



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2012

No. 38

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this House for the leadership of our Nation.

May all the Members have the vision of a world where respect and understanding are the marks of civility and where honor and integrity are the marks of one's character.

As Members take time in the coming week for constituency visits, give them the ability to hear the voices of all in their districts, so that when they return they are focused on the important work to be done.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within these hallowed Halls be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

SUPPORT THE JUMPSTART OUR BUSINESS STARTUPS ACT

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act.

Our Nation's success has been built by individuals who turn innovative ideas into small businesses. By taking risks and working hard, our small business owners drive the majority of job creation in this country.

Right now it's just too difficult to start up a business. The threat of higher taxes and increased regulations has small businessmen and -women and entrepreneurs frozen in their tracks. Small businesses and start-ups simply do not have the bandwidth to comply with Washington's redtape, and yet they are the ones we're counting on to create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the JOBS Act will get small businesses and entrepreneurs back into the game by removing costly regulations and making it easier for them to access capital. This legislation also paves the way for more start-ups and small businesses to go public, which will attract new investors and will allow small businesses to grow and create jobs.

In his State of the Union address, President Obama asked Congress to send him a bill that helps start-ups and entrepreneurs succeed. The JOBS Act that we'll be voting on today does exactly that. Our bill brings together commonsense measures that have bipartisan support here in Washington and from business leaders across the country, including former AOL chairman and founder Steve Case.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize my colleagues who have worked on the JOBS Act, including Congressman STEPHEN FINCHER, Whip KEVIN MCCARTHY, Congressman DAVID SCHWEIKERT, Congressman BEN QUAYLE, Congressman PATRICK MCHENRY, Congressman JOHN CARNEY, and many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Let's build on this bipartisan momentum, Mr. Speaker. This week, President Obama offered his support for the JOBS Act. I strongly urge Senator REID to take up this bill as quickly as possible and let's just get it to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want to see us get something done and produce results. With the JOBS Act, we do have a window of opportunity for both parties in Washington to come together and produce results. We must make sure America remains the place where extraordinary success can be achieved by individuals who are willing to take risks and work hard.

PEDRO GRANT

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, Puerto Rico lost one of the towering figures of its labor movement, Pedro Grant, at the age of 92.

Throughout his life, Mr. Grant was an example for the struggle for justice. He was one of the main leaders of the United Workers Movement, which led to the revival of the labor movement in Puerto Rico in the sixties and seventies.

By his example, Mr. Grant taught us that a life well lived is a life devoted to the struggle for justice and human rights and dignity for working people. He was a lifelong fighter against abuses of power and standing up for the little guy. He was a Puerto Rican patriot whose wisdom and strength will be sorely missed.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1275

I will say a few words in his language, Spanish, in his memory:

Viviste bien. Siempre dijiste presente en todas las luchas de tu pueblo. Viviremos a la sombra de tu ejemplo. Gracias. Mereces un buen descanso, hermano.

You lived well. You were always present in all our struggles. We will live in the shadow of your example. Thank you. You deserve a good rest, my brother.

MODERN-DAY SLAVERY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, modern-day slavery is alive in America.

When Maria was 16, she was lured from Mexico to Houston by a man who promised her a better life. When she arrived in Texas, she learned this scoundrel was in the slavery business. The slave master immediately put Maria up for sale. Now she was a sex slave, a victim of child human trafficking.

Here's what she said she was forced to do:

Every day, 6 to 7 days a week, I'd have sex with seven to 10 men a night during the week, and on the weekends, 20 to 30 men a night.

Tortured and abused, the slave trader threatened her so she was too scared to run away, but she defied her captor and called for help. Law enforcement came to her aid and rescued her.

The trafficker was convicted and sent to prison where we house these deviant international slave traders. Now it's time to prosecute the customers as well.

Meanwhile, we have a duty to help and care for the victims of child sex slavery like Maria.

And that's just the way it is.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of International Women's Day.

Today is a day that honors numerous women who have actively and passionately participated in various economic, social, and political issues within their communities.

Women around the world continue to face significant obstacles in all aspects of their lives, including discrimination, gender bias, and the denial of basic human rights.

Let's take a look at Vietnam, for example:

Ms. Bui Thi Minh Hang, who was sentenced without trial to 2 years of re-education camp for participating in peaceful protests related to the Eastern Sea; or

Ms. Do Thi Minh Hanh, a labor organizer, who was sentenced to 7 years' imprisonment for advocating for farmers and workers' rights; or

Ms. Pham Thanh Nghien, who was unfairly sentenced to 4 years' imprisonment, followed by 3 years' house arrest for participating in a nonviolent hunger strike in her home related to the issue of the Eastern Sea.

In the discourse of women's rights, these women are only three of the many voices who have been unjustly sentenced to prison without any due process.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in recognizing International Women's Day and the women who are advocating for freedom and democracy in their communities and in countries such as Vietnam.

□ 1010

RECOGNIZING AUGUSTO OPPUS AND OTHER DENIED FILIPINO VETERANS

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

Mr. HECK. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today saddened by the news of the passing of World War II veteran and Las Vegas resident Augusto Oppus over this past weekend. Mr. Oppus was part of a small community known as the "Denied Filipino Veterans."

Born in the Philippines on August 28, 1924, Mr. Oppus entered into military service on behalf of the United States in March of 1945 and was trained as a military policeman. He served in the 12th Military Police Company and was honorably discharged in 1946.

While he enjoyed a happy, healthy life following the war, one thing Mr. Oppus did not share with his fellow World War II veterans was full recognition for his service and access to military benefits he had rightfully earned.

In February 1946, President Truman signed the Rescission Act of 1946 into law. This bill denied over 200,000 Filipino World War II veterans who served before July 1, 1946, the benefits promised to them 5 years prior by President Franklin Roosevelt. The men who joined prior to July of '46 put their lives on the line for the Allied cause and helped us win the war in the Pacific, yet, due to a technicality, are not afforded the recognition they deserve.

With every day that passes, it is estimated that 10 of these forgotten soldiers die having received no answer or recognition of service from our government. Men like Augusto Oppus deserve the recognition and access to benefits they've earned.

My district is home to four remaining forgotten Filipino veterans. Besides Augusto, we lost Francisco Cedula last year, and I want their families to know that I am personally thankful for their service and will continue working to see them properly recognized.

COMMENDING PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA'S COMMITMENT TO THE AMERICAN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

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

Mr. FALDOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, increasing American manufacturing is central to President Obama's vision for an economy built to last. The American manufacturing industry has expanded for 30 straight months. For the first time since the 1990s, we are creating manufacturing jobs again. The past 2 years, American manufacturers have created nearly 400,000 jobs across the country.

Because of President Obama's decisive actions, we've also experienced a revival in the automotive industry. In the last 2½ years, the auto industry alone has added more than 200,000 jobs. Furthermore, General Motors Company once again is the number one company in the world, and it recently announced its largest annual profits in history, thanks again to President Obama's determination to assist this important industry to get back on its feet.

Because of President Obama's leadership, the United States also is on track to meet his goal of doubling exports within 5 years. Now more and more consumers around the world are buying products stamped with the three magic words, "Made in America."

The vitality of the American manufacturing industry is crucial to the economic recovery of our Nation. I commend President Obama for his commitment to our manufacturing industry and, most of all, for his bold leadership and vision.

IT'S WORSE THAN WE THOUGHT

(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. Madam Speaker, it's worse than we thought. President Obama and his activist Interior Department are threatening an estimated 100,000 direct and indirect coal jobs, according to a new study. This is from the administration's proposed rewrite of the stream buffer zone rule that would cut coal production in half. Instead of developing one of America's most abundant resources, the Obama administration chooses to attack the coal industry and the jobs that go with it and would rather put the American taxpayer on the hook for failed companies like Solyndra.

This is unacceptable. We need solutions and real growth to create jobs through energy development, because the President's current policies continue to hurt America and are making our economy worse. House Republicans have a plan to stop President Obama's attack on coal. It's part of the plan for America's job creators that's being

blocked by President Obama and Senate Democrats. This failure of leadership is irresponsible, and it needs to stop.

THE U.S. NAVY IS DEVELOPING CLEAN, GREEN ENERGY

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

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the United States Navy, who, under the leadership of Secretary Ray Mabus, is doing a fantastic job developing clean, green sources of energy for the United States Navy and, eventually, the world. The Navy is already flying the Blue Angels on biofuels, it is charging our communication equipment in Afghanistan with solar energy, and it is on a path to half of its energy coming from clean sources by 2020 and the Great Green Fleet by 2016.

In my State, we're building whole industries around this: Imperium Renewables, Targeted Growth, General Biofuels, Boeing, and Alaska Airlines.

We can power the future with clean energy. The Navy is leading the way. Washington State University is doing great work, and I know there's one great former Washington State student who's helping on this effort, and her name is Trudi.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF REPRESENTATIVE DONALD M. PAYNE

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the life and contributions of our colleague and friend, Donald Payne.

Don will always be remembered for his commitment to his community, which he served with distinction as a local elected official; to his country, evident by 23 years of service in Congress in which he championed education and fair labor practices; and to the global community, where he was a champion for global health, especially malaria prevention and treatment.

Don was a joy to travel with. He combined gentleness with strength, stood with and for the underserved and underrepresented, and always spoke of his commitment. But as he did, he had this warmhearted smile, even his eyes smiled, as he gave voice to the voiceless.

Our thoughts and prayers are with Don Payne's family, with his staff and the people of the Tenth District of New Jersey, and for all of us as we keep his legacy alive.

Don, you will be missed.

JUMPSTART OUR BUSINESS STARTUPS ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3606 and insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 572 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. 3606.

□ 1018

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. 3606) to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies, with Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 7, 2012, amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 112-409 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. MCHENRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 112-409.

