and policies are an open violation of the Older American Act and the federal statutes and regulations of which you are particularly in charge of administering, we request a formal filing of this complaint before the Corps.

If you have any doubts or questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office at (787) 721–6121.

Cordially,

ROSSANA LÓPEZ LEÓN, MSG,
Ombudsman for the Elderly.

ABORTION DEBATE

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Abortion is one of the most divisive issues in America. One side sees the child in the womb as nothing but tissue, like a skin mole, and no one should tell a women when and if she can have an unnecessary and inconvenient tissue removed from her body. The other side looks at that ''tissue'' in the womb and sees it sucking its thumb, reacting to her mother singing, and possessing unique DNA, and asks the question: How can that not be a child?

The debate about life will not be resolved today, though for the sake of millions of children who will die in the womb in abortion clinics, I wish it could have been resolved yesterday. H.R. 3, which we will be discussing all day today asks the question: Should the Federal Government ever use taxpayer dollars to pay for or supplement abortions?

When the Nation is so divided over this issue, isn't it common sense not to force a person who is passionately opposed to the death of the unborn to assist in paying for the procedure?

H.R. 3 also protects the conscience of health care providers to not be forced to perform a procedure that they believe violates their most basic oath: Do no harm.

Each year, this Congress votes to prohibit abortion funding through our appropriations process. It's time that we settled this issue permanently and clearly. No taxpayer funding, support, or tax incentives of abortion in any way for this year, in any future year.

In a day of skyrocketing debt, how can we justify supplementing abortion and saying that it's a necessary and essential element of government? I think we cannot.

This is time to resolve this issue. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 3 today in that vote.

OUR DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the great debate over oil and gas prices, there are actually many things we can all agree on. We agree our dependence on foreign oil endangers our environment, hurts our economy, and weakens our national security. Our disagreement lies in potential solutions.

I believe that in order to lower gas prices, we can and must crack down on oil speculators, end Big Oil handouts, invest in public transit and electric vehicles, and increase corporate average fuel economy standards. The other side of the argument would have you believe that all we need to do is increase our domestic oil resources and remove regulations—regulations that purportedly forced us to look outside our Nation's borders for oil.

Our answers do not lie in more oil. Our answers lie in conservation and smart investments.

Talk about smart investment—every increase of 1 mile per gallon in auto fuel efficiency yields more oil than can be found in two Arctic National Wildlife Refuges. An improvement right now of 2.7 miles per gallon would eliminate our need for all Persian Gulf oil.

But it's not a question of simple domestic supply and demand either, another argument the other side of this issue will use. Oil prices are set on a global oil market. Historically, such small increases in U.S. production have had little or no impact on world oil prices.

The U.S. Energy Information Administration, or EIA, states in a 2008 report that Arctic Refuge oil production ''is not expected to have a large impact on world oil prices,'' noting that OPEC ''could neutralize any potential price impact of ANWR coastal plain production by reducing its exports by an equal amount.''

Again, our answer does not lie in increased domestic oil production. Our answer lies in conservation and in a solid commitment to investment in renewable energy resources.

Recent increases in conservation and use of alternative technologies has cut our Nation's projected need for imported oil between now and 2050 by more than 100 billion barrels. That's 10 times more benefit that we might be able to get during the same period from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, without sacrificing one of our Nation's most valued wilderness ecosystems.

In the past few years, we've taken small steps to focus on conservation rather than production. In late 2007, corporate average fuel standards, commonly known as CAFE standards, received their first overhaul in more than 30 years. This was a huge step in the right direction, but there remains much work to do.

The bills we will consider in the coming week will endanger our environment, hurt our economy, and weaken our national security. It seems to me these are the very same concerns we have with an overarching reliance and addiction to foreign oil.

H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1230 supplant our national environmental policies, tell residents along our coasts we don't care how they feel about drilling in their waters, damage the ecosystems the industries along our coasts rely on, and go against what military experts have been saying about drilling.

Just weeks ago, several former military officers shared their thoughts and concern. ''America's dependence on oil constitutes a clear and present danger to the security and welfare of the United States.'' And they continue to say they are concerned with congressional efforts to undermine the agencies charged with overseeing extraction. What they are saying is it's important to reduce our dependence on foreign oil for our national security's sake, and it's important to retain regulatory authority to oversee drilling and extraction of oil and gas. Then, you follow that it's important to regulate our extraction in order to protect our Nation.

These bills do not offer solutions. And what is worse, a full year following the disaster of the Macondo/Deepwater well, we have yet to reform our Outer Continental Shelf policy. But, again, you don't need to take my word for it.

The U.S. Energy Information Administration put out a 2009 report comparing the difference between full, unrestricted offshore drilling and restricted offshore drilling. EIA found that in 2020, restrictions on drilling versus unrestricted access had no impact on cost. The cost per barrel was identical. In 2030, indiscriminate drilling would lower our gas prices by just 3 cents.

Take the calls for drilling in the Arctic Refuge as another example. Even at peak production in 2030, Arctic Refuge oil would account for six-tenths of 1 percent of world oil production and only 2.4 percent of U.S. oil consumption.

We can proactively move our Nation toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil so that we can take control of our energy future, protect our Nation, our economy, and our environment. And we must.

SPENDING-DRIVEN DEBT CRISIS

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

Ms. FOXX. If your car is speeding into a ditch, the only thing to do to survive is to slam the brakes as fast and hard as you can. Anything else only stalls the disaster to come.

At this moment, America is speeding into bankruptcy, and the only way to stop the descent and save our country is to slam the brakes on government spending and set our Nation on a brand new fiscal trajectory.

Critical times call for critical measures. The American people deserve honest and courageous leadership from

Washington that will act to save the future of our great Nation.

□ 1020

The Path to Prosperity would lift the crushing burden of record high debt, spur economic growth and job creation, and fulfill our Nation's obligations to the health and retirement security of every American.

With the Path to Prosperity, the budget that Republicans adopted in the House 2 weeks ago, Americans will be back on the road to more jobs for today and a bankrupt-free nation for tomorrow.

GAS PRICES AND MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, before I begin to share my thoughts this morning about how the Republican budget is a blow to our American ideas and priorities, I would be remiss if I didn't use this opportunity to praise our men and women in uniform, our President, and his advisers for the extraordinary courage and capability they all demonstrated in the mission that put an end to Osama bin Laden on Sunday.

Being from New York, we know firsthand of the consequences of this horrible, horrible action that Osama bin Laden took on September 11, 2001. I can't tell you how many families in my congressional district were hurt, lost their loved ones, children becoming orphans in ways that it is going to take them years, if forever, to recover.

That is why Sunday was so important. It was a moment in history, our history. We told the world as Americans, we're going to fight not only for each other but we're going to fight for our rights, our ideals that are at the core of our very being.

I would hope that, in the aftermath of Sunday, we would be able to come together in the way that we did after September 11. We need to find more ways to come together. We need to work together for the good of our constituents, for the good of our country. But that doesn't mean that we don't have extraordinary differences of opinion, and that's what I'm here to talk about today. I'm here to talk about the budget that the House Republican majority just passed—and I voted against—on April 15. I believe that that budget is a document that lays out the wrong priorities.

Trust me when I say that I'm as anxious as anyone about our Nation's fiscal policies, but we also need to make sure that, in the process, we do not kill thousands of jobs and hurt millions of American families. A budget, as far as I'm concerned, is a moral document. It should be a declaration of our country's priorities. But the Republican budget does anything but that. It hurts our most vulnerable citizens while giving tax breaks to our oil companies.

I spent over 33 years as a nurse before I came to Congress, and let me tell you, the one thing that strikes me every week when I come down to Washington is the disconnect that I see between a lot of the politicians here and the people who are back home struggling in their districts.

The budget that was passed by Republicans is absolutely out of touch with the people back in my district. How in the world can you undermine the health and well-being of our seniors at the same time that you continue to give the richest companies on the planet tax breaks? That's not what the people in my district want. The seniors, and all the people in my district, want health care. They feel like that as they get older, they want the peace of mind to know that they have access to the greatest health care system in the world. They've paid for that right. As they worked throughout their life, they paid into the Medicare system. They believe that they have the right to Medicare, and I agree with them.

Yet the Republican budget fundamentally undermines that right. The Republican budget ends Medicare as we know it. It eliminates guaranteed coverage for our seniors and turns the program into a voucher program. This is a drastic, drastic concept.

Let's not try to pretty things up here. Republicans are essentially pushing seniors into the private marketplace where they will pay more and get less. As health care keeps rising with inflation, these vouchers will not keep pace. As the Congressional Budget Office has said, Medicare beneficiaries would bear a much larger share of their health care costs. The result would be absolutely awful for our seniors. We are going to see our parents and our sisters and our brothers faced with awful choices: Are they going to pay higher premiums? Are they going to have to get health plans that cover less? Or, even worse, will they drop out and have no health care at all?

Cutting our health care system isn't the only way that families are being hurt. The high price of gas is hurting families across this country and certainly in New York. Across the country and definitely on Long Island, the price of gas has climbed way above $4. Yet in what is an absolutely mind-boggling position, Republicans in Congress still refuse to allow a vote to repeal the billions of dollars in taxpayer money that oil companies are getting. Exxon, for instance, just took in $10.7 billion during the first 3 months of the year alone. That's a 69 percent increase over the same time frame from last year. Other companies have enjoyed the same increases, all while continuing to receive $4 billion annually in subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, we're Americans. We can disagree, but we're supposed to be fighting for this country. We need to make sure we protect our seniors. We need to make sure we have jobs. We need to make sure that we keep this country safe.

God bless America.

The oil companies aren't struggling companies in need of a helping hand. They're companies with huge profits receiving billions of dollars in wasteful government spending.

I'm not a person who is against drilling.

I believe that we need a comprehensive energy policy that takes advantage of clean energy, but also takes advantage of the natural resources that we've been blessed with.

I also believe that we need to be aggressive in taking on the oil speculators who are profiting from the ballooning price of oil.

But what I find particularly abhorrent is that, at a time where Republicans are claiming that our country's fiscal problems are an excuse for us to undermine the needs of our seniors, many of whom live month-to-month, we are at the same time giving oil companies $4 billion in tax breaks.

Those are not the priorities that I believe in.

And those are not the priorities that my constituents believe in.

A budget is a moral document of our priorities. It should say something about a country's values.

That's why, to turn back to Sunday for a second, that heroic rescue said so much about our country.

Americans persevere, Americans fight for their values, and Americans are unrelenting in their efforts.

But we do those things because we want safety and security for our families.

We want to see our children and grandchildren grow up in a country where fairness and equity is the order of the day.

The Republican budget is not about fairness and equity.

It is about hurting our seniors—and doing so in order to give oil companies, who are wealthy beyond belief, additional tax breaks.

That's not just.

That's not fair.

That is not what I came to Congress to fight for.

STORM AND DISASTER RELIEF IN NORTH CAROLINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago on Saturday, April 16, North Carolina was struck with vicious tornadoes that caused unprecedented destruction and despair throughout the State and in my district. The loss of property will take years to rebuild, but the lives that were lost can never be replaced. In an instant, lives were cut short, leaving families with a gaping hole that can never be filled. With over 24 deaths throughout the State, this tragedy has touched each of us on a personal level.

Our district was hit especially hard with six of our 10 counties affected, but thanks to the resources provided by President Obama's emergency declaration and officials at FEMA, we have been able to turn this tragedy into a swift recovery.

On behalf of all North Carolinians, I would like to thank the officials at FEMA, the American Red Cross, the

Small Business Administration, and emergency first responders for taking swift action and providing our district with supplies, funding, and on-the-spot guidance for victims.

While we still have a tough road ahead, our district can take heart in the fact that every step is being taken to ensure that help will reach everyone affected and in a swift and efficient manner. I hope that all Americans will keep the residents and families of North Carolina and those families in Alabama and the other States that have been so terribly affected in their prayers as we continue to work in the rescue effort going forward.

Thank you. God bless America.

SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Small Business Innovation Research program. For over a quarter century, SBIR has been key to American competitiveness around the world. It has provided quality research, spurred technological advancements, and allowed innovative small businesses to partner with the government for the development of some of today's most cutting-edge goods and services.

The region I represent in western Pennsylvania is home to a number of companies that have benefited from the SBIR program, yet these companies have been faced with uncertainty over the past few years because Congress has failed to act on a full reauthorization. Short-term extensions are putting the future of research and development at risk. In this fragile economy, Congress owes it to these innovators to give them the certainty they need to fully pursue their ideas.

□ 1030

I have supported legislation to reauthorize this program for the past 4 years because I understand the importance of innovation and the Federal Government's unique role in creating a fertile climate for it. In the past, whenever our Nation has bounced back from economic downturns, innovation has been the catalyst. Time and again, inventive ideas have led to new products, generating a wave of job creation and putting us on a path back to prosperity.

This year, I have joined with my colleagues on the Small Business Committee to introduce a full 3-year reauthorization of the SBIR program. As Congress looks for ways to reduce spending yet keep America globally competitive, the SBIR program is that rare piece of legislation that can accomplish both goals simultaneously.

At its most fundamental, the SBIR program provides valuable seed money for entrepreneurs who are willing to explore untested concepts and, ultimately, develop new products. Additionally, it solves one of the primary concerns facing small businesses today—access to capital. This reauthorization would make important changes to the current program that will allow more entrepreneurs to participate by allowing companies that receive funding from multiple venture capital groups to competitively apply for a portion of SBIR grants.

Reauthorization of SBIR will allow us to continue to foster research and innovation that will translate into a wealth of new employment opportunities and economic growth for western Pennsylvania and all of America. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this bipartisan legislation that encourages creativity and ensures America will stay a global leader in innovation for years to come.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN ROBERT B. DUNCAN

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to comment on the passing of a dear friend and Oregon icon, former Congressman Robert Duncan, who died last week at age 90. Bob served his Nation with distinction beginning with his service during World War II in both the merchant marine and the U.S. Navy. After graduating from the University of Michigan Law School, he settled in Medford, Oregon, with his wife Marijane. He was a State legislator from that community. He served two terms as speaker for the first time in Oregon history.

From there, he went to serve in Congress, representing the Fourth Congressional District in southwest Oregon until he was persuaded by President Lyndon Johnson to leave Congress to run for a vacated U.S. Senate seat against Governor Mark Hatfield. In a campaign that defined Oregon politics for over a decade, Bob lost narrowly to Mark Hatfield in, to say the very least, a heated campaign, focusing in large measure over the United States' involvement in the war in Vietnam, which he supported and Mark Hatfield opposed. A significant development was the endorsement of then-Democratic U.S. Senator Wayne Morris of Republican Hatfield, which many experts feel provided the narrow margin of victory for Hatfield. Later, Bob almost won the Democratic primary against Wayne Worse when he ran for reelection 2 years later sending shockwaves that reverberated for a decade.

I first had the opportunity to work with Bob Duncan when I was directing a campaign to lower Oregon's voting age in 1969, and he was a zealous supporter of engaging young people in the political process.

In 1974, Bob again made history by being the first Oregonian to represent 2 different districts in Congress as he was elected to the Third Congressional District, which I am now privileged to represent. He continued for another 6 years of distinguished service, serving on the Appropriations Committee.

After leaving Congress in 1981, Bob returned to private practice as a lawyer in Portland and Washington, D.C., and later served on the Northwest Planning Power Council.

Bob had many passions in his life but none more important than his family. He was married 48 years to Marijane until her death in 1989, and later, he married Kathy Boe and found many years of happiness. Bob had seven children who survive him: Nancy, Angus, David, Jamie, Laurie, Bonnie and Jeanne.

He was by turns a stubborn political animal, generous of spirit, with a legacy for courage strengthened by his convictions. He was a man of great humor, intellect, and conviction. He was also thrifty to an extent that is legendary to family and friends and many of his constituents. Until the end of his life I would still get letters from him with a series of 3-cent stamps and the old congressional return address on the envelope scratched over. But he was very careful with the taxpayer money in his Appropriations Committee to an extent that sometimes drove even his supporters to distraction.

He leaves a legacy for courage, passion for justice, and accomplishment of decades of service, particularly a decade in two very different congressional districts that were united in the admiration of this dedicated public servant. He will be missed, but fondly remembered.

RAPIDLY RISING GAS PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join together to immediately address one of the greatest problems facing our families and small business right now; that is, rapidly rising gas prices.

As I traveled across Rhode Island during the district work period, the issue of high gas prices was never far from anyone's mind. It affects every family's bottom line and the budgets of small businesses that are still recovering from the recession.

As our fragile economy continues, it is imperative that we work to find solutions in the short term as we turn our attention towards a serious, long-term solution to reduce our demand for oil. Our Nation simply cannot have low gas prices without reducing the amount of oil that we use.

We remain in constant competition right now with India, China, and other developing Nations, and the world does not have the resources to continue to supply us all with cheap oil, especially

with disruptions in the Middle East that continue to affect production.

I supported the American Clean Energy and Security Act last session because it took steps to immediately reduce demand through improved vehicle fuel economy standards and energy efficient technology in our buildings and homes, while investing in clean energy, including an increased commitment to the research and development of offshore wind.

We should put our money behind those efforts instead of giving billions of dollars in tax breaks each year to oil companies. As we just recently heard, ExxonMobil just reported first quarter earnings of $11 billion, a nearly 70 percent increase, with other oil companies following closely behind. Mr. Speaker, let's eliminate subsidies for these big corporations that don't need our help.

In the short term, Congress must partner with President Obama and support Attorney General Holder's efforts to monitor oil and gas markets and safeguard consumers against unlawful practices. We also need stricter guidelines for speculators and getting speculators out of the market. We need guidelines for people who buy oil just to sell it at a profit, perhaps by allowing people to buy oil on the market only if they can actually receive product.

Additionally, I urge my colleagues to pressure oil companies to drill on domestic lands where they already have existing leases. The industry right now is drilling on less than a quarter of the 80 million acres where it already has leases approved. While this is not a long-term solution, we need responsible drilling on lands where there are existing leases. Now, this is, I believe, a faster, fairer, and safer path to more domestic production, unlike legislation on the floor this week which will put oil rig workers and the environment at risk by expediting critical safety reviews.

None of this, of course, lessens the urgency of switching to alternative fuels.

□ 1040

The U.S. has only 1.4 percent of the world's proven oil reserves but currently consumes 22 percent of the world's oil.

In the long run, we will remain susceptible to repeats of the current crisis unless we take every opportunity to decrease our dependence on oil. Now I want to highlight one important initiative in my State that involves public transportation. The Rhode Island Public Transit Authority acquired just recently 53 new hybrid buses and is upgrading 10 trolleys to hybrid propulsion, and we should encourage others to follow their lead. RIPTA expects that their new hybrid fleet will save them approximately 20 percent on fuel usage, which will help prevent price increases and route closures.

We should build on the success in Rhode Island nationally by requiring specific hybrid and fuel efficiency standards for any vehicles involved in Federal grant programs. Complicated problems, like the price of gasoline, often require difficult solutions. But we cannot let this prevent us from moving forward and delivering to our constituents who cannot afford these costs or a slowed economic recovery. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to work together to enact short-term provisions and long-term solutions to bring relief to working families and small business.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Kurt Gerhard, St. Patrick's Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God of peace, Who called all people from every nation to seek reconciliation with each other for the good of creation, inspire in us the will to persevere, through moments of conflict, to seek common ground.

Bless this country and all its leaders in the continued fulfillment of a vision set forth in July of 1776 that all people are ''endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.''

During this session of the 112th Congress in this, the people's House, may the hearts of these duly elected Representatives be blessed with the integrity of purpose and the steadfast commitment to seek and serve the people of the United States of America for the betterment of this country and the world.

We ask this all in the name of the one God, the God of all nations. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches from each side of the aisle.

GAS PRICES

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the average for a gallon of gas in Ohio is over $4 a gallon. In eastern and southeast Ohio, this is particularly hard on families who live in rural areas. Farmers, ranchers, seniors, working families who have limited means of transportation—these high gas prices are having a negative impact on everyone. The higher gas prices go, the more of an impact it has on our economy and on our chances for a real economic recovery.

Small business owners are watching money they could otherwise invest in their businesses go to paying for fuel, and working families are anxiously redoing their budgets to account for higher fuel costs and looking for ways to cut back.

We're blessed with an abundance of natural resources in Ohio. We're one of the highest coal-producing areas, and with the Marcellus shale right next door in West Virginia, we're poised to make an enormous contribution to making America self-sufficient in energy. We need an energy strategy that will help us become energy self-sufficient so we stop relying on other countries to meet our energy needs.

Now is the time to levy a ''permatorium'' on developing American energy resources. Let's open up our American resources and put our country on the path to ensuring our energy security, instead of continuing to rely on foreign sources for energy.

WE MUST NOT PASS H.R. 3

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3 and to remind my colleagues of two key dates.

January 20, 2011, the day H.R. 3 was introduced. Just 3 months ago, the authors of this extremist, offensive bill introduced a version of H.R. 3 that would have redefined rape and incest. They don't want us to remember, but we cannot forget 173 Members of Congress signed their names to a bill that would have redefined rape to exclude women who are unconscious, mentally disabled, or forced into sex by threat.

The authors of this bill would also like us to forget another important date: January 22, 1973. On that day, the Supreme Court ruled that women have the right to make their own decisions about their own bodies and their own lives.

But we will not forget that date, and we will not forget the 173 Members of this body who want to redefine rape and incest, and we will not turn back the clock to a time when women could not make their own choices and access vital care.

We will not forget. We will not go back, and we must not pass H.R. 3.

NAVY SEALS 1—BIN LADEN—0

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, Osama bin Laden has met his maker, and we appreciate the Navy SEALs for arranging the meeting, but Pakistan gives us some concern. It seems like Pakistan might be playing both sides, and they have a lot of explaining to do.

For all these years, we believed that Osama bin Laden was on the run, living in a cave; but, apparently, Satan's Pawn has been living for years in a million-dollar compound just yards away from a Pakistani military base, but Pakistan claims no knowledge of Osama bin Laden's whereabouts. I just don't buy it.

I've introduced a bill that would require Congress and the American people to get a full understanding of what Pakistan knew about bin Laden's whereabouts and when they knew it, before we give them any more American money. Congress has already appropriated $3 billion in aid to Pakistan for this year; and unless Pakistan can prove that they were not providing sanctuary for America's number one enemy, they should not receive any American aid.

And that's just the way it is.

OPPOSE H.R. 3

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the majority's attempt to undermine a woman's right to choose, a right that is fundamental to a woman's freedom.

H.R. 3 would raise taxes on any American whose employer-sponsored health care plan provides coverage for an abortion. It eliminates Americans' right to use their own funds in health savings accounts for a legal abortion unless they can prove to the IRS that they were victims of rape or incest. This legislation allows a hospital to refuse to perform an emergency abortion, even if a woman would die without it. It would allow doctors to refuse abortion services, even if a pregnancy threatens a woman's health. And this law makes radical changes to the way we treat survivors of rape and even how we define rape.

My colleagues say that they are for no new taxes and for preserving life, but this legislation belies that claim.

HAMAS MERGER

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, the news that Osama bin Laden had been killed by U.S. forces on Sunday brought reassurance to many around the world that justice had finally been served. A man responsible for the deaths of thousands of innocent people of all races and religions had been located and eliminated. However, not everyone saw it the same way.

Ismail Haniyeh, leader of Hamas in Gaza, called bin Laden a sheikh and said, ''We condemn the assassination and the killing of an Arab holy warrior.'' This comes the same week that Palestinian political parties Hamas and Fatah have reconciled and formed a unity government.

How can the United States provide aid to a unity government if one of its most important leaders praises a mass murderer? How can Israel negotiate treaties with a government composed of a party that is actively seeking its destruction?

There cannot be true peace as long as Hamas holds up Osama bin Laden and other terrorists as heroes. The Palestinian people must recognize that hatred and terrorism will never bring them true peace and true independence.

COMMEMORATING JEWISH AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the rich history of the Jewish American experience in the United States as we mark Jewish American Heritage Month.

It is fitting that the words of the Jewish American poet, Emma Lazarus, are immortalized on the Statue of Liberty, ''Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,'' because here in the United States we recognize the powerful impact of the Jewish American experience—people who escaped persecution, arrived here as immigrants and prospered.

Jewish Americans formed strong communities, became involved in their neighborhoods, and have made lasting contributions to our country. Jewish Americans represent some of this country's, and indeed the world's, foremost innovators in health and science, business and industry, politics and government, arts and culture. This spirit is also found in many Jewish Americans who work tirelessly to seek a better life for future generations.

In celebrating the many milestones of Jewish Americans this month, we honor the lives, work, and rich history of Jewish Americans throughout our Nation. And that's why this month we take time to remember the unique Jewish American identity, steeped in history and faith, and their tremendously important contributions to our Nation.

□ 1210

SHALE NATURAL GAS

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

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the plentiful natural gas reserves that we have in the United States. Many of my colleagues may not be aware of two studies which recently highlighted the abundance of this clean-burning domestic fuel source which holds so much promise.

The first study I would like to draw attention to is the Energy Information Administration's Energy Outlook 2011, which analyzes energy production, consumption, technology, market supply and demand, and the direction those trends may take in the future. The outlook anticipates strong growth in the natural gas development and consumption because of development of shale gas resources. The outlook notes that growth in natural gas would not be permissible but for the combination of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing technologies which have made shale gas economical to produce. The outlook finds that hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling have led to an average annual growth rate of 48 percent in the time period from of 2006 to 2010.

The second study I would like to mention is the American Gas Association's Potential Gas Committee 2010 biennial report.

This report highlights the potential supply of natural gas in the United States. To be specific, the report finds that the Untied States possesses an untapped natural gas resource potential of 1,898 trillion cubic feet. This is the highest resource evaluation in the Potential Gas Committee's 46 year history.

My Congressional District in New York State overlays a formation known as the Marcellus Shale. This shale play is one of the leading contributors to the rapid growth in estimates of recoverable natural gas in the United States.

By developing and utilizing these massive natural gas reserves, we can begin to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and thus over time, reduce the cost of gasoline. As we all know, American producers and consumers are paying a heavy price as the cost of gasoline continues to rise. Everything costs more to produce, more to transport, and more to purchase.

Reducing our dependence on foreign oil is both a national security issue and an economic issue. I urge my colleagues to consider

these reports and support policies that will lead to the development of these valuable resources.

VOTE ''NO'' ON H.R. 3

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

Ms. BASS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3, which the House will vote on later today.

After voting last month to end Medicare, as we know it, for seniors, today the majority is attacking women's reproductive freedom. For the last 3 months, we have watched as the majority party has consistently attacked the right of women to receive comprehensive health care, and today is no different.

H.R. 3 has outrageous provisions that would end comprehensive private health insurance coverage and reduce women's access to abortion care in many ways. H.R. 3 manipulates the Tax Code to restrict access to comprehensive care. The bill raises taxes on individuals and small businesses with insurance plans that cover abortion, forcing them to drop their health insurance plan.

H.R. 3 is an unprecedented attempt to deny access to full reproductive care. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this radical antichoice bill.

TAX PENALTIES ON WOMEN'S HEALTH

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3. This deceptively titled legislation is nothing more than an assault on women's access to health care.

If enacted, this legislation would severely curtail women's access to reproductive health care services. What would it do? It would impose tax penalties on women. It would narrow the already restrictive areas that the Hyde amendment has dealt with. And further, what I find most alarming, it would attack the coverage for Federal employees, including women who serve in the military. Where is all of our applause now?

The Hyde amendment clearly states that no taxpayer dollars are to be used for abortion care and has narrowly provided exceptions that state for rape, incest, and health complications that arise from pregnancy which would put a mother's life in danger. Are we against that?

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill resoundingly, ''no'' on H.R. 3.

ABORTION COVERAGE

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

Mr. PETERS. The people in Michigan are clear: Our number one priority is jobs. And yet the Republican majority here in Washington is once again ignoring the economy and pushing a bill that raises taxes and attacks women's health care choices. Current law already prohibits Federal funds from covering abortion services, and it has for 30 years. Now Republicans want to stop private insurers from offering coverage, and they want to ban women from purchasing a comprehensive health care plan with their own money.

H.R. 3 is not about taxpayer funding, and it's certainly not about reducing the deficit. It is an extreme plan that will raise taxes on any person or business that buys insurance that includes abortion coverage. That's right, if a small business wants to treat women equally and guarantee them access to legal health care services—paid for with their own money—that business will pay higher taxes.

Do not be fooled by the talk about taxpayer funding. This bill is harmful to women's health. It undermines the right to choose, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill later today.

WHEN WILL THE REPUBLICANS WORK ON RESTORING JOBS?

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

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning with a question, which is: What are we doing? What are we doing here? Like all 434 of my colleagues, I just spent 2 weeks at home listening to my constituents, and I heard one message: Do everything you can. Don't let a second go by. Work to restore jobs in this country. Improve the economy.

And I get down here on Monday, and what did we do this week? We voted in this Chamber to eliminate funding for school-based health centers, funding for kids who don't have any other way to see a doctor. Today, thanks to the Republican majority, we will vote to try to scale back the right of women to have access to reproductive health care. And later on this week, we are going to take up measures that will keep the gravy train flowing to the oil companies, the $4 billion in our taxpayer money that goes to companies like ExxonMobil, which last week reported $10 billion in profits. I'm glad ExxonMobil is making money, but you know what? They don't need ours.

So what are we doing? When is the Republican majority going to get serious about the one thing that my constituents care about—jobs?

NEW HEALTH INSURANCE TAX

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3.

You know, Republicans say that they are for smaller government, but that ends when it comes to women. In order to curtail women's reproductive rights, it isn't enough to prevent the public dollars from helping poor women end a dangerous or unplanned pregnancy. That's already the law: no public money for abortions. But now they are going to raise taxes on small businesses, telling them that if they offer a health plan for men or women that has the gall to cover abortions—and, by the way, that's about 90 percent of plans that cover all legal procedures—then they can no longer get a tax break for offering such a plan.

Raising taxes on businesses that offer comprehensive health plans, that's the bill that's up today. Now, even private money of individuals, both men and women, and businesses will now face a new tax. So, so much for small government and lower taxes that the Republicans talk about.

□ 1220

THE NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

First of all, to imply that taxpayers fund abortions today is a lie. No, not one penny can be spent on abortions because of the Hyde Amendment which passed on September 30, 1976.

What this bill does is to play reproductive roulette with the Tax Code. Under H.R. 3, if someone buys private insurance that includes coverage for abortions, they will be taxed. If someone buys private insurance, using your own money, obviously, that doesn't include coverage for abortions, then they can deduct the cost of the health plan from their taxes. This would turn our tax collection agency into a health care policing agency.

I support a woman's right to opt for or against abortion. The decision is private. It's a matter of faith. It's a matter of conscience, and our Constitution recognizes this.

Make no mistake, this is an attack on women's health and it's a giant step back for the equality we've worked so hard to achieve. This is wrong, this is dangerous, and the House should oppose it.

OPPOSING H.R. 3

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I also rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3.

Our first priorities here in the House of Representatives must be helping foster job creation and supporting middle-

class families. Yet, more than 4 months into this Congress, we have not considered one bill, not one bill that would achieve these goals.

Instead, we have before us today H.R. 3, one of the centerpieces of the Republican agenda, and it would limit the health care choices of women.

Now, even if all it did is what the name implies, to prohibit Federal subsidies for abortion, it would be redundant, unnecessary and misguided. But it's much worse than that. In truth, it's an unprecedented and extreme attempt to limit health insurance coverage for American women, to raise taxes on small businesses, to infringe on the legally protected right of American servicewomen, to make this legal, constitutionally protected medical procedure inaccessible to women.

I oppose H.R. 3, and urge my colleagues to vote ''no.'' And I urge the majority to get to work helping Americans to get to work.

VOTE ''NO'' ON H.R. 3

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

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, it appears that there are some in this body who believe that if you state a falsehood often enough people will believe that it's the truth. That's what the bill before us is all about. It's an attempt to legislate something that isn't.

The proponents of H.R. 3 want you to believe that abortion is rampant in America, and we spend zillions of Federal dollars a year, and this bill will stop the use of those Federal funds. This is a crock of baloney.

Everyone in this House knows that Federal funds are not spent on abortions. It's been the law of this land for the last 35 years. H.R. 3 will have no effect, zero, nada, on the use of Federal funds for abortion services in America because it's the law under which we are already operating.

But what H.R. 3 will do is drastically codify an untruth. It will reach into the pockets of women and prevent them from using their own money, their own private money, on purchasing health care insurance which covers abortion services.

This is a mass intrusion into the private lives of people and to businesses. It should be defeated.

ASSAULT ON WOMEN'S HEALTH

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Later today, the House will continue its extreme assault on women's health. H.R. 3 would prevent small businesses and families from receiving tax credits for private insurance coverage that includes safe and legal health procedures; allow hospitals to deny lifesaving care to women; if audited, potentially require victims to prove to the IRS agents they were raped.

Most troubling, in the report accompanying the bill, radical Republicans want to limit the exception for rape victims who can access full legal health services to only forcible rape victims.

This bill to limit women's health services is a shameful distraction from the public's top priority, creating jobs.

BIG OIL WELFARE REPEAL ACT

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, with gas prices in my district in Louisville, Kentucky hitting $4, as they are all over the country, ExxonMobil just reported earnings of $10.7 billion for the quarter, almost 70 percent higher than last year. BP, Conoco, Shell, and Chevron already reported huge increases in profits. And we are still giving them taxpayer-financed subsidies.

Last week, the chairman of the Budget Committee said he thinks we ought to do away with these subsidies. And yet, he and the rest of the Republican majority are pushing a budget that not only sustains those giveaways to oil companies, but also would lower taxes for billionaires, all at the expense of our seniors, our students and our struggling families who are paying that $4 a gallon all over the country.

We ought to do away with these subsidies, and the Democrats have introduced the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act to do just that. If we are serious about deficit reduction and equity in this country and fairness, we will pass the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act, and we will help to begin to return this country to having an economy that works for everybody, and not just for ExxonMobil.

THE NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3, which has nothing to do with taxpayer funding of abortion. Right or wrong, Federal funding for abortion hasn't been allowed for more than 3 decades.