Mr. MCHENRY. I have an amendment printed in the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 19, after line 23, insert the following:

(C) EXPLANATION OF EXEMPTION.—Section 4 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77d) is amended—

(1) by striking “The provisions of section 5” and inserting “(a) The provisions of section 5”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b)(1) With respect to securities offered and sold in compliance with Rule 506 of Regulation D under this Act, no person who meets the conditions set forth in paragraph (2) shall be subject to registration as a broker or dealer pursuant to section 15(a)(1) of this title, solely because—

“(A) that person maintains a platform or mechanism that permits the offer, sale, purchase, or negotiation of or with respect to securities, or permits general solicitations, general advertisements, or similar or related activities by issuers of such securities, whether online, in person, or through any other means;

“(B) that person or any person associated with that person co-invests in such securities; or

“(C) that person or any person associated with that person provides ancillary services with respect to such securities.

“(2) The exemption provided in paragraph (1) shall apply to any person described in such paragraph if—

“(A) such person and each person associated with that person receives no compensation in connection with the purchase or sale of such security;

“(B) such person and each person associated with that person does not have posses-

sion of customer funds or securities in connection with the purchase or sale of such security; and

“(C) such person is not subject to a statutory disqualification as defined in section 3(a)(39) of this title and does not have any person associated with that person subject to such a statutory disqualification.

“(3) For the purposes of this subsection, the term ‘ancillary services’ means—

“(A) the provision of due diligence services, in connection with the offer, sale, purchase, or negotiation of such security, so long as such services do not include, for separate compensation, investment advice or recommendations to issuers or investors; and

“(B) the provision of standardized documents to the issuers and investors, so long as such person or entity does not negotiate the terms of the issuance for and on behalf of third parties and issuers are not required to use the standardized documents as a condition of using the service.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 572, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is very simple. We know, and policymakers in Washington here know, that entrepreneurship is at a 17-year low in the United States. We also know that small businesses are the drivers of our economy. So what this amendment does is it enables investors to connect with start-ups.

□ 1020

It takes away some red tape that is within securities regulations, and it allows incubators, forums, and online platforms which only connect accredited investors to start-ups to be exempt from SEC registration as a broker-dealer if they, number one, do not charge a commission or fee for their service; number two, do not handle the moneys of investors; and, number three, only permit accredited investors to use their platforms.

This is a very narrow amendment, very specifically crafted. In fact, the President's Council on Jobs and Competitiveness in October of last year said in their report that the emergence of angel investors and networks have also played a crucial role in initial funding of companies, and that the council recommends that clarifying that experience and active seed in angel investors and their meeting venues should not be subject to the regulations that were designed to protect inexperienced investors.

This amendment deals with that subject matter within the President's jobs council recommendations. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time that would go to someone in opposition if there is anybody in opposition, which there does not appear to be.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chair, I support this amendment. I am pleased that we have been able to come together in a process that is providing some improvement. As I've said, I think there have been people in both the executive and legislative branches that have exaggerated the impact of these, but they are helpful.

I do want to make one point, though, that it is true that the President has been one of those who has been a proponent of this—it's been a very bipartisan and very cooperative process—and there is a Statement of Administration Policy in support of the bills.

I do want to make it clear because there will be some subsequent amendments that I think will be controversial. This one is not. The next two are actually not, I believe. But then there are one, two, three, four that may be. I want to make it very clear that the President's Statement of Administration Policy, which supports the bills—or the bill, with the package of bills within it—in general is in no way—and I speak for the administration on this, having talked to them—an expression of opposition to the later amendments, none of the later amendments—and Members will debate them one way or the other, although I deeply regret that the Rules Committee only gave us 5 minutes to debate controversial amendments on each side. I think that's a denigration of process.

I would note we're probably going to finish up before noon today, or maybe 12:30. The notion that we couldn't have taken 20 minutes or even a half hour to debate a couple of these significant issues seems to me to be very, very regrettable.

But I did want to make it clear that there are amendments that will be coming up that are not either supported or opposed by the administration; that is, they are not in opposition to the general approach. And since we only have 5 minutes, I will take a little of this time to note that, for example, there is one from Mr. CAPUANO, who is a very thoughtful student here, to make sure that when we talk about holders of record, that that's not a subterfuge, that the holders of record, we are talking about limiting the number, that you don't get a whole lot of people listed as one holder of record. I think that amendment by Mr. CAPUANO is wholly in the spirit of this bill.

Mr. PETERS' amendment, one of the things that we had talked about, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), is to talk about the job impact. These have been listed as a "jobs" bill. We have one of those foolish acronyms of which I'm not very fond. They call this the "JOBS"—whatever. Well, Mr. PETERS wants to know how many jobs are really going to be created. I think that's very helpful. Similarly, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) wants to know about what the real impact is.

So I will reserve the balance of my time at this point, but I did want to

make clear that several of the subsequent amendments are not in any way derogatory to this bill. In fact, I say, look, if this bill does what it says, let's know about it.

I reserve the balance of my time. I believe I have the right to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has the right to close because the gentleman is not a true opponent.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, I will take the rest of our time to say this—and this is another relevant issue: this is a bill which does unusual things to reduce what the SEC will have to do in some of these areas, not primarily that save time for the SEC, but in fact to try to make it less burdensome for the companies that are involved.

But with that having been said, the reduction in SEC duties, which are really incidental to this bill, in no way removes the need for adequate funding for the SEC. One of the things that has been troubling to many of us is a tendency on the part of the majority to refuse the adequate funding to the SEC that it needs to carry out its new responsibilities. That's especially troubling because the SEC funds do not come from the taxpayers. The SEC is funded by a fee paid by those who participate in the securities business. In fact, as we are doing here, we are exempting the smaller people.

So when we have the largest financial institutions in this country paying a relatively small fee, in fact, an absolutely small fee, we can fund the SEC adequately. What we have seen is a disturbing refusal on the part of the majority in this House to give the SEC the funds it needs. We gave the SEC increased powers over investor protection with fiduciary responsibilities over shareholder rights. We gave them increased powers, particularly over derivatives, which had gone unregulated for so long. We have had some criticism of the SEC for not moving more promptly. We have had some criticisms of the SEC for not doing a better job of enforcement. None of those are helped by starving them of funds.

So when we have a situation where the majority does the financial community the favor of withholding funds that the administration has asked for for the SEC—and we've asked that it be funded at that adequate level—and by doing so not only damages the enforcement capabilities of the SEC, but gives an unjustified present to the largest financial institutions—investment houses and others—I think that a very grave error has been made.

So I welcome the fact that we are making some minor reductions in the SEC burdens here as an incidence of trying to help the companies, but that does not justify fairly and adequately to fund the SEC out of fees assessed on the companies.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would clarify that the gentleman from North Carolina, the proponent, is recognized to close.

Mr. MCHENRY. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I appreciate the more conciliatory tone in today's debate. It's fantastic, Madam Chair, to have the ranking member back in debating form today and permitted to debate on the House floor.

This amendment is about investors, incubators, and start-ups. We've got wide endorsements from 155 folks from across America—both investor level, we have incubators, we have online platforms and forums that have endorsed this, including the founder of AOL, Steve Case, the founder of Netscape, Marc Andreessen, who is also a renowned investor in Silicon Valley.

This is a great amendment that clarifies something that's very important for us to update in securities laws. I certainly appreciate the support across the aisle for this important issue as well. I'm glad it can be passed with bipartisan support.

With that, I ask my colleagues to vote "yes."

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 112-409.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 36, line 25, strike "by 1,000 persons, and" and insert "by either—

"(i) 2,000 persons, or

"(ii) 500 persons who are not accredited investors (as such term is defined by the Commission), and".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 572, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I hate to be the only one at the campfire not singing "Kumbaya," but I do part company with my President and with the ranking Democrat on the Financial Services Committee in their support for this bill.

I do fear that if we cut back on the transparency and we cut back on the investor protections, it really is only going to take one or two well-publicized cases of investors losing their shirts, losing their retirement savings because they got defaulted for small business capital to dry up, to get harder to come by instead of easier to come by.

But I do agree that governments should not go to great lengths to protect people who really can fend for themselves, who are more sophisticated, and who really knowingly decide that they do not want protections.

□ 1030

This amendment increases the exception from SEC registration to 2,000 investors, provided that no more than 500 are not accredited investors. I think the importance of accredited investors, or their sophistication, may well be overstated. But they are, in fact, people who have well more than the net worth of most Americans. They have a net worth of \$1 million, without consideration of equity in their home, which used to be more than it is now; or have an income of \$200,000, annual income of \$200,000 for an individual or \$300,000 for a couple.

More important, they actually have to fill out a form to ask to be an accredited investor. They have to opt in. They have to decide that they do want to be outside of some of the protections of the SEC. So this will limit some of the effect of the bill to investors who are somewhat more able to fend for themselves, are somewhat more sophisticated, and are more able to take a loss in investing in a small business that may be a greater risk of an investment, an investment which may be more of a risk but may also promise more reward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, though I do not oppose the underlying amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chair, this is one of those occasions where Mr. MILLER and his staff—I extend an appreciation. We've gone back and forth in discussion over the last year, you know, what should the number be. We all came to a collective agreement that 500 was far too small for capital formation. Was 2,000 appropriate? Well, should be it 2,000 accredited? Well, what should be the unaccredited portion for that?

I think this is what we'll call an appropriate compromise, and I thank Mr. MILLER for bringing this to us and helping us get there. What this ultimately does is allow an organization to have investors, up to 2,000. Five hundred of those can be unaccredited. The other 1,500 have to fill out the form; have to have net assets over \$1 million, exclusive of their home; a couple hundred thousand dollars a year income, \$300,000 if they're a married couple.

So at that point, we've made the decision that this somewhat more sophisticated population gets to participate, but they have to opt in. And yet, we still do not lock out those who are, shall we say, working their way to becoming that next sophisticated population.

So, Madam Chairwoman, we support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 112-409.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 37, after line 22, insert the following:
SEC. 504. COMMISSION STUDY OF ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY UNDER RULE 12G5-1.

The Securities and Exchange Commission shall examine its authority to enforce Rule 12g5-1 to determine if new enforcement tools are needed to enforce the anti-evasion provision contained in subsection (b)(3) of the rule, and shall, not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act transmit its recommendations to Congress.

The table of contents in section 2 of the bill is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 503 the following new item:

Sec. 504. Commission study of enforcement authority under Rule 12g5-1

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 572, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chairman, we'll call this amendment a study amendment, but we've had repeated discussions on the difference between shareholders of record and beneficial interests. So think of this: we have just raised the number of shareholders that an organization can have. Okay.

Well, what if you're a broker-dealer? Do you count as one? Do you count as many? And does it actually make any difference in investor protection?

So, in this amendment, we basically say, All right, SEC, we believe you already have this authority. Please, for the first 120 days look into this, see if it causes any harm. If it doesn't, make that decision.

We felt this would be a rational way to approach the question because it was a repeated discussion within committee, and just simply say, All right, if it's a problem, SEC, you have the authority. If not, let's move forward.

But it's a good example of us not legislating something that, at this point, may be just folklore.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, even though I'm not opposed, and I'd like to speak generally on H.R. 3606.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. First of all, it's very refreshing that we have legislation that's focused on improving the business climate that we're doing together, and we've had some internal squabbles about whose name should go first. I'm not sure it amuses the American people. But the bottom line here that should encourage the American people is that we have bipartisan legislation that is going to do positive things for the business climate, certainly in Vermont and around the country.

I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT, for working together so well to bring this legislation to the floor. And there are a number of good things here.

We don't have to exaggerate this as the answer to the real challenge we have in creating jobs. But you know what? Just selling this for what it is is a good thing, and it's a good thing because it does practical things to help us improve our business climate, particularly for small businesses, and for the rare time that we have this opportunity, we're doing it together.

But the legislation, overall, does a number of good things. The IPO on-ramp that is going to allow companies that need access to capital fewer barriers to get access to capital, particularly our small companies, where the cost of putting together an initial public offering is very significant, oftentimes prohibitive, that's a very good thing.

The Access to Capital for Job Creators Act that removes the regulatory ban that prevents small, privately held companies from using advertisements to solicit investors for private offerings, so they are allowed to let the word go out that they are open for business and they want investors, that's a good thing.

The Entrepreneur Access to Capital Act permits crowdfunding to finance new businesses by allowing companies to accept and pool donations up to \$1 million. Again, a very practical step to take. Good step to take.

The Small Companies Capital Formation Act that Mr. SCHWEIKERT, my colleague from Arizona, pioneered raises the offering threshold for companies exempted from registration with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission from \$5 million, the threshold, to \$50 million.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT, again, you've been busy. The Private Company Flexibility and Growth Act raises the threshold for mandatory SEC registration for companies from 500 to 1,000 shareholders. We've got a company in Newport, Vermont, that has been under a lot of regulatory pressure. They can't go over that 500 threshold. This is going to be very helpful, Madam Chairman, to that company to get access to capital, and it's going to make certain that the SEC regulations are still complied with.

Then the provision that raises the threshold for mandatory SEC registration for community banks from 500 to 1,000 shareholders, that's going to have a direct impact on a bank in Newport, Vermont.

So these are all practical steps. I don't think we need to oversell it. It's not the step that is going to get us down to an unemployment rate of 1 or 2 or 3 percent that all of us aspire to, and there's a tendency in this body sometimes to oversell what we're doing. But you know what? We shouldn't minimize what we're doing as well. And these, again, practical, sensible small business-oriented steps that are taken on a bipartisan basis. This is a good thing that we're doing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chairman, I am prepared to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. May I request the time available?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Well, hopefully, I won't take 4 minutes here.

Madam Chairman, this amendment is actually very, very simple. We're basically reaching out to the SEC saying, Look, come back, make your determination, and let us know within 120 days if you see this is an actual issue.

The language in here—"not later than 120 days after the enactment of this act transmit its recommendations to Congress"—this is actually, I believe, a good, workable, rational answer to much of the discussion that happened in the Financial Services Committee. It also has the SEC stand up and say yes, they have the authority, or no, they don't, and then transmit that back to us in the committee.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. CAPUANO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 112-409.

Mr. CAPUANO. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 37, after line 22, insert the following (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 504. STUDY, REPORT, AND RULEMAKING.

(a) STUDY.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall conduct a study regarding whether the term "held of record" (as defined pursuant to section 12(g)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934) should be changed—

(1) to mean the beneficial owner of the security; and

(2) to address anti-evasion concerns, such as those described under section 240.12g5-1(b)(3) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit a report to the Congress containing the conclusions of the study carried out under subsection (a).

(c) RULEMAKING.—If, based on the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a), the Commission concludes that a change to the definition of the term "held of record" is necessary and appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors, then, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall revise such definition.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 572, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Chair, this amendment is actually just to piggyback on the previous one that we just adopted by voice vote. It's just a little bit more specific. And honestly, had I known the gentleman was going to offer the other amendment, I might have worked with him a little bit more to make it more specific.

In some levels it's redundant, but this particular one is more specific as to what the issue is. It's actually the specific issue that Mr. SCHWEIKERT pointed out, which is the definition of the beneficial owner.

□ 1040

Right now, when Facebook went public, they allowed one or two or three or a handful of investors to be counted as one. Broker-dealers can hold investments on behalf of thousands, an unlimited number of people. The concept of having 2,000 or 1,000, I respect the gentleman's comments previously that there is no magic number—2,000 sounds fine, 1,000 was fine. That's all well and good, and there is no magic answer to that number. I think the compromise that was reached was pretty reasonable.

At the same time, what it doesn't address, which is exactly what the gentleman said earlier, is that each one of these 2,000 people in theory and in reality often do hold the beneficial interest of tens of thousands of people. I'm not talking about mutual funds. But these are the people that have the authority to direct the broker-dealer to act on their behalf. All this says is it does very similar, but it directs the SEC to look at this specific issue, and to do it within 6 specific months and to come back not just with recommendations to Congress, but if they determine it's an appropriate issue, to actually act.

I don't think there is any disagreement that the SEC has the current authority under current law to do this action if they choose to do it. All this says is rather than simply coming back to Congress with a proposal that if they see the appropriate thing to do is act, that they should do it within 6 months. It is very similar. On many levels it overlaps. It's a technical dif-

ference, and a more specific amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I appreciate our friend from Massachusetts. I do believe, though, that we are about to be somewhat duplicative to the amendment that we just did.

I accept that there is a little bit more here that is a bit more specific, but it is, I hate to say, not necessary. We just passed an amendment that I believe accomplishes where the gentleman from Massachusetts wishes to go, and therefore, I don't see this amendment as actually being necessary.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Chair, as the gentleman said in his debate on his bill, even that was unnecessary because the SEC has the authority to do this now. That was unnecessary, and I agree this in theory is unnecessary. The only difference is that this tells the SEC that if they determine that it is a problem, that they are required to act. That's the only major difference here, and they're required to act within any specific period of time.

The previous amendment, also unnecessary pursuant to current law, does direct the SEC look at an issue and make recommendations to Congress. That's all it says. You can actually argue that that might undermine the SEC's authority to take action. I don't think that it does, but you could make that argument if you so chose. This amendment, I agree, is overlapping; but it is not fully redundant, and it keeps the clarification that the SEC is empowered to act now to take action. That's the only major difference.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I appreciate the part of the argument here, but in the amendment we just passed, we basically, I believe, did what the Congress is supposed to do. We asked the SEC to come back to us within that 120 days, say all right, here's your authority. Do this, do that. Here's where we see a problem. Here's where we don't see a problem. Actually, I think that's actually where those questions come from.

Mr. CAPUANO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I do yield.

Mr. CAPUANO. Will the gentleman agree that the SEC is currently empowered to take these actions on their own without congressional approval?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Reclaiming my time, I actually do.

Mr. CAPUANO. If the gentleman agrees with that and the gentleman agrees that his amendment, his proposal, which I agree with that we just adopted, doesn't undermine that authority at all, would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Would the gentleman restate the question?

Mr. CAPUANO. I simply asked under the amendment that we just adopted, your previous amendment, do you think in any way that that undermines the current ability of the SEC to take action? I would think that it doesn't, but I'm just trying to build the record to be clear as to what it does.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Reclaiming my time, actually, where I think it's a really interesting part of the discussion is, all right, if I do believe the SEC actually has this authority, but at the same time, I also believe you and I and all of us in this body are responsible for the ultimate policy, that this policy should be coming back before us, particularly those in the Financial Services Committee, because we're going to also see it as it ties into this whole package of legislation, but also other moving parts out there.

Substantially, for that reason, I must tell you I preferred the amendment we just adopted over the one you've offered because it does say that provision, if it comes back before us, yes, the SEC may have this authority; but we're also going to be the ones also touching it and saying, yes, but it needs to be in context.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. I don't disagree with anything that the gentleman just said. I happen to agree that Congress should exercise its responsibility every time, but I also understand and I also agree that we have empowered various agencies across the government to take action on their own. We agree that the SEC has current action; and I would argue very clearly that this amendment, this bill, doesn't change the SEC's authority. If they would come out with a ruling tomorrow that defined "beneficial owner" or "owner of record" in a different way—that they're fully authorized to do so—all this amendment does is suggest that they do, actually requires them to do so one way or the other.