Instead, H.R. 3 has everything to do with infringing on the constitutionally protected right to an abortion that has been the law of the land for 38 years.

For years we've been listening to Republicans call for smaller government, less regulation, fewer taxes. But this bill represents the opposite of these values. It's more regulation on business, more regulation on health care decisions that should be left up to women and their doctors. It's more taxes on small business, more taxes on women. And it's more control by anti-choice extremists in Washington.

Finally, this bill isn't about job creation either. Instead, it's about bringing up divisive legislation that has no hope of becoming law in order to divide and distract the American people.

It's been 4 months, and still the new majority here hasn't brought a serious bill about job creation to this floor for a vote. It's time to get back to the work of putting Americans back to work. Let's do that.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 237 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 237

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide for conscience protections, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NUGENT. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. House Resolution 237 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 3. The rule provides for ample debate on this bill and gives Members of both the minority and the majority the opportunity to participate in the debate.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying

bill. For the past 30 years, we've used a patchwork system of clauses and amendments to protect American tax dollars from being used to pay for abortions. Every year Congress has to attach a series of amendments to appropriation bills specifically stating that funds spent in that legislation may not be used for elective abortions. Every year these amendments pass. These amendments pass, Madam Speaker, because Members of Congress know and recognize the fact that the vast majority of Americans do not want their hard-earned money to be spent for abortions of innocent, unborn lives.

□ 1230

In 2010 the Zogby/O'Leary poll found that 77 percent of Americans believe that Federal funds should never be used to pay for abortions or should only be used to save the life of the mother—77 percent, Madam Speaker. This number proves that even people who support a woman's right to choose still believe that tax dollars should not pay for that choice.

Clearly the time has come to move beyond this piecemeal approach and reform the way our Nation addresses this very important and sensitive issue.

H.R. 3 simply codifies and makes permanent the policies that currently rely upon regular, re-approval of Congress. Among the riders made permanent to H.R. 3 are:

the Hyde amendment, which prohibits funding for elective abortion coverage through any program funded through the annual Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations Act;

the Helms amendment, which prohibits funding for abortion as a method of family planning overseas;

the Smith Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan amendment, which prohibits funding for elective abortion coverage for Federal employees;

the Dornan amendment, which prohibits the use of congressionally appropriated funds for abortion in the District of Columbia;

the Hyde-Weldon conscience clause, which ensures that recipients of Federal funding do not discriminate against doctors, nurses, and hospitals because they do not provide, pay for, cover, or refer for abortions.

Madam Speaker, a woman's right to choose can be a divisive issue that splits the American people down the middle. However, we aren't talking about a 50/50 issue; we're talking about 77 percent. It's clearly a majority.

Just like Americans on both sides of the aisle believe that tax dollars shouldn't go to pay for abortions, so do the Members of Congress from both parties. There are 227 bipartisan cosponsors of H.R. 3. I'm proud to be one of those cosponsors.

H.R. 3 will ensure that American taxpayers are not forced to fund what many consider the destruction of innocent human life through abortion on demand.

The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act will establish a government-wide statutory prohibition on funding abortion or insurance coverage that includes abortion. This comprehensive approach will reduce the need for numerous separate abortion-funding riders.

It eliminates abortion-related amendments to appropriation bills, bills that the rules of the House remind us aren't even supposed to legislate through amendments. It ensures that all Federal programs are subject to this important safeguard.

Once again, Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We have had many misnamed bills, euphemistically called almost anything to try to make some kind of point, but this one does not have a thing in the world to do with restricting Federal money used in abortions. That has not been done for 30 years. This bill actually says let's try to make sure that no insurance companies in the country will ever cover them again no matter what the circumstances.

With no other medical procedure would we be even standing here talking about what's best for American citizens. In all my years in Congress, I have never had to debate a bill about how and when a patient can receive an appendectomy nor a bill about how or when a patient can receive corrective surgery nor is it legal to have a vasectomy.

Yet here we are today debating a bill that will reach far beyond the status quo and place restrictions on the constitutionally protected right to access reproductive health care. In the case of abortion, it has been decided with this bill that they can dictate how and when a woman is allowed to receive reproductive health care.

In part because women are instinctual nurturers, the decision about whether or not to have an abortion is one of the most personal and important decisions that they will ever make. In making this decision, a woman should be free to consult with whomever she pleases, whether it be her doctor, her spouse, her family, a parent, confidant, or religious adviser.

But a woman should never, never be forced to adhere to extreme restrictions placed upon her by Members of Congress. I've served in three legislatures, and in every one of them were always men in blue suits who knew very little about the life-altering experience of pregnancy and birth who demanded this kind of action.

I have often spoken in support of a woman's right to access an abortion and have many people, including some of my own constituents, who disagree with me, and that's fine. They have never, however, tried by law to enforce upon me what they themselves believe.

Once I was at a meeting in my district and I was asked by a man who was strongly opposed to a woman's right to choose, What should be done about that? And my response to him was simple and personal and still applies today.

I asked him that if, God forbid, he ever finds himself in a difficult position of having to decide whether or not his wife needed to have an abortion, either because of the health of the fetus or the mother was in danger or because of another personal or private matter, is he willing to say to people gathered in the hospital and during the discussion, No decision can be made until LOUISE SLAUGHTER gets here because Congress will make that decision for him?

The right to an abortion is already a procedure that is carefully regulated by the decision of Roe v. Wade. Today's legislation would go far beyond this status quo and further restrict access in an attempt to make it practically impossible to receive an abortion under these laws.

Today's bill changes the tax system—this is an important point and I want you to understand this—for private health care plans that offer abortion coverage to small businesses and individuals, as most of them do. If passed into law, this bill would pressure private health insurance plans to stop offering that coverage altogether. And that, Madam Speaker, is the purpose of this bill.

In addition, and most egregiously, today's legislation opens the door to the IRS audits of rape and incest survivors, to prove that they followed the law when paying for an abortion. Do we do this with anything else—I'm absolutely astonished—to place this kind of burden on a medical procedure? It's been designed specifically to chip away at the rights of women.

Most egregiously, this bill has put a dangerous provision into the committee report that accompanies this bill. Please listen up. You need to know what this says in this report language, which is as important as the bill itself. That report language states that the legislation is intended to prohibit the use of Federal money to subsidize abortions in cases of statutory rape. That, ladies and gentlemen, is the rape of a child too young to give consent.

Now, think about that for a moment. This bill forbids any money being used to help that child. It's not bad enough that they have been raped or that they are victims of incest. Now we're telling them that they have to keep records so that they can prove to the IRS that they followed the law? That is what I thought about when I made the statement earlier this spring ''show me your papers.'' And that is precisely what this bill is asking to do.

If this bill becomes law, think about the statutory rape. Think about your children. Think about other people's children. If it becomes law, the committee report will become one of the

documents relied upon by the courts when deciding the cases about abortion. With the committee report in hand, a future justice would have the document they need to further restrict access to abortion for victims of rape and incest. If this sounds extreme, believe me, it is.

We, like our Nation's Founders, know that each individual is entitled to his or her beliefs. But no matter how strongly we believe them, we should not be allowed to force them upon others as we wish. Yet placing an ideology upon others and restricting their choices when it comes to reproductive health is the spirit behind today's legislation and one of the many reasons why it should be stopped.

□ 1240

As we all know, at the time of our Nation's founding, the ideal of equal rights and freedoms was far from realized. In fact, it was not even of much concern. African Americans were property; women could not vote or own anything; and indeed, a pregnant woman who was widowed could find that her child had been willed away from her by her husband, who had all the rights. Native Americans were pushed off their land and out of our society.

With great struggle and over time—and certainly, I know of the struggle for women's rights because of what happened in my own district, which is where that struggle began—we have righted many of these wrongs, and as a Nation, we have come to believe that men and women of every color and creed are created equal, that we are all entitled to the rights and individual freedoms at the core of our Nation's ideals.

Today's proposed legislation up-ends the principle of equal rights and freedoms by placing severe restrictions on the constitutionally protected right to an abortion. Instead of crafting legislation to restrict a woman's right to safe, secure reproductive health, this Congress should respect the rights of women and uphold their constitutionally protected rights.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's rule and on the underlying bill, which may be the most egregious that comes to the floor this year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague, Dr. GINGREY of Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

I do rise in very strong support of this rule as well as the underlying bill, H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

I would also like to commend our colleague from New Jersey, Representative CHRIS SMITH, for his leadership on this legislation and for his steadfast pro-life stance throughout his tenure in Congress.

Madam Speaker, as a practicing OB/GYN physician for nearly 30 years, I believe that all life is sacred. The issue of abortion is a very personal issue for me as it is for many people across the country and for many Members of this body. However, that is not why we are considering this legislation on the House floor today. Instead, we are here to answer one simple question:

Should American tax dollars be used to fund abortions? When an elective choice can decide life and death, should the Federal Government be allowed to use tax dollars to pay for that choice?

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3 is a bill that seeks to set right what the last Congress got wrong: to ensure that abortions are not funded by taxpayer dollars. At its very base level, H.R. 3 simply codifies the Hyde Amendment, which has been enacted in some form or another as an appropriations rider since fiscal year 1976. Through this legislation today, we will make permanent the prohibition on Federal funding for abortions, thereby eliminating the inherent vulnerability that riders like the Hyde Amendment face as part of the annual appropriations process.

Furthermore, H.R. 3 codifies the Hyde-Dr. Dave Weldon conscience clause that has protected health care providers from discrimination by State and local governments for simply refusing to provide, to pay for or to even refer for abortion. Additionally, H.R. 3 will allow those health care providers who choose not to perform abortions legal recourse if they face, as they often do, overt discrimination.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3 also prevents Federal funds from being used for tax credits that subsidize health insurance coverage that includes elective abortion through the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, so-called ''ObamaCare.'' One of the many problems with this law ObamaCare is that there is no statutory language prohibiting premium assistance from being used for abortions despite many efforts of House and Senate Republicans during the last Congress. H.R. 3 provides the assurance that our taxpayer dollars will not be used in any form of Federal subsidies for abortion coverage.

So, Madam Speaker, as a father and as an OB/GYN physician who has delivered over 5,000 babies, I will be voting to ensure that the Federal Government does not use taxpayer dollars for any elective abortion. I ask all of my colleagues to support this rule as well as the underlying bill, H.R. 3.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in vehement opposition to this rule and dangerous legislation, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

This extreme bill's title belies its true intent—to go far beyond current law and comprehensively curtail women's health care. This bill isn't just about taxpayer funding for abortion. It is a comprehensive attack on women's lives. We hear all the time that people want government out of their lives, out of their business. There is nothing more invasive than the government's getting in between families and their doctors when making this difficult decision.

This bill won't save taxpayer dollars or create jobs, but it will undermine women's health, and it will hurt small businesses by penalizing them for offering their employees insurance plans that cover a full range of women's health care. This is a slap in the face of small businesses, which are trying to take care of their companies, their employees and their own families. It is also a slap in the face to any family that has to make the difficult decision to seek abortion care.

As a daughter and wife of physicians, I am shocked that we would so quickly dismiss the judgment of our country's medical personnel and families in making the best decision to preserve the health and lives of their loved ones. We are wasting time on divisive issues while denying the real implications this will have on our families and economy.

I urge my colleagues to join me in strong opposition to this bill.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, Americans deserve to know how the government spends their money, and they are right to refuse the use of their tax dollars for highly controversial activities—in this case, abortion. Let me first make my own position clear.

I am pro-life, and I believe that women deserve better than abortion; but certainly, we can all agree that the U.S. Government should not take tax dollars from hardworking Americans to fund abortion. I really believe it is time that we look at the reality of abortion, that we be honest and see the choice for what it is. It is interesting to note that the early feminist movement recognized that abortion is a fundamental injustice. Abortion harms women. It takes the lives of children, and it allows a man to escape his responsibility.

The abortion industry many times profits from all of this pain. Abortion is also so often the result of psychological or physical coercion or even emotional or physical abandonment, which is a tragic social paradigm that has caused a deep wound in the soul of our country. No matter how difficult the circumstances, Madam Speaker, I believe we can and must do better as a society, and at a minimum, taxpayer dollars should not be involved.

This issue has manifested itself again most intently during the health care debate. Unless a prohibition is enacted, taxpayers will fund abortion under the framework of the new health care law. Madam Speaker, abortion is not health

care. The House of Representatives recently voted to stop the use of taxpayer funds for abortions in the District of Columbia. For decades, Congress has proscribed Federal funding for abortion in this piecemeal fashion through the Hyde Amendment and other similar provisions in annual appropriations.

It is time to settle this once and for all as the majority of Americans wish. This bill will provide a comprehensive prohibition on the use of Federal tax dollars to fund the socially divisive issue of abortion, and it is time we stopped it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself 30 seconds just to speak to something that is very important.

H.R. 3 is actually dangerous for women's health. By refusing to provide any exceptions to women who are facing serious health conditions—cancer, heart or whatever that may be—you are forcing women to choose to risk their health or to risk bankruptcy, and I think that is morally unacceptable.

Under H.R. 3, a woman facing cancer who needs to terminate a pregnancy in order to live might have to go into debt over the $10,000 that the legal and necessary procedure could cost. Despite having both health insurance and tax-preferred savings accounts, this bill would prevent her from having that.

I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a nurse, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

□ 1250

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation.

A mere 2 weeks ago, the Republican majority brought us to the brink of government shutdown over their disapproval of Planned Parenthood. But instead of moving past divisive social issues and addressing our economic challenges with housing and creating jobs, we are here again today witnessing the Republicans' obsession with reopening the culture wars.

H.R. 3 represents the most egregious attack on reproductive rights in over 35 years, rights that are protected by the Supreme Court decision. H.R. 3 uses the Tax Code to effectively deny access to insurance that includes abortion care coverage, no matter how it is paid for. What it doesn't do is trust our Nation's women, trust our Nation's families, their doctors, their clergy, and trust small businesses to make their own health care choices for their employees. This is unacceptable. Make no mistake, despite the rhetoric coming from the other side of the aisle, the bill is not about funding. It is about using our laws and our Tax Code to infringe upon the rights of women, the protected rights of women and families across this Nation.

Madam Speaker, it is time that this Congress places trust in our Nation's women, its families and small businesses to make their own health care choices.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the author of H.R. 3.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend Mr. NUGENT for yielding and thank him for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, America has changed and today is more pro-life than ever. By ever-increasing majorities, especially among our young people, the megatrend is to protect the child in the womb from the insidious violence of abortion and to protect women from the trauma, often lifelong emotional harm, of procuring an abortion.

This paradigm shift, reflected in all the major polls, is the direct result of pro-life education, pregnancy care centers, pro-life laws, including funding bans, informed consent and parental involvement statutes, the molding of consciences by the faith-based community and advances in ultrasound that have shattered the pernicious pro-abortion myth that the baby in the womb isn't a human person or alive or of innate value.

Even Planned Parenthood abortion clinic director Abby Johnson was shocked into her new pro-life view by witnessing an ultrasound-guided abortion of a 13-week-old baby who was dismembered and pulverized in real time right before her eyes at that Texas clinic.

But perhaps the greatest reason for the huge shift in public opinion in favor of life is the growing number of extraordinarily brave post-abortive women who deeply regret their abortions and today are silent no more.

One post-abortive woman told a group outside the U.S. Supreme Court, and I heard her say it, that as she lay on the operating table, the abortionist laughed as he inserted a sharp knife into her womb and said, ''Oh, it is trying to get away.'' Partially sedated, the woman immediately pleaded with the nurse and doctor to stop the abortion and to spare her child. They told her to shut up. Today she is deeply wounded by that cruel assault, that lethal assault on her baby.

Dr. Alveda King, niece of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, has had two abortions. Today she has joined the growing coalition of women who deeply regret their abortions. Out of deep personal pain and compassion for others, they challenge us to respect, protect and tangibly love both mother and child.

The women of Silent No More give post-abortive women a safe place to grieve and a roadmap to reconciliation. And to society at large, and especially to Congress, these brave women compel us to rethink and to reassess the cheap sophistry of the abortion culture. Reflecting on her famous uncle's speech, the ''I Have a Dream'' speech, Dr. Alveda King asks us: ''How can the dream survive if we murder the children?''

Madam Speaker, there is no doubt whatsoever that ending public funding for abortions saves lives. Even the pro-abortion Guttmacher Institute in June of 2009 in a report said ''approximately one-fourth of women who would have had Medicaid-funded abortions if the Hyde amendment didn't exist instead give birth when this funding is unavailable.''

I vividly remember the late Congressman Henry Hyde being moved to tears when he learned that the Hyde amendment had likely saved the lives of more than 1 million children, who today are perhaps in school and getting ready for summer vacation, perhaps playing sports, or, if they are in their twenties or thirties, building their own families.

H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, comprehensively ensures that all programs authorized and appropriated by the Federal Government, including ObamaCare, including the Hyde amendment, do not subsidize the killing of babies except in the rare cases of rape, incest and life of the mother.

H.R. 3 ends the current IRS policy allowing tax-favored treatment for abortions under itemized deductions, HSAs, MSAs and FSAs. H.R. 3 also ends the use of tax credits under ObamaCare to purchase insurance plans that include abortions, except in cases of rape, incest or life of the mother.

Today we seek to end taxpayer complicity in abortion violence. No taxpayer should be coerced to pay, subsidize or facilitate the dismemberment, the chemical poisoning, the starvation—and remember, that is how RU–486 works; it first starves the baby to death, then the other chemical brings on delivery of a dead baby—or the suctioning to death of a child and the harming of women.

Regarding conscience rights, H.R. 3 protects pro-life health care entities by discrimination by State, local and Federal governments and empowers the courts with the authority to prevent and redress actual or threatened violations of conscience.

The need for this protection is great. According to the Alliance of Catholic Health Care, which represents California's Catholic health systems and hospitals, ''California's Catholic hospitals operate in a public policy environment that regularly challenges the concept of conscience rights protections by attempting to coerce them and other health care providers to perform, be complicit in or pay for abortions.''

So I urge Members to support this legislation. It is backed by 228 cosponsors.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to put in the real Guttmacher statement, what they have said. ''The claim that restoration of Federal Medicaid coverage would result in a significant increase in the incidence of abortion nationwide is not supported by research, and extrapolating from Guttmacher's Medicaid

findings to assert that coverage in the private insurance market is strongly linked to abortion incidence is entirely illegitimate.''

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady.

Henry Hyde was one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives in the history of the House of Representatives. He believed intently in a pro-life position, and the remarks of colleagues who support this legislation are ones that I think Mr. Hyde would approve of. But he was also a master legislator, and he understood that other people have a different point of view than he has, and on the matter of abortion, something that is a matter of faith for many people, a matter of conscience for everyone, there are different points of view.

The excellent job that Mr. Hyde did was to take direct taxpayer funding out of the equation. If there were going to be abortions, they were not going to be paid for by taxpayer dollars. This amendment takes it a radical step further. What it does is it says, if there is any tax credit that is part of a health care plan, then this legislation would prohibit a small business from offering that health care plan to its workers.

Now, just think about the enormous burden that is being placed on hundreds, if not thousands, of small businesses in Vermont, on millions of small businesses in this country. Every one of those businesses, where it offers a comprehensive health care plan to their employees that may include abortion services, suddenly has to unravel those plans and deny that coverage to its workers. So what we have is an action by the sponsors of this legislation that would impose its will far beyond what Mr. Hyde ever did or sought to do on every small business in this country.

□ 1300

By the way, there's another issue here, a precedent. If now we're starting to interfere with the use of tax credits, does this mean the next target is what kind of home you buy if you're going to get the use of a taxpayer deduction?

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

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

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady.

Does it mean that if you're doing research on biotechnology, that the tax credit is going to be restricted and dictated by a majority, whoever it happens to be, of this House of Representatives? The basic question for this Congress is whether we're going to allow the status quo to exist through the Hyde amendment where people can exercise their conscience on this important question, or are we going to have a dictation from this Congress that absolutely and completely prohibits people from making that choice themselves.

The mutual respect that Mr. Hyde understood we needed in this country is really going to be frayed with this legislation. So I would urge Members to vote against this legislation. That's out of respect for the fact that there are sharply different views on this extraordinarily important question.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to my colleague from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me time to speak on the importance of protecting defenseless unborn children and ensuring taxpayer money is not used to pay for elective abortions.

I do want to explain to my glib friend from Vermont, who is so good on the floor, that the Hyde amendment itself covers plans as well as direct funding. So I think the people need to know there's a slight correction to the comments that he made.

According to a CNN poll last month, Madam Speaker, more than 60 percent of Americans oppose taxpayer-funding for abortion. Today, this House has the historic opportunity to end the patchwork of policies that are intended to prohibit taxpayer funding for abortion by passing a government-wide prohibition on funding elective abortions. H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, codifies many longstanding pro-life protections that have been passed under both Republican and Democrat-controlled Congresses. In fact, Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI has voted 14 times to prohibit taxpayer funding for abortion in the District of Columbia. President Obama voted against taxpayer funding of abortion in the District of Columbia twice when he was in the Senate; and since being elected President, he's signed appropriations legislation into law that prohibits this funding.

As you can see, Madam Speaker, opposition to taxpayer funding for abortion is bipartisan, bicameral, and supported by the American people. There's nothing more important than protecting voiceless unborn children and their families from the travesty of abortion. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for life by voting in favor of this rule and the underlying bill and say that my colleague from Vermont said we can differ on opinions, but this is the right position to take.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and in opposition to H.R. 3, a bill that threatens women's health and access to care. Over the past 2 weeks, as I traveled in my district, the top-of-mind issues were the economy and jobs. Now that we're back in D.C., instead of working together on bills that move our economy forward, we're asked to debate divisive social policy. Clearly, the priorities of the Republican majority do not match those of the people of Hawaii.

There are those who will say that H.R. 3 maintains the status quo. Not so. H.R. 3 is an extreme, radical measure that could deny tax credits for small businesses, take us back to the days when a woman had to prove that she was a victim of rape, and violate women's medical privacy rights. Do you think small business owners have the time and needed expertise to determine if their insurance plans cover abortions? Do you want to take our country back to the days when a woman had to prove that she resisted her rapist? Do you want to share your medical history with an IRS audit?

I was a member of the State legislature in the 1980s in Hawaii when I worked with women and victim advocacy groups to change our sexual assault laws so that the prosecution focused on the perpetrator of the rape rather than on the actions of the victim. Our court system in those days, because of our law, victimized the victims of rape. Hawaii changed its laws. This bill takes us back to those days when a woman had to show that she resisted.

Hawaii was also the first State in the Nation to decriminalize abortion and give a woman the right to choose. The person who carried this bill in the legislature was Senator Vince Yano, a devout Catholic. Governor Jack Burns, a devout Catholic—he went to mass every single day—he allowed this bill to become law in Hawaii, in spite of the fact that he had a lot of pressure as a Catholic to veto this bill. He could have done so. He respected the right of a woman to choose.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this rule and this bill.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I thank my colleague for this opportunity.

You're seeing the old argument of Washington versus the new realities of America. We have two distinct issues here. Those two issues are: one, life; two, the taxpayer. I think those things are becoming very stark. Here we are, a situation where a President has signed an executive order to do many of the exact same things—to not allow Federal-funded abortions to be happening. Yet somehow we shouldn't be putting this into law. It seems common sense that we would do that. We need to do this to protect the taxpayer. If you look at polling, you look at the number of things that are going on, we cannot allow Federal funds to be used and our taxpayers to be used for this procedure.

Now let's move on to life. We know the sanctity of life that is there from that very conception until natural death. We need to protect that. We need to protect that atmosphere as a government. That is not our job to promote that horrendous operation. It's our job to protect those children.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the

gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. I thank you, Madam Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation. Gas prices are approaching $5 a gallon, millions of Americans are looking for work, and we're busy turning the Tax Code into a moral club. Forget that abortion is a legal procedure. Forget the Republicans want limited government when it comes to protecting you in the workplace but Big Government when it comes to regulating your bedroom. This isn't about anyone's position on abortion. Roe v. Wade was decided 38 years ago. It's the law of the land. This is about whether we should use the Tax Code as a moral club to impose the religious beliefs of a few Members of Congress on the entire Nation.

What's next? Some find it immoral to drink alcohol or gamble. Should we outlaw business deductions for meals that include wine? How about business conventions in Las Vegas? Many people are morally opposed to profanity. Maybe we should make it against the law to swear when filling out your taxes.

Now, how about more serious issues? Many of my constituents think the war in Iraq is immoral. The same goes for subsidies for Big Oil and tax breaks that reward corporations for shipping our jobs overseas.

Singling out abortion is wrong. Even worse, it's a distraction from the serious challenges our Nation faces. If Republicans want to overturn Roe v. Wade, they should draft a bill and give it their best shot; but don't use the Tax Code as a bludgeon because you don't have the votes.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

A majority of Americans have made it clear that they oppose the government using their tax dollars to pay for abortions, and it's time that we permanently extend the Hyde amendment, which bans this irresponsible practice. Particularly in our current budget situation, the Federal Government should not be subsidizing abortions.

□ 1310

Additionally, this bill permanently extends important legal protections for doctors and other health care providers who refuse to perform abortions to which they are morally opposed. Every doctor and health care provider deserves the right to act according to his or her own conscience, and this important legislation will ensure that he or she is not punished for doing so.

Madam Speaker, the American people support this legislation. They do not want their tax dollars used to pay for abortions. Let's stand together today and do the fiscally and morally responsible thing—vote to pass H.R. 3.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, if a proposal were brought to the House floor that said the following, ''If an American makes a charitable contribution and takes a deduction on his income tax return, that we're going to disallow the charitable deduction if the group that's receiving the money promotes gun ownership, gun rights or gun education,'' I suspect it would not get one vote on the Republican side of the aisle, and it shouldn't get any votes on the Democratic side of the aisle because it's wrong and it's probably unconstitutional.

That is exactly what the underlying bill does here. It says that an American exercising his or her constitutional right, in this case her constitutional right, with their own money, will suffer a negative tax consequence because the majority wants them to.

Understand this. If an American woman, with her own money, chooses to exercise her constitutional right, she will be suffering an increase in taxes as a result of making this decision. I scarcely say that anyone on the majority side would agree that if we picked one of their favorite social issues and said we're going to raise taxes on people who engage in that social issue, much less than a constitutional right, that they would agree with this.

This is not a debate about abortion. This is a debate about privacy. It's a debate about individual liberty and the right of people to do what they choose with their own money, particularly when they're enforcing one of their own constitutional rights.

I would also say for the record, it's my understanding that if this bill is carried out, a person who is a minor who is a victim of statutory rape may not be able to avail herself of her constitutional rights with her family's own money.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I know very well, Madam Speaker, that people feel passionately about the right to life and the right to choose, and this is the forum in which that debate ought to take place. But using the Internal Revenue Code to either punish or reward certain social conduct, particularly conduct that is in the exercise of a constitutional right, is wrong, and if anyone on the majority side would like to tell me that they would vote for that NRA provision, I welcome that. I wouldn't, because it's an impermissible, unconstitutional burden on the constitutional rights of Americans. So is this.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation.

As an obstetrician and gynecologist, I have delivered nearly 5,000 babies, and I strongly support the sanctity of life. I believe life is a precious gift from God that begins at conception. I have seen human development occur from the earliest stages of a small fetus all the way through birth. The magic of the heartbeat at 26 to 28 days post-conception is indescribable in my field like this, which strengthens my conviction of the right to life.

Since 1976 until the passage of President Obama's health care reform law, Congress prevented taxpayer funding for abortions. Unless abortion is specifically excluded from Federal insurance plans, the courts and administrative agencies have historically mandated it. That's why the language in H.R. 3 is so important and necessary. It explicitly states that taxpayer dollars should not be used to fund abortion.

Abortion is not a business our government should be involved in. Because something is legal doesn't mean you should do it. Regardless of how people felt about the President's health care law, people shared the belief that the President's Executive order on this subject was simply insufficient. I agree with this concern and believe that further efforts need to be made to ensure that no taxpayer funds are ever used for this purpose.

Under H.R. 3, Federal funds are statutorily prohibited from being involved in any type of health care coverage or benefits that include abortion. This means future Presidents, or even our President, can't go back and insert abortion coverage on a whim.

As legislators, we carry the responsibility and privilege to protect those who do not have a voice. We must make our laws consistent with our science and restore full legal protections to all who are waiting to be born. This starts with legislation like H.R. 3.

One of government's core functions is to protect the most innocent among us, and I will do my best to ensure that government fulfills its duty. I will always fight for the right to life because it is my belief that we are unique creations of God who knows us and loves us even before we are conceived.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her strong work on this bill.

Madam Speaker, this bill is unprecedented in a number of ways. It is unprecedented in that it uniquely affects my district, and yet I was not allowed to testify at the hearing of the Judiciary Committee where it was considered. It is unprecedented in its attack on a woman's right to choose, going

well beyond the Hyde amendment. And it is unprecedented in seeking to federalize the local funds of the District of Columbia.

Section 309 of this bill would make permanent the ban in the recent 2011 spending bill that keeps the District from spending its own local funds on abortions for poor women. That's bad enough, but the party that came to power even to devolve Federal power back to the States is engaged in the reverse process in this bill, in federalizing what has always been understood in our Constitution to be local power and, worse, local money and deciding how it should be spent.

It is a dictatorship over local funds. It goes against every principle that the majority claims to support when it cites the Constitution. It goes against the accepted practice, a practice you can do nothing about in the States, where 17 States have, of course, spent their own local funds on abortions for poor women for decades, recognizing that this could not be done with Federal money.

The District of Columbia does not ask for 1 cent of Federal money. In the same way, the District of Columbia demands that its local funds be kept local for us as for every other jurisdiction of this body.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2011.

DEAR SENATORS BOXER, CANTWELL, FEINSTEIN, GILLIBRAND, HAGAN, KLOBUCHAR, LANDRIEU, MCCASKILL, MIKULSKI, MURRAY, SHAHEEN, AND STABENOW: We, the women of the Congressional Black Caucus, write for two reasons. First, we want to express our gratitude to you, the Democratic women of the Senate, for successfully blocking the Planned Parenthood rider from the final fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution (CR). The rider was an attack on the health and lives of all American women, especially women of modest means. The public conditioning of your support for the CR on the exclusion of the rider made the critical difference. We agreed with your strong position, which showed the country that you would not abandon women in a tough fight. Although our party is in the minority in the House, we are ready to join with you to defeat future Republican attacks on women's health.

However, we are deeply disappointed that low-income women in the District of Columbia were sacrificed during the CR negotiations. The Administration and Senate Democratic Leadership agreed to re-impose a rider prohibiting the District government from spending its own local taxpayer-raised funds on abortions for low-income women. The poor women in the District have already begun to feel the terrible effects of the rider. Abortions are time-sensitive, and scores of women scheduled for District-funded abortions at a Planned Parenthood clinic immediately had their appointments canceled. This paradox cannot be overlooked. Nonprofits in the District, including the DC Abortion Fund which helps D.C. women pay for abortions, are desperately trying to raise funds to mitigate the harm done by the rider.

Not only did this concession by Democrats violate our party's long-standing support for reproductive choice and for the District's right to self-government, it was unnecessary. As House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi has noted, fifty-nine House Republicans voted against the CR. This means 36 Democratic votes were needed to reach 218 votes for passage. According to media reports, most House Republicans who voted against the CR did so because it did not cut enough spending, not because of the absence of the Planned Parenthood or of any other rider. In fact, the CR was remarkably clean, with only four riders. Only two were controversial, D.C. abortion and a new private school voucher program in the District. It is no wonder that the District felt abandoned.

The D.C. abortion rider, as well as every other anti-home-rule rider, was removed during the last four years of Democratic congressional control. This was a historic first that could not have been achieved without your help. As the fiscal year 2012 appropriations process begins, we believe it would be invaluable if you stated, early and publicly, your opposition to the inclusion of the D.C. abortion rider in the fiscal year 2012 appropriations bill. This is perhaps the only way to keep it out of the bill after Democrats agreed to it in the CR. Such a statement would not only help in fiscal year 2012, it would discourage House Republicans from escalating their attacks on women in the District, which are already underway.

An odious anti-choice bill, H.R. 3 (the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act), is due on the House floor this week. It would make the D.C. abortion rider permanent. Although we know you will not allow H.R. 3 to pass in the Senate, House Republicans may feel emboldened to bring up a permanent D.C. abortion ban as a stand-alone bill or to attach it to another bill. The consideration of H.R. 3 on the House floor could provide you an occasion to speak out against it and to note the D.C. provision as a special reason for your opposition. You could also use this opportunity to indicate your opposition to a D.C. abortion rider in the fiscal year 2012 appropriations bill.

District women have no vote in Congress and no representation in the Senate. The city's low-income women need the support of women in Congress who not only have a vote, but who have also shown they will stand with women everywhere.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lee, Karen Bass, Donna Christensen, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Corrine Brown, Yvette Clarke, Donna Edwards, Sheila Jackson Lee, Laura Richardson, Terri Sewell, Marcia Fudge, Gwen Moore, Maxine Waters, Frederica Wilson, Members of Congress.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
May 4, 2011.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: I write to express my outrage with legislation that is pending before the House of Representatives, H.R. 3, which contains language extremely offensive to the District of Columbia. I ask you to withdraw the bill from consideration immediately.

H.R. 3 purports to limit the use of taxpayer funds for a constitutionally protected activity, but in truth, it goes much further in its effects on the District of Columbia. The language used in the bill converts the District into a Federal property for the first time in its history. This unprecedented affront to the sovereignty of a local and state government would never be contemplated anywhere else in the United States. Yet, the District is particularly singled out in the bill for such treatment.

This effort to alter the entire status of the District Government is truly beyond the pale. The District of Columbia is comprised of 600,000 people who deserve the same rights as other citizens and residents of their nation. American history is defined as resistance to oppression while promoting freedom and democracy. Given the principles upon which this nation was founded, and America contrives to promote steadfastly world-wide, how can you justify the disparate and disrespectful treatment to which District residents are subjected?