Even if they disagree with me, this doesn't direct them to agree with me. This simply directs them to act if they determine that they should.

I would also argue very clearly that if that's the determination that they make, that they will act anyway, and that's the way it should be. That's all this amendment does is try to draw a big bold line under a potential massive loophole that could be utilized by not necessarily most people but by a few nefarious people who might intend to defraud people, and that's all this is intended to do—close one more door that can be used by people that should be used.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chairman, may I request the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the discussion, and I know we may be bordering on that line of being esoteric. I actually believe that we took care of much of this concern in the previous amendment. If you are with us and agree, we're literally looking at two tracks here. The SEC does hold authority. At the same time, we also want this brought back to us if the SEC does see an issue. That's the proper venue. It is the proper venue that we passed in the previous amendment, therefore making this amendment somewhat duplicative.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 112-409.

Mr. PETERS. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following:

TITLE VII—REQUIRED DISCLOSURE OF NUMBER OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN EMPLOYEES

SEC. 701. REQUIRED DISCLOSURE OF NUMBER OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN EMPLOYEES.

Section 13 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(r) DISCLOSURE OF NUMBER OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN EMPLOYEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning the first full fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this subsection, each issuer required to file reports with the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) shall disclose annually to the Commission and to shareholders—

“(A) the total number of employees of the issuer and each consolidated subsidiary of the issuer who are domiciled in the United States and listed by number in each State;

“(B) the total number of such employees physically working in and domiciled in any country other than the United States, listed by number in each country; and

“(C) the percentage increase or decrease in the numbers required under subparagraphs (A) and (B) from the previous reporting year.

“(2) EXEMPTIONS.—

“(A) NEWER PUBLIC COMPANIES.—An issuer shall not be subject to the requirement under paragraph (1) for the first 5 years after the issuer is first required to file reports with the Commission pursuant to subsection (a).

“(B) EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.—An issuer that is an emerging growth company shall not be subject to the requirement under paragraph (1).

“(3) REGULATIONS.—The Commission may promulgate such regulations as it considers necessary to implement the requirement set forth in paragraph (1).”

Amend the table of contents in section 2 by adding at the end the following new items:

TITLE VII—REQUIRED DISCLOSURE OF NUMBER OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN EMPLOYEES

Sec. 701. Required disclosure of number of domestic and foreign employees

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 572, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Madam Chair, I'm the cosponsor of H.R. 3630 because I believe that this bipartisan legislation has the potential to create thousands of jobs in the coming years.

My amendment improves this bill by ensuring that those jobs stay here in the United States and in our local communities.

When I meet with constituents, one of their top concerns is the persistent outsourcing of American jobs. Between 2000 and 2009, multinational corporations cut 2.9 million U.S. jobs while adding 2.4 million jobs overseas.

□ 1050

Millions more jobs in diverse sectors, such as the life sciences, agriculture, and sales, could be moving abroad over the next few years. Annual job losses to offshoring have been estimated to be around 300,000. Those 300,000 job losses, of course, are significantly slowing net job creation at a time when we need it most in this country.

My amendment will simply require publicly held companies to disclose where their employees are located in their annual SEC filings. Are their employees here in the United States or are they overseas? While there is consistent concern in this Chamber regarding new regulations on businesses, I think we can all agree that employers know where they are sending their paychecks every month, and this bill specifically exempts newly appointed companies for 5 years.

With unemployment above 8 percent and persistently high unemployment rates possible in the coming years, policymakers at every level of government must look at all credible options for creating jobs. Analyzing the effectiveness of past and future job policies is difficult without knowing whether corporations benefiting from tax incentives or other policies are creating the jobs here in America or abroad. Additionally, responsible investors have a right to know how publicly traded companies are spending their money and whether they are hiring and investing in the United States or are sending their resources overseas.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to support the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. I guess the threshold question I have to ask is: How does this amendment help jumpstart business start-ups?

What this amendment does is require one more disclosure report. Much of

this, frankly, I do not believe to be germane to the underlying bill, but it is here before us. Nonetheless, it is one more regulatory burden. It is one more cost imposed upon our job creators. It is one more piece of red tape when already the Small Business Administration under the Obama administration has reported the total regulatory cost amounts to \$1.75 trillion annually, which is enough money for businesses to provide 35 million private sector jobs with an average salary of \$50,000. The same report from the Obama administration's Small Business Administration has reported that 64 percent of all new jobs in the past 15 years have come from small business. Yet these small businesses face an annual regulatory cost of \$10,585 per employee.

So, again, I begin to wonder. I know every single report, every single study, every single regulation has, perhaps, some beneficial purpose, but the cumulative impact of them all, Madam Chair, is hurting our businesses.

According to a recent Chamber of Commerce small business survey, 78 percent of small businesses surveyed report that taxation, regulation, legislation from Washington is what is making it harder for their firms to hire more individuals. What we understand from the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, a division of OMB, is that during the first 3 years of the President's administration, we have seen a 95 percent increase in the average number of completed regulations deemed economically significant to our economy—almost double. The administration has currently proposed 3,118 regulations. Again, at what point do you begin to say enough is enough?

I understand the purpose of the gentleman's amendment, but I think we know that we have lost far too many jobs overseas. It's not a matter of documenting the symptom; it's getting to the disease. What is the root cause? Well, we know what the root cause is. The root cause is too much red tape. It's bills like the President's health care plan, which is an anathema to small businesses across the land—2,000 pages of legislation that have promulgated even more regulations. Talk to any small business person in America, and the person will cite the President's health care program as something that is inhibiting job growth.

This regulatory burden almost doubles economically significant regulations imposed. That's what's chasing jobs overseas—taxation. The President is proposing \$1.9 trillion more in taxes, much of it to fall upon small businesses; and we wonder why we're losing jobs overseas? That's what needs to be documented—not the fact that it's happening, but the root causes. That would be more worthy of a study.

At this point, the purpose of this bill is to help bring more companies on to this IPO on-ramp. This is at cross-purposes, and I would urge my colleagues to defeat this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS. I would like to respond to my esteemed colleague in a couple of respects.

He mentions that this is outside the scope of the legislation, that this is really not germane to what we're dealing with. I think, hopefully, my colleague will agree with me that this legislation is about jobs, that it is about creating jobs. More importantly, it is about making sure that those jobs are here in the United States. My colleague across the aisle wants to create jobs overseas. He can do that somewhere else. He should not be doing it in the legislation before us.

This is about empowering American businesses to hire American workers in order to grow the American economy. For us to do that, though, we need to have information. We have to know whether or not these policies that we are implementing are, indeed, doing what they are intended to do, which is to create jobs in the United States.

My colleague argues that this is somehow some incredible burden on companies to be able to report this. I want to remind my colleague that they already do report the number of employees they have. That is part of the SEC filings that currently public corporations are required to file. All this does is ask where those employees are. Are they in the United States or are they overseas? To argue that this is somehow some incredible administrative burden would be to argue that these companies have no idea where they are sending their paychecks and that they're going to need to have some sort of expensive compliance mechanism put in place. I would argue companies know exactly where they send those paychecks each and every month. They know if they're sending them to the United States, and they know if they're sending them overseas.

This is easy to comply with, but it is absolutely essential information for those of us as policymakers who hear from companies regularly that only if we were to adopt this policy they would create jobs. Well, if we adopt that policy, I would like to see that those jobs are actually being created in America and not overseas. We need to have that transparency.

Additionally, this amendment is very careful to exempt new companies, those that are first filing. The initial first 5 years of a start-up company do not have to file this; but what often happens with these new start-up companies is that they start up in the United States. When they then move to scale up operations and really start selling products, all too often we see those companies sending those jobs overseas, and the scale-up—most of the jobs, most of the good-paying middle class jobs, which are critical for a strong economy and for a strong democracy, are being sent overseas.

We need to know. We need to have the transparency. That's simply what this amendment does, and I would urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. I would inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. In that case, Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER).

Mr. FINCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate Mr. PETERS' concerns, but this is about the private sector creating jobs. As we've been here as freshmen for a year and a few months, we have to remind ourselves in this body that jobs are not created in the Halls of Congress, they're created in the private sector, which is what this jobs package will do for America. It lets the private sector get back in the business of creating jobs. I do appreciate the concern, but we're looking out for America here, not overseas jobs. We're looking at bringing back jobs, lowering unemployment and letting the private sector get back in the driver's seat of our economy.

American businesses don't need more mandates from Washington. I couldn't help but hear "we, we, we" and "us, us, us" here in the House. Let's get back to the people and to the private sector.

While I understand, again, that the gentleman's intention may be to encourage more companies to keep jobs at home, I think this amendment would only add to the list of reasons a company chooses a path other than going public, which leads to less job creation at home. So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PETERS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

□ 1100

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 112-409.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE VII—REPORT ON IPQS AND MANUFACTURING

SEC. 701. REPORT.

After the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue a report to the Congress on

the increase in initial public offerings that resulted from this Act and the amendments made by this Act, including the specific increases in offerings by companies in the manufacturing industry and the high technology industry.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 572, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer a straightforward amendment to H.R. 3606, the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act.

My amendment would simply direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a study 1 year after enactment of the law to determine the increase in initial public offerings, or IPOs, resulting from this legislation. The study would also include data specifically on the increases in the manufacturing and high-technology industries.

Though I have concerns about the underlying bill, I plan to support it because I believe it will help small high-tech manufacturers, particularly many in my congressional district, to grow and to hire. However, I also believe we must take steps to ensure these provisions are actually working and our innovative entrepreneurs and small business are getting the support they need.

Madam Chair, as our Nation has struggled these past few years from the economic crisis, we have taken a hard look at what is required for our economy to grow and to thrive into the future. One thing we have all agreed upon is the need to Make It in America.

Of course, this means rebuilding and re-energizing American manufacturing, especially in high-tech. America's greatest export has always been our innovative ideas. For decades, we excelled at both imagining and building new products here in America. But in recent years, we've lost so many manufacturing plants and the millions of quality middle class jobs that came with them.

Small start-ups and local companies have been replaced with large global corporations who have exported our best ideas and our jobs overseas. This has to stop.

Encouraging growth in high-tech manufacturing here at home is critical to rebuilding our economy to better compete in the 21st century. Whether it's in clean energy, defense, or computer science, high-tech manufacturers are creating jobs, spurring economic growth, and helping our Nation regain its rightful place as the global leader in innovation and manufacturing.

What my amendment will simply ensure is this bill is actually accomplishing what it is supposed to accomplish. It will ensure that these reforms are helping high-tech entrepreneurs and small businesses grow and hire more workers.

I'm fortunate in my district to see firsthand the tremendous success these innovative high-tech manufacturers can have in the 21st century economy, companies like Transphorm, Inogen, Trust Automation, MariPro, Owl Biomedical, and Wyatt Technologies. They're all homegrown, often with ideas first hatched at our public universities like UC Santa Barbara and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo.

These companies, and so many more like them, are all innovating, expanding, and creating quality local, good-paying jobs on California's central coast. These innovative businesses have weathered the economic crisis better than anyone else, and they've done this not by outsourcing jobs or cutting pay and benefits. They are doing it the old-fashioned way by constantly innovating and outthinking their competition. They demonstrate the critical link between education, innovation, and our economy. Well, the reforms in the underlying bill are certainly important. We can't lose sight of the many other critical policies that help nurture and grow small business.

As I meet with small business owners and entrepreneurs throughout my district, I hear about access to capital and cutting red tape, of course. But I also hear about the importance of funding our local community colleges and universities, improving local infrastructure, and protecting critical Federal programs like the Small Business Innovation Research, SBIR, under the Small Business Administration.

This bill certainly moves us in the right direction, but we need to do so much more. We need to take up a long-term transportation bill that rebuilds our crumbling roads, bridges, and railways without partisan gimmicks and giveaways.

We need to address the ongoing housing crisis that continues to drag down our economy and force families from their homes. We need to close the gaping loopholes in our Tax Code that encourage companies to ship jobs overseas.

Madam Chair, this bill is a positive step forward, but as many of my colleagues have pointed out, there is room for improvement. While I hope this bill can be improved as it moves forward, I plan to support it because it includes important reforms that will help small businesses. We must also ensure these reforms are actually helping the businesses that need it most, our small manufacturers and innovators.

My amendment will make that happen, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, this, again, the underlying piece of legislation is a piece of legislation that is designed to ensure that small businesses have an on-ramp to equity fi-

nancing into the IPO market. Let's recall again, why are we seeing so few IPOs? Why are we continuing in this 8 percent-plus unemployment environment for over 3 years, the longest period of sustained high unemployment since the Great Depression?

Well, I listen closely to businesspeople in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas. I listen to other job creators around America, and here's what I hear.

John Mackey, cofounder and CEO of Whole Foods Market:

In some cases regulations have gone too far, and it really makes it difficult for small businesses. There's too much bureaucracy and red tape. Taxes on business are very high. So we're not creating the enabling conditions that allow businesses to get started.

We're trying to cut away red tape with this JOBS Act.

Andrew Puzder, CEO, CKE Restaurants:

Government just doesn't understand how much uncertainty it creates in the economy when it attempts to regulate what the private sector does, and it really doesn't understand what the private sector does.

Bernie Marcus, cofounder, former CEO of Home Depot:

Having built a small business into a big one, I can tell you that today the impediments that the government imposes are almost impossible to deal with. Home Depot would have never succeeded if we tried to start it today.

Let me repeat that, Madam Chair. Home Depot would never have succeeded if we tried to start it today.

Every day you see rules and regulations from a group of Washington bureaucrats who know nothing about running a business, and I mean every day. It's become stifling.

If you're a small businessman, the only way to deal with it is to work harder, put in more hours, and let people go. When you consider that something like 70 percent of the American people work for small businesses, you are talking about a big economic impact.

Just three voices, Madam Chair, from America's job creators. Again, it's not a real secret why we've had a dearth of IPOs.

I understand the gentlelady's amendment is to have the SEC issue a report, number one. I would also note, since these are public filings, we ourselves, as Members of Congress, will have no trouble whatsoever understanding how many companies will go public in the next year.

I understand the gentlelady's argument, I respect that, but, again, it's just one more reporting burden that, frankly, is being placed on the SEC. Now, we've had a debate, and the ranking member has brought up many times he's unhappy with the level of funding that the SEC has received. In fact, I would note, however, that even the President of the United States in his budget is not trying to give the SEC what they have requested.

But what the ranking member has said:

Studies are not done for free by the SEC. I think we have got a further burdening of the SEC with more work. Given the current decision to restrict SEC funding, I will be much more careful about burdening them with studies which will inevitably come at the expense of more important duties.

Again it's a debate. Does the SEC have the right amount of resources, too much, too many? I don't know, that's a legitimate debate.

But, apparently, he thought strongly enough that we should not be burdening the SEC with further burdens at this time. For all of those reasons, I would urge that we defeat the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As I said initially, this amendment is simple and it's straightforward. It simply ensures that the provisions of the bill are actually helping small business grow and hire more workers. It's an amendment about oversight and accountability, and it focuses especially on the manufacturers and high-tech innovators that are so critical to future economic growth.

Madam Chair, how much time remains on our side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 5 seconds remaining.

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield the balance of my time to my ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

□ 1110

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas selectively quoting me. I do not want to pile on studies, but this one makes a great deal of sense.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Among other reasons I think we should oppose this amendment, number one, I'm not sure what we're going to learn in 1 year. We didn't get into this terrible environment of high unemployment overnight. Frankly, it took 3 years of the burdens that this administration has placed on small businesses. I don't know if we are going to get out of it overnight. So, number one, I don't believe that 1 year is particularly helpful.

But, again, we can have a debate about the root causes. We're already going to know which companies go public. And at some point in time you have to say are the benefits to be derived from the report, from the regulation, worth the cost? I simply don't see it, Madam Chair. Again, I urge defeat of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. LOEBSACK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 112-409.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE VII—OUTREACH ON CHANGES TO THE LAW

SEC. 701. OUTREACH BY THE COMMISSION.

The Securities and Exchange Commission shall provide online information and conduct outreach to inform small and medium sized businesses, women owned businesses, veteran owned businesses, and minority owned businesses of the changes made by this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 572, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I first want to thank Congressman FINCHER and the Financial Services Committee for bringing this package forward. I am encouraged the House is taking steps today to support small businesses, and I would urge and hope the House will take up additional legislation to create jobs. As any Iowa family can tell you, our Nation is still recovering from the worst recession since the Great Depression, and Congress' focus must be on jobs. Our unemployment rate is painfully high, is still painfully high, and has been a long-term problem for millions of Americans and thousands of Iowans.

We need to be working on legislation to boost our economy, and helping our small businesses flourish is an important step in that direction. This is why I am offering this amendment, to ensure provisions of this legislation are made widely available, and particularly to women-owned, veteran-owned, and minority-owned businesses to make sure that they are informed of changes that might help. Small businesses will be leaders in helping our country climb out of the recession.

I'm home every weekend in Iowa, and I hear time and again the two big problems small businesses face is access to capital and finding skilled workers. In order for this bill to be effective, small and medium businesses must be aware of the new opportunities they will have to expand their business and raise cap-

ital. This will be particularly important for the segment of businesses I am targeting in my amendment—women-owned, veteran-owned, and minority-owned businesses.

Specifically, my amendment would require the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide information online and also conduct outreach to these businesses to help them utilize the changes made through this legislation.

Especially since it is Women's History Month, there is no better time to highlight the importance of women-owned businesses to our economy. It's estimated there are over 8 million women-owned businesses in the United States, generating nearly \$1.3 trillion in revenues and employing nearly 8 million people. Women-owned businesses account for almost 30 percent of U.S. firms and are growing in some nontraditional areas as well.

Especially during these tough economic times that are weighing heavily on our veterans and their families, it is also essential we as a Nation do all we can to ensure no man or woman who has served our country in uniform should have to fight for a job here at home. Veterans bring to the table many of the skills necessary to run a small business as well and to be leaders in their community. Veterans own 2.4 million businesses, generated over \$1 trillion in receipts, and employed nearly 6 million people.

Minority business owners also employ nearly 6 million people with \$864 billion in receipts.

All small businesses owners are important, which is why there is a requirement in my amendment to post information about advantages changes in this bill might offer on the SEC Web site in addition to conducting outreach for women-owned, veteran-owned, and minority-owned businesses. This amendment does not score according to the nonpartisan CBO and is simply a commonsense way to ensure employers we're trying to target in this legislation are able to use these new tools to grow our economy and create new jobs and industries. I ask for the support of my colleagues on this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for bringing this amendment to the floor. I suspect, given that the SEC already has a fairly comprehensive Web site, they probably would have done the proper job in outreach on small business issues. But as important as the JOBS Act is, his amendment is helpful to the underlying bill. I also want to thank him for working with us to tailor his amendment to the underlying bill. Again, it is my expectation

that the SEC would do this job. This will help ensure that all the benefits of this act will be known throughout the small-business community. I urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and compliment him on his very thoughtful amendment, and appreciate the support of the other side of the aisle.

This amendment is aimed at supporting the growth of small and medium-sized businesses and easing the sometimes daunting task of figuring out just what new legislation will mean to them.

This amendment requires the SEC to provide online information and, perhaps more importantly, outreach to small and medium-sized businesses, businesses owned by women, minorities, and veterans.