The Constitution guarantees every citizen of age a direct line of communication to the highest levels of our representative government so that their interests are always heard and protected. Our interests are not being protected, they are being stripped from us. As an elected member of the national government, we implore you not to further encroach upon the rights of the people who live in our city.

I cannot urge you strongly enough to remove the District from this bill as we are not a component of the federal government.

Regards,

VINCENT C. GRAY,
Mayor.

COUNCIL OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2011.

Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: We write in strong opposition to H.R. 3, the misleadingly named ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act,'' because it has nothing to do with federal funds. The bill would prohibit the District of Columbia from using its own, locally-raised funds to support abortion services for low-income women.

The bill would overturn the rule of local government. Republicans and Democrats nationwide believe that local governments should decide what is best with respect to local issues. This belief is bedrock American principle that extends from the original Founding Fathers to today's Tea Party activists. It is also the principle underlying your own Home Rule Act for the District—the purpose of which is ''to relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local District matters.''

H.R. 3 would make the District of Columbia the only jurisdiction in the country that is prohibited from choosing whether or not to use its own locally-raised funds to support low-income abortion services. It would be a Pyrrhic victory for abortion opponents, as it does nothing to affect Congress' inability to overrule the 17 states that currently fund abortion services for low-income residents.

The 600,000 residents of the District have neither a voice nor a vote in the Congress to defend against this renewed assault that is H.R. 3. We urge members of Congress to respect the District and the fundamental American principle of local rule. We urge you to be helpful, not harmful, to our efforts to improve public health and safety. We urge you to vote against H.R. 3.

Sincerely,

Kwame R. Brown, Chairman; Phil Mendelson, Councilmember At-Large; Sekou Biddle, Councilmember At-Large; David Catania, Councilmember At-Large; Michael A. Brown, Councilmember At-Large; Jim Graham, Councilmember Ward 1; Jack Evans, Councilmember Ward 2; Mary M. Cheh, Councilmember Ward 3; Muriel Bowser, Councilmember Ward 4; Harry Thomas, Jr., Councilmember Ward 5; Tommy Wells, Councilmember Ward 6; Yvette Alexander, Councilmember Ward 7; Marion Barry, Councilmember Ward 8.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman.

Before I begin my remarks, I just have to say that I am really shocked by the statement from my friend and colleague from the State of New Jersey as well when he basically makes the bold statement that basically by taking away a subsidy of sorts of what we're doing here, and that translates to a tax increase on an individual. Nothing, of course, is done in this legislation to that effect.

I come to the floor today and rise in full support of H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. I commend everyone who has worked on this, especially my other colleague from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) not only for sponsoring the bill before us today but for being a leader on this important issue. You see, by passing this bill, what we really do is establish a permanent government-wide prohibition on subsidies for abortion and abortion coverage, while giving the doctors opposed to abortion certain protections to safeguard them from performing abortions against their will.

□ 1320

This is a commonsense bill. It is consistent with the opinions of the majority of Americans who have voiced opposition to Federal funding for abortion.

See, I believe that the time has come to do away with the patchwork ban currently in place with a law that extends the Hyde amendment to all aspects of spending authority here in Congress.

Now, I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will tell you that cutting off funding to abortion services will only cause abortion rates to do what? Rise, they say, but just the opposite. In fact, published research by the pro-abortion Alan Guttmacher Institute shows what? That we would actually see a 25 percent decrease in abortions.

Furthermore, contrary to what the opposition would have you believe, this legislation will not affect funding for family planning services. It will only prevent funding and subsidies for abortion and abortion coverage.

So it's important to point out that taxpayers across the country do not believe that they should be funding abortion coverage. Well, just last week in Indiana, Governor Daniels signed probably the most comprehensive taxpayer protection law.

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

Mr. NUGENT. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GARRETT. As I was saying, just last week in Indiana, the Governor signed probably the most comprehensive taxpayer protection law to prevent taxpayers from doing what? Subsidizing abortion. I was reading the article in the L.A. Times. They said this is probably going to go in other States. Why is that? Because it's the will of the people.

Let me tell you and conclude on this. I'm the father of two beautiful girls. When I look at them, I see the promise of tomorrow. My life is, without question, better for the love I share with them. America is better for each child and life that is here.

So I will come to this floor and continue to fight to protect the most fundamental right of the unborn in each of us: the right to life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1¾ minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her leadership not only on this but so many important issues.

I want to make it very clear, in response to the gentleman's statement, there are no taxpayer-funded abortions now. There weren't any yesterday, and there won't be any in the future. H.R. 3 goes far beyond current law. It is stunning in its scope, appalling in its indifference, and outrageous in its arrogance.

The right to choose is absolutely meaningless without access to choice, and H.R. 3 creates obstacles for women to access safe, legal, and constitutionally protected health care. This makes access to abortion coverage incredibly difficult, and I would say that the bill is not only an attack on women's rights, but it is also an attack on the rights of the private insurance companies and small businesses.

It tells private insurance companies how to run their businesses, raises compliance costs for small business, and even tells the local government how they may spend their money. The bill manages to offend nearly every high-sounding principle the other side says they stand for.

So if you truly believe in the freedom of the individual and the wisdom of free market, vote ''no'' on this absolutely appalling piece of work. It is anti-woman, anti-choice, anti-respect, and anti-business. It is a totally flawed bill, goes far further than any existing law, and it is the deepest and strongest attack on a woman's right to choose that has come before this body in my lifetime.

And the Republican majority says its priority is jobs and job creation, but their actions speak louder than words. They want to come into the bedroom. They want to come between a woman and her doctor. It is an appalling bill. Please vote ''no.''

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER).

Mr. FINCHER. I rise in support of the rule.

Over 20 years ago, in his 1985 book, ''For Every Idle Silence,'' Congressman Hyde wrote ''It is becoming culturally fashionable to protect the defenseless unborn.'' Those words hold even truer today as polling continually shows the majority of Americans oppose the vast majority of abortions and more Americans consider themselves pro-life more than ever.

Polls also show that a large majority of Americans oppose taxpayer subsidies for abortion and abortion coverage. An April 2011 CNN poll found that 61 percent of respondents opposed using public funds for abortion. A November 2009 Washington Post poll showed 61 percent of respondents opposed government subsidies for health insurance that includes abortion. A September 2009 International Communications Research poll showed that 67 percent of respondents opposed measure that would require people to pay for abortion coverage with their Federal taxes.

Our constituents and our conscience demand of us that we wait no longer. We must permanently end taxpayer funding of abortion and protect the lives of unborn children.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the privilege to come here to the floor and stand up for the rights of the innocent unborn in this country.

At the root of this issue is the question of what is human life and is it sacred in all of its forms and at what instant does it begin, and I think all of us with a conscience will recognize that human life needs to be sacred in all of its forms and it begins at the instant of conception, and once we come to that conclusion we stand up to defend every voiceless innocent miracle that's on its way into breathing free air into this country.

And to think that we are compelling the American taxpayer to fund abortions across this country and in foreign lands on occasion, because we can't quite hear that voice—Henry Hyde heard that voice, and we're standing up with and for Henry Hyde. I so much appreciate him and CHRIS SMITH, who is the principal author of the underlying legislation.

I rise in support of this rule, Madam Speaker, and I rise in support of the innocent unborn. The conscience of America must be heard in this debate today, on this rule and on the underlying bill. The voice of the voiceless need to be heard, that of those people who were not heard in the life we will hear from in the next, as Henry Hyde so eloquently said. But an America that is a pro-life America, with over 60 percent that oppose Federal funding, taxpayer-funded abortions, this is a consistent position that reflects the will of the American people. We must draw this line not just with Planned Parenthood but every abortion provider in the country. If they can't make it in the market on their own, we have no business subsidizing them without regard to the impact on our overall economy.

Madam Speaker, I'm pleased and proud to be here today to take this stand, and I'm pleased and proud of the

entire Pro-Life Caucus that's here in the United States Congress, both Democrats and Republicans alike, who have done so much over the years to bring us to this point of consensus. And this is a consensus that will be reflected on this vote on the rule and on the vote on the underlying bill, a consensus of the American people with their resounding support for this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I first want to remind people what we've said about statutory rape. When this bill was first introduced, it modified the long-standing rape exception to the Hyde amendment by adding the term ''forcible'' before the word ''rape.'' In other words, the victim of rape had to show wounds and other matters that she really was forcibly raped before she could be covered, but they changed that because there was such an outcry. But they have found another way to get to exclude other victims of rape. Just saying those words scandalizes me.

The House Judiciary Committee report, which will be used by the courts to interpret the intent of this bill, says the bill will not allow the Federal Government to subsidize abortions in cases of statutory rape, claiming that this reflects existing law, and of course it does not. Statutory rape is one of the most serious of crimes because the young woman involved has not given consent and, indeed, is not allowed to because of her age. How dare we do that? Have they not suffered enough?

The Hyde amendment does not distinguish between statutory rape or any other kind of rape. In fact, a 1978 regulation implementing the Hyde amendment makes clear that it includes victims of statutory rape in the funding exemption.

Now, if most people in the United States don't want their tax money used for abortions, they can relax. We've not been using tax money for 38 years. We're not going to change that with this bill. That's not the intent of this bill at all. It's simply the title, which is meaningless.

□ 1330

What it does do is it increases taxes on middle class and lower-income women and their families, but it singles out small business employers and penalizes them if they provide comprehensive insurance coverage that includes abortion. Nearly two-thirds of all voters polled—this is two-thirds—oppose this draconian change in the tax system for small business and individuals with plans that cover abortion. In fact, even most Republicans, tea party supporters, anti-abortion workers, and evangelical Christians oppose the tax increase.

As the head of the South Carolina Small Business Chamber of Commerce wrote in a Hill column Monday: ''H.R. 3 is simply a slap in the face to the millions of small businesses now offering health insurance to employees and eligible for the new tax credits'' that come from the new health care bill.

[From The Hill's Congress Blog, May 2, 2011]

H.R. 3 A DELIBERATE ATTACK ON SMALL BUSINESS

(By Frank Knapp, Jr.)

After decades of escalading group health insurance premiums and demands for Congressional action for relief, a little over one year ago many of our small businesses finally were given the opportunity for federal health insurance tax credits.

Now H.R. 3, up for a vote this week, threatens to erase this benefit for small businesses because it would eliminate the health insurance tax credits under the Affordable Care Act for any existing or new plans that provide coverage for abortion.

The problems H.R. 3 would cause for small businesses that are trying to do the right thing and offer health insurance have nothing to do with the ideological intent of this bill. Even if a small business owner agrees with the intent, the cost of passage of H.R. 3 in terms of time, money and continuity of policy is very significant.

Small business owners do not have the expertise to closely examine healthcare plans to determine if abortion coverage is included. Such services are not labeled ''abortion'' but rather fall into numerous clauses in a health care policy from prescription drugs to outpatient surgery to maternity care that includes unforeseen complications. Small business owners are no more prepared to completely understand the fine print of their health insurance policies than members of Congress.

Requiring a small business owner to try to understand the intricacies of their health insurance policies would require considerable time on their own or with an insurance agent (who also probably has no idea how to interpret the verbiage in the policy as it relates to abortion). Essentially H.R. 3 will cause a small employer to divert time from running the business. And if time is money, as we are all told, then H.R. 3 will be an increase in cost for small businesses offering health insurance.

Small businesses that finally determine that their health insurance policy does in fact cover even one abortion service will be financially punished in one of two ways. Either they can keep their present policy and lose thousands of dollars in hard won tax credits or they will give up their current health plan and most likely have to pay higher premiums for a new plan. The latter will result from both re-underwriting by a new carrier and adding provisions now required in any new policy. This is especially true since the health insurance exchanges will not be in place until 2014 to increase competition for this business.

H.R. 3 is simply a slap in the face to the millions of small businesses now offering health insurance to employees and eligible for the new tax credits. Targeting small businesses for such punitive action, while ignoring big businesses that also receive tax benefits when offering health insurance, demonstrates a callous disregard for the ''backbone of our economy'', as members of Congress love to proclaim.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I need to correct one thing. The word ''forcible'' is nowhere in the statute or the legislation as we have it on the floor.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have you believe that H.R. 3 is about taking away a woman's right to choose. That is simply not true. H.R. 3 is about ensuring that taxpayers aren't on the hook for paying for that choice. My Democratic colleagues would have you believe that we want to raise your taxes and allow the IRS to audit women. Again, that is simply not true. The bill is about one thing: keeping our tax dollars from being spent for elective abortions on demand.

The United States is currently borrowing 42 cents of every dollar we spend. We are in debt and spending money we don't have. We need to focus on bringing our government back to its core mission. You can't tell me that paying for elective abortions is part of our core mission.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 177, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

YEAS—243

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan

Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—177

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Costa
Diaz-Balart
Emerson
Giffords
Johnson, Sam
Lummis
Nunnelee
Pingree (ME)
Thompson (PA)

□ 1356

Ms. BROWN of Florida changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. COFFMAN of Colorado, GARY G. MILLER of California, and HELLER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 237, I call up the bill (H.R. 3) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide for conscience protections, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MYRICK). Pursuant to House Resolution 237, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 112–71 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3

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

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—the table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY-FUNDED ABORTIONS AND PROVIDING FOR CONSCIENCE PROTECTIONS

Sec. 101. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions and providing for conscience protections.

Sec. 102. Amendment to table of chapters.

TITLE II—ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN TAX BENEFITS RELATING TO ABORTION

Sec. 201. Deduction for medical expenses not allowed for abortions.

Sec. 202. Disallowance of refundable credit for coverage under qualified health plan which provides coverage for abortion.

Sec. 203. Disallowance of small employer health insurance expense credit for plan which includes coverage for abortion.

Sec. 204. Distributions for abortion expenses from certain accounts and arrangements included in gross income.

TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY-FUNDED ABORTIONS AND PROVIDING FOR CONSCIENCE PROTECTIONS

SEC. 101. PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED ABORTIONS AND PROVIDING FOR CONSCIENCE PROTECTIONS.

Title 1, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 4—PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED ABORTIONS AND PROVIDING FOR CONSCIENCE PROTECTIONS

''Sec.

''301. Prohibition on funding for abortions.

''302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion.

''303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees.

''304. Construction relating to separate coverage.

''305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage.

''306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws.

''307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion.

''308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother.

''309. Application to District of Columbia.

''310. No government discrimination against certain health care entities.

''§ 301. Prohibition on funding for abortions

''No funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be expended for any abortion.

''§ 302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion

''None of the funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be expended for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

''§ 303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees

''No health care service furnished—

''(1) by or in a health care facility owned or operated by the Federal Government; or

''(2) by any physician or other individual employed by the Federal Government to provide health care services within the scope of the physician's or individual's employment,

may include abortion.

''§ 304. Construction relating to separate coverage

''Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as prohibiting any individual, entity, or State or locality from purchasing separate abortion coverage or health benefits coverage that includes abortion so long as such coverage is paid for entirely using only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

''§ 305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage

''Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as restricting the ability of any non-Federal health benefits coverage provider from offering abortion coverage, or the ability of a State or locality to contract separately with such a provider for such coverage, so long as only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law are used and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

''§ 306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws

''Nothing in this chapter shall repeal, amend, or have any effect on any other Federal law to the extent such law imposes any limitation on the use of funds for abortion or for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion, beyond the limitations set forth in this chapter.

''§ 307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion

''Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to apply to the treatment of any infection, injury, disease, or disorder that has been caused by or exacerbated by the performance of an abortion. This rule of construction shall be applicable without regard to whether the abortion was performed in accord with Federal or State law, and without regard to whether funding for the abortion is permissible under section 308.

''§ 308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother

''The limitations established in sections 301, 302, and 303 shall not apply to an abortion—

''(1) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

''(2) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

''§ 309. Application to District of Columbia

''In this chapter:

''(1) Any reference to funds appropriated by Federal law shall be treated as including any amounts within the budget of the District of Columbia that have been approved by Act of Congress pursuant to section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (or any applicable successor Federal law).

''(2) The term 'Federal Government' includes the government of the District of Columbia.

''§ 310. No government discrimination against certain health care entities

''(a) NONDISCRIMINATION.—A Federal agency or program, and any State or local government that receives Federal financial assistance (either directly or indirectly), may not subject any individual or institutional health care entity to discrimination on the basis that the health care entity does not provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortions.

''(b) HEALTH CARE ENTITY DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'health care entity' includes an individual physician or other health care professional, a hospital, a provider-sponsored organization, a health maintenance organization, a health insurance plan, or any other kind of health care facility, organization, or plan.

''(c) REMEDIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to prevent and redress actual or threatened violations of this section by issuing any form of legal or equitable relief, including—

''(A) injunctions prohibiting conduct that violates this section; and

''(B) orders preventing the disbursement of all or a portion of Federal financial assistance to a State or local government, or to a specific offending agency or program of a State or local government, until such time as the conduct prohibited by this section has ceased.

''(2) COMMENCEMENT OF ACTION.—An action under this subsection may be instituted by—

''(A) any health care entity that has standing to complain of an actual or threatened violation of this section; or

''(B) the Attorney General of the United States.

''(d) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall designate the Director of the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health and Human Services—

''(1) to receive complaints alleging a violation of this section;

''(2) subject to paragraph (3), to pursue the investigation of such complaints in coordination with the Attorney General; and

''(3) in the case of a complaint related to a Federal agency (other than with respect to the Department of Health and Human Services) or program administered through such other agency or any State or local government receiving Federal financial assistance through such other agency, to refer the complaint to the appropriate office of such other agency.''.

SEC. 102. AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CHAPTERS.

The table of chapters for title 1, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''4. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions and providing for conscience protections ..... 301''.

TITLE II—ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN TAX BENEFITS RELATING TO ABORTION

SEC. 201. DEDUCTION FOR MEDICAL EXPENSES NOT ALLOWED FOR ABORTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) AMOUNTS PAID FOR ABORTION NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An amount paid during the taxable year for an abortion shall not be taken into account under subsection (a).

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

''(A) an abortion—

''(i) in the case of a pregnancy that is the result of an act of rape or incest, or

''(ii) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy, and

''(B) the treatment of any infection, injury, disease, or disorder that has been caused by or exacerbated by the performance of an abortion.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. DISALLOWANCE OF REFUNDABLE CREDIT FOR COVERAGE UNDER QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN WHICH PROVIDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 36B(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 213(g)(2))''.

(b) OPTION TO PURCHASE OR OFFER SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Paragraph (3) of section 36B(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.—

''(i) OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any individual from purchasing separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the premiums for such coverage or plan.

''(ii) OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as premiums for such separate coverage or plan are not paid for with any amount attributable to the credit allowed under this section (or the amount of any advance payment of the credit under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 203. DISALLOWANCE OF SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE CREDIT FOR PLAN WHICH INCLUDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 45R of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''Any term'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any term'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) EXCLUSION OF HEALTH PLANS INCLUDING COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—The terms 'qualified health plan' and 'health insurance coverage' shall not include any health plan or benefit that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 213(g)(2)).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ABORTION EXPENSES FROM CERTAIN ACCOUNTS AND ARRANGEMENTS INCLUDED IN GROSS INCOME.

(a) FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS UNDER CAFETERIA PLANS.—Section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsections (k) and (l) as subsections (l) and (m), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection:

''(k) ABORTION REIMBURSEMENT FROM FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENT INCLUDED IN GROSS INCOME.—Notwithstanding section 105(b), gross income shall include any reimbursement for expenses incurred for an abortion (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 213(g)(2)) from a health flexible spending arrangement provided under a cafeteria plan. Such reimbursement shall not fail to be a qualified benefit for purposes of this section merely as a result of such inclusion in gross income.''.

(b) ARCHER MSAS.—Paragraph (1) of section 220(f) of such Code is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that any such amount used to pay for an abortion (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 213(g)(2)) shall be included in the gross income of such holder''.

(c) HSAS.—Paragraph (1) of section 223(f) of such Code is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that any such amount used to pay for an abortion (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 213(g)(2)) shall be included in the gross income of such beneficiary''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) FSA REIMBURSEMENTS.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to expenses incurred with respect to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) DISTRIBUTIONS FROM SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.—The amendments made by subsection (b) and (c) shall apply to amounts paid with respect to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee of the Judiciary, 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, let me recognize the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chief sponsor of H.R. 3, for his persistent leadership over the years on this issue.

□ 1400

Many Members and the American people have strong feelings about the subject of abortion, but one thing is clear: The Federal funding of abortion will lead to more abortions. For example, in 2009, there were only 220 government-financed abortions. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the Federal Government would pay for as many as 675,000 abortions each year without the Hyde Amendment and other provisions that prevent the Federal funding of abortion.

The American people do not want federally funded abortions. A Zogby poll found that 77 percent of Americans feel that Federal funds should never pay for abortions or should pay only to save the life of the mother. That is the policy of the Hyde Amendment, which H.R. 3 would enact into law.

H.R. 3 does not ban abortion. It also does not restrict abortions or abortion coverage in health care plans as long as those abortions or plans use only private or State funds. This legislation places no additional legal restrictions on abortions. It simply protects taxpayers from having to fund or to subsidize something they morally oppose. H.R. 3 also is necessary to fix the recent health care law. Absolutely nothing in that law prevents the Federal funding of abortions under the programs it creates.

Neither Congress nor the administration should take the view that they know better than the American people what is good for them. Congress should pass H.R. 3 to codify the longstanding ban on the Federal funding of abortions.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker and Members of the House, the problem with this bill is that it reaches far beyond Federal funding in that it subjects women to profound government intrusion, that it restricts women's access to health care, and that it targets small businesses for disparate treatment under the Tax Code. That's why I have more than a dozen organizations, ranging from the American Nurses Association to the YWCA, which are all opposed to this legislation. In addition, this bill will punish women for their private health care decisions, and will subject them to profound government intrusion. So this is not a Democrat versus Republican issue. It is a very important personal decision.

Now, the goal of this bill—and I'd like to suggest it from the outset of this discussion—is to make it impossible to obtain abortion services even when paid for with purely private, non-Federal funds. If there is anyone who has a different view about this, I hope that it gets expressed this afternoon.

Finally, H.R. 3 subjects small businesses to disparate treatment under the tax laws; and as one who supports small business and workers in this country, that alone would turn my support against this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the current chairman of the Crime Subcommittee of the Judiciary.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today we are presented with an opportunity to take a giant step toward protecting the unborn. For almost 35 years, restrictions on the use of Federal funds for abortion have been enacted separately and have been contained in annually renewed congressional temporary funding restrictions, regulations and Executive orders. Such policies have sought to ensure that the American taxpayer does not fund the destruction of innocent human life through abortion. The legislation on the floor today will end the need for numerous separate abortion funding policies, and will finally put into place a permanent ban on any U.S. Government financial support for abortion.

Each year, the abortion industry is allocated millions of tax dollars to advance its agenda. Last year alone, the Planned Parenthood Federation of America collected more than 360 million taxpayer-funded dollars. Because all money is fungible, when taxpayers pay an organization like Planned Parenthood millions of dollars, we cannot help but empower and promote all of that organization's activities. Taxpaying Americans are fed up. They are tired of their hard-earned money being spent on supporting and promoting the abortion industry.

Under H.R. 3, Federal funds will be prohibited for elective abortion coverage through any program in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The legislation prevents the funding for abortion as a method of family planning overseas. It prohibits funding for elective abortion coverage for Federal employees, and it prevents taxpayer-funded abortions in Washington, D.C.

Importantly, H.R. 3 would also protect the conscience-driven health care providers from being forced by the government to participate in abortions. The conscience clause is critically needed in order to protect health care providers who do not want to take part in the abortion business. Without it, people could be forced to participate in something they strongly believe to be morally wrong. Faith-based hospitals could lose funding and be forced to close.

It is time to end taxpayer-funded abortions. I strongly support this important and needed approach to preserve and promote the sanctity of life in our country.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I would like now to yield 3 minutes to the former chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, JERRY NADLER of New York.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this bill has nothing to do with creating jobs, reducing our deficit or bolstering our economy. It addresses, instead, the completely fictitious claim that legislation is needed to prevent the Federal funding of abortion services. This bill has been falsely advertised as a mere codification of existing law prohibiting the Federal funding of abortion.

I have always opposed the unfair restrictions on Federal funding for a perfectly legal health care procedure, but this bill goes far beyond prohibiting Federal funding. The real purpose and effect of this bill is to eliminate private health care choices for women by imposing significant tax penalties on families and small businesses when they use their own money to pay for health insurance or medical care. This tax penalty is intended to drive insurance companies into dropping abortion services from existing private health care policies that women and families now have and rely upon.

This bill claims that a tax credit or deduction is a form of government funding. It follows that tax-deductible charitable contributions to a church, synagogue or other religious institution are also government funding—a position my Republican colleagues have never taken and that, if taken, would prohibit tax deductions for charitable contributions to religious organizations because they would then be violations of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment.

You can't have it both ways. Either tax exemptions, deductions or credits for private spending are government funding or they are not. If they are not, this bill makes no sense. If they are, then tax-deductible private contributions to religious institutions are government funding prohibited by the Constitution.

The power to tax is the power to destroy, and here, the taxing power is being used to destroy the right of every American to make private health care decisions free from government interference. This bill is an unprecedented attack on the use of private funds to make private health care choices, and is part of the new House majority's broader and disturbing attack on women's access to health care.

After 2 years of hearing my Republican colleagues complain that government should not meddle in the private insurance market or in private health care choices, I am astounded by this legislation, which is so obviously designed to do just that. It seems that

many Republicans believe in freedom provided that no one uses that freedom in a way that Republicans find objectionable. It is a strange understanding of freedom.

There is also a provision in this bill that might allow any health care provider or institution to refuse to provide an abortion to a woman whose life depends on having that abortion. They could let that woman die right there in the emergency room, and the government would be powerless to do anything. In fact, if the government insisted that the hospital not let the woman die, the bill would allow the hospital to sue the government and, in the case of a State or locality, strip that community of all Federal funding until the jurisdiction relented.

□ 1410

Despite the fact that Republicans made a big show of taking out language limiting rape to forcible rape, the committee report now says that the bill still excludes victims of statutory rape in order to close a ''loophole.'' That is right. You women who have been sexually victimized are really just a loophole. Frankly, disgusting.

A vote for this bill, Madam Speaker, is a vote for a tax increase on women, families, and small businesses. It is a vote for taking away the existing health insurance that women and families now have and pay for with their own funds. It is a vote to elevate the right to refuse care over the obligation to provide lifesaving care. It deserves to be defeated.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), who is the chairman of the Constitution Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, it is said that a government is what it spends. This bill is really about whether the role of America's government is to fund a practice that takes the lives of over 1 million unborn American babies every year, despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of Americans, even some of those who consider themselves prochoice, strongly object to their taxpayer dollars being used to pay for abortions.

In 1973, Madam Speaker, the United States Supreme Court said the unborn child was not a person under the Constitution and we have since witnessed the tragic deaths of over 50 million innocent little baby boys and girls who died without the protection we in this Chamber should have given them. Some of this was carried out with taxpayer dollars before the Hyde amendment and other such laws were in place, and taxpayer funding of abortion could recommence in the future under ObamaCare.

So before we vote on this bill, it is important for Members to ask themselves the real question: Does abortion take the life of a child? If it does not, then this is simply a budgetary issue. But if abortion really does kill a little baby, then those of us sitting here in these chambers of freedom are presiding over the greatest human genocide in the history of humanity, and some of it may be financed in the future, Madam Speaker, with taxpayer dollars over which we will have had direct control.

Madam Speaker, our Founding Fathers believed there were certain self-evident truths that were worth holding on to. The greatest of those truths in their minds was the transcendent meaning of this gift of God called human life. Our Constitution says no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. Thomas Jefferson said that ''The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government.''

Madam Speaker, protecting the lives and constitutional rights of our fellow Americans is why we are all here, and forcing taxpayers to pay for the indiscriminate killing of helpless little baby Americans is not good government and it should be ended once and for all.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. CHU. Imagine what life would be like for women under H.R. 3. Imagine you are pregnant and then diagnosed with breast cancer. Your doctor says that chemotherapy could save your life, but will permanently harm the baby. The diagnosis is devastating. But to add to your grief, because of H.R. 3, an abortion will not be covered by your private health insurance. You must pay out of pocket, even though it is necessary to save your life.

Imagine IRS agents as abortion cops. You see, under H.R. 3 you couldn't deduct an abortion as a medical expense unless it were the result of rape or incest, even though you are using your own money and even though you can deduct every other medical procedure. Imagine the IRS knocking at your door demanding receipts and grilling you about your rape.

This bill forces women to live their lives as if America was Orwell's 1984, where big brother Washington bureaucrats dictate the personal and private health decisions of American families.

Stop these attacks on women. Oppose H.R. 3.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. I have long believed that the right to life is one that we must vigorously protect, and I have cosponsored many bills to do that, including the Right to Life Act last Congress.

While there are many divergent views on this topic, one thing that most agree on is that it is wholly improper for the Federal Government to use taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to fund abortions. This is a moral issue of the highest importance to many taxpayers and to force them to fund these activities is completely unacceptable. For many Americans, taxpayer-funded abortions would constitute an extreme violation of conscience that should not be sanctioned by this Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3, and I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SMITH, for first introducing and then advancing this legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a strong progressive in this Congress.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, for the last 18 years as a Member of this body I have listened to Republicans go on and on about keeping government out of the health care system. That and taking away the voice of women actually puts the government between that woman and her most private health care decisions and is the biggest, the most intrusive government of all.

I thought my Republican friends hated taxes, but apparently they hate reproductive freedom and women's rights even more, because this bill would raise taxes on small businesses that provide their employees with health plans that include abortion coverage. And in one of its most egregious provisions, this bill could lead to IRS audits of women who seek abortion care after they have had a sexual assault. Absolutely unconscionable. Vote ''no'' on H.R. 3.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee and also chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chair of the Judiciary Committee.

Look, life is precious, life is sacred, and government should protect that basic fact. It is not some grant from government. It is a gift from God. Our founders understood that when they talked about the creator giving us this inalienable right, and the fact that we live in the greatest Nation in history and our tax dollars are used to destroy the life of unborn children is just plain wrong.

This bill corrects that. This bill is what the American people want, and this bill is consistent with this great Nation, founded on life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That is why it should pass and that is why I am a proud sponsor and urge a ''yes'' vote on the legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY).

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If you remember only one thing about this bill, remember this: It is a solution in search of a problem. The simple truth is that there are no taxpayer dollars being used to pay for abortions. None. Zero. Nada.

Don't be fooled by this bill. It isn't about funding. It is about preventing women from being able to access comprehensive health care. That is what this bill is about. The debate is about whether politicians sitting in Congress should dictate the personal, private medical decisions of the American people. It aims to impose intrusive government rules on personal medical decisions.

The bill's supporters don't want abortion, any abortion, to be legal in the United States, and so they are adding as many bureaucratic rules as they can come up with. This bill would not allow an exception for rape and incest for women in the military and military dependents.

□ 1420

Think about that. Military studies in news reports suggest that the sexual assault in the military is unconscionably high. CBS News reported that one in three military women experience sexual assault during their career in the service. One in three. This is outrageous. And yet under this bill, those brave women who took an oath to defend and support the Constitution of this country and put their lives on the line every day, if they are sexually assaulted by a peer and become pregnant, would not have an opportunity to get an abortion under this rule.

That's what we're talking about today. And that is the contrast between these two philosophies of the role of government and the personal-private medical decisions of women. And that is why I ask my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT).

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I want to thank CHRIS SMITH and Chairman SMITH for this very simple but profound bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, all this bill does is end public funding—taxpayer funding—of abortion. The driving force behind H.R. 3 is simply to update the longstanding Hyde amendment and apply it to programs that are federally funded but outside the scope of the Labor-HHS appropriations as well as replace a patchwork system with permanent law. It takes the Hyde amendment, the Dornan amendment, the Helms amendment, the Hyde-Weldon amendment, as well as others, and makes them permanent. That's what the bill does.

H.R. 3 enjoys great bipartisan support and had over 227 cosponsors. The support of this bill is in the public's hands. A CNN poll recently taken last month said 61 percent of the respondents do not want their tax dollars used to pay for abortions. And that's what this bill does. It ends the public funding of abortions. There are a host of other polls that clearly state the same thing.

The Hyde amendment is in current law but it simply needs to be broadened for all the things that we do here in Congress.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this very important bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from California, BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE. I want to thank our ranking member for his leadership and for leading for so many years on so many important issues.

Madam Speaker, here we go again. Instead of working on creating jobs and jump-starting the economy, we're debating another cynical and divisive attempt to strip away the rights of women. Republicans continue to perpetrate their war on women while millions of people around the country are desperate for jobs to help provide for their families. Let me be clear. Current law already bans Federal funds from being used for abortions. That is a fact—even though I personally think we should get rid of that ban.

What's next? Are we going to block transportation funding because it might be used to build a road to a hospital that provides a road to abortion? Come on. By the logic of this bill, any type of Federal funding, whether it's health related or not, would become abortion money. That is such a cynical ploy on the majority side.

This bill specifically attacks low-income women in the District of Columbia by permanently prohibiting the District from spending its purely local funds on abortions for low-income women.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentlewoman 30 additional seconds.

Ms. LEE. These women in the District have already begun to feel the terrible effects of the rider passed already in the CR. This is outrageous. It's ideologically driven and it's dangerous.

So let's reject this bill and this attack and this dangerous war on women, especially low-income women. Vote ''no'' on H.R. 3.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), a member of the Judiciary Committee and the vice chairman of the Constitution Subcommittee.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

I believe that ending an innocent human life is morally wrong. But I also believe it's morally wrong to take the taxpayer dollars of millions of pro-life Americans and use it to fund a procedure that they find morally offensive. Fortunately, for over 30 years, a patchwork of policies has regulated Federal funding and denied Federal funding for abortion in America.

But today, thanks to the yeoman's work of Congressman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey and Congressman DAN LIPINSKI, we're bringing forward a bipartisan measure that will send a clear and strong and codified message that the American people don't want to allow public funding of abortion at the Federal level. I strongly support it.