It is widely recognized that such businesses face a unique set of challenges. We should be doing everything we can to encourage their growth and supporting their success.

Again, I compliment the hard work and really meaningful amendment that my friend from the great State of Iowa has put forth, and I urge unanimous support of it and appreciate the support of the other side of the aisle.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I wish to urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment. Madam Chair, I would note that this is the last amendment that we will be debating. So, again, I want to use this opportunity to urge all of my colleagues to support the JOBS Act. We again know that jobs, economic growth, the state of our economy continue to be the most pressing issues we are facing in the Nation today. These are foremost in the minds of our constituents.

I want to thank the Republican leader, the gentleman from Virginia, for his leadership in bringing this effort to the floor. I certainly want to thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, and the prime author of the legislation, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER), who has been very active in this debate. I also want to thank the Representatives, my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, for working with us again. It is challenging, most challenging, to find areas of consensus, and most challenging to find the ability to move bipartisan legislation. I think this is a day, a moment, that can be celebrated by all Members. It certainly doesn't do what we would totally like done on our side of the aisle, and I'm sure my friends on the other side of the aisle have the same thing to say.

□ 1120

But it is a step in the right direction for allowing more start-ups to access

equity capital to create more jobs for a Nation in desperate need of more job growth and more economic growth.

Again, we know the President in his Statement of Administration Policy has indicated a desire to sign this piece of legislation, and I look forward to the President having that opportunity. I hope it is not our last opportunity to work on a bipartisan basis in this Congress and in this year. It is certainly a good start and something I believe the American people will celebrate.

I want to urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment; I want to urge all of my colleagues to support the bill; and let's find ways to grow this economy and get America back to work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I really do appreciate the support from the other side of the aisle for this amendment.

I concur with my colleague from Texas in his sentiment that the American people want us to work together to get America back to work again. That's what I'm hearing when I'm home every weekend in my district. I appreciate the support from the gentleman from New York as well.

Hopefully, this is the beginning of something bigger where we can work across the aisle and get America back to work and get this economy back on track.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FINCHER) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, 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. 3606) to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2012.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following mes-

sage from the Secretary of the Senate on March 8, 2012 at 9:34 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1855.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 11:45 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1145

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan) at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 572 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. 3606.

□ 1146

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. 3606) to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 112-409 offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-409 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

Amendment No. 16 by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 175, noes 239, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

AYES—175

Ackerman	Gibson	Neal
Altmire	Gonzalez	Oliver
Andrews	Green, Al	Owens
Baca	Green, Gene	Pallone
Baldwin	Grijalva	Pascrell
Barrow	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Bass (CA)	Hahn	Pelosi
Becerra	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Berman	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Polis
Bishop (NY)	Hinchev	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Hirono	Quigley
Bonamici	Hochul	Rahall
Boswell	Holden	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Holt	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Honda	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Insee	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Israel	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Carnahan	Jackson Lee	Ryan (OH)
Carney	(TX)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Jones	Schakowsky
Chandler	Kaptur	Schiff
Chu	Keating	Schrader
Ciilline	Kildee	Schwartz
Clarke (MI)	Kind	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Kissell	Scott, David
Clay	Kucinich	Serrano
Cleaver	Langevin	Sewell
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Sires
Connolly (VA)	Lee (CA)	Slaughter
Conyers	Levin	Speier
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Courtney	Lipinski	Sutton
Critz	Loeb sack	Thompson (CA)
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Tierney
Cummings	Lowe y	Tonko
Davis (CA)	Luján	Towns
DeFazio	Lynch	Tsongas
DeGette	Maloney	Van Hollen
DeLauro	Markey	Velázquez
Deutch	Matsui	Walz (MN)
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Wasserman
Dingell	McCollum	Waters
Doggett	McDermott	Watt
Donnelly (IN)	McGovern	Waxman
Doyle	McIntyre	Welch
Duncan (TN)	McNerney	Wilson (FL)
Edwards	Meeks	Woolsey
Ellison	Michaud	Yarmuth
Engel	Miller (NC)	
Eshoo	Miller, George	
Farr	Moran	
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	
Frank (MA)	Nadler	
Fudge	Napolitano	

NOES—239

Adams	Buerkle	Dreier
Aderholt	Burgess	Duffy
Akin	Burton (IN)	Duncan (SC)
Alexander	Calvert	Duncan (TN)
Amash	Camp	Ellmers
Amodei	Campbell	Emerson
Austria	Canseco	Farenthold
Bachmann	Cantor	Fincher
Bachus	Capito	Fitzpatrick
Barletta	Carter	Flake
Bartlett	Cassidy	Fleischmann
Barton (TX)	Chabot	Fleming
Bass (NH)	Chaffetz	Flores
Benishkek	Coble	Forbes
Berg	Coffman (CO)	Fortenberry
Biggert	Cole	Fox x
Bilbray	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Billirakis	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (UT)	Costa	Galle g y
Black	Cravaack	Gardner
Blackburn	Crawford	Garrett
Bono Mack	Crenshaw	Gerlach
Boren	Cuellar	Gibbs
Boustany	Davis (KY)	Gingrey (GA)
Brady (TX)	Denham	Gohmert
Brooks	Dent	Goodlatte
Broun (GA)	DesJarlais	Gosar
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Gowdy
Bucshon	Dold	Granger
		Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)	Marino	Roskam
Griffin (AR)	Matheson	Ross (AR)
Griffith (VA)	McCarthy (CA)	Ross (FL)
Grimm	McCaul	Royce
Guinta	McClintock	Ryunan
Guthrie	McCotter	Ryan (WI)
Hall	McHenry	Scalise
Hanna	McKeon	Schilling
Harper	McKinley	Schock
Harris	McMorris	Schweikert
Hartzler	Rodgers	Scott (SC)
Hastings (WA)	Meehan	Scott, Austin
Hayworth	Mica	Sensenbrenner
Heck	Miller (FL)	Sessions
Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
Herger	Mulvaney	Shuler
Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)	Shuster
Himes	Noem	Simpson
Huelskamp	Nugent	Smith (NJ)
Huizenga (MI)	Nunes	Smith (TX)
Hultgren	Hunter	Southerland
Hunter	Nunnelee	Stearns
Hurt	Olson	Stivers
Issa	Palazzo	Stutzman
Jenkins	Paulsen	Sullivan
Johnson (IL)	Pearce	Terry
Johnson (OH)	Pence	Thompson (PA)
Johnson, Sam	Peterson	Thornberry
Jordan	Petri	Tiberi
Kelly	Pitts	Tipton
King (IA)	Platts	Turner (NY)
King (NY)	Poe (TX)	Turner (OH)
Kingston	Pompeo	Upton
Kinzinger (IL)	Posey	Walberg
Kline	Price (GA)	Walden
Lamborn	Quayle	Walsh (IL)
Lance	Reed	Webster
Lankford	Rehberg	West
Latham	Reichert	Westmoreland
LaTourette	Renacci	Whitfield
Latta	Ribble	Wilson (SC)
Lewis (CA)	Rigell	Wittman
LoBiondo	Rivera	Wolf
Long	Roby	Womack
Lucas	Roe (TN)	Woodall
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Yoder
Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)
Lungren, Daniel E.	Rogers (MI)	Young (FL)
Mack	Rohrabacher	Young (IN)
Manzullo	Rokita	
Marchant	Rooney	
	Ros-Lehtinen	

NOT VOTING—18

Bonner	Hinojosa	Neugebauer
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)	Paul
Culberson	Labrador	Rangel
Davis (IL)	Landry	Schmidt
Filner	Miller, Gary	Thompson (MS)
Garamendi	Moore	Visclosky

□ 1218

Mr. CALVERT changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WAXMAN, HONDA, and CLYBURN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 107, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 236, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

AYES—172

Ackerman	Gibson	Napolitano
Altmire	Gonzalez	Neal
Andrews	Green, Al	Oliver
Baca	Green, Gene	Owens
Baldwin	Grijalva	Pallone
Barrow	Gutierrez	Pascrell
Bass (CA)	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Berkley	Hanna	Perlmutter
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Hinchev	Quigley
Bonamici	Hirono	Rahall
Boswell	Hochul	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Holden	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Holt	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Honda	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Insee	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Israel	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Carnahan	Jackson Lee	Ryan (OH)
Carney	(TX)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Jones	Schakowsky
Chu	Kaptur	Schiff
Ciilline	Keating	Schwartz
Clarke (MI)	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Scott, David
Clay	Kissell	Serrano
Cleaver	Kucinich	Sewell
Clyburn	Langevin	Sherman
Coffman (CO)	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Connolly (VA)	Lee (CA)	Speier
Conyers	Levin	Stark
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Sutton
Courtney	Lipinski	Thompson (CA)
Critz	Loeb sack	Thompson (PA)
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Tierney
Cuellar	Lowe y	Tonko
Cummings	Luján	Towns
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Tsongas
DeFazio	Maloney	Van Hollen
DeGette	Markey	Velázquez
DeLauro	Matsui	Walz (MN)
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Wasserman
Dicks	McCollum	Waters
Dingell	McDermott	Watt
Donnelly (IN)	McGovern	Waxman
Doyle	McIntyre	Welch
Edwards	McNerney	Wilson (FL)
Engel	Meeks	Woolsey
Eshoo	Michaud	Yarmuth
Farr	Miller (NC)	
Fattah	Miller, George	
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	
Fudge	Nadler	

NOES—236

Adams	Buerkle	Duffy
Aderholt	Burgess	Duncan (SC)
Akin	Burton (IN)	Duncan (TN)
Alexander	Calvert	Ellmers
Amash	Camp	Emerson
Amodei	Campbell	Farenthold
Austria	Canseco	Fincher
Bachmann	Cantor	Fitzpatrick
Bachus	Capito	Flake
Barletta	Carter	Fleischmann
Bartlett	Cassidy	Fleming
Barton (TX)	Chabot	Flores
Bass (NH)	Chaffetz	Forbes
Benishkek	Coble	Fortenberry
Berg	Coffman (CO)	Fox x
Biggert	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Bilbray	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Billirakis	Cooper	Galle g y
Bishop (UT)	Costa	Gardner
Black	Cravaack	Garrett
Blackburn	Crawford	Gerlach
Bono Mack	Crenshaw	Gibbs
Boren	Davis (KY)	Gingrey (GA)
Boustany	Denham	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Dent	Goodlatte
Brooks	DesJarlais	Gosar
Broun (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Gowdy
Buchanan	Dold	Granger
Bucshon	Dreier	

Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Ross (AR)
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Ross (FL)
Griffin (AR)	McClintock	Royce
Griffith (VA)	McCotter	Runyan
Grimm	McHenry	Ryan (WI)
Guinta	McKeon	Scalise
Guthrie	McKinley	Schilling
Hall	McMorris	Schock
Harper	Rodgers	Schrader
Harris	Meehan	Schweikert
Hartzler	Mica	Scott (SC)
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Scott, Austin
Hayworth	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner
Heck	Mulvaney	Sessions
Hensarling	Murphy (PA)	Shimkus
Herger	Myrick	Shuler
Herrera Beutler	Noem	Shuster
Himes	Nugent	Simpson
Huelskamp	Nunes	Smith (NE)
Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee	Smith (NJ)
Hultgren	Olson	Smith (TX)
Hunter	Palazzo	Smith (WA)
Hurt	Paulsen	Southerland
Issa	Pearce	Stearns
Jenkins	Pence	Stivers
Johnson (IL)	Peterson	Stutzman
Johnson (OH)	Petri	Sullivan
Johnson, Sam	Pitts	Terry
Jordan	Platts	Thornberry
Kelly	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
King (IA)	Polis	Tipton
King (NY)	Pompeo	Tipton
Kingston	Posey	Turner (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)	Price (GA)	Turner (OH)
Kline	Quayle	Upton
Lamborn	Reed	Walberg
Lance	Rehberg	Walden
Lankford	Reichert	Walsh (IL)
Latham	Renacci	Webster
Latta	Ribble	West
Lewis (CA)	Rigell	Westmoreland
LoBiondo	Rivera	Whitfield
Long	Roby	Wilson (SC)
Lucas	Roe (TN)	Wittman
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Wolf
Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Womack
Lungren, Daniel	Rogers (MI)	Woodall
E.	Rohrabacher	Yoder
Mack	Rokita	Young (AK)
Manzullo	Rooney	Young (FL)
Marchant	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (IN)
Marino	Roskam	

NOT VOTING—24

Bartlett	Garamendi	Moore
Bonner	Hinojosa	Moran
Cardoza	Hoyer	Neugebauer
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Paul
Culberson	Labrador	Rangel
Davis (IL)	Landry	Schmidt
Doggett	LaTourette	Thompson (MS)
Filner	Miller, Gary	Visclosky

□ 1222

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 108, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. EMERSON). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mrs. EMERSON, 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. 3606) to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies, and, pursuant to House Resolution 572, reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. ESHOO. In its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Eshoo moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3606 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 12 insert before the period the following: ", and discloses publicly and to the Commission any political expenditures made by the issuer during such fiscal year".

Page 3, line 21, insert before the period the following: ", and discloses publicly and to the Commission any political expenditures made by the issuer during such fiscal year".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support a very good recommit motion, but I want to clarify one point.

Reference was made in the debate to this bill being one that would relieve small businesses of regulations imposed by this administration recently. Let me be very clear. With the exception of Say-on-Pay, which I strongly support, the administrative and regulatory issues addressed here were not imposed by this administration, were not a result of the bill. These are long-standing things that predate this administration. So I'm for the bill, but I wanted to clear up that misconception. This is not any reaction to anything that was done recently; it's making accommodation for these small businesses with regard to things that are of long standing.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, this is the final amendment to improve this important piece of legislation that I fully support. Capital formation is the lifeblood of innovation in the 21st century, as it was in our past in America. It's so essential to our national economy. Just as importantly, transparency is the lifeblood of our democracy.

The amendment I'm offering today will ensure that emerging growth companies nurtured under today's legislation will fully disclose their political

expenditures. Just as entrepreneurs deserve all of the tools available to create and grow companies, voters deserve every tool to decide on public issues for themselves.

Since the Supreme Court's disastrous Citizens United decision, voters across the country have been treated to a sad spectacle not seen since the Watergate era or even the Gilded Age. This year's Presidential election is bearing witness to hundreds of millions of dollars spent on behalf of candidates. The vast majority of the money is coming from outside the channels of parties and candidates, unaccountable to the voters for the messages they deliver. Instead, money from corporations and extremely wealthy people is now being spent through so-called nonprofits and super PACs, denying and delaying disclosure or preventing it all together.

The American people deserve better. House Democrats have offered comprehensive transparency legislation called the DISCLOSE Act, and we should pass that bill together as soon as possible. We can begin that work today by adopting this final amendment and passing the bill. It will not burden small businesses, and it will empower the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this final amendment to the bill will not kill it nor will it send it back to committee. If it's adopted, the bill will proceed to final passage as amended. Congress can say today to the American people that we respect them. We can say we trust them to decide for themselves because they have complete information.

I've always believed that sunlight is the best disinfectant. By voting for this amendment and voting for the bill, we can score two victories for the American people. We can strengthen small businesses across our country, and we can strengthen democracy.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me how good my friends on the other side of the aisle have become in putting politics before jobs.

They've said "no" to the dozens of job bills that the House Republicans have put forward and "no" to unleashing investment in small business.

Mr. Speaker, we have all been somewhere where you've seen a family, a family with a small child, and the child is crying and throwing a tantrum and the parent turns and gives the child what they want, but the child still cries. Today we see another good example of something good still not being good enough for the other side.

At a time when the economy is struggling, unemployment above 8 percent for more than 35 consecutive months, underemployment above 15 percent, you have a bill here that would

unshackle and unleash small business growth. So it is beyond me why, after both subcommittee and full committee markups where provisions passed almost unanimously, this idea never came forth after a full and open debate on the floor with 15 Democrat amendments.

□ 1230

What really shocks me the most is that the President of the United States offered a statement in support of the bill. But when I read his entire statement, Mr. Speaker, he never mentions this motion to recommit or the concern. So, Mr. Speaker, it's one more time that the floor tries to come together, but politics are put before job growth.

So I urge all my friends to come together in a bipartisan fashion—the way this bill was created—to vote down this motion and support the underlying bill.

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. ESHOO. Mr. 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 170, noes 244, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

AYES—170

Ackerman	Crowley	Hoyer
Altmire	Cuellar	Inslee
Andrews	Cummings	Israel
Baca	Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)
Baldwin	DeFazio	Jackson Lee
Bass (CA)	DeGette	(TX)
Becerra	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Berkley	Deuth	Johnson, E. B.
Berman	Dicks	Jones
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Kaptur
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Keating
Blumenauer	Donnelly (IN)	Kildee
Bonamici	Doyle	Kind
Boswell	Edwards	Kissell
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Kucinich
Braley (IA)	Engel	Langevin
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Farr	Larson (CT)
Capps	Fattah	Lee (CA)
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Levin
Carnahan	Fudge	Lewis (GA)
Carson (IN)	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	Loebsack
Chandler	Green, Gene	Lofgren, Zoe
Chu	Grijalva	Lowey
Ciциlline	Gutierrez	Lujan
Clarke (MI)	Hahn	Lynch
Clarke (NY)	Hanabusa	Markey
Clay	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Cleaver	Heinrich	McCarthy (NY)
Clyburn	Higgins	McCollum
Cohen	Himes	McDermott
Connolly (VA)	Hinchev	McGovern
Conyers	Hirono	McIntyre
Costello	Holden	McNerney
Courtney	Holt	Meeks
Critz	Honda	Michaud

Miller (NC)	Richmond	Speier	Turner (NY)	West	Woodall
Miller, George	Rothman (NJ)	Stark	Turner (OH)	Westmoreland	Yoder
Moran	Roybal-Allard	Sutton	Upton	Whitfield	Yoder (AK)
Murphy (CT)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)	Walberg	Wilson (SC)	Young (FL)
Nadler	Rush	Tierney	Walden	Wittman	Young (IN)
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Tonko	Walsh (IL)	Wolf	
Neal	Sánchez, Linda	Towns	Webster	Womack	
Oliver	T.	Tsongas			
Pallone	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen			
Pascarell	Sarbanes	Velázquez			
Pastor (AZ)	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)			
Pelosi	Schiff	Wasserman			
Perlmutter	Schwartz	Schultz			
Peters	Scott (VA)	Waters			
Pingree (ME)	Scott, David	Watt			
Polis	Serrano	Waxman			
Price (NC)	Sewell	Welch			
Quigley	Sherman	Wilson (FL)			
Rahall	Sires	Woolsey			
Reyes	Slaughter	Yarmuth			
Richardson	Smith (WA)				