The man who first brought this idea before the Congress was the late Henry Hyde. I had the privilege of serving with him. His eloquence cannot be matched, but it can be repeated. Henry said, ''I believe nothing in this world of wonders is more beautiful than the innocence of a child, that little, almost-born infant struggling to live as a member of the human family; and abortion is a lethal assault against the very idea of human rights and destroys, along with a defenseless little baby, the moral foundation of our democracy.''

Today, we say ''yes'' to life but we also say ''yes'' to respecting the moral sensibilities of millions of Americans who, wherever they stand on this divisive social question, stand broadly for the principle that no taxpayer dollars should be used to subsidize abortion at home or abroad. H.R. 3 is that legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

It has been mistakenly repeated at least a dozen times on the floor that without this bill Federal funds could be used for abortion. I want it to be clear on the RECORD that that is incorrect. I'm sorry that I have to make this statement.

This legislation subjects women to profound government intrusion. It restricts women's access to health care, and it targets small businesses for additional taxing under our IRS Code.

There are many, many organizations that are opposed to this legislation: The American Nurses Association, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Catholics for Choice, the Equal Health Network, the Human Rights Campaign, the National Association of Nurse Practitioners, the National Organization of Women, the National Women's Law Center, People for the American Way, the Union for Reform Judaism, the United Church of Christ, the United Methodist Church, and the YWCA, plus numerous others.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH).

Mr. AMASH. Free societies are founded on a core set of rights—rights that are beyond the reach of government and that no other person or group can take away. The Founders created our government to secure these unalienable rights, and chief among them is the right to life.

President's recognize this right when they weigh carefully whether to put our soldiers in harm's way. Our judiciary respects this right when it spends years reviewing each and every capital punishment case. Yet this same government authorizes, and in some cases pays for, the routine taking of the most innocent of lives—the lives of the unborn.

It is unconscionable that in a country founded explicitly to protect individuals' fundamental rights we allow the regular violation of the right to life. Worse yet, the government forces each of us to pay for the killing of innocent life.

I urge you to vote for H.R. 3, to strengthen our protection of the right to life.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the minority whip from Maryland, STENY HOYER.

□ 1430

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Two minutes, of course, is not time enough to discuss this issue, but I rise in opposition to this piece of legislation.

With millions out of work, the American people sent Congress a strong mandate in the last election: take action on jobs. Yet after 4 months in the House majority, Republicans have yet to put forward a jobs agenda. What are they doing instead? They are pursuing a controversial social agenda, one that is far too extreme for most Americans.

Let me say something to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, my friends on the other side of the aisle. Some of you, I think, probably characterize yourselves as libertarians, or close to libertarians. You believe the government ought to stay out of people's lives. I think that's a worthwhile premise. I have been here for, as some of you know, a long time, some 30 years; and I have heard Republicans say so often, it's their money, let them keep their money, they know better how to spend their money.

So what do you do today, my friends? What you say is, well, it's your money, and, yes, we'll give you a tax credit, if you spend it the way we want you to spend it. That's what this legislation says: it's your money, but if you don't spend it the way we want you to spend it, we will not give you the tax credit that every other American can get.

How far can you take that, my friends? In tax preference after tax preference after tax preference, we can say, you don't get it if you don't spend it the way we want you to spend it. I want you to think about that. I want you to think about the precedent that you're setting here, the social activism that you are embarking upon, on the imposition of your views on others through the Tax Code.

My friends, this bill undermines, more than any bill that I have seen, the rights of women under the Constitution of the United States.

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

Mr. HOYER. May I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. Stingy, aren't you? I miss my 1 minute, ladies and gentlemen, I tell you that. The public won't know what I'm talking about, of course.

But the fact of the matter is this bill is bad public policy, it's bad for women's health, and it's bad for America. Vote ''no'' on this bill. Let freedom ring.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak today. Clearly, there is one clear issue before us in H.R. 3, and it is whether or not Americans shall be required to fund the taking of innocent human life.

It has been indicated that this is controversial, and it certainly is; but without a doubt the American people demand they not be required to subsidize abortion.

The second issue here, Madam Speaker, is the question that over and over we've heard from my colleagues that they would like to see abortion rare. That is what this bill does. With the subsidization of abortion, it expands. This bill will limit the payments and restrict and prohibit the use of Federal taxpayer dollars for the funding of abortion. That's what this bill does.

Madam Speaker, again it is very clear, and, contrary to the claims of the opponents of this bill, it is very simple. Americans should not be required to pay for abortions. H.R. 3 accomplishes this objective. I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida, TED DEUTCH, a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DEUTCH. I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3, but I also rise in great disappointment that the people's House is again engaging in a debate about the rights of women rather than a discussion about the challenges our Nation faces.

For months, Democrats have urged this body to refocus its efforts on jobs; yet since the Congress convened in January, the Republican majority has failed to bring to the floor any measures to help create jobs. Their negligence is showing. Instead of working in a bipartisan way to regain America's economic strength, we again find ourselves on the floor in a divisive debate over women's reproductive freedoms.

That's right. Rather than wage a war on unemployment, my Republican colleagues are waging a war on women's health.

Under this legislation's logic, anyone who has government-subsidized insurance coverage—which is really everyone who has private health insurance, for we exempt employers from paying taxes on health benefits—would be forbidden from abortion.

Where does it end? The answer is it doesn't end. Even in the face of overwhelming support for women's rights among the American people, even in the face of more pressing challenges, real challenges like the jobs crisis, nothing stops my Republican colleagues from their assault on a woman's right to choose.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), who is also the chairman of the Republican Conference.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I rise to proudly support H.R. 3 for three simple reasons:

Number one, this bill just simply helps codify what has de facto been our policy for 35 years through the Hyde amendment, and that is a policy that no way, shape or form outlaws abortion; it simply says Federal taxpayers will not be compelled to subsidize them.

Second of all, Madam Speaker, at a time when our Nation is going broke, where we're borrowing 42 cents on the dollar, much of it from the Chinese and sending the bill to our children and grandchildren, maybe, maybe those programs that have the least consensus and are most divisive among us ought to be the first to lose their taxpayer subsidies.

Third, and most importantly and profoundly for me, Madam Speaker, in my heart and in my head, I can come to no other conclusion but that life begins at conception. It is our most fundamental right, enshrined in the Constitution. No taxpayer should be compelled against their will to subsidize the loss of human life, truly the least of these.

Mr. CONYERS. I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlelady from Connecticut, ROSA DELAURO.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this overreaching legislation, which raises taxes, threatens the health of our economy, and endangers women's health.

This bill will raise taxes on small businesses that offer comprehensive health coverage for women. It will punish perfectly legal private health decisions by raising taxes on plans that offer coverage for abortion. Eighty-seven percent of private health plans will be impacted by this unprecedented assault, and Americans will see their health insurance options restricted or taken away.

With this legislation, we have yet another example of the majority's real priorities, not to create jobs, not to grow the economy, not to reduce the deficit but to advance a divisive social agenda by manipulating the Tax Code.

And they're doing more than just raising taxes. Rather than trusting women, like the majority of Americans do, the House majority is trying to force women back into traditional roles. They are risking their very health. The report that accompanied this bill goes even further; it tries to redefine rape and narrow the exception for sexual assault.

This bill is unconscionable, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it. Let's create jobs. We should not be raising taxes and putting women's lives at risk to appease an ideological agenda.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. Madam Speaker, a large majority of Americans oppose taxpayer subsidies for abortion. Those who oppose this bill, including the President, claim that it denies access to health care for women. My message to them is simple: the majority of women are opposed to having their hard-earned tax dollars spent on abortion. In a recent survey, it was found that 70 percent of women oppose taxpayer funding for abortion.

We must permanently end this practice. It is our duty to act and to act now. I urge my colleagues to listen to the majority of Americans who strongly oppose publicly funding abortion services and pass this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, ROB ANDREWS.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Members who are pro-life or pro-choice should oppose this bill because it does violence to the Constitution. This bill purports to say that through the Tax Code, we can favor or disfavor the exercise of constitutional rights.

□ 1440

That's not right, and that's not constitutional. The Members on the majority side would certainly not support, nor would I, a provision that says you can't take a charitable contribution to support a group that lobbies in favor of pro-life causes. But if we wanted to disfavor that point of view in the Tax Code, this is the way we would do it. There is no difference between what the majority's doing here and that odious provision that I just described.

It is wrong to raise taxes on people who exercise their constitutional rights because they've chosen to exercise their constitutional rights. Whether you are pro-choice or pro-life, if you are pro-Constitution, you should vote ''no.''

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the legislation.

As of today, Congress prohibits the expenditure of Federal funds on abortions through a patchwork of riders on our annual appropriations bills. These riders include the Hyde amendment in Labor-HHS and other prohibitions in the State and Foreign Operations bill, the Financial Services bill, the Commerce-Justice-Science bill, in addition to the Defense bill. Simply put, this legislation will eliminate the need for these annual riders to ensure that these policies become permanent statute.

This bill also codifies the Hyde-Weldon conscience clause that would expand the policy to include all recipients of Federal funds. The conscience clause protects health care entities that choose not to provide abortions from discrimination by State, local, or Federal agencies that receive Federal funds. Therefore, no one who has deep religious or moral opposition to abortions should be forced to provide for them.

Madam Speaker, I support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), who is also a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, my first daughter was born very prematurely. They rushed her over to Shreveport to the highest level intensive care. The neonatologist encouraged me, because my wife couldn't come, to caress her, talk to her, that it meant so much, even though she couldn't see me. She grabbed my finger and held it for hours. She wanted to cling to life.

For those of us who think it's wrong to kill children in utero, it is even more wrong to pry money from our hands at the point of an IRS gun so that others can use our tax dollars to pay to kill those children.

Please, let's stop it.

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

I want to urge all of the Members of the House to please consider this issue from as an unemotional point of view as possible, to please determine in your hearts and in your mind about the fact that this bill goes over the top.

I would now like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished minority leader, NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his ongoing leadership on issues that relate to privacy and the health of America's women.

Madam Speaker, today is approximately the 120th day of the Republican majority in the Congress of the United States; and in all those 120 days, we have yet to see a jobs bill brought to the floor. We haven't even seen a jobs proposal or a jobs agenda. Instead, once again, we see a diversion. We see legislation which is extreme and divisive and harmful to women's health.

I rise today to urge my Republican colleagues in the House to let us come together to work in a bipartisan way to address the number one priority of the American people, the creation of jobs; and I rise today as the Republicans bring to the floor this legislation instead of bringing to the floor a bill to end the subsidies for Big Oil. They gave the impression during the break that they would do that. I wrote to the Speaker; the President of the United States has written to the bipartisan leadership in Congress asking for an end to the subsidies to Big Oil. Instead of doing that, we are, again, undermining women's health.

Let us begin this part of the debate with a clear understanding of the facts. Federal funding for abortion is already prohibited under the law due to the Hyde amendment except in the cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother. Federal funding for abortion is already prohibited. This bill is even a radical departure from the Hyde amendment. It represents an unprecedented and, again, radical assault on women's access to the full range of reproductive health care services. For the first time, this bill places restrictions on how women with private insurance can spend their private dollars in purchasing health insurance.

This bill will deny tax credits for women who buy the type of health insurance that they currently have, health insurance that covers a full range of reproductive care. As a result, now, this is about businesses. If you're a woman and you have a job and your employer gives you health insurance, that employer will no longer be able to take a tax deduction from your health insurance—quite different from what happens with their male employees. And in that event, when that happens, health insurance companies will then roll back that coverage because there won't be enough people participating in the pool to justify that insurance. So there are millions of women who will no longer have access to insurance policies from their employer that cover all reproductive services.

The practical result of this legislation for many is there will be a tax increase, a tax increase on small businesses and a tax increase on women based on how they choose to spend their private dollars simply for keeping the coverage they have right now.

Even more of a problem, this legislation allows hospitals to deny life-saving care to women in moments of direst emergency. The bill would permit medical professionals to turn their back on women dying from treatable conditions. It is appalling.

As the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists wrote in opposition to this effort: ''We oppose legislative proposals to limit women's access to any needed medical care. These

proposals can jeopardize the health and safety of our patients and put government between a physician and a patient.''

□ 1450

Madam Speaker, let us not work to limit the care; let us expand it. Let us not raise taxes on small business and women; let us strengthen our middle class. Let us never attack the health of women; let us, instead, create jobs. That's what the American people expect us to do, and that is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this divisive and radical legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding and express my support for H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This commonsense bipartisan legislation codifies the Hyde amendment and similar policies by permanently applying a ban on taxpayer funding of abortion across all Federal programs.

Last year we listened to the American people through our America Speaking Out project, and they spoke out on this issue loudly and clearly. We included it in our Pledge to America, and today we are taking another step toward meeting that commitment and keeping our word.

A ban on taxpayer funding of abortion is the will of the American people and ought to be the law of the land. But the law, particularly as it is currently enforced, does not reflect the will of the American people. This has created additional uncertainty, given that Americans are concerned not just about how much we are spending but how we are spending it. Enacting this legislation would provide the American people with the assurance that their hard-earned tax dollars will not be used to fund abortions. And I want to commend the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. SMITH, for his great leadership. I want to thank Mr. LIPINSKI, prime cosponsor of H.R. 3. I want to thank the other distinguished chairmen, DAVE CAMP; and FRED UPTON; our extraordinary Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, for his eloquent statement and for his compassion for both mothers and children who are hurt by abortions; and for ERIC CANTOR, our superb majority leader, and the 228 cosponsors of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, there is no doubt whatsoever that ending all public funding for abortions saves lives. Even the pro-abortion Guttmacher Institute said in an analysis in 2009 that ''approximately one-fourth of women who would have had Medicaid-funded abortions (if the Hyde amendment did not exist) instead give birth when this funding is unavailable.'' In other words, when public funding and facilitation isn't available for abortion, children have a greater chance at survival.

I said earlier during the debate on the rule that I remember the late Congressman Henry Hyde being moved literally to tears—I was in the room when it happened—when he learned that the Hyde amendment had likely saved the lives of more than 1 million babies who today are getting on with their lives, going to school, forging a career, perhaps serving in this Chamber—at least some of them—or even establishing their own families.

H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, comprehensively ensures that all programs authorized and appropriated by the Federal Government, including ObamaCare, do not subsidize the killing of babies except in the rare cases of rape, incest, or the life of the mother. H.R. 3 ends the current IRS policy of allowing tax favored treatment for abortions under itemized deductions, HSAs, MSAs, and FSAs. H.R. 3 also ends the use of tax credits under ObamaCare to purchase insurance plans that include abortions, again, except cases of rape, incest, or a threat to the life of the mother.

Madam Speaker, we know that Americans are taking a good, long, hard second look at abortion. The polls show it. On taxpayer funding, a supermajority—over 60 percent and some polls put it as high as 68 or 69 percent—do not want their funding being used to pay for abortions.

Earlier in the debate, some of my colleagues had suggested that this is a tax increase; yet the Americans for Tax Reform, who doggedly protect the public purse, have said, ''Americans for Tax Reform has no problems or issues with H.R. 3. The bill has no net tax change whatsoever.''

H.R. 3 also makes the Hyde-Weldon conscience protection permanent and significantly more effective by authorizing the courts to prevent or redress actual or threatened violations of conscience. And we know without any doubt that there are huge pressures, particularly in some States, like California, to coerce healthcare providers and plans and insurers and entire health care systems—especially those who are faith-based—to change their policy and to permit abortion on demand.

The need for this protection—Hyde-Weldon—is great. According to Alliance of Catholic Health Care, which represents California's Catholic Health Systems and Hospitals, ''California's Catholic hospitals operate in a public policy environment that regularly challenges the concept of conscience-rights protections by attempting to coerce them and other health care providers to perform, be complicit in, or pay for abortion.''

On three different occasions in the past three years, the California Department of Managed Health Care denied health insurance plan applications because the plans excluded abortion coverage and demanded that all healthcare plans must provide coverage for all basic health care services and medically-necessary health services including so-called ''medically-necessary abortions.'' This is a clear violation of the Hyde-Weldon conscience clause, but the injured parties lack judicial recourse. This legislation would remedy this problem by making the policy permanent and providing access to the courts.

Let me just conclude, Madam Speaker. Someday I truly believe future generations of Americans will look back on us, especially policymakers, and wonder how and why such a rich and seemingly enlightened society, so blessed and endowed with the capacity to protect vulnerable human life, could have instead so aggressively promoted death to children and the exploitation of their moms. They will note with deep sadness that some of our most prominent politicians, while they talked about human rights, they never lifted a finger to protect the most persecuted minority in the world, the child in the womb. Protect innocent life, vote for H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of DAVE CAMP, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and me, I stand today in strong support of H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, a bill that restricts the use of taxpayer funds for abortion.

I will continue my statement, but at this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader of the U.S. House.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And I would also like to congratulate and thank the gentleman from New Jersey, who had just spoken, for his leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, above all else, we are a culture that values life. Likewise, our efforts as a Nation are dedicated to improving, preserving, and celebrating life. That's why it's no surprise that polling routinely shows that over 60 percent of Americans oppose taxpayer funding for abortion.

H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, enforces a government-wide prohibition on subsidies for abortion and abortion coverage. At a time of fiscal crisis, this bill ensures that scarce resources are not diverted towards increasing the number of abortions in America. This bill also codifies existing conscience protections and

closes loopholes that offer tax-preferred status to abortion. In short, it comports with our values as a people.

Thomas Jefferson warned that ''to compel a man to subsidize with his taxes the propagation of ideas which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical.'' Forcing Americans to subsidize elective abortion with their tax dollars falls squarely in this camp.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3 to ensure that no taxpayer dollars go toward the funding of abortion.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 2 minutes.

We here need to talk straight to the American people. This bill does not codify the Hyde amendment. It goes well beyond it. We don't need to codify the Hyde amendment. It's the law of the land. The purpose of this bill is to go beyond it, and that's what you should acknowledge.

□ 1500

In doing so, you cross a very, very important line. This bill is going nowhere in the Senate. Where it can go is everywhere in interfering with a person's access to health care, or with the use of their own money for their own purposes as they choose. The logic here, if it becomes precedent, could be used, for example, to prevent a health policy falling under the Tax Code if the procedure relates to a development that occurred because of stem cell research. We should not be doing that. It takes away the ability to use an itemized deduction. We should not do that.

Where does this stop? Where does it stop? It crosses a line for the first time. It does not codify. It threatens crossing a line we should not in terms of the ability of people to provide health care and use their own resources.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Simply put, this legislation is about making sure taxpayer funds aren't used to fund abortions. In the clearest and most general terms, we're codifying the longstanding bipartisan Hyde amendment which prevents taxpayer funds from being used for abortion-related costs.

I want to be clear about what the legislation does and does not do. This legislation does not, as critics claim, affect either the ability of an individual to pay for an abortion or abortion coverage through private funds or the ability of an entity to provide separate abortion coverage. It does not apply to abortions in the cases of rape, incest or life-threatening physical conditions of the mother. Nor does it apply to treatment of injury, infection or other health problems resulting from an abortion. And to be crystal clear, this legislation does not increase taxes.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to submit a letter from Americans for Tax Reform to that effect.

AMERICANS FOR TAX REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2011.

Hon. PAT TIBERI,
House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD NEAL,
House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TIBERI AND RANKING MEMBER NEAL: On behalf of Americans for Tax Reform, I write today to clarify our position on H.R. 3, the ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.'' As you know, the Congressional Budget Office on March 15, 2011 declared that H.R. 3 has ''negligible effects on tax revenues.'' In budgetary parlance, that is synonymous with a zero tax score. As a result, ATR has no problems or issues with H.R. 3. The bill has no net tax change whatsoever, and is therefore not legislation at all relating to the Taxpayer Protection Pledge. Attempts to claim otherwise are not based on reality, but on mere political gamesmanship of the lowest order.

We look forward to continuing to work with you to make certain that all tax legislation is (at worst) tax revenue-neutral, as H.R. 3 already is.

Sincerely,

GROVER NORQUIST.

This legislation makes specific and narrow changes to the Tax Code so if funds in an FSA or health savings account are used to pay for an abortion, those dollars will not receive tax-favored treatment; prevents the cost of an abortion from counting towards the deduction for unreimbursed medical expense; and clarifies tax subsidies made available in the 2010 health law for the purpose of insurance cannot be used for policies that cover abortion.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3 is pro-life, pro-family, and it is pro-taxpayer. It's a responsible step to ensuring a longstanding precedent Republicans and Democrats have supported for decades. And I urge all Members to support H.R. 3 so that no taxpayer funds are used for abortion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to another member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. My friend from Michigan said it right. There are no Federal funds for abortion under the terms of the Hyde amendment, except in the case of rape and incest.

What this is about is how families spend their money and small business deals with insurance. It's part of a continuing Republican assault against people with whom they disagree. It continues the sad spectacle of using the Internal Revenue Service—I would say not just the use but the abuse of the IRS—to attack people with whom they disagree.

Remember the spectacle of the Ways and Means hearing where they drug AARP before them and tried to have an investigation because they disagreed with them on health insurance?

Yes, this would put government between doctors and American families. But it's not just about abortion under the Hyde amendment.

Remember, there are some people who are against the rape and incest exemption. There are some people who had a shocking proposal to radically change the very definition of rape.

There is a continuing effort to erode basic fundamental reproductive freedom, and this shows a tactic of using the IRS that I think is very dangerous. It does, in fact, increase the complexity and raises taxes on individuals who may, in fact, need these procedures that may, in fact, be lifesaving. The proponents may not agree with what a woman and her doctor decide but that should be their decision.

This raises the specter of using the Tax Code and the Congressional investigating power in ways that no one should support.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a nurse and a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, today we have heard many misrepresentations of the true nature of this bill, and so I want to boil it down to the simple facts of what this bill actually does—no hyperbole, no scare tactics.

This bill codifies the Hyde amendment that no taxpayer dollars will go to funding abortions. And this is a longstanding policy of the Federal Government since 1976.

We already know how medical expenses of all sorts are treated under the Tax Code. Taxpayers who use itemized deductions for medical expenses, who have HSAs or FSAs or MSAs, do not, and I want to highlight that, do not identify each medical expense on an individual tax return. That is not the case today nor will it be the case if this bill is signed into law.

And to be clear, what this bill does not do, a woman would not have to list on a tax form that a specific medical expense was for an abortion. That's simply not how the process works. It's not how it works today nor will it be how it works if this is signed into law.

So it's important to make clear that no one would ever be audited because of an abortion. They would have to already be under an audit for some other reason before—and I want to emphasize before—the IRS would even consider asking about any medical procedure.

Many types of medical care are very private. And as a nurse for over 40 years, I fully understand how personal medical issues can be. And taxpayers who don't want to tell the IRS about medical procedures they wish to be kept private can do so by not claiming those tax credits for such care.

Now, even if this issue did arise in an audit, other Federal agencies that already use taxpayer dollars, such as Medicaid and the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program, have had no problem distinguishing between abortions following rape and incest and elective abortions, and have done so without a reporting requirement. It's already there. They generally accept

the statement of the provider, basically, a doctor's note. And I would expect the IRS to do the same in these extremely rare cases.

Now, that doesn't mean that this is not a very difficult situation for that small group of women. And I understand it is incredibly difficult, and my heart goes out to them. But if you claim a tax benefit for a medical procedure like an abortion and you get audited, you can either choose to forego that tax benefit or else prepare to substantiate the tax benefit.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield the balance of my time to a very distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, with all due respect to my colleague, Mrs. BLACK, when someone comes to the floor and says, I'm going to speak now free of hyperbole, well, it will be so high up to your neck you don't have to worry about getting it off your shoe because the reality is that was all hyperbole.

If what we were doing here right now was simply codifying existing law, there would probably be very little angst on this side of the aisle. But that's not what's happening. What this provision does is goes so much further. It only speaks to the ideological purge that you're on right now.

Madam Speaker, on the 100th day of Republican rule of the House, I stood speechless on this floor at their failed campaign promise to focus on job creation and economic growth. It's said, ''Actions speak louder than words,'' and that is true.

□ 1510

For all the Republicans' talk about putting Americans back to work, their actions demonstrate this is the least of their priorities. Instead, they have cut jobs, they have raised taxes, and reduced Americans' access to health care.

The bill being debated today also has no jobs component whatsoever. Not a single job will be created because of this bill today. In fact, it will raise taxes and hamper the ability of small businessmen and -women to hire people.

In their ideological zeal to restrict a woman's right to choose, the Republicans have prioritized a measure that the South Carolina Small Business Chamber of Commerce calls, and I quote, ''a slap in the face to small business owners.''

We just a few weeks ago removed the 1099 onerous provisions, and now we are going to further burden small businessmen and -women with this provision. It will burden them. It will not create a single job. It will only further burden the ability of small businessmen and -women to create jobs in America.

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

Madam Speaker, the bill before us today should be a no-brainer. Americans overwhelmingly reject the use of taxpayer funds for abortion. In several polls over the last few years, anywhere from 60 percent to 70 percent of the public oppose using taxpayer funds for abortion. H.R. 3 puts into statute the will of the American people.

Since 1976, the Hyde amendment has been included in appropriations bills to ensure that Federal funds are not used to provide abortions. This policy provision has passed year in and year out with bipartisan support. H.R. 3 would just take that provision and put it into law. This may make sense to most Americans, but for some reason this idea receives great pushback in Washington.

Health care reform also placed abortion funding at the center of its debate. In their haste to pass ObamaCare last Congress, the Democrat leadership in Washington neglected to include any adequate prohibition on abortion funding. The President did issue an executive order to support the intentions of Hyde. Unfortunately, the order merely reiterated the accounting gimmick in the health care bill.

The President's own chief of staff at that time would later comment on how he thought up the idea for this executive order so that they could ''allow the Stupak amendment not to exist by law but by executive order.''

When the President signed that bill into law, he allowed a massive expansion in Federal funding for abortion. In a time of great Federal debt, the last thing the American people want is to have their taxpayer dollars used on the morally objectionable practice of abortion.

According to a 2007 Guttmacher Institute report, if the Hyde amendment were removed from law, the number of abortions would likely increase by 25 percent. The study reveals what is common sense: an increase in funding for abortions will directly lead to an increase in the number of abortions.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have expressed their desire to reduce abortions. If that is truly their desire and not just a talking point, then they should have no problem at all voting in favor of this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this extreme legislation, and I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. But don't be confused. H.R. 3 goes far beyond current law which is already highly restrictive and, frankly, which I oppose.

The Hyde amendment already prohibits women enrolled in Medicaid and Medicare, Federal employees, women serving in the military, women in Federal prisons, Peace Corps volunteers, and women seeking care under the Indian Health Services Act from getting the care they need. In other words, there is no Federal funding for abortion. But actually what it does do, among other things, is attack small businesses.

Let's hear the words of Frank Knapp, Jr., president and CEO of the South Carolina Small Business Chamber of Commerce with 5,000 members. Here is what he says:

H.R. 3 is an attempt to roll back the historic small business health insurance tax credit created by the Affordable Care Act. When the House voted to eliminate and defeat the entire Affordable Care Act, we—he means small businesses—could rationalize that this great benefit for small businesses was just collateral damage. My own Congressman told me he would support the small business health insurance tax credits in the Affordable Care Act replacement legislation. But small businesses can no longer think of themselves as collateral damage.

Mr. Knapp says: Let me make this very clear. A vote for H.R. 3 is a direct attack on small business. Every Representative who loudly proclaims their love for small businesses because they are the backbone of the economy now can put their vote where their mouth is. Their true support for small business will be judged by their ''no'' vote on H.R. 3.

I urge all my colleagues not to let this phony use of the Tax Code to take away the rights of small businesses that get tax credits or individuals to pay for abortions with their own money.

Mr. PITTS. For the information of the Members, the Hyde amendment only applies to the Labor-H bill. It is offered every year as a rider. Similar language is offered to Indian Health, Federal Employee Health Benefits Act. We have done these amendments, or riders, to these bills every year for years. So when you speak about the Hyde amendment, we should speak about it accurately.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3.

This is not a controversial bill. This is a commonsense bill to rein in our runaway government spending and to quit spending money on things that the American citizens don't want. Certainly we should not be spending our hard-earned tax dollars on abortion.

People work hard all year to send in their taxes on April 15, and they shouldn't have their money going to something that is morally objectionable to them that takes away human life.

There are many, many areas of this budget that we need to rein in, but this is noncontroversial. This is something that over 60 percent of the American people say, I don't want my tax dollars

going to pay for abortions, the taking of a human innocent life.

So it is time to make this permanent so that we don't have to, as a Congress, come in every year and discuss these issues on all the different legislation that is out there. Now is the time to make this permanent. Get it off the table so we can get on to other areas of reining in the runaway spending, making government more efficient and more effective, using our tax dollars more wisely.

And certainly it is not an affront to women's health. Women have the opportunity to get the health care that they need now, but we don't need to be using it to take innocent human life.

I certainly applaud this bill, which has so many cosponsors. We need to make sure that our tax dollars are not used for abortion.

□ 1520

Ms. DEGETTE. I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to a senior member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I believe my friends on the other side of the aisle think that, if they repeat something again and again, people will begin to believe it. The fact of the matter is the Hyde Amendment already prohibits Federal funds from being used for abortions. This is not about Federal funds.

The other thing I don't understand is my Republican friends always claim that they want smaller government, that they don't want the government to intrude on people's lives. So here we are, about to pass a measure that expands government, that intrudes on people's lives, that penalizes small businesses, and impedes them from creating jobs.

I don't believe the government should be in the business of preventing people from accessing legal medical treatment. It surprises me and worries me that this Congress keeps proposing legislation that diminishes the right to access health care. Abortion is legal in this country. I understand how people feel on both sides of the aisle. It's a very personal decision. Yet Republicans seem intent on interfering with a woman's right to make her own decisions with her family and physicians, using her private money.

Abortion is a difficult choice, to be sure, and this extreme legislation makes the decision even harder. We need to provide women and their families with the support they need to make health decisions, not criminalize them. Vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. PITTS. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his leadership on this issue and for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, not using the hard-earned money of taxpayers to destroy innocent unborn children is not extreme, and it is not radical. It is the right thing to do. The majority of Americans agrees with us that it is the wrong thing to use their money for this issue.

I want to support my colleague in this legislation in saying we need to pass this bill, and we need to send a message to the American people that we are wise stewards of their money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, in sitting and listening to this debate, it would be extremely easy to become completely confused. The proponents of this bill keep repeating the same mantra. They want to stop the Federal funding of abortion. They forget to mention that there is no Federal funding of abortion.

What they want to do for the first time is to expand restrictions on funding into tax policy. Right now, under current law, we have the Hyde Amendment, which every year prevents Federal funds from being used for abortion except in the cases of rape, incest or in saving the life of the mother. I don't like the Hyde Amendment. Lots of people don't like the Hyde Amendment, but it's the law. This bill, however, goes far beyond current law. Now my colleagues across the aisle want to expand these restrictions and make sure that individuals and businesses can't get complete women's health care in their health insurance, with their own money, without paying for a tax increase. Businesses, which right now get tax relief for having full health insurance, would not be able to get it.

Let me say this again: At a time when everybody in this House and certainly when everybody on the other side of the aisle is saying we can't raise taxes, the leadership of this House is supporting raising taxes to advance a social policy.

I don't think, Madam Speaker, that this was in the Republican Pledge to America. I don't know how many times the Republican leadership is going to make this Congress vote to strip American women of their access to health care with their own money. I, for one, would like to encourage them to spend their time getting our country back to work rather than on an extreme agenda that the American people didn't ask for, didn't want, and that is going nowhere in the U.S. Senate but, if it did, would be vetoed by the President of the United States.

I urge the Members to vote ''no'' on this ill-conceived piece of legislation.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, sponsored by Congressman CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH. This bill, supported by the United Conference of Catholic Bishops, would reinforce the Hyde Amendment, which prohibits the use of federal funds to cover abortion services; the bill would also prohibit federal funding for health insurance that includes abortion coverage.

H.R. 3 would prevent public funds from being used to pay for, or subsidize, abortions, either through the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or health care affordability tax credits. The bill includes a provision to provide for exceptions in the case of rape, incest, physical injury or physical illness to the women. The Hyde Amendment is already in place in current federal health programs like Medicaid and Medicare, and this bill would ensure it is governed in a consistent manner.

I have received numerous letters from my constituents whom have expressed serious concerns that federal funds would be used to pay for elective abortion procedures. I am very supportive of the overall goals of H.R. 3, which would effectively codify the Hyde–Weldon clause to support existing federal conscience protections for health care providers.

I commend Congressman SMITH for his leadership on this important issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. MARINO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. I believe strongly that every human life should be protected, whether born or yet to be born. As the father of two adopted children this issue is very personal to me; every day that I spend with my children reminds me that all lives are precious. Protecting the lives of innocent children should be the responsibility of Congress and this legislation represents an important step in the right direction.

Currently, we rely on a patchwork of ''riders'' to appropriations legislation or Executive orders to protect American taxpayers from funding abortions. As the debate on the health care legislation transpired during the last Congress, we saw first-hand the problem with continuing to rely on this draconian process. Instead of relying on the whims of the annual appropriations process or any easily revocable order by the President, it is time to put into law the prohibition against using taxpayer dollars to pay for abortions. The Federal government should not, directly or indirectly, provide any funding for abortion services and this legislation is critical to ensuring these prohibitions exist.

As you can see, I believe one of the largest responsibilities of Congress is to provide the utmost protection for our nation's children—including the lives of the unborn. It is time that we enact one, consistent policy to eliminate any problems or confusion about abortion funding in future legislation.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, H.R. 3 is an extremely misleading piece of legislation. Supporters of the bill argue that it will simply codify the Hyde amendment and permanently prohibit taxpayer funding of abortion. However, we all know that is false. H.R. 3 is actually much more nefarious than that. It seeks to restrict women's reproductive rights and access to health care; increase healthcare premiums for many Americans and small businesses; and, limit the private insurance choices of consumers. It will almost certainly guarantee that insurance companies will no longer offer abortion coverage to consumers.

The Republicans in the House have been on a mission, ever since they took over the Majority, to completely eliminate women's reproductive rights and their access to healthcare.

I recently received a letter from a male constituent who is 68 years young; someone we can all agree is definitely not in need of reproductive health care. This man is a recipient of Medicare and receives his primary care at the Santa Cruz chapter of Planned Parenthood. His doctor is the one of the few doctors in Santa Cruz County who currently accepts Medicare patients.

If the Republicans get their way and federal funding is denied to Planned Parenthood and other organizations that provide primary healthcare for low income patients simply because they also provide reproductive healthcare, then this man, along with millions of other low income Americans, will be denied their only access to primary healthcare in their communities. Hospital emergency rooms will become the health care provider of first resort. Hospitals that are currently overwhelmed would be further inundated, thereby driving up healthcare costs even higher and costing the federal government even more taxpayer dollars.

If saving taxpayer dollars is truly the goal, then the Majority should be supporting family planning and reproductive healthcare services, not attacking them. We all know that for every $1 spent on family planning, $4 of taxpayer money is saved.

This bill is radical and extreme. It is a far cry from any kind of middle ground or compromise on abortion policy. It will make abortion as difficult to obtain as possible without actually criminalizing the procedure. H.R. 3 overreaches in every possible way. More importantly, it would penalize rather than help taxpayers, impede basic government functions, and discriminate against women who are struggling to do their best in a difficult situation.

Madam Speaker, the American people want both parties to work together. H.R. 3 only inflames an already intense and intractable debate and further polarizes this House. I urge my colleagues to object to H.R. 3.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3, an unnecessary and intrusive bill that represents a short-sighted attack on the rights of women and families, and distracts us from the work that Americans sent us here to do.

H.R. 3 would diminish meaningful access to healthcare for millions of lower and middle income families by denying them tax credits if the insurance plan they choose includes coverage for abortion services. This means that under this bill, for the first time ever, our country would equate health expenses that are the subject of preferential tax treatment as the same as federal spending. The costs of health services remain the same, whether the coverage for abortions is provided in a plan or not. Removing these tax breaks for the most vulnerable members of our society is not only dangerous, it is heartless, and it will return a constitutionally-protected medical procedure to its dark back-alley days. Rather than offering real solutions to the problems our nation faces, the other side of the aisle only offers a return to the fights over social issues of the past.

Republicans claim that H.R. 3 merely codifies the Hyde Amendment, a provision prohibiting the use of federal funds for most abortion services, but it goes much farther than that—it tries to end private insurance coverage of abortion care. Besides, the Hyde Amendment has been passed every single year for nearly forty years—we already have a law prohibiting the use of federal funds to pay for abortion, we don't need another one.

H.R. 3 is an unnecessary distraction from the real issues that we were sent here to address. While some of us take our duties seriously, the GOP is busy creating diversions to avoid doing real work. Rather than focus on job creation, as the American public has said it wants us to do, the Republican majority would limit women's healthcare options and increase healthcare costs for lower- and middle-income women and families. This kind of diversion has no place in this Congress. The GOP has been in the majority for four months, yet they have failed to introduce even one piece of legislation that addresses jobs. They do, however, have the time to play political games with the health care of poor Americans and to attack the rights of every woman in this country to choice—a personal decision that is and should remain between a women and her physician.

The proponents of this legislation aren't interested in addressing real problems, Madam Speaker. They're only interested in creating more of them. That is why I oppose H.R. 3.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3, the ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.'' This deceptively titled legislation is nothing more than another Republican assault on women's access to reproductive health care.

At a time when Congress needs to be focused on creating jobs and protecting the middle class, the Republican majority has decided to make this anti-choice bill a priority. If enacted, this legislation will severely curtail women's access to reproductive health care by:

1. Banning the coverage of abortion services in the new health care law;

2. Imposing tax penalties on women and small businesses with health insurance plans that cover abortion;

3. Narrowing the already restrictive rape and incest exceptions in the Hyde Amendment; and

4. Continuing to limit access to reproductive health care for low income women, and ban coverage for federal employees and women in the military.

If this bill were enacted, millions of families and small businesses with private health insurance plans that offer abortion coverage would be faced with tax increases, making the cost of health care insurance even more expensive.

Under the Affordable Care Act, insurers are able to offer abortion coverage and receive federal offsets for premiums as long as enrollees pay for the abortion coverage from separate, private funds. If enacted, H.R. 3 would deny federal subsidies or credits to private health insurance plans that offer abortion coverage even if that coverage is paid for from private funds.

This would inevitably lead to private health insurance companies dropping abortion coverage leaving millions of women without access to affordable, comprehensive health care. Currently, 87% of private insurance health care plans offered through employers cover abortion. If H.R. 3 is made into law, consumer options for private health insurance plans would be unnecessarily restricted and the tax burden on these policy holders would increase significantly.

H.R. 3 would also deny tax credits to small businesses that offer their employees insurance plans that cover abortion. This would have a significant impact on millions of families across the nation who would no longer be able to take advantage of existing tax credits and deductions for the cost of their health care. For example, small businesses that offer health plans that cover abortions would no longer be eligible for the Small Business Health Tax Credit—potentially worth 35%–50% of the cost of their premiums—threatening 4 million small businesses. Self-employed Americans who are able to deduct the cost of their comprehensive health insurance from their taxable income will also be denied similar tax credits and face higher taxes.

A November 2010 Hart Research poll found that a significant majority (74%) of the American population opposes the key provision of this bill, which would increase the tax burden on those who purchase comprehensive health insurance plans.

Current law requires state Medicaid programs to cover abortion care in limited circumstances, including in cases of rape, incest, or when the pregnancy jeopardizes the woman's life. H.R. 3 would allow states to refuse abortion coverage for Medicaid beneficiaries in all of these cases, even when their life is in danger.

Women who would need to terminate a pregnancy as a result of medical complications would be forced to pay up to $10,000 or more for abortion services. For many women, being forced to pay the full cost of an abortion is not economically feasible and would lead many families into bankruptcy or force pregnant women with medical complications to take on major risks to carry the child to term. H.R. 3 would also undermine the District of Columbia's home rule by restricting its use of funds for abortion care to low-income women.

The Hyde Amendment stipulates that no taxpayer dollars are to be used for abortion care, and has narrow exceptions for rape, incest, and health complications that arise from pregnancy which put the mother's life in danger. H.R. 3 would restrict women's access to reproductive health care even further by narrowing the already stringent requirements set forth in the Hyde Amendment.

When the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, the President issued an Executive Order to ''ensure that Federal funds are not used for abortion services.'' This bill goes far beyond the safeguards established under the Affordable Care Act, and sets a dangerous precedent for the future of women's reproductive health in this country.

At a time when the American people want Congress to focus on creating jobs and stabilizing the economy, the Republicans wish to focus on this divisive piece of legislation that does nothing to move our country forward.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting no on H.R. 3, a bill that represents an unprecedented step backward in women's reproductive freedom.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, I would like to express my deep opposition to H.R. 3. Rather than focus on legislation that will help the millions of Americans struggling to recover from a national recession, the majority in this chamber have instead decided to take up an unreasonable piece of legislation that essentially declares war on women's access to healthcare.

H.R. 3 is being called the ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.'' In fact, the healthcare legislation that President Obama signed into law last year already states that no federal taxpayer dollars may be use to fund abortion services. Additionally, the law requires that plans receiving federal funds must keep taxpayer dollars separate from funds for abortion services.

Women in the United States simply do not get public funds for abortion services. However, under the guise of eliminating abortion funding, what this bill really does is limit access to reproductive healthcare for the millions of women who pay for insurance and medical expenses through their own private insurance plans.

Finally, it is my firm belief that it is not the place of Congress to impede on women's reproductive freedom rights, which is exactly what this bill does.

Instead of debating divisive partisan issues, we should be working to get the nation back on track. The Republican leadership has controlled the agenda in the House of Representatives for the last 18 weeks and has still not brought forth legislation that would help stimulate the economy and spur economic growth.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, let me be clear. Throughout my years in Congress, I have always supported the Hyde amendment and have been against any government funding of abortion. Moreover, I have voted with the conviction that we, as Members of Congress, should not reach into the private lives of our constituents on issues as personal as this.

There is a very thin line here and this bill goes beyond it. As we all know, good policy is about striking a good balance. During health care reform, we reached a delicate compromise yet this bill would unravel that compromise to use the tax code in an unprecedented manner. As a Member of the Ways and Means Committee, I am acutely aware of how we use the tax code and disagree with the majority's choice to set this precedent.

At the end of the day, my constituents know my position on this issue. I believe women should be able to make their personal decisions in consultation with their families, their faith, and with their health professionals. That is how it should be. However, should this bill become law, not only would the IRS be involved asking women about a very personal decision, but the middle class would face increased taxes. I am not comfortable with these consequences and with the unbalanced approach of this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 3.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I am wholly opposed to this legislation, and urge its defeat.

We have a lot of challenges in this country: high gasoline prices, high unemployment, an economy that is not growing strongly enough, crumbling infrastructure, a growing threat from carbon pollution and climate change, and two ongoing wars in the Middle East, among many others.

But rather than focus on issues that are front and center in the lives of Americans from all walks of life, what legislation does the Republican leadership choose to bring to the floor today? Not a bill for jobs. Not a bill for growth. Not a bill that will promote clean energy. Not a bill for education. Not a bill for infrastructure investment. Not even a bill that addresses the deficit.

Instead, the Republican leadership presents a bill whose relentless focus is to extinguish a woman's right of choice with respect to pregnancy.

We have already resolved this issue. Last year, we did so in the Affordable Care Act. That law clearly and unequivocally prohibits the use of federal funds for abortion; keeps state and federal abortion-related law in place; and ensures that those whose conscience dictates against abortion are protected, and not discriminated against.

But this is not enough for some. H.R. 3 will result in a virtual shut-down of abortion services in the United States.

In addition to making permanent the prohibition in existing law on any federal funding for abortion, H.R. 3 prohibits any federal funds from being expended for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion. It establishes tax penalties for private expenditures on abortion. It provides a limitation on federal facilities and employees with respect to abortion. It again singles out the District of Columbia to prevent the citizens of that city from determining whether the local government can fund abortion services with its own revenue.

H.R. 3 is extreme, it is cruel, it is offensive, and it is wrong.

As I have stated in opposing other restrictive legislation on reproductive rights this year, this legislation will not become law. It is not what the American people are asking us to do. November's election was focused on jobs and economic growth. Its outcome was not a mandate to erode the rights of choice that are protected by the Constitution.

H.R. 3 turns the clock back to over 50 years ago. It should never have been brought to the floor and it should never be given the force of law. Not in the United States of America. Not in the 21st century. I urge its defeat.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to state my strong opposition to H.R. 3. This bill—ostensibly the Republican leadership's third-highest priority—is a reprehensible piece of legislation that will do nothing but put the lives of American women at risk.

It also tells us what the Republican leadership thinks of American women. When this bill was first introduced, I was outraged and horrified that the bill narrowed the long-standing exemption for rape to only ''forcible rape.'' I called this out for what it is—a violent act against women.

When this bill was marked up in the House Judiciary committee, ''forcible'' had been removed, therefore leaving the language as it has stood for decades. Without the word ''forcible,'' this exemption includes a wealth of horrifying circumstances, such as date rape, statutory rape, and rape where the woman is unconscious or mentally unable to consent.

To say that these instances are not really rape is a violent affront against women and the gravest insult to ALL victims of sexual assault.

Madam Speaker, I was absolutely incensed when I learned that although ''forcible'' does not appear in the bill language, its sponsors ensured that the report language clearly noted that the bill intends to apply to only ''forcible'' instances of rape.

So not only do the bill's sponsors not have a problem with endangering the lives of American women—but they're perfectly fine with not telling them the truth, too.

Let me be clear—no amendment, no word change could make this bill even close to acceptable. It is an insult to American women who require life-saving abortion care for health purposes, and a slap in the face to all American women who until now may have thought that their constitutional right to make their own private medical decisions about their body was safe.

Now we know that it's not— and the anti-choice community will stop at nothing to ensure that they chip away at Roe v. Wade until it is gone forever.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this atrocious bill. A vote against H.R. 3 is a vote for the health of American women and the sanctity of constitutional rights for us all.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I rise in vehement opposition to the ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.''

Of the many problems with this legislation, it ignores the fact that the Affordable Care Act already bans federal funding for abortion except in rare cases. Instead of being content with these firm restrictions, the authors of this bill have paved a new way for the most perilous anti-choice policy: their legislation would actually deny a woman an abortion when carrying out her pregnancy would endanger her life. The more subtle details of the bill are almost as onerous.

Republicans want IRS agents to double as ''abortion detectives'' who decide whether tax benefits have been improperly claimed with regard to abortion service expenses. Their legislation prevents low-income women and families from using premium tax credits if their coverage includes abortion services. It increases families' taxes when they use funds from their health savings or flexible-spending accounts for abortion related expenses. It denies employers the right to use ACA tax credits to provide their employees with comprehensive health coverage.

If this bill becomes law, our constituents will be paying far more than just higher taxes: they will be paying with their privacy, their dignity, and their right to determine the course of their own lives.

This bill does everything short of having anti-choice politicians physically present in our doctor's rooms, in our hospitals and looking over our shoulders when we fill out our tax forms. I urge my colleagues to show their respect for our constituents by opposing this thoughtless and harmful bill.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strongest opposition to H.R. 3, the ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.'' Not only is this bill taking up valuable floor time, but it is redundant and goes beyond a woman's right to control her body by tinkering with the tax code and private health insurance plans.

It is a mystery to me why we keep wasting time on legislation that addresses abortion. The Supreme Court has ruled on this issue, and there are established policies that prohibit the use of federal funds for abortion services except in very narrow circumstances. The President has announced he will veto this bill should it actually reach his desk.

Almost 9 percent of Americans are out of work, yet the House of Representatives has not taken one step to address this pressing national concern.

My Republican colleagues—who are strong advocates for less government—consistently

want the federal government to oversee a woman's reproductive rights. This legislation jeopardizes the health of pregnant women who may be suffering from cancer or another devastating disease, by limiting their ability to obtain adequate insurance in the private market.

House Republicans are manipulating the tax code to make sure abortions are out of reach for low income and in some cases, even middle class women. This legislation would also take away benefits that women insured in the private market currently have by imposing tax penalties on individuals and small businesses whose insurance plans include any kind of abortion services.

And if all this weren't enough, H.R. 3 would once again tell the District of Columbia how to spend its own money. It would codify policy included in the CR usurping the city council's authority to use locally raised revenue to provide abortion care for its low-income residents, an unfair restriction which Congress lifted in 2009 and reimposed this year.

Why should the District of Columbia be constantly used as a Petri dish for Republican policy experiments. It just isn't right.

Abortion is a hard choice for any woman. It is a decision that should be made by her, her family and her physician—without the federal government restricting access to services.

Let's move on to legislation that will help grow our economy and get people back to work.

I urge a ''no'' vote on H.R. 3

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, today we have an opportunity to examine H.R. 3, ''the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act,'' a bill which is claimed to simply codify what is already law. However, H.R. 3 is by far more restrictive than any current law, or interpretation thereof.

My colleagues across the aisle claim that this bill is simply about limiting federal funding for abortions. If that were truly the case, then there would be no purpose for H.R. 3, because Federal funding has not been available for abortions since passage of the Hyde amendment in 1977.

The effect of H.R. 3 is, in fact, to so drastically limit access to abortions that they will essentially become unavailable, even when paid for with an individual's own funds. In its attempt to make abortions unavailable, H.R. 3 will have a detrimental impact on women's health, and moreover, attacks a woman's constitutionally protected right to choose.

Twice, first in the Judiciary Committee Markup and secondly when H.R. 3 was being considered in the Rules Committee, I have attempted to offer to amendments to this bill that help to protect both the constitutionally protected rights of women, and their health. In both instances, my amendments were not accepted by the Republican majority on the Rules Committee.

My first amendment would have required the Attorney General to certify to Congress that H.R. 3 does not violate any constitutionally protected right before allowing this bill to take effect. The sponsor's of this bill have been perfectly clear that their goal with H.R. 3 is to create so many barriers and obstacles to abortion that it essentially becomes unavailable. The law is clear that while the government may regulate, it cannot impose an undue burden on a constitutionally protected right. The effect of H.R. 3 would be to impose such an insurmountable burden on a woman's fundamental right to make decisions about pregnancy that it could very likely be considered unconstitutional.

The second amendment I attempted to offer would have created an exception to protect women from severe long lasting health damage. This amendment is supported by the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Every year, 10–15 million women suffer severe or long-lasting damage to their health during pregnancy, including but not limited to lung disease, heart disease diabetes, and loss of reproductive ability. H.R. 3 only considered a woman's health when she is faced with death, but provides no protection for women who face serious health consequences from continuing a pregnancy. Congress should not be in the business of interfering with a woman's health, nor should we ever single out women who choose not to endure long-lasting health defects or diseases due to a pregnancy.

H.R. 3 would impose a great burden on a women like Tamara, a mother of 3 who had been diagnosed with cervical cancer and found out she was pregnant. She was faced with the difficult choice of carrying the pregnancy to term and risking her own health or terminating the pregnancy to receive treatment for her cancer.

H.R. 3 would impose a great burden on women like Holly from my state of Texas, a mother of two who suffered from a serious illness affecting her liver. Treatment for her liver would pose a threat to her pregnancy.

H.R. 3 goes to new lengths by effectively using the tax code to impede upon a woman's right to choose and essentially penalize individuals for even carrying health insurance that covers abortions.

It imposes an unprecedented penalty on anyone who spends their own money to pay for abortion, or in many cases, those who use their own money for insurance that will cover abortion if needed.

H.R. 3 will actually impose a tax increase on many Americans—across all races, all classes, and all socioeconomic levels. It increases taxes on women, families, and businesses by denying them the normal tax exemptions and credits for health insurance if they choose a policy that provides abortion coverage. This unprecedented penalty is a radical restriction on a lawful and constitutionally protected medical procedure. It will result in a tax increase on anyone who uses their own money to pay for abortion or, in many cases, insurance that would cover abortion.

Furthermore, the Bill puts the IRS into the middle of private and personal decisions by families. The result of this bill would also be that the IRS would be required to use the tools currently available as part of its tax enforcement duties, including the IRS's ability to audit taxpayers, to determine whether tax benefits had properly or improperly been claimed with respect to expenses related to abortion services. Family planning decisions, which are amongst the most personal and private decisions many people face, are subject to scrutiny by the IRS for tax purposes.

H.R. 3 does not merely codify existing protections for so-called rights of conscience. H.R. 3 rejects the even-handed approach taken since 1973 in the Church Amendment, which protects the religious or moral beliefs of those who provide, or refuse to provide, abortion services.

Furthermore, it takes the more-recent Weldon Amendment approach, which allows a large universe of entities to refuse abortion services for any—or no reason whatsoever. Unlike the Church Amendment approach, H.R. 3 protects only those who refuse to provide abortion services, and makes that one-sided protection permanent for all laws by providing a completely new private cause of action. It does nothing to protect those entities that do offer abortions.

The conscience rights of those who provide services, and not just those who refuse, deserve equal respect and recognition. Americans rights of conscience should not be protected only if they accord with the views of the Members of Congress; they should be protected regardless of what lawmakers' personal beliefs are.

Instead of Bringing Up Bills to Create Jobs, Republicans Are Pursuing An Extreme and Divisive Agenda. Today, the House will consider H.R. 3, Restricting Women's Access to Full Range of Health Care Services. Americans want us to work together to create jobs and move the country forward. This bill would do exactly the opposite—move our country backwards in an attempt to re-litigate a divisive issue.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called and sorely mislabeled ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.''

This bill is a hoax as Federal law currently prohibits the use of taxpayer money on abortion services. The legislation would effectively prevent millions of American women from using their own private money to purchase an insurance plan that includes coverage of abortions—whether it is private insurance or an insurance plan in the Health Insurance Exchanges. In addition, small businesses would not be allowed to take advantage of tax credits if it provided comprehensive health care coverage to its employees. This is a dramatic break with the current practice where most insurance plans provide for such coverage for individuals who choose such plans.

A woman's right to choose her own health care is a fundamental one, and the Congress should not tell women how to manage their health or reproductive care. Sadly, the legislation we're considering today will do just that and severely jeopardize women's access to health care.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided bill because it would effectively prohibit individuals from using their own money to purchase insurance plans offering comprehensive health care coverage. Instead, I urge the Republican majority to focus on an agenda that will create jobs, help America's middle class families, and move our country forward.

Mr. BOSWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose this legislation and to focus on the importance of the health of the many women in my district and across our nation.

I stand against H.R. 3, because I believe that a woman deserves the same respect as a man. She deserves this respect as an employee, a wife, a mother, a sister, simply just for her humanity. And that respect must be real and must include important matters like access to health care.

During the 111th Congress, we made it illegal for insurance companies to charge a woman a higher premium just because she is

female. We did this because to do anything else is blatant discrimination.

Yet here we are today, with a bill that would circumvent the very discrimination we stopped and would direct the Internal Revenue Service to tax a woman based on her health needs, just because her needs are different from that of a man.

Even worse, at this critical time in our economy, we are now going to tax any business that provides comprehensive health care to a woman.

So, instead of fighting for the most critical need of our nation right now, job creation, H.R. 3 picks a fight with a woman and her employer.

Why do any one of us seek to have health insurance? We choose to have health insurance in order to plan for the unforeseeable, the unknown, those emergencies that arise and for which no one can plan. No one plans to have cancer, but many Americans do. Health insurance is how each of us protects ourselves against the unknown.

This legislation says that a woman—with her own money—cannot have comprehensive health insurance without a penalty. It creates a new barrier to access to care, and puts in place a system of discrimination, backed by statute in the United States Tax Code.

For my colleagues who argue that this is to reduce the rate of abortion services, it will not. The facts show otherwise.

Access to family planning services is what reduces the need for abortion services. It is family planning services that have proven to cut the rate of abortion by more than 200,000 per year and reduce unintended pregnancies by more than 600,000 per year.

This bill was titled the "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act," but it reads more like a "Tax our Daughters Act."

Stop this boldfaced attack on American women. Let us instead provide them with jobs and a fair paycheck.

Vote against H.R. 3. Show the women of your district, and your family, that you respect them.

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LUMMIS). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 237, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 3 is postponed.

REPEALING MANDATORY FUNDING FOR SCHOOL HEALTH CENTER CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 236 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1214.

□ 1525

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1214) to repeal mandatory funding for school-based health center construction, with Mrs. MYRICK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 3, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 218, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—207

Ackerman
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

NOES—218

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster

Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Emerson
Giffords
Johnson, Sam
Wasserman Schultz
Young (AK)

□ 1554

Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. GRANGER, and Messrs. DENHAM, MARINO and COSTA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. UPTON, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Messrs. DOYLE, CRITZ, BISHOP of Georgia, ISSA, SHULER and YOUNG of Indiana changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the Committee now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MYRICK). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, noes 210, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

AYES—205

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—210

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Akin
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Crowley
DeFazio
Ellison
Emerson
Fincher
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Johnson, Sam
Neal
Nunnelee
Paul
Towns
Wasserman Schultz
Young (AK)

□ 1603

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FINCHER. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 288, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MYRICK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1214) to repeal mandatory funding for school-based health center construction, and, pursuant to House Resolution 236, reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I am, in its current form.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1214 to the Committee

on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 1, add at the end the following:

(c) PUBLICATION OF NAMES AND LOCATIONS OF APPLICANTS WHO WILL NOT RECEIVE GRANTS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall publish on the public Website of the Department of Health and Human Services the names and locations of each school-based health center or sponsoring facility that has an application for a grant under section 4101(a) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 280h–4) pending at the time of the repeal of such section 4101(a) by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer a motion to recommit to this misguided bill.

It is important to note that this motion is simply a final amendment to the bill and will not kill the bill as the majority may claim.

School-based health centers are on the front lines of preventative care, and preventative care saves lives and saves money, and school-based centers are on the front lines of preventative care.

As a nurse for over 30 years, I know that prevention can keep people out of the emergency rooms that taxpayers help fund, and it keeps them from needing expensive procedures and medicines that drive up insurance costs.

Patients seen at school-based centers, for example, cost Medicaid an average of $30 less than comparable non-school-based health center patients. School-based health centers play an important role in treating sports concussions and halting the spread of infectious diseases like the flu.

School-based centers also have a positive effect on our educational system. They have been shown to increase academic performance and reduce absenteeism. For example, a recent study found that students who use high school health centers had a 50 percent reduction in absenteeism and 25 percent reduction in lateness. Many students also increased their grade point averages over time compared to students who did not use school-based health centers.

Finally, the sad fact is sometimes these centers are a student's only source of health care. So, we are faced today with legislation that attacks the preventative health care work done by our school-based health centers. H.R. 1214 is an upsetting piece of legislation, but that's not surprising at all. After all, this bill is coming from the same conference that just voted to end Medicare as we know it.

Both the Republican budget and this legislation today are penny-wise and pound-foolish approaches that cut preventative care for those Americans who need it the most. And the worst common denominator? Both measures go against the most honorable Americans: the elderly and the children. The Republican majority passed a reckless budget before the recess, and they are poised to pass this reckless piece of legislation today.

I offer this motion to recommit today to highlight the terrible impacts of the Republican approach in this legislation. This motion to recommit is simply, again, a final amendment and will not kill the bill.

My motion to recommit requires the names and locations of each school-based health center that has applied for a grant under the program that the Republican Party would end today be posted on a publicly available Web site.

□ 1610

This way, we will be able to all see very clearly the damage that this Republican proposal will cause.

Like many of my colleagues, a school-based health center in my district would be denied funding under this bill. One of my hospitals in my district, Winthrop University Hospital, has been partnering with Hempstead High School to run a school-based health center. This school-based health center has 1,500 students enrolled and has 6,000 visits from students each year.

Winthrop University's partnership operates in one of my most underserved communities. About 50 percent of students who use this school-based health center are uninsured. Let me say that again: Nearly half of all students who use this health center are uninsured. Hempstead High School is the only access to medical care that they have. The grant that this center applied for will help them serve this population who has nowhere else to turn. I am going to stand with those students and their families and protect the Winthrop-Hempstead High School health center. I hope that other Members will choose to stand with their constituents as well.

Should this bill become law, those Members who voted for this bill will have to answer to their communities who would have a vital link to health care cut off. I should also note some misinformation that's being spread by the supporters of H.R. 1214. They claim that these grants aren't needed because they are readily available in other sources, but that's not true. The evidence is that SBHC construction and renovation needs have not been met through other funding. My colleagues across the aisle also claim that construction funds would be provided to centers that aren't sustainable. That's also not true. Guidelines have been developed by the Health Resources and Services Administration to ensure that no construction funds will be provided to any school-based health center that cannot document that they are sustainable now and into the future.

As I said, ladies and gentlemen, school-based health centers work. They keep our young people healthy and successful in school, and they do it in a way that saves our taxpayers money. It is just common sense to support school-based centers. Again, this amendment will not kill the bill. This motion to recommit is simply a final amendment to the bill that will provide transparency to the process. I urge all Members to support this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. BURGESS. I will withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. It's an interesting little motion to recommit, described as being benign and not changing the overall nature of the underlying legislation. So benign is the motion to recommit that it descends into the realm of being superfluous and unnecessary. It is a motion to recommit to publish the names and locations of applicants who will not receive grants.

Now, look, just from this, we won't know if those grants that were not approved were just simply poorly drafted. We already have a health care law that was poorly drafted, so we know it is within the realm of someone working in the Federal Government to poorly draft an application for a school-based clinic.

Washington's addiction to spending has become crystal clear to the American people, and the passage of this massive health care law by President Obama last year is exhibit A. Of the thousands of problems in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the underlying bill, H.R. 1214, addresses but one of them and a very small one at that. The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act provides $200 million in mandatory funding for the construction of school-based health centers. The bill eliminates this funding as our Nation faces a mounting deficit and debt crisis.

Funding for school-based health center construction may be a good idea. Maybe it's not a good idea. Maybe we should have that debate, which we didn't in the run-up to the passage of this bill. But the 111th Congress, the last Congress, did not think about it before they threw literally $200 million at the program.

And, Madam Speaker, I would just point out, out of all of the so-called ''cut'' bills that are to remove the advanced appropriations in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, out of all of those bills that remove advanced appropriations, it is this small little bill that has not drawn a veto threat from the White House. Madam Speaker, that leads me to believe that

the President himself was embarrassed about the language that was included in the bill on this point; and the White House, now recognizing that, is not about to go out on a limb and issue a veto threat against this bill.

The motion to recommit, brought forward by the other side, shows they simply do not realize that we have a spending problem in Washington, D.C. Congress should examine if there is a need for a program, and through regular order, rather than rushing to authorize or appropriate dollars in a feel-good piece of legislation. We hear about standing with the American families. How about standing with those American families that actually pay taxes to the Federal Government for a change?

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit, ''yes'' on the underlying bill. Let's get our fiscal house back in order.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask all Members to avoid trafficking the well while another Member is under recognition.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 230, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

AYES—180

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—230

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—22

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Brady (TX)
Cantor
Clyburn
Dreier
Emerson
Giffords
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Johnson, Sam
McCarthy (CA)
McMorris Rodgers
Noem
Peterson
Price (GA)
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Scott (SC)
Sessions
Walden
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1634

Ms. SPEIER changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ROSS of Florida. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 289, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall, No. 289, I inadvertently was detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 289, I was detained in a bicameral leadership meeting with the Speaker. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 191, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)

Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—191

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
West
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Emerson
Giffords
Johnson, Sam
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1641

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, consideration of the bill (H.R. 3) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide for conscience protections, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. SPEIER. I am opposed to the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Speier moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendments.

Page 8, after the matter following line 5, insert the following:

SEC. 103. PROTECTION OF PRIVATE MEDICAL RECORDS OF VICTIMS OF RAPE AND INCEST.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to permit the Federal Government to gain access to the private medical records of the victims of rape and incest.

On the first page, in the matter following line 5, insert after the item relating to section 102 the following:

Sec. 103. Protection of private medical records of victims of rape and incest.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, at the outset, let me say the following:

As a member of the Democratic Caucus, there have been times in the past when I have supported Republican motions to recommit. I have done it a number of times, I confess. I am speaking to my Republican colleagues this afternoon, seeking to ask you to do the same, because this particular motion is very simple, very clear. It will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If it is adopted, it will be incorporated in the bill, and the bill will be immediately voted upon.

So what does it do?

It is about what every one of us cares about, and that is privacy. Americans believe in privacy. Justice Brandeis once said in a court opinion, ''Every American has the right to be left alone.'' This is something we can all agree on.

My motion would simply prohibit Federal agents from accessing a woman's health or other medical records because she was a victim of rape or incest. Now, that's pretty simple. If you're a victim of rape or incest, no Federal agency or agent will be able to access your medical records in order to prove that you, in fact, were raped or were a victim of incest.

Both the Hyde Amendment and this legislation specifically create exceptions for victims of these crimes. The underlying bill would create an exception to the exception. It actually revictimizes the victims of rape and incest by requiring them to relive their horror. Rape kits could be examined. Confidential medical records could be breached.

How can we possibly ask a woman who has suffered an horrific crime to now face scrutiny by an IRS audit? Think about it. Is that what we want? Do we want women who have been victims of rape and incest to have IRS agents knocking on their doors to determine whether or not they really have been raped or have been victims of incest? We should be treating these victims like victims and not like criminals. Medical privacy is a longstanding and protected right for every American. Why should the right be forfeited because you are a victim of rape or incest?

Let me say it one more time: Passage of this motion will not prevent passage of the bill. If it is adopted, it will be incorporated in the bill, and the bill will be taken up immediately.

Madam Speaker, last month, I received a call from a woman who was raped while serving in the United States Navy. Sometimes we get wrapped up in the words and forget about the real lives we're talking about. This member of the Navy was raped, beaten savagely and left for dead in her quarters. She was later informed that she was pregnant, and opted to have an abortion. Does anyone here believe that this woman who volunteered to serve our country should be subject to an audit by the IRS? This particular

Navy serviceperson has since been diagnosed with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, and has attempted suicide more than once.

This is a real-life story of an American in uniform, fighting for our freedom. We should not use the Tax Code to force women like her to relive their ordeals to an IRS agent. Privacy is a fundamental right, and this motion would ensure that the most vulnerable in our society have access to it. The underlying bill would potentially unleash IRS audits on rape victims—and that, my friends, is a disgrace.

Let me be clear one more time: Passage of this motion will not prevent passage of the underlying bill.

So, though we may disagree on the bill and on the issue of abortion rights in general, today we have the opportunity to speak with one voice to protect the privacy of victims of rape and incest. It is really up to us. I urge everyone to vote ''yes'' on this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1650

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation, and I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to recommit. The amendment supposes that the bill does something that it doesn't do. Nothing in this bill allows the IRS any greater access to health information than they have ever had. HIPAA is still in place. This is simply an amendment looking for a problem that isn't there.

Madam Speaker, well over a dozen weakening amendments to this bill were offered at the Judiciary Committee and the committee carefully considered and, frankly, dismissed most of those amendments. Likewise, opponents had a second opportunity to challenge the bill in the Ways and Means Committee, and the product is the bill before us.

I have heard so much incorrect information about the bill, Madam Speaker. I would like to say to you that when the gentlelady speaks of the most vulnerable among us, I would simply say that before the sun sets today in America, 4,000 unborn children will die of abortion on demand, and in every case a nameless little baby will die a tragic and lonely death, a mother will never be quite the same, and all the gifts that child might have brought to humanity will be lost forever.

I would like to tell you that this bill does something to prevent that same thing from happening tomorrow, but it doesn't. Madam Speaker, this bill simply says that taxpayers in the future will no longer have to pay for or worry about their taxpayer dollars being used for that purpose. And whatever red herrings we may have heard from the opponents today, this bill does nothing more than require that abortion funding remain in the private sphere and outside the reach of government's coercive power.

The bill is a very simple piece of legislation without the complexity that it has been reputed to have. I would encourage all Americans to take a look at the underlying legislation so that you can see for yourself that this bill has no need of this motion to recommit.

Unlike the ObamaCare bill, this piece of simple legislation is only a few pages long and is easily understandable. The new majority writes its bills this way on purpose so that Members and the American people can be confident that this body is in fact carrying out the will of the people. That is exactly what this bill does, Madam Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit.

Mr. CAMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CAMP. I just want to instruct the House, on this motion to recommit, it only affects title I of the bill. All of the tax provisions are in title II of the bill. So this does not affect any of the tax provisions in the legislation.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, what he said.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 235, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

AYES—192

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts

Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Emerson
Giffords
Johnson, Sam

□ 1713

Messrs. PAUL and PLATTS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. SEWELL and Mr. JONES changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 251, noes 175, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—251

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—175

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Emerson
Giffords
Johnson, Sam
Petri

□ 1720

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MYRICK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SOUTHERN STORMS

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to all those affected by the devastating storms that ripped through Tennessee and 12 other States last week. My thoughts and prayers are with the families who lost loved ones and with those that must rebuild their lives after this terrible natural disaster.

Just as the people of Tennessee came together following last year's floods, we will do so again. With heavy hearts, we will overcome our great loss with greater strength and a renewed sense of community.

I would also like to extend my heartfelt thanks to all of the volunteers and rescue workers involved in the disaster relief efforts. Even in dark hours, the efforts of Americans like these should give all of us cause to hope.

In the days ahead, we will work together to ensure that our communities have the resources needed to rebuild. I have complete faith that we will emerge stronger and better than ever before.

Madam Speaker, my prayers go to those family members in our State and others who have lost loved ones. It's a terrible, terrible tragedy.

HONORING WILLIAM ''BILL'' SCHULTZ

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor William ''Bill'' Schultz.

Bill is an educator who has dedicated over three decades, specifically 34 years, to teaching in Maine, New Hampshire, and New York. Upon retirement, he has dedicated his energies and talents to other retirees.

Bill was a leader in the labor movement and served two terms as president of the Niskayuna Teachers Association in my congressional district. Serving 8 years as president of Retiree Council 12 of the New York State United Teachers Association, Bill was influential in organizing the council.

Bill's leadership, dedication, compassion, and knowledge have had a profound influence on the lives of the students he has taught, the retirees for which he has advocated, and the friends he has made along the way.

In 1921, John Cotton Dana said, ''Who dares to teach must never cease to learn.'' It is in this spirit that Bill will be honored later this month.

I commend and congratulate him on all his efforts and hope his service and dedication can stand as a model and inspiration for countless others. After all, our future and our children's future are only as good as those who teach them.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HAROLD J. SCHNITZER

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I rise today in honor of the long and productive life of Harold J. Schnitzer.

Harold was a skilled businessman who, together with his wife, Arlene Director Schnitzer, established and later with his son, Jordan, grew one of the largest privately owned real estate companies in the western United States. But this quiet, thoughtful, modest man was a civic leader, a philanthropist for the arts, education, and culture in Oregon.

I personally experienced his kindness to a young man interested in public service. He continued to be generous with his opinions and advice, a story I know was repeated many times. His important contributions to our community will be enjoyed for generations to come.

We honor his life, even as we mourn his passing, and extend our condolences to his wife of 62 years, Arlene, his son, Jordan, his extended family, and countless friends.

HAROLD SCHNITZER OBITUARY

Schnitzer, Harold J. 87 June 08, 1923 April 27, 2011 Harold J. Schnitzer, businessman, philanthropist, and civic leader, passed away early Wednesday morning, April 27, 2011, in Portland, at age 87, from complications of cancer and diabetes. He was born June 8, 1923, in Portland, growing up in S.W. Portland where he attended Shattuck Elementary School and Lincoln High School. He earned a Bachelor of Science in metallurgy from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1944 and, immediately thereafter, served in the U.S. Army until his discharge in 1947. Upon returning to Portland he joined his brothers in the family scrap and steel business, working alongside them until 1950, at which time he left and founded Harsch Investment Properties, a leading diversified owner and operator of industrial, office, retail and multi-family properties in five Western states. He served as President and Chairman of the Board for two decades before being joined by his son Jordan in 1970, who now serves as President. Together they grew the company into one of the largest, privately held real estate companies in the Western United States. Throughout his life he focused on three things: family, the business and his community. Harold learned early on from his parents, Sam and Rose Schnitzer, who immigrated to the United States in the early 1900s, the responsibility of making a difference with his life. They taught him and his siblings, Manuel, Morris, Mollie, Edith, Gilbert and Leonard, the importance of giving back to your community. In 1949 he met and married Arlene Director, daughter of family friends, Simon and Helen Director. Married for 62 years, they were lifelong partners in business, the arts and philanthropy. Their son, Jordan, was born in 1951. Over a career of 60 years there have been hundreds of organizations and causes that have benefited from his leadership and financial support. Harold served on the board of Lewis & Clark College for 16 years, a Life Trustee since 1995. His service to the Portland Art Museum spanned 21 years, ultimately as Chairman of the Board from 1997 to 2001, during which time a major expansion resulted in the opening of the Mark Building. He and Arlene are especially proud of establishing the Center for Northwest Art, and a curatorial and awards program. They also were major collectors of Han and pre-Han ceramics that led to establishing the Arlene and Harold Schnitzer Collection of Early Chinese Art. They gifted a number of works from the collection to the Portland Art Museum along with endowing the position of Curator of Asian Art. Harold and Arlene have also been strong supporters of arts and cultural institutions in both the Bay Area and Palm Springs, where they have residences. More recently Harold provided the lead gift establishing the Harold Schnitzer Diabetes Health Center at OHSU in 2007, one of only ten centers in the nation treating children and adults, and the only one on the West Coast. A diabetic since his early 40s, he valued good health care and appreciated its connection to the quality and longevity of life. The Center is his expression of helping others in their struggle with diabetes. Harold valued family and philanthropy that extended to Portland, the State of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. He served as chairman of multiple capital and building campaigns for Portland's Jewish Community that led to the establishment of the Mittleman Jewish Community Center, and facilities for Congregation Shaarie Torah and Congregation Beth Israel, both of which he remained as a member until his death. Harold was always interested in ensuring that young people have the same educational opportunities that he had. He believed that with education comes greater appreciation of one another's differences and increased tolerance. He had a lifelong interest in funding scholarships and educational grants, and that ultimately led to him establishing Judaic studies programs at both the University of Oregon and Portland State University. Harold served the City of Portland on a variety of projects including the development of the Portland Center for the Performing Arts. Because of his leadership and philanthropy, the city named its symphony hall, the Arlene Schnitzer Concert Hall, in honor of his wife, Arlene. He has been honored by numerous civic organizations regionally and nationally in partnership with his wife Arlene including the following: Doctor of Humane Letters, Portland State University, 2004; Distinguished Service Award, University of Oregon, 2001; Aubrey Watzek Award, Lewis & Clark College, 2000; Arts Breakfast of Champions Honoree, NW Business for Culture and the Arts, 1997; Portland First Citizen Award, Portland Metropolitan Association of Realtors, 1995; SAFECO Art Leadership Award, ArtFair/Seattle, 1994; Distinguished Service Award, United Jewish Appeal, 1966–1967; and the Outstanding Philanthropist Award, National Society of Fundraising Executives, 1996. He is this year's honoree of the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation to be celebrated Saturday, April 30, 2011. Also in April, the faculty of the Pacific Northwest College of Art voted to award honorary doctorate degrees to both Harold and Arlene. Harold is survived by his wife, Arlene; son, Jordan; granddaughters, Arielle and Audria; brother, Gilbert of the Bay Area, Calif.; sister Mollie of Beverly Hills, Calif.; and numerous nieces and nephews. Even during the last days of his life he was still working and planning on how to make life better for everyone else around him. Therefore, in lieu of flowers and to honor his memory, the family suggests that contributions maybe made to the Harold Schnitzer Diabetes Health Center at OHSU; the Portland Art Museum; at either of two Judaic studies programs at the University of Oregon or Portland State University, or to the charity of your choice. A memorial service will be at 4 p.m. Wednesday, May 11, 2011, at Congregation Beth Israel, 1972 N.W. Flanders St., Portland, with a reception to follow at 5:30 p.m. at the Portland Art Museum, Mark Building, 1219 S.W. Park Ave., Portland.

IT'S TIME TO GET FOXES OUT OF THE HENHOUSE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we had a hearing yesterday in the Judiciary Committee. The Attorney General of the United States came before us, and one of the things we discussed was the fact that in 2008, toward the end of the year, there was the biggest, most important terrorist funding case that was ever tried, conviction of all five defendants on 108 counts, and now this administration has dismissed and is not going to pursue the evidence that the trial judge said was there to make a prima facie case against the coconspirators.

Instead, you can go to the White House Web site and find that their deputy national security adviser is thanking the president of the Islamic Society of North America, which was one of the unindicted coconspirators, for his wonderful help in the White House and his great prayer he gave the year before.

It's time to get foxes out of the henhouse. Let's hold people responsible who want to destroy our way of life.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to just thank my colleagues for voting so overwhelmingly for H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

America today is solemnly pro-life and the trend line tangibly improves by the year. On public funding, a supermajority of well over 60 percent oppose public funding of abortion. Clearly, Americans get it. There is nothing compassionate, benign, or nurturing about abortion. Abortion methods, the actual deed of dismemberment, chemical poisoning or suction is an act of violence against children.

Abortion also hurts women. Earlier today in the Capitol, we heard from Nancy Tanner, a woman from Silent No More Awareness Campaign, who eloquently urged passage of H.R. 3. Ms. Tanner spoke of her abortion and the emotional agony that she has endured and noted that well over 10,000 women have come forward and now have spoken out publicly against abortion. Each and every one of those women have had at least one abortion themselves, and they talk of the ongoing and enduring agony of that abortion.

I want to, again, thank my colleagues for supporting the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

ALL-OF-THE-ABOVE ENERGY

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, when I drove to the airport to come out here this week, I recognized that gasoline was at $3.86 a gallon in my district, and the last time we got to these levels was almost 2½, 3 years ago in the summer of 2008.

And we, at that time, came up with an all-of-the-above energy plan, a plan that recognizes that what we need to do is expand production in the United States. We need to concentrate on conservation. We need to incentivize new forms of energy. But first and foremost, in order to get us over the bridge, we need to make certain that we utilize responsibly resources that have been given to this great country by our Creator.

We need offshore exploration, onshore exploration, clean coal technology, oil shale, all of the things that the American people know will decrease not just the price of gasoline but will decrease our reliance on foreign oil and make this country safer and the world safer.

Let's get to work on an all-of-the-above energy plan on behalf of the American people.

□ 1730

RISING GAS PRICES

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately in what has become a time-honored tradition, the President and my Democratic colleagues that are here in Congress find it more convenient and politically expedient to make targets of energy companies. These are companies who invest their own capital and resources to increase our country's energy supply and the security of our Nation. They want nothing more than to operate in a free market environment without excessive government regulations.

However, in a move to deflect the spotlight from this administration's own failings and the Democrat Party's own failings and their incompetent policies, this administration and many in Congress find it easier to attack the success of the energy companies than to actually confront the challenges that we face, often espousing policies to increase government interference in the marketplace that do more harm than good.

Recently, companies like Koch Industries, which employs more than 10,000 people in my home State of Georgia, contributing more than $700 million to our State's economy, along with tens of millions in community and environmental philanthropic efforts, have come under attack by several Democrats in this body and this administration just because Koch's work provides for an easy red meat target to throw to their radical environmental friends. It's also a sad state of affairs when other energy companies actually post a positive profit report, even though most of these profits go back into more energy exploration as well as clean energy development. I'm also sure that you won't hear many attacks on how those profits help boost the retirement accounts of millions of Americans and put more into our struggling economy than any government stimulus program has or could.

According to the new Washington Post/ABC News survey out today, more than seven in 10 Americans are suffering financial hardship from the skyrocketing gas prices. In fact, we've got a chart here tonight, the first one in a series. This is the gas price, the average retail price in America when Barack Obama took office. The average price at that time was $1.84 per gallon just as recently as January of 2009, a little over 2 years ago. Look what's happened. As of April 25 of this year, the average price per gallon was $3.88. The average price 2 years ago was $1.84; now it is $3.88, $2 higher, over twice. It's over double in just a 2-year period of time.

Gas prices don't just affect the price at the pump. I was talking to a Member just a few minutes ago. She was telling me that she just fueled her pickup truck, and it cost her over $100 to fill the gas tank of her pickup truck. She and her husband own a ranch. They are active ranchers out west. Never before has she had to pay $100 to fill the tank of her vehicle, and I filled the tank of mine, and it was almost $90 in my GMC Yukon that I've used to make house calls as a medical doctor. This is unsustainable.

Our gas prices impact our grocery bills, job opportunities, travel plans, and thousands of other decisions that businesses and families make. In fact, according to an analyst from Cameron Hanover, every penny increase in the price of gas costs consumers, American citizens, consumers, more than $4 million per day. A one-penny increase costs consumers over $4 million per day. And, folks, who are hurt the most by this? The people who are hurt the most are poor people and people who are on limited incomes, our senior citizens.

As the cost of fuel and gas and oil go up because of the misplaced policies of this administration, this winter, fuel prices are going to be out of the roof. In fact, the President said while we were talking about his cap-and-trade bill not long ago, he said that energy prices, to use the President's words, ''would necessarily skyrocket'' for his policies. ''Necessarily skyrocket.'' Under President Obama, the cost of energy has skyrocketed. That's what he has said in a national speech.

The national average price of gasoline, as I just mentioned, was $1.84 when President Obama took office. Today it is $3.96. Rising gasoline prices are hurting families and small businesses. They are costing jobs. In fact, I just talked to a manager of a restaurant in my hometown of Athens, Georgia, just this last weekend. He was telling me that when he orders food for his restaurant, his suppliers are adding a fuel surcharge, a fuel surcharge onto the cost of groceries, food for his restaurant. That's happening in all the grocery stores, and that's happening all across this country. It's threatening our economy and our economic recovery.

While the new House majority is taking steps to address gas prices and help create jobs with the American Energy Initiative, the Obama administration's anti-energy policies are driving up prices, and they are threatening our economy by blocking American energy production. We have had a 16 percent decrease in American energy production under this administration. It is 16 percent lower than it was projected to be. Future projections show continued decreases in domestic production and more and more reliance upon foreign imports for our energy sources, particularly for gas and oil. We're getting those energy resources from countries that hate us, that hate our American free enterprise system, that hate the liberty we have here in this country.

More than a 200,000-barrel-per-day decrease in Gulf Coast energy production, this is according to the Energy Information Administration's March 2011

short-term energy outlook. Production from the Gulf of Mexico is expected to fall by 240,000 barrels per day in 2011 and a further 200,000 barrels per day in 2012. A reduction. And 27 billion barrels of oil are under lock and key in Alaska. According to a recent FOX News report, the EPA's refusal to grant permits for energy production in Alaska's Outer Continental Shelf has limited access to an estimated 27 billion barrels of oil. With Alaskan oil production already decreasing by 7 percent annually, continued delays could force the Trans-Alaska Pipeline to shut down.

□ 1740

What's that going to do to our cost of gasoline, heating oil, natural gas and all of our other energy sources? What's that going to do to the cost of food? It's all going to skyrocket.

More than 40 American energy projects have been stalled by this administration. As the House Natural Resources Committee notes, 10 months after the Obama administration's official moratorium on American energy ended, over 40 projects remain stalled, and people are left without work. This administration's energy policy is killing jobs in the Gulf Coast, as well as all over this country. We're sending American jobs overseas. Twelve rigs have already left the Gulf.

Before we change, let me go to this quote here from Michael Bromwich, the Chief Regulator of U.S. offshore drilling. Even if we permitted the hell out of everything tomorrow, every pending permit, some permits that haven't even been filed yet, it would not have a material effect on gas prices, Bromwich said. That's the simple, clear reality.

The simple clear truth, the simple truth is Michael Bromwich is absolutely wrong. And, in fact, as soon as the first drill bit starts hitting dirt or ocean floor, you will see oil prices plummet in this country, in my opinion. Why? Because OPEC will get a message that we're going to produce our own energy resources here in America.

Mr. Speaker, I submit any country that is not energy independent, if it cannot produce its own energy resources, if it cannot produce its own food and its own clothing, is not a secure Nation. And the American people need to know that we are not a secure Nation today, and it's because of policies of this administration that are making us less secure. We need to go in the opposite direction of the direction we're going today, that this administration's taking us.

According to James W. Noe, Executive Director of the Shallow Water Energy Security Coalition, at least 12 offshore rigs have already departed the Gulf of Mexico, resulting in a significant and precipitous reduction in domestic employment and energy production.

In January, the moratorium forced seven oil rigs to abandon the Gulf and head overseas, costing American jobs and forcing the U.S. to import more foreign oil. These rigs have left. You see where they've gone. Nigeria, Egypt, the Congo, Brazil, French Guyana. They won't be coming back. Thousands of American jobs left with them. In fact, as many as 12,000 American jobs have been lost, and more than 36,000 jobs are at risk.

I hear my Democrat colleagues talking about it's jobs, jobs, jobs. In fact, we heard that just today in the Science Committee. One of my Democratic colleagues talked about jobs are the number one issue. Well, she's absolutely right. But it's her party's policies that are running jobs overseas. It's this administration's policies that are making these rigs leave the Gulf of Mexico and go to Nigeria and Egypt and Congo and Brazil, French Guyana.

According to the study at Louisiana State University, monetary economist, Dr. Joseph Mason, the Obama administration's de facto ban, and it is a ban, he says he's lifted the moratorium but they're not putting out the permits. It's a de facto ban on American energy production, could cost as many as 24,532 jobs in the Gulf Coast and 36,137 jobs nationwide.

By the administration's own admission, the first 6 months of the official moratorium alone has resulted in as many as 12,000 American jobs have been lost. They're gone. They've left the Gulf Coast. They've gone to other areas. They've gone to produce energy, if you look at this chart, in the Middle East, in Africa, South America and Brazil.

In fact, the President just sent billions of dollars to Brazil for them to produce their energy and create Brazilian jobs at the cost of American energy and American jobs. It makes no sense, absolutely no sense.

Recently, in a trip to Brazil in March, President Obama pledged to help with technology and support to develop the Brazilian oil reserves so that America could become one of Brazil's, quoting Barack Obama himself, Brazil's best customers. He wants us to become Brazil's best customer.

How about those American jobs that he is killing and his administration is killing?

His Energy Secretary, Dr. Chu, a couple of years ago said, we have to find some way to make gasoline prices in America the same as they are in Europe. We'll talk about that in a bit, and remind the American people that the President himself said that energy prices under his policies that he's promoting would necessarily skyrocket. He wants Americans' energy prices to skyrocket, putting people out of jobs, costing all these thousands of jobs, costing our economy millions and millions and trillions of dollars in all probability eventually. Certainly billions.

He just gave a loan to Brazil, $2 billion to produce jobs and produce oil in Brazil instead of producing oil in the Gulf Coast and off Alaska. And his EPA just denied any production off Alaska. It makes no sense.

According to stories from the Gulf Coast residents shared at a recent Natural Resources Committee hearing, the President's policies already are helping make good on his pledge, with one offshore boat company employee reporting that his employer is sending 100 vessels overseas to Brazil to keep them working, Brazilians working. With those transfers go many American jobs.

This administration's policies are destroying jobs. The Democrat Party policies under the former Speaker, Ms. PELOSI, the Majority Leader in the Senate, HARRY REID, are destroying jobs, destroying our economy. And they want more of the same. They want more stimulus, more government, less American jobs in the private sector, less American energy production.

Mr. Speaker, the American people need to know very clearly, they need to know the simple truth. They deserve the truth; that the policies created by this administration, the policies created under the leadership of NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID are building a bigger government but destroying our energy. They're building a bigger government, even higher prices for housing in Washington, D.C. to destroy jobs in the private sector all across the country. And their energy policies are going to harm the most vulnerable Americans, poor people, people on limited incomes, our senior citizens.

□ 1750

Recently, President Obama and Washington Democrats trotted out two blame-shifting strategies that Democrats have tried unsuccessfully to use in the past to deflect blame for their failed anti-energy policies.

Just last month, Democrats recycled their so-called ''use it or lose it'' argument that has already been debunked as nothing more than a hoax. It is political fodder that they are utilizing. And I have heard it in our Natural Resources Committee. I have heard it on the floor of the House. American people are sick and tired of this kind of political dialogue.

Americans are demanding all over this country, not only in the 10th District in Georgia, my district, not only in the State of Georgia, but Americans all over the country deserve for this Nation to be energy independent. They are crying out for energy independence.

The Carter administration established the Energy Department to make us energy independent as a Nation. The Department of Energy has failed miserably, failed miserably in that task, and has failed miserably in that task under both Democrat as well as Republican administrations.

Now, President Obama is trying to shift blame to oil speculators just as he did back in 2008. And this is in spite of the fact that, as Washington Post's Jennifer Rubin notes: It is the administration's own policies that are contributing to yet another drain on the wallets of average Americans.

The Washington Post has not been a particularly conservative newspaper that has promoted conservative policies. That is what Jennifer Rubin said: The administration's own policies are contributing to yet another drain on the wallets of average Americans. And she is absolutely correct in that assessment, and I commend her for saying so.

Earlier this month, the House passed the Energy Tax Prevention Act, H.R. 910, to stop the Obama administration from imposing a backdoor national energy tax that will further drive up gas prices. President Obama says he is going to veto that legislation, proving that he won't let skyrocketing gas prices get in the way of his administration's job-crushing anti-energy agenda regardless of the cost to American families and small businesses.

I have got a small business in the timber industry in Lincoln County, Georgia, and the owner of that business recently told me he parked all of his trucks because he cannot afford to put fuel in those trucks, and that has cost several jobs in Lincoln County. Lincoln County has an unemployment rate that is way, way higher than the national average. In fact, the State of Georgia's unemployment rate I think just recently was reported to be over 10 percent.

This administration's anti-energy policies are crushing jobs, crushing small businesses, crushing family budgets, and it is anti-American. House Republicans are making strong efforts to create jobs and lower fuel prices in this country.

Recently, CNN did a poll. They found that seven in ten Americans support increased offshore drilling for oil and gas—seven in ten. I wonder about the other three in those ten. Forty-five percent strongly favor.

Here is the question. They asked how Americans feel about increased drilling for oil and natural gas offshore U.S. borders, and here is how they responded: 45 percent said that they strongly favor us doing increased drilling for our own oil and gas in the gulf coast offshore, 24 percent mildly favor, 16 percent strongly oppose, and 15 percent mildly oppose.

Now, that 15 percent and 16 percent, I wonder if they have looked at their checkbook. I wonder if they have looked at the cost of bread and milk, cabbage and potatoes in their grocery store. Because the prices of those goods that we all depend upon when we go to the grocery store are markedly affected by the cost of gas and oil in this country.

Increasing American energy production will help create new jobs, and it addresses the rising gas prices. And Americans know it. The House is prepared to vote on legislation to boost offshore energy production.

As I said, seven in ten Americans support offshore drilling for our oil and natural gas. It belongs to us, it belongs to the American people, and we are being prohibited from tapping into that by this administration and the Democratic Party policy.

Implementing a comprehensive plan to build a more stable supply of petroleum from our own North American resources, along with reforms that end litigation, the endless litigation, and reveal policies that artificially inflate cost will provide immediate relief to the price of gasoline. The market knows that more energy means lower prices.

When President Bush removed the executive moratorium on offshore drilling in 2008, as a good example, crude oil futures by the speculators fell more than $9 almost immediately. It is not the speculators that are causing the rising cost of oil. It is not the speculators who are causing the rising cost to Americans when they go to fill their cars and pickup trucks. It is failed policies by the Obama administration, failed policies by NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID and their cronies here in the House and in the Senate.

We can create good jobs. We can insulate the economy from energy price shocks by actively producing our own energy resources here in this country. And we can do that, we must do that, while we are good stewards of our environment, repealing Federal mandates and the prohibitions that artificially drive up the cost of gasoline and stopping the EPA's backdoor energy tax. They are trying to implement what I call tax-and-trade by EPA edict in a dictatorial manner when they could not pass that bill through Congress in the last Congress. And by halting the President's drilling permatorium, as some of us call it, it has been described, and unlocking our own energy resources that God has given us here in America both on- and offshore, all these will help alleviate the pain at the pump, the pain at the grocery store, the pain for every good and service, even the pain in the doctor's office and the pain of all the higher energy costs and the pain of all the increased costs of every good and service in this country.

□ 1800

Through the American Energy Initiative, House Republicans are actively working to increase American energy production in order to do a number of things: to lower the cost of gasoline, to create American jobs, to generate revenue to help reduce the debt and this deficit that's unsustainable, and to strengthen our national security by decreasing our dependence on foreign energy, particularly on foreign oil.

As I mentioned just a few minutes ago, I believe very firmly that, if a country is not energy independent, it is not a secure nation. We are not secure today. We must make America energy independent, and we do that by developing our own energy resources—all of our energy resources, not only oil and gas but coal. We need to develop clean coal technology. We need to look at alternative energy resources, such as wind and solar and waves, and all of those things. We need to have research and development on nuclear energy and on all of the things that are critical for us to be energy independent as a Nation.

Republican bills would create 250,000 jobs short term and 1.2 million jobs long term, according to Louisiana State University's Joseph Mason. We've got to create jobs, but the energy policies that this administration and our Democratic colleagues are promoting are killing jobs, not creating them. Republican policies want to create jobs.

Under the Republican bills that we have introduced, one of which is H.R. 1230, the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act, we would expand American energy production and create jobs by requiring the Secretary of the Interior to conduct oil and natural gas lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico as well as offshore of Virginia that have been delayed and cancelled by the Obama administration.

H.R. 1229, Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act, will end the Obama administration's de facto drilling moratorium in a safe, responsible and transparent manner, and it will put thousands of Americans back to work, increasing American energy production to help address the rise in gasoline prices that Americans are facing every single day. Every single day, we see gas prices jump.

H.R. 1231, Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act, will lift the President's ban on new offshore drilling by requiring the administration to move forward on American energy production in areas containing the most oil and natural gas resources.

Many organizations support the three bills I just mentioned: the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Americans for Tax Reform, the National Taxpayers Union, Americans for Prosperity, Citizens Against Government Waste, Americans for Limited Government, the National Federation of Independent Business, the 60 Plus Association, the American Trucking Association. I could go on and on and on. Gulf organizations are supporting the passage of the Outer Continental Shelf legislation, and I could list organization after organization.

I won't continue with those right now because I've been joined by a good friend who is stalwart on this issue and who, I think, has probably done as much or more than any other Republican Member of Congress to try to help make us energy independent as a Nation and to help us create jobs here in America.

My dear friend, JOHN SHIMKUS, I yield to you.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Thank you, Congressman BROUN. It's great to be with you, and I appreciate the introduction. You're too kind.

One thing I do know: If you want to create good-paying jobs, it's in the fossil fuel industry.

During this recession, one of the two biggest job engines for organized labor has been the production of a new, supercritical coal-fired power plant. There will be thousands of building trade workers building this power plant and hundreds of people who will be working in this power plant and mining the coal. They'll have great wages and superb benefits. So, if we want good, high-paying jobs in this country, the fossil fuel industry is one sector that can do that.

The other major job engine next to my congressional district is the expansion of a refinery in Wood River. Actually, it's in Congressman COSTELLO's district, but we're right next to each other. It's the ConocoPhillips-Wood River Refinery, and it has thousands of employees. It's a $2 billion project to help crack the oil that would come from the Canadian oil sands. You have thousands of jobs right now. You have another supply decreasing our reliance on imported crude oil from an ally with North American Energy—great wages, great benefits, secure jobs. It's the fossil fuel industry.

I am just amazed at the continued attack on that sector by my friends on the other side and of the whole debate about what drives the cost of energy. It's a simple formula. We all learned it in basic economics and accounting: supply and demand. If you want to lower the cost of the good, you have to increase the supply. We continue to demand more. In fact, we're going to demand 30 percent more in electricity generation by 2030. If we don't marry that with increased electricity generation, guess what? We're going to have higher costs. The same is true with liquid fuels.

So we're in a very exciting time in this country because, for the first time, we really can make the argument that we could be independent of imported crude oil by using what we're proposing as an all-of-the-above energy strategy. Let these energy commodities compete for our purchase. One example we drew up with some friends on the other side is an open fuel strategy so that anybody can use anything when they pull up to the pump. Another manner in which you do that is you continue to allow all commerce to compete for electricity. You don't allow government to stifle the electricity generation or the liquid fuel market.

So many of us have seen these, and I'll go through them quickly since I know you've got some issues you want to talk about.

In an all-of-the-above strategy, we say ''all of the above.'' If you want to use solar and wind, great. That's part of ''all of the above.'' A small portion of electricity generation does nothing for liquid fuel, liquid transportation fuels, but it might add 3 percent of electricity. OCS, we've got to be there. We've got new excitement in the Marcellus shale. That's got to be an exciting new venue that can go for electricity generation and for liquid fuels. We've got fuel from coal, not just electricity generation. For years, South Africa has been turning carbon-based coal into liquid transportation fuel or aviation fuel, and as you know, I'm very supportive of the biodiesel provisions.

It all comes down to this: jobs. When we continued to add additional regulations on the fossil fuel industry, what happened to these miners? They all lost their jobs—a thousand of them in one mine. The attack by this administration and by my colleagues on the other side with regard to the fossil fuel industry has to stop.

I know we've been joined by another of my colleagues, and I'll end with this because you hear it quite a bit on the floor.

□ 1810

I just want to pose a question: If you raise taxes on a commodity good, how does that lower its price? If you raise the tax on a commodity, how does that lower the price to the consumer? It cannot, and it will not. It will only add to the price of that energy.

Thank you for letting me join you.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. SHIMKUS. I appreciate it. And I appreciate your efforts over many Congresses since I have been here. I am in my third Congress, as you know. You have been a stalwart fighting this issue all along, and I appreciate the hard work you have done for the people in your district in Illinois and for this Nation. So thank you so much for what you have been doing.

I have also been joined tonight by another friend of mine who has been very active in this issue because he is from Louisiana. He has been on the floor many times talking about the moratorium and the permatorium that has been going on, as some have called it. This has cost people jobs in his home State of Louisiana.

I yield to my good friend STEVE SCALISE from New Orleans.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding. I appreciate the hard work that you have been doing for years, as I have, on this issue. I appreciate the comments from my colleague from Illinois who just talked about just what is happening here.

In the last 2 weeks we were in our districts, and I got the opportunity to go through parts of my district. When you talk to people about what is happening in this country with the economy, the biggest question that comes up, beyond the short-term issues of the economy and jobs, is the high price of gasoline, and just why is it that right now people are paying almost $4, if not $5 in some parts of the country, $5 per gallon for gasoline, and we are still not even into the heart of the summer.

It is very clear as people look, it is very clear that the policies of this administration that have completely shut off our ability to produce, go and explore for and produce energy in America, is one of the main contributing factors to this high price of gasoline.

Of course, you don't have to go far in south Louisiana to see the direct impact because, as my colleague from Georgia just pointed out, not only the moratorium that was imposed about a year ago, but the permatorium that we are still experiencing today, where the administration won't let our people go back to work exploring safely for energy, people that had absolutely nothing to do with the BP explosion of the Deepwater Horizon, people in much deeper waters, drilling safely back then that now cannot go back to work.

We have lost over 13,000 jobs in the energy industry in south Louisiana in the past year specifically because of President Obama's policies that have shut those areas down. It has literally run thousands of jobs, 13,000 by the White House's estimates—we think the number is much higher, but I will just use the White House's numbers—13,000 people in this country who have lost their job in the energy industry, high-paying jobs, by the way, that have gone to foreign countries.

We have tracked some of these deepwater rigs that have left. Of course, the President goes to Rio de Janeiro a few weeks ago and brags that he wants to drill in Brazil. I would suggest, Mr. President, let's drill in America safely, where we know there are billions of barrels of oil here in this country, where we can create thousands of high-paying jobs and generate billions of dollars that the Federal Treasury would take in because of all that economic activity and the royalties that would be paid by those oil companies, that would lower our deficit. And yet, no, the President says we want to shut you down and put your people out of work, but we want to go and spend our resources drilling in Brazil.

This is the backward policy that this administration has pursued that has gotten us to this point where we are paying over $5 in some places in this country—$4, close to $4 in my district—for a gallon of gasoline, and we are not even in the heart of the summer.

So then when you look at what the administration's plan is. Clearly, our plan is we want to let our people go back to work exploring and drilling safely for energy, creating thousands of good jobs, bringing all that tax revenue into this country to lower our deficit. But the Presidents's answer, is, you would think maybe he would be agreeing on us with this. This should be a bipartisan issue, there is bipartisan support, by the way, to do what my colleague from Georgia and I are talking about, but the President not only doesn't support our plan, but the President's proposal is to raise taxes on American energy.

He goes out, and I guess every time he speaks he wants to go and beat up on an American industry, and right now it is the oil companies. Well, frankly, the oil companies that are out there right now, many of them are producing in other countries. But our

local producers, the small businesses, these aren't the big guys. These are the small businesses that are barely hanging on by a thread, struggling to survive, that he would be shutting down by raising taxes. His plan is to raise $22 billion in taxes on American energy production.

Now, his plan, by the way, coincidentally, doesn't apply to foreign countries. So when he goes to Rio and says ''drill in Brazil,'' his package that he actually has asked Congress to pass, and I sure hope we don't pass it, but his package not only raises taxes on American energy. That same tax increase doesn't apply to the drilling in Brazil or in Saudi Arabia or some of these other Middle Eastern countries that use that money to do things that are counterproductive not only to American energy security, but our homeland security.

So the President would say to raise $22 billion in taxes on American energy production, which, by the way, runs even thousands more jobs out of our country and increases our dependence on Middle Eastern oil. This is counterproductive policy, but that is the President's answer to high gas taxes, is to raise taxes on American energy, which means higher prices at the pump. And, by the way, we are already paying too much at the pump. Gas prices have more than doubled since President Obama took office.

It is not just bad luck that gives us high gas prices. It is bad policy that comes out of Washington, D.C. That is why I really appreciate the gentleman from Georgia bringing us here tonight. But also the legislation that we will be voting on tomorrow that actually starts to address this problem and says, you know what, if people in America want to safely explore for and produce energy here in America, we are going to let them do that. We are going to let them go to work here so that we don't send those jobs and those billions of dollars to countries like Brazil, and, even worse, Middle Eastern countries who want to do us harm.

So clearly the policy impacts the price of gas we are paying at the pump. We have got to reverse these policies that make absolutely no sense that are coming out of this White House and get back to an all-of-the-above strategy that actually allows us to utilize our resources here in America in a safe way, that produces thousands of good-paying jobs and brings billions more dollars into the Federal Treasury to pay down the national debt.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the rules that were presented by Mr. BISHOP from Utah from the Rules Committee are the two bills that Congressman SCALISE was just talking about that will start forcing actually this administration to start letting out leases and helping us to develop our own energy resources here in America.

But I wanted to ask Mr. SCALISE before he leaves, I am on three committees. I am on Natural Resources, I am on the House Homeland Security Committee, and I am also on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. Just today in Science, Space, and Technology, I heard Democratic colleagues talk about the number one issue in America today. One lady said, it is jobs, jobs, jobs.

□ 1820

And I have heard it in my other two committees. I've heard that from Democrat after Democrat. I know the gentleman is on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and the question I wanted to ask Mr. SCALISE is, Have you heard in that committee, one of our eight committees—one of the most important committees dealing with energy production—have you heard that same mantra from our Democrats on Energy and Commerce? Has it been jobs that we need to be focusing upon?

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. This mantra that's thrown out there, frankly, for over 2 years now, yourself, myself, we've been clamoring for policies that actually create jobs. And then when we bring forward legislation, actual bills—not to run up the deficit like our colleagues on the other side, not to run more jobs out of our country like our colleagues on the other side—but when we actually bring bills to say, Stop the madness, change these policies and bring that work back to America, create those jobs here, bring in that revenue here, they actually criticize us and say that has nothing to do with jobs.

Well, it shows, first of all, that they're out of touch. They don't understand how job creation works in this country. But they also, obviously, haven't been tracking the history; tracking exactly what's happening all across America, but especially in using the areas around southeast Louisiana as the prime example. You don't have to go any further than to go down to south Louisiana and you'll see the job losses that have occurred because of this administration's policies which have, one, shut off American energy production, which have led to higher gas prices, but also run thousands of high-paying jobs out of America. We've tracked those rigs, those deepwater rigs, which each of them is about a billion-dollar asset. So you have got an American employer that said, You know what; I can't even do business in America any more with my billion-dollar asset. I've got to move it somewhere else; to a foreign country. One of those rigs went to Egypt. I think we all know what's going on in Egypt right now.

Isn't it a sad indictment on this administration's failed energy policy that an American employer would say I think it's better to do business with my billion-dollar asset, to bring that asset over to Egypt and take the chances over there because of how bad the environment is business-wise in America. By the way, that one rig—and there are multiple rigs that have left our country—that one rig that went to Egypt is representing about a thousand high-paying jobs that are no longer here in America, that are no longer here in America, that are now in Egypt. I think that's a shame. It shows the failure of this administration's policies and it's the reason why—one of the few, but an absolute reason why—American families all across this country are paying higher gas prices at the pump. And there's no reason for it. We can reverse it. We need to reverse it.

I'm glad your committee passed legislation that we'll be voting on tomorrow. I know in our Committee on Energy and Commerce we're working on similar solutions. I think American people want as many solutions as possible. But at least we're finally putting solutions on the table to say, Mr. President, your plan might be to raise taxes on American energy and raise the price of gas at the pump. We've got a different approach. The House Republicans here, and hopefully Senators, will understand and push this issue. But our approach is to lower gas prices by increasing the supply here in America so that we're energy secure, we don't have to rely on these Middle Eastern countries, and we don't have to send our jobs and billions of dollars to those Middle Eastern countries, which jeopardize our security here at home, which as a member of the Homeland Security I know you know about very well, too.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Absolutely. In fact, I'm not a good lawyer—I'm not even a lawyer. I'm a medical doctor, as the gentleman knows. In law school they teach you not to ask a question if you don't know what the answer is. And I didn't know what your answer was going to be, but I felt sure you were going to answer the way you did, for the simple reason that we hear our colleagues on the other side, the Democrats, keep talking about wanting to create jobs. But their policies are destroying jobs—American jobs, private pay jobs. Their policies are developing bigger jobs, bigger government here in Washington, D.C., so much so that the only city in this country that real estate prices have not gone down is Washington, D.C. They've gone up.

Why? Because this administration, NANCY PELOSI, HARRY REID, and their colleagues in the House and the Senate in the 111th Congress are creating bigger government, more regulations, more taxes, more attacks on jobs in the private sector, more attacks on small businesses, and it's creating a bigger government. Thus, higher real estate prices here in Washington because we've created government jobs. They claim about all the jobs created with the stimulus bill, et cetera, but it's government jobs is pretty much what we're creating.

We've got another problem. In fact, I introduced H.R. 1032, the RELIEF Act, because we have excessive and frivolous lawsuits against our own energy production and it has significantly delayed and in many cases prevented our

energy resources from reaching the American marketplace. H.R. 1032, the RELIEF Act, doesn't stop people from having their day in court. But what it would do is it would allow the environmental wackos that are trying to stop energy production here in this country from having this endless plethora of lawsuits that stop the permitting and stop the production.

What it would do is it would require that all lawsuits be filed within 60 days and that the courts would have to have a determination or solution to that case within 180 days, and that if the district court ruling was appealed, that it would go to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court would have a ruling within another 180 days. It would also allow some relief from the frivolous lawsuits by allowing the prevailing party to be able to seek legal fees and other expenses under the Act. This is the kind of bill that we need to pass. I've been asking Members of Congress to cosponsor this because we need to pass this kind of legislation.

We hear from our colleagues, Let's stop the subsidies to the big oil companies with all their billions of dollars of profits. I would like to stop subsidies to everything, including ethanol, which has not made sense. I'm a good southern boy. I love my grits and cornbread. And it makes no sense to me to drive down the road burning up my grits and cornbread in my Yukon. It's destroying engines, it's destroying food prices, it's destroying jobs here in this country. We need to stop all of this. We need to start developing our own energy resources.

Mr. Speaker, what can the American people do? What American people can do is contact their Members of the Senate and the House and demand that we start producing American energy. America is not secure as a Nation because we're not energy secure. We've got to start developing our own energy resources here in America. All of them. We need to have an all-of-the-above energy policy. It's up to the American people to demand that from their Members of the House as well as the Senate.

Former U.S. Senator Everett Dirksen one time said when he feels the heat, he sees the light. The American people absolutely must contact their Senators and Congressmen to say: We need American energy. We've got to start developing our own energy resources—all of the American energy resources—coal, oil, natural gas, wind, solar, nuclear energy. Every single energy resource. It's absolutely critical. It's critical for us to lower the cost of American energy, lower the cost of groceries in the grocery store and in restaurants, lower the cost of all goods and services by lowering the cost of energy production, make us secure as a Nation. It's up to the American people to demand it from your Member of Congress, from both your U.S. Senators as well as U.S. House Member. If we get enough heat upon Members of Congress, particularly heat upon our Democratic colleagues in the House as well as our Democratic colleagues in the Senate, as well as the Obama administration, we can be a secure Nation, we can be energy independent. We must. And it's up to the American people to demand it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1229, PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1230, RESTARTING AMERICAN OFFSHORE LEASING NOW ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah (during the Special Order of Mr. BROUN of Georgia), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–73) on the resolution (H. Res. 245) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1230) to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain offshore oil and gas lease sales, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1830

JUSTICE IS SERVED: THE DEATH OF OSAMA BIN LADEN

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

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

I want to really focus today on an extraordinary event that took place on Sunday, that is, American time, but before I do that, I just want to take a couple of minutes having sat here listening to the last 45 minutes on energy policy, just a couple of things.

The President is not suggesting that we raise taxes on fuel but that we eliminate subsidies to the oil industry that has received, for a century, American taxpayers' support, and those subsidies are no longer needed given the extraordinary profits that they are making. We ought to also consider that last year, ExxonMobil paid zero Federal income tax, yet they had billions, about $11 billion, of profit.

The second point, the oil production in the Gulf of Mexico is up this year compared to the previous year, and even though there is more production of oil out of the Gulf of Mexico, we've still seen this spike in gasoline prices. So the notion that somehow more drilling in the Gulf of Mexico will drive prices down is just not the case, because we've seen more production and yet a spike in prices.

Finally, with regard to the bills that were just announced during the middle of this discussion about drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, the Democratic Party wants to make sure that that drilling is done safely; the President wants to make sure that drilling is done safely. And what we have suggested, that when these bills come to the floor, they be amended so that the recommendations made by the commission that studied the blowout on the BP platform, that those safety recommendations be put into the law. I guess that's not such a bad idea, but I want to just get that out here just so we have some understanding about what was discussed over this last hour.

But what I really want to do—and I see my colleague from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) here—is focus on an extraordinary and extremely important event that took place on Sunday, American time, and Monday, Pakistani time. The United States persevered for a decade to get Osama bin Laden. The President of the United States, Barack Obama, was determined during his campaign for Presidency and in the very first moments of his Presidency that he would focus like a laser beam on getting Osama bin Laden. It took some time. It took an extraordinary effort by the intelligence community, by the military, by this Congress in providing the necessary support and by our colleagues in other branches of government to get the job done. It was accomplished, and finally that banner on that aircraft carrier has real meaning—Mission Accomplished.

Mission Accomplished. Osama bin Laden is no more. The man that was responsible for the biggest mass murder ever in this Nation's history is no more. President Obama, we thank you. We thank the men and women of this military and the intelligence community that made this happen. We applaud the courage of all that were involved and the wisdom and the determination to get the mission accomplished.

Let me now turn to our colleague from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you so much. Thank you for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend and give thanks to all those who played roles in the operation that resulted in the death of Osama bin Laden.

First and foremost, President Obama who came into office determined to renew the focus on Osama bin Laden, and he has delivered. His gutsy decision to proceed with the raid as he did, as opposed to striking the compound from the air, will go down in history as one of the great Presidential decisions of all time.

Next, the Navy SEALs who carried out the mission. Their unparalleled courage, dedication, and physical and mental strength are truly awe inspiring and were crucial for the success of the operation.

We have been trying to eliminate the threat to our homeland since 1993, and

the effort has continued unabated as the White House and the Congress have switched hands several times.

While nothing can bring back the lives lost in the World Trade Center back in 1993, our Embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, the USS Cole and the Twin Towers on September 11, last Sunday's events serve as a modicum of closure for many Americans and should be a reminder to those who wish to do us harm that America does not waver in the pursuit of justice.

God bless the brave men and women, and their families, who work every day to protect our Nation and its people.

Before closing, I want to also thank CIA Director Leon Panetta and all the unsung heroes in our intelligence community who do their work anonymously and seldom receive deserved accolades. Their families sacrifice immensely so that they can serve our country.

God bless the United States of America. Thank you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. CLYBURN, for your heartfelt and very, very appropriate words.

The mission that was carried out was not something that came about just in a matter of days. It had been planned over the course of many, many years, and, with determination, the intelligence community, led by most recently Mr. Panetta, worked tirelessly to track down Osama bin Laden. It took a great deal of time and many, many years but ultimately succeeded in ways that the news media is now beginning to report. We can only give thanks and congratulations to that part of this mission and their determination and steadfastness to stay on the track, to follow every lead and to find every stone that needed to be turned over so that ultimately success could be had in locating Osama bin Laden.

I think we all now know a great deal more about Abbottabad and what it is, a community, not large, but what was this strange new compound doing in that particular location? We found out precisely what it was doing and we took the steps necessary.

I think all of us have seen pictures of the Situation Room at the White House, with American leaders surrounding a table, looking at the television screens, watching in real time what was going on half the world away. I think all of us could see the concern on the faces of those leaders, the President, the Secretary of State, Mr. Panetta and others who were there who had spent their previous hours preparing for the mission and making a very difficult decision.

□ 1840

They knew that this was an extremely risky program that could quite possibly fail, and I'm sure they had the failure of the mission that President Carter ordered three decades before to go into Iran to rescue the hostages, I'm sure that weighed heavily on their minds.

But nevertheless, the President made a very, very courageous decision to accept the risk of failure and quite possibly to succeed in finally dealing with the mass murderer Osama bin Laden. We must keep in mind that it wasn't just Americans who were murdered here on the shores of this Nation, but in Pakistan and in other countries around the world, al Qaeda murdered far more people in those countries.

I notice now that I'm joined here by my colleagues. I'd like to turn to my colleague from San Diego. SUSAN, if you would care to join us, thank you.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Thank you. I'm delighted to join you, and I want to thank you so much for taking this time today.

We know that the events that occurred just a few days ago were really the result of multiple government agencies working together over a number of years, but today, at this time, I want to rise to honor one of our Nation's finest fighting forces, our Navy SEALs.

My district is home to Coronado, which houses both the Coronado Naval Amphibious Base, where all SEALs undergo basic training, as well as the Naval Special Warfare Command; and over the years, I've had the pleasure of meeting these brave young SEALs who are willing to do a job that most of us would rather not even imagine, and, quite frankly, we can hardly imagine many of the things that they're asked to do. And, you know, the most amazing thing to me is they do this job so quietly. They really don't talk about their work, but you can see it often on their faces and the fact that they are very proud of what they do and they are very proud to be Americans.

These men ask nothing in return for the work that they do, a quality that I certainly admire in them, not only among our Special Forces but among our brave men and women in uniform across the services.

So I rise to say a very big and grateful thank you. You ably and swiftly removed one of the most heinous criminals this world has ever seen, and I simply want to say thank you to our SEALs for a job very well done, and I'm very proud to represent you. Hooyah.

Thank you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Representative DAVIS. I share your enthusiasm. Not too long ago, I also represented San Diego but in a different role, not as a Representative but as Lieutenant Governor.

Indeed, Coronado is an extraordinary place, and the naval forces that are such a prominent part of San Diego did play a role in this in many, many ways. I was trying to recall whether the aircraft carrier that ultimately did the final burial at sea was stationed in San Diego. I think it was a San Diego aircraft carrier.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Yes, it was.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So what we have here is another way in which the American Armed Forces, in the many different ways, in the case that you talked about, the role of the Special Forces, the special operations, and the SEALs that actually participated, carried out the mission, and the aircraft carrier, and then in between the Air Force and the Army, all of them playing a role. It's an extraordinary example of the way in which military power, properly focused on a very important task, is able to carry it out.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Yes.

I think the other thing that we realize, and those of us in San Diego are so aware of our Navy, but all the other agencies that work well together, that's important. And over the years it hasn't always been that way at the level that it is today, and I think that's why they were so successful. And as we've had an opportunity to read newspapers throughout this country and to have some opportunity as well to speak to the people who were key in carrying out this operation, that's something that they're very proud of, that the communication, that the—we use the word ''synergy'' a lot, but people came together on many different levels and, quite honestly, it's something that probably would not have been possible quite a number of years ago, but it is today. And I think that it's something I hope that our enemy is paying attention to because we are a lot abler, a lot more smart, a lot more capable of carrying out these kinds of activities, and it should make those who want to do us harm think twice.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Absolutely correct, and I thank you so very much for your participation tonight in honoring and congratulating President Obama and the special operations and the American intelligence community for what they were able to accomplish. Finally, mission accomplished.

I'd like now to turn to our new colleague just a little less experienced than myself, Mr. CLARKE from the State of Michigan and the city of Detroit.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

I, too, want to commend the Obama administration, our military forces, the national security and intelligence team for mission accomplished by taking out America's public enemy number one, Osama bin Laden. And while I believe it's important that we continue to work to eliminate terrorist breeding grounds and safe havens for terrorism that exist in foreign countries, because bin Laden is now gone, this is the time to reassess our mission in Afghanistan.

For example, we've been spending in recent years in total military and civilian aid to Afghanistan approximately $100 billion. That's billion with a ''B.'' We could take a share of that money, a share of those billions, redirect it to the United States to better protect Americans right here at home, invest that money in homeland security, for sound intelligence, to better

protect our borders, and also to support our first responders. And what I'm talking about is our local police officers, our local firefighters, our emergency medical providers. They need resources now because State and local governments really don't have the money to properly fund those operations. They need money. They need our support because our local police and fire, that's our first line of defense against terrorism here in the United States. Let's return some of that money here to protect Americans in the homeland, because it's American tax dollars in the first place that we're spending in Afghanistan.

Similarly, we spend billions of dollars in economic assistance to help rebuild Afghanistan. I am not taking great issue with that, but we could take a portion of that money to help rebuild our cities, rebuild our manufacturing capacity, repair our roads and bridges, build industrial parks and new schools. We're doing all of this right now in Afghanistan. We can do more of that right here at home for Americans.

So I want to thank, again, the Obama administration for a job well done, taking out our number one public enemy. This now provides us an opportunity to reassess how we're spending our money overseas, especially in Afghanistan, to redirect more of those funds right here at home because Americans, we need it. It's our money in the first place.

We can create jobs if we invest some of that in manufacturing, invest some of that in cities like the city of Detroit which are the basis of our manufacturing capacity, those types of industrial cities all around the country. And we know we need the industrial parks and schools.

Afghanistan, yes, we're rebuilding that infrastructure there. Let's do the same thing. Let's do more of that right here in the United States. That's how we can help all of us make it in America, and that makes the world a better place to live.

□ 1850

Finally, the real homeland security comes from within. When you take care of Americans and you make America stronger, that's the best way to fight off terrorists. The best way to defend ourselves against a threat that comes from overseas is to make sure that we are as strong as possible right here at home. Let's return some of that money to help serve Americans because, again, it's American tax dollars in the first place. I appreciate you giving me this opportunity to speak on these issues.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. CLARKE.

Your concern about the economy of Detroit and, in a larger sense, the economy of the United States is very, very well founded. There is no doubt that the economic and social strength of America is the foundation upon which every other aspect of the war on terrorism must be fought. We have to deal with our economy. And you're quite correct about the allocation of resources.

I notice that New Jersey and RUSH HOLT, who has been a stalwart in dealing with the policies of protecting America in many ways, energy policy and the rest, has joined us. Mr. HOLT, if you would care to join in and share your thoughts on this most important event, the elimination of the world's greatest mass murderer.

Mr. HOLT. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, and thanks for setting aside some time tonight to recognize this work by some great patriots. When I heard the news on Sunday, my thoughts turned immediately to those harmed by bin Laden's vicious attacks on our embassies, our ships, planes, the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and the many thousands of deaths caused by the havoc he sewed. Our hearts go out to those families.

Certainly in central New Jersey, we lost hundreds and hundreds of people on September 11, but we mustn't forget those who died in the embassies a couple of years before that, those who died in the wars that followed. Middletown, New Jersey, lost more people on September 11 than any other single town, except New York City. They went off to work, not understanding that this evil was at play, that Mr. Bin Laden was plotting just the most dastardly thing that you can imagine.

America's military and intelligence services demonstrated why they are known as the best in the world. Bin Laden's removal was of course not immediately the end of the threat of terrorism against the United States, but his death represents a crippling blow to the organization responsible for these many attacks over the last 13 years. It really is appropriate that we congratulate President Obama and the dedicated and brave members of our military and intelligence services for acting as they did.

The President showed that he understands intelligence efforts and military operations, and the Special Forces showed that they have skills and equipment like no others. The hunt for Zawahiri and other al Qaeda leaders will continue. I suspect that the information gathered in the assault on bin Laden this week will speed that search. I spent a number of years on the Intelligence Committee here in the Congress and learned a great deal about the dedication and skills of these people that work behind the scenes.

When the United States began its military campaign in Afghanistan nearly a decade ago, our goal was to bring to justice bin Laden and other al Qaeda leaders that were responsible for the attacks. It's worth noting that the senior most al Qaeda leaders have been captured or killed not in Afghanistan but in Pakistan. That fact only reinforces my conviction that the time has come for the United States to begin a swift and orderly withdrawal of our combat forces from Afghanistan, and I hope the President will heed the call of people all over the country and, I would say, all over the world to do precisely that.

As we celebrate the courage and the work of the Special Forces, we must also talk about the intelligence services, where they combine enormous skill and brain power and perseverance and, yes, courage. They are frequently only one intelligence leak away from losing all their work or sometimes their lives.

The fact that this has taken more than a dozen years since the bombing of the embassies to track down bin Laden and his evil operations emphasizes the need for full reliable cooperation with other countries, not intermittent sometime cooperation. It should have been, America would have wanted, the world would have wanted that this be completed sooner. So we need that international cooperation. This demonstrates it.

As Mr. CLARKE, our colleague, points out though, the day-to-day protection of Americans won't be done by Special Forces. It will be done by courageous Americans who do the right thing day in and day out, our local first responders, the investigators. That's how most—in fact, nearly all of the potential terrorist attacks that have been beaten, undone, have been uncovered.

So this is sobering to think about what we have in front of us yet, but we know we have good people working on it. We saw that this past week, and we celebrate them and congratulate them and our leaders for carrying it out.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HOLT, thank you very much.

A couple of things about your discussion really struck me as being very, very important. You reminded us of the men and women that died not only on September 11, the impact on the community that you represent there in New Jersey, and other communities but also the fact that men and women died in the previous attacks that were sponsored and planned by al Qaeda. You also reminded us that there were men and women not of this country but of other countries, Kenya, Tanzania, Iraq, Pakistan, and other countries, that were also the victims of the vicious evil attacks that were planned and carried out by al Qaeda.

It's not just Americans that were the targets of this organization. And you also reminded us of the importance of our own first responders and police and others here in the United States. We know that the reach of al Qaeda is not just Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan. It includes Yemen and Somalia and other countries and America, that there are Americans that have been radicalized by the message. We need to deal with that and address those individuals and organizations that may exist within our own country.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman would yield, I will add one more comment which is, I hope that this will bring the world closer together. The recognition

that the killings, the evil worked by this man affected many thousands—really, hundreds of thousands around the world. I'm sure many of these people are grateful to families of those who have been killed in other countries, and so forth, are grateful for the actions of these brave Americans. But I hope that what this does is bring the countries of the world and the peoples of the world more closely together in fighting such evil.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might take it from there, you reminded me that in the newspapers here in Washington and I think across this Nation, there was what we call an op-ed, an article that appeared on the editorial pages written by the President of Pakistan who congratulated President Obama and the United States for ridding Pakistan of a terrible problem.

□ 1900

I thought that that was a remarkable article that he wrote. He noted that his own wife was the target of al Qaeda, not once, not twice, but three times. The final effort resulted in her assassination.

So the point that you made about bringing all of us closer together to deal with terrorism, wherever it may be, and whatever rationale it may perceive itself to have, is a threat to every peaceful person and every country that desires peace. Point well made and well taken, Mr. HOLT. Thank you so very much for joining us this evening.

You're welcome to stick around and join us after we hear from my colleague from the State of California, LOIS CAPPS, who represents the Santa Barbara region of the Golden State.

Mrs. CAPPS. Thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI, for yielding me time and for organizing us to have this conversation and this opportunity to pay tribute this evening.

I rise, like my colleagues have risen, to commend the many people involved in bringing Osama bin Laden to justice. From all accounts, and from what we heard from Director Panetta yesterday, it was a meticulously planned and executed operation. I commend the President and his national security team for their focus.

When the President was running for office, he said that if he were presented with actionable intelligence on al Qaeda's leaders, that he would act, with or without the host country's permission or assistance. He got some heat on that commitment, if you'll remember, my colleague, but it's clear he was correct.

The result is that the perpetrator of the 9/11 attacks has now been brought to justice and the organization he has led has been further weakened.

And I am so grateful to our colleague from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for calling to mind, again, as all of us felt as we heard the news of Osama bin Laden's demise. We were immediately, at least I was, as well, reminded again of that awful day, 9/11 and the image, where we were when we heard the news, how we were riveted to watching the horror unfold, explode in D.C., at the Pentagon, and New York City and in Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

And I acknowledge that this was closure for those families who have suffered and continue to suffer, and a good thing that they have seen this person, this evil man brought to justice. But it doesn't lessen their sorrow and their loss, and we're mindful of that. And it comes back again to remind us that we have not, by any stretch, ended the threat of terrorism, and we must remain vigilant.

Mr. HOLT talks about all of the New Jerseyans who lost their lives that day. And it was concentrated in our metropolitan areas surrounding New York City. But these were trans-country flights, and some of the passengers were bound for the west coast, and some of them were my constituents as well as, I don't know about Mr. GARAMENDI, but others in California I know, lost their lives and those families are still grieving. So my heart goes out to them this evening.

But I want to acknowledge also the comments and the contribution from our colleague from Detroit, HANSEN CLARKE, who acknowledges for us all, which I am very mindful of, that our need to remain vigilant includes our homeland security. And that goes immediately to the role that our first responders play, and the responsibility that we have in this body to make sure that our front line defense in our cities, in our rural areas, in our vulnerable places that we're all mindful of now with the heightened security, because we know that this event that happened just so recently is going to have some kind of effect, and we need to be even more on guard.

But every day we want and need our first responders to be there in our homes guarding our streets and guarding our communities and making sure that we're safe. And we have a responsibility to see that they have the resources to do that.

On the other hand, disrupting the operations of this murderous group is such an important step to safeguarding our country.

But, Mr. Speaker, my main reason for wanting to contribute and add to this discussion this evening is what I feel is our important duty to pay tribute to these Navy SEALs who pulled off this operation and to thank them. We don't know their names. We don't want to reveal their identities for the safety of their families. But these brave individuals serve, not for fame, not for fortune. They do it in some of the most dangerous situations imaginable. They do this service for us to protect our freedoms. They do it as they did this past weekend and on so many countless other occasions to keep our country safe. While we sleep, they are on watch. And for that, we owe them such a huge debt of gratitude.

Finally, I believe that all Americans are rightly impressed and grateful by the tireless work done every day by members of our intelligence and our military communities. Indeed, it was that relentless hard work that tracked down bin Laden and countless others of his ilk. The dedication, the sacrifice of these men and women and that of their families have been so critical to keeping our country safe. It is a duty that's been particularly heavy in the days since 9/11.

It's easy for us to go about our life and to resume our normal ways of living, but not for them and not for their families. And now, as this has occurred, we really want to call to mind all those who serve our country, at home and abroad in the military, wearing the uniform for love of country, for their patriotism. And we owe them so much. Their service in Iraq and in Afghanistan, whether we agree with the engagement or not, they are serving their country. And this has been nothing short of amazing.

I think of my own naval base, Ventura County, where the Seabees ship from, and the work that they have done and continue to do reconstructing the war-torn areas and assisting the folks in Iraq and Afghanistan and rebuilding their lives.

I think of the Air Force base at Vandenburg, which I'm also privileged to represent, where so much of this intelligence comes from as our operations are carried out with such precision and such skill. The multiple tours of duty, the extended tours, the time away from family and friends, the danger that goes along with every deployment. These burdens are, quite frankly, something that most of us don't think about enough. So much of what these brave men and women do goes unnoticed and uncommented upon.

So, tonight, as we pay tribute to the courageous Navy SEALs who stormed that compound in Pakistan, I want us all to recognize the daily sacrifices of all of their brothers and sisters in arms, in the intelligence communities and serving in uniform. Let us thank them for the service that they have given and do give to us. Thank them for carrying out their duty to serve their fellow citizens every single day, and thank them also for calling to mind for us that they do this, not as Democrats or Republicans. They do this in service to their country.

And I believe that this action, such as we came together in 9/11, calls for us to join together in this Congress and in this country in a call to unity to rededicate ourselves to serving our country.

We have many pressing challenges today. Our involvement in Afghanistan is one of them, and it's a major one, and in Iraq as well. But we have our own homeland with our economic struggles that calls for us to work together as well.

So your desire to bring us together, Mr. GARAMENDI, makes me think about

a great many things and, again, to say how grateful I am that we have taken this important step in our war for freedom, against al Qaeda, but for freedom and for this life that we can enjoy in this country.

□ 1910

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative CAPPS, thank you for your words. As you were talking, you were talking about families. I remember a discussion you and I had just a couple hours ago as we were sitting here in the Chamber and you told me about the birth of your granddaughter.

Mrs. CAPPS. Grandson. Little Oscar Walter. But you are absolutely right.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Congratulations on that. Our own tenth grandchild was born just 8 months ago. And I was thinking about them in the context of what has happened this last week and about what we here in Congress, the people's House, representing 350 million, 360 million Americans, about the task that we have to assure that those children of the next generation will have a world that is peaceful, safe, in which they can live out their dreams as we have been fortunate enough to do ourselves.

I notice that an extraordinary woman like yourself, Mrs. CAPPS, has joined us representing the great State of Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE. I think you would like to make some comments on the subject of the extraordinary courage that our President and our intelligence and our military have displayed this last few days.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California, and would say to him what a contributor he has been to really improving the lives of all Americans. I have enjoyed coming to the floor and engaging in important discussions on behalf of our colleagues. Really, we are speaking to our colleagues. And we hope that all of those that are represented by the many colleagues here would realize, when we are on the floor, we are trying to help set policy to improve the lives of Americans.

We traveled just 2 or 3 days ago to another exciting venture, and that was of course the set time for Endeavor to launch into space. And I think it connects very well. I enjoyed meeting your wife and having discussions about how great America is, and as well knowing that our dear friend and colleague was able to travel, Congresswoman GIFFORDS, and that a Texan, her husband, was going to be the commander of Endeavor. We looked forward to it going.

But I mention that because of course many of the astronauts are military personnel. And I could imagine when President Kennedy challenged us to go into space, into outer space, which seems like a fiction but was real, no later than 1969 we landed on the Moon. This is a great country, and we have the ability to be resilient and persistent.

As all of us reflect on where we were on 9/11, and I know that you could say where you were. We were right in this place. We were meeting and huddled around issues. I remember it as clear as day. Small Business. We were not on the floor, but we were huddled in a room right underneath this Chamber discussing how do we help small businesses. And all of a sudden we heard such a sound, such a shrill, ''Get out of here.'' It was something we had never heard before.

But I say that only that you would have thought in that experience, a 21st century experience, that America would have been brought to her knees. That was the intent. It was to put us in such panic and such intense depression that we can never rise again. And many of us who have flown into New York over the years always remember the very special view of the two towers.

So come now almost 10 years later, 2011, and as each President talked about making sure that they would find Osama bin Laden, even as President Clinton experienced the first World Trade towers bombing in 1993 and he responded, and even as President Bush made the comment of going to get him, we are so grateful that in all of those disappointments of not finding Osama bin Laden, that America never gave up.

So today I am delighted to join you to salute and honor all of the principals that were involved: President Barack Obama, his national security team, the Joint Special Operations Command, JSOC, the Navy SEALs, and all of the courageous men and women of the United States military as we were detailed this very intricate and very, very difficult and dangerous mission, how proud we were to understand the willingness of the Navy SEALs to sacrifice or to stand up and say, ''Let me be counted.''

I am hoping that we will have an opportunity to debate a resolution on the floor of the House. I am hoping that we will be able to do it in a bipartisan manner. I have introduced H. Res. 240 with 50 Members of Congress now joining in and asking for what might be a waiver this one time to allow us on this historic opportunity to debate on the floor of the House as our friends have in the other body.

But even as we speak tonight, and I want to thank our leader Congresswoman PELOSI for having the insight knowing that Members wanted to come and to express themselves. So let me just quickly say these words as I come to a close.

I like this comment. ''The world is safer without bin Laden,'' says Obama. President Obama. And then this other comment that I think is so very important speaking about this Nation and recognizing how we have never given up, the President has indicated that this is a country that is continuously resilient. And as we are resilient even in the face of obstacles and the continued threat from the USS *Cole* that happened, from the bombing in Africa, the embassies that were bombed, all of those incidents, and we never gave up.

And it is important for America to know that there were voices who opposed decisions that were made. And not in any way to be negative, but they doubted what was being presented. This was not an easy decision. This was a courageous decision. This could have been a calamity. This could have been the worst decision that anyone ever made. But, fortunately, there was a President who had a team who came together. And on behalf of the American people they acted bravely, courageously with sensitivity, astuteness, talent, genius. And I am so very proud to stand on the floor today to offer to the American public my outpouring of congratulations to each and every one.

I close with this. I don't know all of the facts, but I understand that one of those actors, one of those military personnel may have been the child of an immigrant family, a recent immigrant family. How great it is to be able to take those young people who love this country and let them serve this country.

Mr. President, in finality, never give up, never give in, and never give out. You are serving the American people, and as Commander in Chief we salute you.

To all of those who worked, the military, the national security team, the intelligence community, JSOC, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and others not named, we thank you, because we realize that you stand in the shoes of those men and women that are forever brave. To their families I say thank you, and to this leadership I say thank you.

I would like to congratulate President Obama, his National Security team, the Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC), the Navy SEALs, and all of the courageous men and women of the armed forces and intelligence agencies that contributed to the successful implementation of the mission that led to the death of Osama bin Laden. I would also like to congratulate President Obama on his successful policies on the war on terror and in homeland security.

President Obama's leadership, resolve, and perseverance led to the killing of Osama bin Laden, the man and symbol of evil behind the September 11 terrorist attacks.

The death of Osama bin Laden has been a crowning moment in our Nation's war against terrorism and has sent a clear and significant message to terrorists around the world that the United States will not cease in our pursuit of justice for those terrorists who seek to do harm to this Nation and its citizens.

Following the death of Osama bin Laden, the family and friends who lost loved ones in the terrorist attacks on September 11 are able to achieve a greater sense of comfort and closure.

After months of meetings with the National Security Council and intelligence officials, led by President Obama who directed intelligence officials to zero in on Osama bin Laden's whereabouts, intelligence officials devised and carried out a clandestine operation which had frequently been rehearsed in an effort to minimize casualties, both civilian and military.

As Commander-in-Chief, President Obama gave the final authorization to commence the

operation to capture or kill the most wanted terrorist in a manner that would provide proof that the right man was captured or killed.

The highly trained and brave members of the Navy SEAL Team and intelligence officials that entered the compound did so under the highest levels of patriotism and service to the United States of America, and they were successfully able to identify and kill Osama bin Laden with no military losses and minimal civilian casualties.

Upon hearing the news of Osama bin Laden's death, there was an incredible outpouring of unity and defiance of the terrorists who still seek to destroy our free way of life, and there was an impressive show of unity amongst lawmakers regardless of party affiliation.

President Bill Clinton led the Nation during the terrorists' attacks on the USS *Cole*, United States embassies, and the first attack on the World Trade Center and President George W. Bush led the Nation during the September 11 terrorist attacks, and both leaders pledged to defend freedom and seek justice for the horrendous attacks on the United States of America, and President Obama had the strength and wherewithal to see that pledge through to fulfillment.

Osama bin Laden was the symbol and inspiration for terrorism which resulted in acts of violence around the world. His actions resulted in the murder of thousands of America civilians and the men and women of the United States military. I believe that the strategic, successful operation which led to his death should be commended along with the important leadership of President Obama, who worked with his national security team and ultimately authorized this mission. Further, I want to honor and recognize all of the men and women of the military and the intelligence agencies that contributed to the successful implementation of this mission.

This completed mission shows the resilience of the American people and the American government to find the man that caused such death and brutality. Now, we hope that our ideals of democracy, justice, and freedom will prevail so that peace can come to the world.

BILL SUMMARY AND STATUS

H. RES. 240

Latest Title: Commending President Barack Obama and the men and women of the military and intelligence agencies for the successful completion of the operation that led to the death of Osama bin Laden.

Sponsor: Rep Jackson Lee, Sheila [D–TX–18] (introduced 5/3/2011) Cosponsors: 40

Committees: House Armed Services; House Intelligence (Permanent Select); House Homeland Security

Latest Major Action: 5/3/2011 Referred to House committee. Status: Referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

COSPONSORS, ALPHABETICAL [*= original cosponsor]:

Cosponsor Statistics: 40 current (includes 40 original)

Rep Barrow, John [D–GA–12]—5/3/2011*
Rep Bass, Karen [D–CA–33]—5/3/2011*
Rep Berkley Shelley [D–NV–1]—5/3/2011*
Rep Bishop, Sanford D., Jr. [D–GA–2]—5/3/2011*
Rep Boren, Dan [D–OK–2]—5/3/2011*
Rep Boswell, Leonard L. [D–IA–3]—5/3/2011*
Rep Chandler, Ben [D–KY–6]—5/3/2011*
Rep Cohen, Steve [D–TN–9]—5/3/2011*
Rep Cuellar, Henry [D–TX–28]—5/3/2011*
Rep Cummings, Elijah E. [D–MD–7]—5/3/2011*
Rep Dicks, Norman D. [D–WA–6]—5/3/2011*
Rep Gonzalez, Charles A. [D–TX–20]—5/3/2011*
Rep Hinojosa, Ruben [D–TX–15]—5/3/2011*
Rep Hoyer, Steny H. [D–MD–5]—5/3/2011*
Rep Jones, Walter B., Jr. [R–NC–3]—5/3/2011*
Rep Kaptur, Marcy [D–OH–9]—5/3/2011*
Rep Kingston, Jack [R–GA–1]—5/3/2011*
Rep Lance, Leonard [R–NJ–7]—5/3/2011*
Rep Larson, John B. [D–CT–1]—5/3/2011*
Rep Lewis, John [D–GA–5]—5/3/2011*
Rep Lipinski, Daniel [D–IL–3]–5/3/2011*
Rep Loebsack, David [D–IA–2]—5/3/2011*
Rep Lynch, Stephen F. [D–MA–9]—5/3/2011*
Rep Maloney, Carolyn B. [D–NY–14]—5/3/2011*
Rep Matheson, Jim [D–UT–2]—5/3/2011*
Rep McCaul, Michael T. [R–TX–10]—5/3/2011*
Rep Rangel, Charles B. [D–NY–15]—5/3/2011*
Rep Reyes, Silvestre [D–TX–16]—5/3/2011*
Rep Richardson, Laura [D–CA–37]—5/3/2011*
Rep Ross Mike [D–AR–4]—5/3/2011*
Rep Ruppersberger, C. A. Dutch [D–MD–2]—5/3/2011*
Rep Schmidt, Jean [R–OH–2]—5/3/2011*
Rep Serrano, Jose E. [D–NY–16]—5/3/2011*
Rep Shuler, Heath [D–NC–1 1]– 5/3/2011*
Rep Smith, Adam [D–WA–9]—5/3/2011*
Rep Smith, Adrian [R–NE–3]—5/3/2011*
Rep Tierney, John F. [D–MA–6]—5/3/2011*
Rep Velázquez, Nydia M. [D–NY–12]—5/3/2011*
Rep West, Allen B. [R–FL–22]—5/3/2011*
Rep Wilson, Joe [R–SC–2]—5/3/2011*
Rep. Eleanor Holmes Norton (DC)
Rep. Jim Himes (CT–4)
Rep. David Cicilline (RI–1)
Rep. Anna Eshoo (CA–14)
Rep. James Moran (VA–8)
Rep. Adam Smith (WA–9)
Rep. Jim Costa (CA–20)
Rep. Alyson Schwartz (PA–13)
Rep. Joe Courtney (CT–2)
Rep. Madeleine Bordallo (GU)

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Ms. LEE. Your comments are so well taken and so well said.

I was thinking earlier when I was talking about the Situation Room and what led up to the actual moment that the program was being carried out, the extraordinary and very difficult decision that the President had to make. But it was a decision that he had made months and years earlier when he spoke to the American people as he was asking them for their vote to become President that he was going to focus like a laser on the man that caused the problem; that he was going to go wherever it may take and do whatever is necessary to settle the score and to bring to justice Osama bin Laden. And when the moment came, when the information was presented and all of the potential disasters that could occur, international relationship issues, loss of men, and even thinking back on the Jimmy Carter incident in Tehran, he stuck by his determination and completed a mission that was accomplished.

□ 1920

As you were talking and as I was listening to your very fine presentation, I noticed that an extraordinary leader had joined us here on the floor of the House, a leader who, in her own way, set a very unique circumstance for America—the very first woman Speaker of the House, who led this Chamber and this Nation to accomplish tasks that had not been accomplished in the previous 40 years but which were highly desired by the United States citizens: a health care plan that would provide service to nearly every American, Wall Street reform, and women's rights in the workplace. It was a privilege for me to join during the time she was the Speaker. Now she is the leader of our caucus, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his very kind words. I thank you for yielding your Special Order that you have practically every night that Congress is in session to talk about jobs for the American people and to, instead, allow us to use this time to come to the floor to say, ''Hail to the chief. Congratulations and thank you, President Obama. Many of us in Congress come together in appreciation of your leadership, your determination, and your commitment of resources in the fight against Osama bin Laden.''

I am pleased to join so many of my colleagues who have come to the floor to express their appreciation for this historic achievement. We all know that the death of Osama bin Laden is not the end of terrorism, but it is a significant step. It sends a clear message that the American people will pursue justice.

I would also like to express my gratitude to our former Congressman colleague but now Director of the CIA and soon to be the Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta. He was tasked by the President and named by the President in his remarks on Sunday evening as the person who had the responsibility to get the job done.

Our colleague Congresswoman JACKSON LEE has referenced the entire national security team, some specifically. I want to associate myself with her comments in that regard: the President's national security team and the Special Ops team—the men and women in uniform and our officers in the intelligence community. It is a testament to their professionalism, their precision, and their talent that no American lives were lost in this action; but it is indicative of, again, the contribution that they and their families make to help us uphold our oath of office to protect and defend. That's what we take an oath of office to do.

We recognize that this achievement was not just the goal of President Obama's, who said as candidate Obama and as President, If I have actionable intelligence on the whereabouts of Osama bin Laden, I will act upon them—and act upon them he did.

I called both former President George W. Bush and President Clinton to

thank them for their work in this regard. In the '90s, President Clinton declared Osama bin Laden to be America's ''public enemy number one.'' He saw that danger long before 9/11. Then, of course, following 9/11, President Bush tried to pursue Osama bin Laden. Their work was important, but I am here to commend President Obama in particular for executing the plan to get it done in recognition of the foundation that was laid by President Clinton and President Bush.

When we think of the symbol of Osama bin Laden and why bringing this to closure is so important, we are venturing onto sacred ground, 9/11—a shocking act of terrorism that affected our country very, very deeply, but none more deeply than the families who were affected by 9/11. We can never make them whole. We can never make up to them all that they have lost, but I hope it is some comfort to them that at least this has happened, however long it took. They used their grief for the greater good at the time by supporting the 9/11 Commission to investigate why this happened so endangering the lives of the American people would never happen again.

I commend the 9/11 families for their sacrifice, yes, for their patriotism, and for what they did to make a difference as we go into the future. Who knows? Maybe the work of the 9/11 Commission contributed to the success of this operation as well.

I know that our time is running out, and I just want to close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that our colleagues in the United States Senate unanimously passed a resolution to honor those who so successfully carried out this mission, and I'd like to associate myself with the language of their resolution. It says in part:

''The death of Osama bin Laden represents a measure of justice and relief for the families and friends of the nearly 3,000 men and women who lost their lives on September 11, 2001, the men and women in the United States and around the world who have been killed by other al Qaeda-sponsored attacks, the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and the intelligence community who have sacrificed their lives pursuing Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda.''

As they said, the death of Osama bin Laden represents a measure of justice. With gratitude for this measure of justice, I again hail to the chief, President Obama, for his great work. I thank him and congratulate him and all who made this historic achievement possible.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Congresswoman and Leader PELOSI. I'll say, ''Speaker.'' Is that okay? We thank you for your leadership. We thank you for your remarks.

We have a couple of additional members of our caucus who would like to speak. I think we've claimed the next hour. I believe that it will be available. We're out of time at this point, so I will simply wrap up with these three or four words, which are:

It is with gratitude that I and my colleagues congratulate all who were involved in bringing to justice Osama bin Laden. A job well done. Mission accomplished.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

DIALOGUE WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RICHMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to serve as ranking member of the Intelligence Committee. The killing of Osama bin Laden is clearly the most monumental intelligence achievement in recent memory.

Osama bin Laden was a terrorist leader who was responsible for killing thousands of innocent Americans—moms, dads, brothers, sisters, friends, and loved ones. Bin Laden was a threat to the United States and a threat to the world. He had the blood of thousands of people on his hands. As we all know, 9/11 changed America forever.

Over the weekend, our military and intelligence professionals took extraordinary steps. They worked together as a team and killed the al Qaeda leader. It was a risky mission that was executed with intense training and a high level of skill. These professionals risked their lives to keep our country safe, and no American lives were lost. The men and women who carried out this operation exemplify the extraordinary courage of those who serve our Nation. The countless intelligence and counterterrorism professionals who had pursued bin Laden for years have the satisfaction of a job well done. I applaud them for their persistence and professionalism.

□ 1930

It was a great day for America. Justice has now been done. But let it be known, we have shown the world that if you come after Americans, we will come after you. Even if it takes disciplined persistence by our intelligence professionals and considerable time and resources, we will get you. Let that be a warning to all members of al Qaeda and any terrorists who attack the United States. Our fight against terrorism and those who want to harm Americans is not over, but we have severely weakened al Qaeda. We will remain vigilant as we continue to work tirelessly to protect our Nation.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I am going to start something tonight in an attempt to engage more of our American people in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you know that it is no secret that America is still emerging from the recent economic downturn. We still grapple with high unemployment rates and our national debt. We are doing better than we were doing 2 years ago, but we have to do much better, and we will do much better, because we are Americans. That is our history. That is what we do.

We persevered through the Great Depression of the thirties and the depression of the eighties and the recession of yesterday. We supported one another and persevered through hurricanes, through floods, through tornadoes. We mourned together and persevered through the assassinations of John F. Kennedy, through Robert Kennedy, and through Martin Luther King. We persevered. In addition, I personally remember the attempted assassination of President Reagan. I remember writing President Reagan a get well note in the second grade. I even remember getting a note back saying thank you. We persevered again.

Fifty years ago today, an interracial group of Americans left Washington, D.C., on a bus trip to New Orleans with the goal of desegregating bus terminals. They were the first Freedom Riders. They never made it to New Orleans. They were beaten and bloodied throughout the South, but they sparked off a movement of over 400 Freedom Riders with the same goal and the same dogged determination and perseverance. Eventually our Nation repudiated segregation and embraced equality. We persevered.

If we are going to shake off this economic downturn, we need to embrace the Freedom Riders' spirit of perseverance and dogged determination. That is so very American. America will only rise up again on the strength of our collective ideas. Americans make up America, the people make up the Nation, and it is the people who will keep this Nation great.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives is the people's House, and it is time that we listened directly to the ideas from the people.

Mr. Speaker, I am inviting the American people to join in this conversation. Here is how to contact me. Here is how to talk to me. Here is how to talk to Congress. You can email me at myidea@mail.house.gov. Again, that is myidea@mail.house.gov. That is because I want to hear your ideas. Or you can go to Facebook and follow me or leave a message on the wall, or go to Facebook and contact me, or you can follow me and I will follow you on Twitter so we can have a free exchange of ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give credit where credit is due. You and the House Republicans last year launched YouCut based on a similar idea, and I applaud that again. YouCut requested that Americans identify what funding they would cut from the government's funding, and I am glad that you engaged the people.

But I think we need to go further. We should and must request that Americans share how they feel about everything. What bills do they want us to champion, what laws do they want changed, what programs do they want extended or ended.

Mr. Speaker, under House rules, I, unfortunately, can't directly address the American people. I must address my comments to you, Mr. Speaker. However, if I could speak directly to the American people, I would request that they send me their ideas for how to keep America great. I would request that they send me their thoughts on whatever they want to talk about.

Mr. Speaker, the American people can, again, email me at myidea@mail.house.gov. I will lead a conversation with the American people in which they will be an active participant. I will bring your thoughts up here and I will talk about them. I will engage you and Congress so that people can read what you write and read your ideas. I will also put your name on it. I don't want the credit. I just want a better country for our seniors and for our children.

Every couple of weeks while the House is in session I will make sure to come down here and start this conversation with America again. Although it is a conversation by me alone right now, I would suspect that we will get other colleagues joining in the conversation as we get other Americans joining in the conversation.

But right now we are going to stop, and I want to talk factually for a second about our financial situation, and I want to do it as nonpartisan as I can and not lay blame on one party or one President. I just want to talk about where we are.

We can start with recent history. According to the U.S. Treasury, when President Clinton took office, the national debt was $4.188 trillion. When President George Bush took office, the debt was $5.728 trillion. When President Obama took office, the debt was $10.672 trillion. Remember, the total debt is the sum of our accumulated annual budget deficits, so it shows a history of out-of-control spending.

So what is our current budget deficit? Last year, the U.S. Government spent about $3.5 trillion and collected $2.1 trillion in revenue. The deficit was right at $1.2 trillion. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that this fiscal year's budget deficit will be in the neighborhood of $1.4 trillion. The deficit for this fiscal year is projected to be higher than that of last year due to increases in mandatory spending and less growth in revenues as a result of the temporary payroll tax reduction as a part of last year's bipartisan tax deal.

So here we are, Mr. Speaker. The total amount of U.S. debt today is in the neighborhood of $14 trillion and the current debt limit is $14.294 trillion. The Department of the Treasury estimates that the debt will reach very close to this limit the week of May 16, at which time we will be forced to do some courageous things to avoid jeopardizing the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

So, what is the big picture? Well, the fact is over the last several years the U.S. experienced an imbalance between spending and revenues. As a result of the recession, we spent much more than we brought in.

I would like to point out that our recent spending spurred hiring in the private sector. It also provided small businesses with unprecedented tax relief. It helped home buyers purchase homes in this tough market; it helped police, teachers and firefighters continue to get paid; and it helped cities and towns across America weather this financial storm.

Last Monday night while leaving Afghanistan, I was having a conversation with a colonel in our Armed Forces. I was talking about this Special Order and I was going back and forth with him about his input and about ideas on how to engage people. He volunteered to be the first person to start the conversation and to pose a question.

He didn't really have much of a comment, but he wanted to pose a question to the American people. And his question was very simple, and it dealt with how big and what we do as Americans. So, right now I will start with his question, and that was: As Americans, what do we have, what do we want the government to provide, and how are we going to pay for it?

□ 1940

I think that that's a very basic question but it's at the heart of the debate from Democrats and Republicans and Independents. So that's what I think that we will start tonight with, Mr. Speaker, that if I could ask the American people a question, I would request of them to tell me how they feel about that statement: What do we have, what do we want the government to provide, and how are we going to pay for it?

Everyone agrees that where we are now is not where we need to be. We're dealing with big issues that demand big solutions. We have an aging population, rising health care costs, crumbling infrastructure, and uneven educational outcomes. Fortunately for us, America does great things. I believe that we can find a balanced approach that combines some reductions in spending on some programs, but combining that with increases in revenues for those who are most able to afford it and other policies that will promote faster economic growth, like during the Clinton era.

The current budget proposals, both the President's budget and the Republican budget proposed by Congressman RYAN, don't exactly get it right. They both leave room for improvement. We have to get this right, Mr. Speaker. The only way that we can get this right is by both parties working together and sacrificing.

We know that the American people don't want to underfund education or investment to grow the workforce. We know that they don't want us to sacrifice our long-term global competitiveness for short-term gains. Americans believe that we can walk and chew gum at the same time. Mr. Speaker, we can invest in tomorrow and still get our fiscal problems and our fiscal house in order.

How do we move forward? There are a number of options, but one thing is for certain. We should be honest about the tax burden currently faced by Americans.

I want to briefly show you another board, which we're not making any proposals but we want to talk about for a second, the effective tax rates.

The Congressional Budget Office just finished completing an analysis—in fact, they finished it in 2010—about the effective tax rates, which are the actual average rates of taxes paid. What we're going to look at today is the taxes on the top earners were far lower than the top tax rates. The tax rates for the top earners in this country are right at 35 percent of their income. Well, when you look at it after deductions—and legal deductions—and policies that we set as a country, those tax rates are far lower than 35 percent.

The top 10 percent of earners, representing approximately 12 million households in this country, paid an average tax in the neighborhood of 16.2 percent. Now, after paying taxes, their average income was $289,000.

Let's look at, now, the top 5 percent of earners, which only represent 5.9 million households. They're taking home an average post-tax, after-tax income of $440,500. They're paying an effective tax rate of 17.6 percent.

So you can see that when you look at 16.2 and 17.6, those numbers are far below the 35 percent that's in statute.

Now, when we get to the top 1 percent of earners in this country, representing only 1.2 million households, they took home an average after-tax income of $1.3 million, while paying only a 19 percent individual tax rate. So they fall right at 16 percent under the tax rate that's on the books.

Again, I'm not proposing what the numbers should be. But what we do know is that the top number is 35 and the lower three numbers are 16.2, 17.6, and 19 percent as the effective tax rate.

So the question to America, the question to this Congress, Mr. Speaker, is: What is the appropriate number if we're going to continue to pay down the debt, stop running deficits, but at the same time continue to take care of our seniors, invest in our children, do all of those things that continue to make this country what it is?

The next thing I'll talk about: What is the biggest takeaway from these facts? It's about sacrifice. What are we willing to sacrifice to do the things and allow government to do the things that government should do? What are the sacrifices we will make to take care of

our seniors, to take care of our children, to invest in innovation, to protect our homeland, to spread democracy, and to do all those critical things that we want to do?

These are the facts, Mr. Speaker. I encourage the American people to draw their own conclusions based on the facts—not hyperbole, not conversations from either side, not political rhetoric, but from the facts.

So, as I have laid out our debt situation, I would ask that you send me your ideas on what you think the numbers should be. This is the people's House. We see how they feel in the polls, but we need to hear their stories directly from them, Mr. Speaker. I will request that the American people send me those stories, tell me about their hardships, tell me if they think they're paying too much. But give me a specific example. Tell me how that tax rate, that tax liability, that tax burden affected your family. I want to know. I think Congress wants to know. We don't presume, and I certainly don't presume to know everything. I think it's very critical.

My grandmother told me a long time ago, Mr. Speaker, smart people know what they know and know what they don't know. I'm telling you today that I don't know everything, and I'm willing to listen to the people that do.

After all, we need everyone's creativity, everyone's inventiveness, everyone's ideas if we're going to keep this country great. This is America, home of amazing structural feats: The San Francisco Golden Gate Bridge in California, the Hoover Dam on the Arizona and Nevada border, Mount Rushmore in South Dakota. This is America, one of the most inventive nations in the world. We brought the world bifocals and the modern suspension bridge, dental floss and the doorbell, the airplane and peanut butter. America brought the world the defibrillator and the traffic light, digital recording and the Super Soaker water gun, the artificial heart and the personal computer.

This is America, a Nation of firsts and a Nation where our inventive spirit rings from sea to shining sea. This is America, where we do big things because we have big ideas. As President Obama said in this year's State of the Union Address: We're a Nation that says, I might not have a lot of money, but I have this great idea for a new invention; I might not come from a family of college graduates, but I will be the first to get my degree; I might not know those people in trouble, but I think I can help them, and I need to try; I'm not sure how we'll reach that better place beyond the horizon, but I know we'll get there. I know we will. We do big things.

Those were President Obama's words from the State of the Union in which he laid a course of where we are, where we need to get to, and why we all know we'll get there.

Mr. Speaker, again, I wish I could directly address the American people. If I could, again, I would invite them to reach out to me on Facebook, on Twitter, or by email. Email me at myidea@mail.house.gov.

We've been through rough patches before and we got through them because we're Americans. We will work together and we will listen to the American people. Our perseverance, ingenuity, creativity, and work ethic are unmatched. We're going to get through this because of our people.

Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to travel to Afghanistan, Batumi, and Baku, and over there I just want to say that the energy and the optimism in our troops were unmatched because they were representing America. They were representing what that flag stands for. They were representing the sacrifice that stands in this country's history.

□ 1950

We didn't always get it right since our founding, but we've always, always made it a goal to strive to be a more perfect union. I hope that through this conversation, we will continue to pursue being a more perfect union.

I want to take a detour for a second and just thank the New Orleans Hornets and thank their GM, Dave Dickerson, who when they found out that I was going over to Afghanistan to visit with some troops, that they sent care packages and T-shirts and bands and stickers and magazines to our troops because they understood the sacrifice that our troops were making and they wanted to make sure that they participated in just saying to our Louisiana troops, thank you, job well done, we appreciate your sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, thank you for allowing me the time to have a conversation with you about what I believe the American people stand for, about the greatness we have inside ourselves, about the great things that I know we can do when we stand together. And thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to invite the American people to participate and become their own representative in this Congress and talk about their ideas and express their desires, their wishes and what they're willing to sacrifice and those things they think we need to do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. EMERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for May 2 and the balance of the week on account of flooding in her district.

Mr. BILIRAKIS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending the funeral of a family member.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 5, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1393. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Procedures for Monitoring Bank Secrecy Act Compliance and Fair Credit Reporting: Technical Amendments (RIN: 3064-AD76) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1394. A letter from the Deputy Director for Operations, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1395. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Planning Resource Adequacy Assessment Reliability Standard [Docket No.: RM10-10-000; Order No. 747] received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1396. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Mandatory Reliability Standards for Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits [Docket No.: RM10-15-000; Order No. 748] received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1397. A letter from the FWS Chief, Branch of Aquatic Invasive Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Injurious Wildlife Species; Listing the Bighead Carp (Hypophthalmichthys nobilis) as Injurious Fish [Docket No.: FWS-R3-FHC-2010-0094; 94140-1342-0000-N5] (RIN: 1018-AT49) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1398. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulation: Areas of the National Park System, National Capital Region (RIN: 1024-AD96) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1399. A letter from the Chief, Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Carex lutea (Golden Sedge) [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2010-0003] (RIN: 1018-AW55) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1400. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and Delisting, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of Erigeron maguirei (Maguire Daisy) from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants; Availability of Final Post-Delisting Monitoring Plan [Docket No.: FWS-R6-ES-2008-0001]

(RIN: 1018-AU67) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1401. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and Delisting, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassification of the Okaloosa Darter from Endangered to Threatened and Special Rule [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2008-0071] (RIN: 1018-AW95) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1402. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of FS, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for the New Zealand-Australia Distinct Population Segment of the Southern Rockhopper Penguin [Docket No.: FWS-R9-IA-2008-0069; 92210-0-0010 B6] (RIN: 1018-AV73) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1403. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 m) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 101126521-6040-02] (RIN: 0648-XA279) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1404. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring; Amendment 4 [Docket No.: 080513659-1114-03] (RIN: 0648-AW75) received April 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1405. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 101126522-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA276) received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1406. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 17B; Correction [Docket No.: 0907271173-1137-04] (RIN: 0648-AY11) received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1407. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 m) Length Overall Using Jig or Hook-and-Line Gear in the Bogoslof Pacific Cod Exemption Area in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA271) received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1408. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA262) received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1409. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XA263) received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1410. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 110111018-1095-02] (RIN: 0648-XA109) received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1411. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Western Pacific Pelagic Fisheries; Hawaii-Based Shallow-set Longline Fishery; Court Order [Docket No.: 100826393-1171-01] (RIN: 0648-BA19) received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1412. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 101126522-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA277) received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1413. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No.: 040205043-4043-01] (RIN: 0648-XA228) received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1414. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Groper Fishery of the South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No.: 040205043-4043-01] (RIN: 0648-XA229) received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1415. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; American Fisheries Act; Recordkeeping and Reporting [Docket No.: 100413185-1155-02] (RIN: 0648-AY84) received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1416. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business, Small Disadvantaged Business, HUBZone, and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Business Status Protest and Appeal Regulations (RIN: 3245-AF65) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

1417. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Jobs Act: 504 Loan Program Debt Refinancing (RIN: 3245-AG17) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

1418. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Size Regulations; 8(a) Business Development/Small Disadvantaged Business Status Determinations (RIN: 3245-AF53) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

1419. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Capital expenditures; in general (Rev. Proc. 2011-27) received April 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1420. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Reduction of Foreign Tax Credit Limitation Categories under Section 904(d) [TD 9521] (RIN: 1545-BG54) received April 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1421. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Replacement of Schedule SSA with Form 8955-SSA (Announcement 2011-21) received April 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1422. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Capital expenditures; in general (Rev. Proc. 2011-28) received April 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1423. A letter from the Branch Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Japan Earthquake and Tsunami Occurring in March 2011 Designated as a Qualified Disaster under Sec. 139 of the Internal Revenue Code [Notice 2011-32] received April 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 245. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1230) to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain offshore oil and gas lease sales, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–73). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 1705. A bill to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. DAVIS of Kentucky (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1706. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax to facilitate the accelerated development and deployment of advanced safety systems for commercial motor vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1707. A bill to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a security breach; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RIGELL:

H.R. 1708. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to support Operation Odyssey Dawn; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1709. A bill to prevent and end the occurrence of sexual assaults involving members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1710. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish monetary prizes for achievements in designing and proposing nuclear energy used fuel alternatives; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1711. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to require criminal background checks, inspections, and training of child care providers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LANDRY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COLE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 1712. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt sales of natural gas for use in natural gas vehicles from the retail sales limitation on defining independent producers of petroleum products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1713. A bill to reduce Federal expenditures associated with data center real estate and electricity consumption, to implement savings reductions proposed by Federal employees, to reduce energy costs across Federal Executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 1714. A bill to promote human rights and democracy in Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 1715. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to end speculation on the current cost of multilingual services provided by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CRITZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 1716. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to establish a pilot program to facilitate education and training programs in the field of advanced manufacturing; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1717. A bill to require that, in cases in which the annual trade deficit between the United States and another country is $10,000,000,000 or more for 3 consecutive years, the President take the necessary steps to create a more balanced trading relationship with that country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1718. A bill to provide that service of the members of the organization known as the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II constituted active military service for purposes of laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 1719. A bill to better inform consumers regarding costs associated with compliance for protecting endangered and threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1720. A bill to improve the H-2A agricultural worker program for use by dairy workers, sheepherders, and goat herders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 1721. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to increase the maximum amount that may be allotted to Puerto Rico under part A of title III; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. STARK, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1722. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to create a local food credit program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1723. A bill to permit certain current loans that would otherwise be treated as non-accrual loans as accrual loans for certain purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey:

H.R. 1724. A bill to provide for the provision by hospitals receiving Federal funds through the Medicare Program or Medicaid Program of emergency contraceptives to women who are survivors of sexual assault; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 1725. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants for the prevention of cruelty to animals to States that have enacted laws prohibiting the devocalization of dogs and cats for purposes of convenience; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 1726. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to require criminal background checks for child care providers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 1727. A bill to strengthen certain provisions relating to arms export licenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 1728. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit for employers establishing workplace child care facilities, to increase the child care credit to encourage greater use of quality child care services, to provide incentives for students to earn child care-related degrees and to work in child care facilities, and to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 1729. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to authorize certain practitioners other than physicians to dispense

certain narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, and V for maintenance treatment or detoxification treatment without obtaining annually a separate registration for that purpose; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. SEWELL (for herself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 1730. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax-preferred Small Business Start-up Savings Accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 1731. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to submit notifications to Congress with respect to the failure by the Secretary to comply with statutory body armor procurement budget information requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1732. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for equity investments in high technology and biotechnology small business concerns developing innovative technologies that stimulate private sector job growth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 1733. A bill to amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 1734. A bill to decrease the deficit by realigning, consolidating, selling, disposing, and improving the efficiency of federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Rules, 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. DINGELL:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Navy should name a Littoral Combat Ship the U.S.S. Ypsilanti, in honor of Ypsilanti, Michigan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day, and reaffirming United States leadership and support for efforts to combat malaria as a critical component of the President's Global Health Initiative; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H. Res. 246. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Celiac Awareness Month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H. Res. 247. A resolution calling for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela to be designated a state sponsor of terrorism for its support of Iran, Hezbollah, and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS:

H. Res. 248. A resolution honoring the members of the military and intelligence community who carried out the mission that killed Osama bin Laden, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. RUPPERSBERGER:

H. Res. 249. A resolution supporting K-12 geography education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H. Res. 250. A resolution congratulating and commending Free Comic Book Day as an enjoyable and creative approach to promoting literacy and celebrating a unique American art form; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. MEEKS):

H. Res. 251. A resolution urging the President to expedite the submission of the United States - Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement to Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 1705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 1706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 1707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

''The Congress shall have Power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. RIGELL:

H.R. 1708.

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 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress). In addition, the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13, and 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1709.

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 (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18).

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill falls under Congress' authority to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution, Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 1712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution,

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 1714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3, which provides Congress the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations.'' This legislation authorizes sanctions with respect to the transfer of goods or technologies to Iran that may be used to commit human rights abuses. Additionally, the democracy promotion aspect of the legislation implicates the power to ''provide for the common defense'' under Article 1, Section 8, clause 1.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 1715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article 1 of the Constitution which states ''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by Law; and a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 1716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact the Job Opportunities Between our Shores Act pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8.

More specifically,

Clause. 1. of Section. 8. of Article. I.;

Clause. 3. of Section. 8. of Article. I; and

Clause. 18. of. Section. 8. of Article I.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 1719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate commerce and provide for the general

welfare as envisioned and enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1720.

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, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine:

H.R. 1722.

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 4 Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey:

H.R. 1724.

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, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 1725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 1726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 1727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 1728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 1729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. SEWELL:

H.R. 1730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 And The Sixteenth Amendment

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 1731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14:

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 1732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is consistent with Sections 7 and 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and the Sixteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 1733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 1734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and clause 17 (relating to authority over the district as the seat of government), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 59: Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 104: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 177: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 245: Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 287: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 298: Mr. DOGGETT Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 350: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 390: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 421: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 451: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 452: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 459: Mr. LATTA and Mr. WU.

H.R. 466: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 488: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 502: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 601: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 610: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 615: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 642: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 645: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. AMASH, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. FOXX, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BACA, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 674: Mr. KLINE, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WU, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 680: Mr. COBLE and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 724: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 735: Mr. SCALISE and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 740: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 743: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 763: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 765: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 780: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 788: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 835: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 865: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 886: Mr. GOWDY and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 891: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 913: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 929: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 931: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 965: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 992: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 997: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.

H.R. 1000: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1001: Mr. OWENS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1006: Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 1025: Mr. COHEN and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 1028: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1047: Mr. FORBES, Mr. QUAYLE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BONNER, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 1057: Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1058: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 1081: Mr. OLSON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1084: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1093: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. KLINE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HANNA, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CARTER, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1106: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WU, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1121: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1154: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1161: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MICA, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COLE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1176: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1179: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1181: Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MACK, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1195: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. AKIN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 1219: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1236: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1244: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1259: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1265: Mr. KLINE, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1287: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1288: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1299: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 1323: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 1327: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MACK, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1367: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1370: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1385: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1397: Mr. WATT.
H.R. 1402: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1422: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1433: Mr. COHEN, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1439: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1465: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1466: Mr. HONDA and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1489: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1505: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 1510: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1513: Ms. MOORE, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1515: Mr. FILNER and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1546: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WU, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 1551: Mr. KLINE and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 1555: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1558: Mr. BARROW and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1573: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1574: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1576: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1588: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BONNER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1596: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1609: Mr. STIVERS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1612: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1621: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1641: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 1645: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1646: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1653: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 1671: Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 1681: Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 1699: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 1700: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Mrs. MYRICK.
H. Res. 20: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 60: Mr. HARRIS.
H. Res. 77: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 83: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. KILDEE.
H. Res. 98: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H. Res. 134: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. WU.
H. Res. 137: Mr. HEINRICH and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H. Res. 185: Mr. SERRANO.
H. Res. 196: Mr. HANNA, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. KISSELL.
H. Res. 221: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H. Res. 231: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANCE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Ms. CHU.
H. Res. 240: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MORAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H. Res. 241: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. NUNES, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H. Res. 242: Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. DELAURO.