NOES—244

Adams	Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Aderholt	Gallegly	Rodgers
Akin	Gardner	Meehan
Alexander	Garrett	Mica
Amash	Gerlach	Miller (FL)
Amodei	Gibbs	Miller (MI)
Austria	Gibson	Mulvaney
Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Bachus	Gohmert	Myrick
Barletta	Goodlatte	Noem
Barrow	Gosar	Nugent
Bartlett	Gowdy	Nunes
Barton (TX)	Granger	Nunnelee
Bass (NH)	Graves (GA)	Olson
Benishek	Graves (MO)	Owens
Berg	Griffin (AR)	Palazzo
Biggert	Griffith (VA)	Paulsen
Bilbray	Grimm	Pearce
Bilirakis	Guinta	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Peterson
Black	Hall	Petri
Blackburn	Hanna	Pitts
Bono Mack	Harper	Platts
Boren	Harris	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Hartzler	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Brooks	Hayworth	Price (GA)
Broun (GA)	Heck	Quayle
Buchanan	Hensarling	Reed
Bucshon	Herger	Rehberg
Buerkle	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Burgess	Hochul	Renacci
Burton (IN)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Calvert	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Camp	Hultgren	Rivera
Campbell	Hunter	Roby
Canseco	Hurt	Roe (TN)
Cantor	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Capito	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Carney	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Carter	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Cassidy	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Chabot	Jordan	Rooney
Chaffetz	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	King (IA)	Roskam
Coffman (CO)	King (NY)	Ross (AR)
Cole	Kingston	Ross (FL)
Conaway	Kline	Royce
Cooper	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryunyan
Costa	Klaine	Ryan (WI)
Cravaack	Lamborn	Scalise
Crawford	Lance	Schilling
Crenshaw	Lankford	Schock
Davis (KY)	Latham	Schrader
Denham	LaTourrette	Schweikert
Dent	Latta	Scott (SC)
DesJarlais	Lewis (CA)	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Dold	Long	Sessions
Dreier	Lucas	Shimkus
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Shuler
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Shuster
Duncan (TN)	Lungren, Daniel	Simpson
Ellmers	E.	Smith (NE)
Emerson	Mack	Smith (NJ)
Farenthold	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Fincher	Marchant	Southerland
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Stearns
Flake	Matheson	Stivers
Fleischmann	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman
Fleming	McCaul	Sullivan
Forbes	McClintock	Terry
Fortenberry	McCotter	Thompson (PA)
Foxx	McHenry	Thornberry
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Tiberi
	McKinley	Tipton

Turner (NY)	West	Woodall
Turner (OH)	Westmoreland	Yoder
Upton	Whitfield	Young (AK)
Walberg	Wilson (SC)	Young (FL)
Walden	Wittman	Young (IN)
Walsh (IL)	Wolf	
Webster	Womack	

NOT VOTING—18

Bonner	Hinojosa	Neugebauer
Cardoza	Labrador	Paul
Culberson	Landry	Rangel
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Schmidt
Filner	Miller, Gary	Thompson (MS)
Garamendi	Moore	Visclosky

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1250

Mr. MATHESON and Ms. HOCHUL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. ALTMIRE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 109, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

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. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 390, noes 23, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

AYES—390

Ackerman	Braley (IA)	Connolly (VA)
Adams	Brooks	Cooper
Aderholt	Broun (GA)	Costa
Akin	Brown (FL)	Costello
Alexander	Buchanan	Courtney
Altmire	Bucshon	Cravaack
Amash	Buerkle	Crawford
Amodei	Burgess	Crenshaw
Andrews	Burton (IN)	Critz
Austria	Butterfield	Crowley
Bachmann	Calvert	Cuellar
Bachus	Camp	Cummings
Baldwin	Campbell	Davis (CA)
Barletta	Canseco	Davis (KY)
Barrow	Cantor	DeFazio
Bartlett	Capito	DeGette
Barton (TX)	Capps	DeLauro
Bass (NH)	Carnahan	Denham
Benishek	Carney	Dent
Berg	Carson (IN)	DesJarlais
Berkley	Carter	Deuth
Berman	Cassidy	Diaz-Balart
Biggert	Castor (FL)	Dicks
Bilbray	Chabot	Doggett
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Dold
Bishop (GA)	Chandler	Donnelly (IN)
Bishop (NY)	Chu	Doyle
Black	Ciциlline	Dreier
Blackburn	Clarke (MI)	Duffy
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	Duncan (SC)
Bonamici	Cleaver	Ellison
Bono Mack	Clyburn	Ellmers
Boren	Coble	Emerson
Boswell	Coffman (CO)	Eshoo
Boustany	Cohen	Farenthold
Brady (PA)	Cole	Farr
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Fattah

Fincher LaTourette
 Fitzpatrick Latta
 Flake Levin
 Fleischmann Lewis (CA)
 Fleming Lewis (GA)
 Flores Lipinski
 Forbes LoBiondo
 Fortenberry Loeb sack
 Foxx Lofgren, Zoe
 Frank (MA) Long
 Franks (AZ) Lowey
 Frelinghuysen Lucas
 Fudge Luetkemeyer
 Gallegly Luján
 Gardner Lummis
 Garrett Lungren, Daniel
 Gerlach E.
 Gibbs Lynch
 Gibson Mack
 Gingrey (GA) Manzullo
 Gohmert Marchant
 Gonzalez Marino
 Goodlatte Matheson
 Gosar Matsui
 Gowdy McCarthy (CA)
 Granger McCarthy (NY)
 Graves (GA) McCaul
 Graves (MO) McClintock
 Green, Al McCollum
 Green, Gene McCotter
 Griffin (AR) McGovern
 Griffith (VA) McHenry
 Grijalva McIntyre
 Grimm McKeon
 Guinta McKinley
 Guthrie McMorris
 Gutierrez Rodgers
 Hahn McNerney
 Hall Meehan
 Hanabusa Meeks
 Hanna Mica
 Harper Michaud
 Harris Miller (FL)
 Hartzler Miller (MI)
 Hastings (FL) Miller, George
 Hastings (WA) Moran
 Hayworth Mulvaney
 Heck Murphy (CT)
 Heinrich Murphy (PA)
 Hensarling Myrick
 Herger Nadler
 Herrera Beutler Neal
 Higgins Noem
 Himes Nugent
 Hirono Nunes
 Hochul Nunnelee
 Holden Olson
 Honda Owens
 Hoyer Palazzo
 Huelskamp Pallone
 Huizenga (MI) Pascrell
 Hultgren Pastor (AZ)
 Hunter Paulsen
 Hurt Pearce
 Insole Pelosi
 Israel Pence
 Issa Perlmutter
 Jackson (IL) Peters
 Jackson Lee Peterson
 (TX) Petri
 Jenkins Pitts
 Johnson (IL) Platts
 Johnson (OH) Poe (TX)
 Johnson, E. B. Polis
 Johnson, Sam Pompeo
 Jones Posey
 Jordan Price (GA)
 Kaptur Price (NC)
 Keating Quayle
 Kelly Quigley
 Kind Rahall
 King (IA) Reed
 King (NY) Rehberg
 Kingston Reichert
 Kinzinger (IL) Renacci
 Kissell Reyes
 Kline Ribble
 Lamborn Richardson
 Lance Richmond
 Langevin Rigell
 Lankford Rivera
 Larsen (WA) Roby
 Larson (CT) Roe (TN)
 Latham Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ruppenger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Scalise
 Schiff
 Schilling
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Moran
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Noem
 Sullivan
 Sutton
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner (NY)
 Turner (OH)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Petri
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Webster
 Welch
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Woolsey
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Hinojosa Paul
 Labrador Rangel
 Landry Schmidt
 Maloney Thompson (MS)
 Miller, Gary Visclosky
 Moore
 Neugebauer

□ 1304

Mr. KUCINICH changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 110, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 2012, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 107 through 110.

Had I been present for rollcall 107, on agreeing to the Peters amendment to H.R. 3606, to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present for rollcall 108, on agreeing to the Capps amendment to H.R. 3606, to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present for rollcall 109, on the motion to recommit with instructions H.R. 3606, to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present for rollcall 110, on passage of H.R. 3606, to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies, I would have voted “aye.”

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO CORRECT ENGROSSMENT

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 3606, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references and to make other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to accurately reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, March 13, 2012; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m.

on Friday, March 16, 2012; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 19, 2012.

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

There was no objection.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY IFC/PANHELLENIC DANCE MARATHON.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Pennsylvania State University IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon, otherwise known affectionately as “THON.”

THON’s goal every year is to raise money for the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Hershey Children’s Hospital. The fund was established to support children’s cancer by assisting patients and their families through treatment. The fund has helped thousands of families by offsetting medical expenses incurred during cancer treatment. This year, THON broke the previous record and raised \$10,698,924. They raised over \$10.6 million. That’s amazing work. Congratulations.

Penn State’s THON has grown to become one of the largest student-run philanthropies in the world, and their efforts have helped improve the lives of so many.

As a proud Penn State alum and Member representing the university here in Washington, I want to congratulate Penn State, the students, the donors, and all of the organizations involved in the THON for another amazing year in support of a truly important cause.

END THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today’s New York Times headline: “Intractable Afghan Graft Hampering U.S. Strategy”; the subtitle: Elite group is known for corruption, but high level trials have been absent.

Mr. Speaker, another story about corruption, another story about Afghan President Karzai’s complicity in corruption. This story appears while American servicemen and -women continue to die in Afghanistan, while the American people continue to send billions of dollars each day to Afghanistan to sustain the Afghan Government.

Mr. Speaker, I’ve had it; the American people have had it. This war is not worth another American life. It is not worth another taxpayer dollar. I urge the President to bring our troops home now. I urge the President to end this war now. Enough is enough.

NOES—23

Baca Capuano Edwards
 Bass (CA) Conyers Hinchey
 Becerra Dingell Holt

[From the New York Times, Mar. 7, 2012]
 INTRACTABLE AFGHAN GRAFT HAMPERING U.S.
 STRATEGY

(By Matthew Rosenberg and Graham
 Bowley)

KABUL, Afghanistan.—For the past few months, possibly the most intriguing poker game in Kabul has been taking place in the sprawling pink sitting room of the man at the center of one of the most public corruption scandals in the world, the near collapse of Kabul Bank.

The players include people tied to President Hamid Karzai's inner circle, many of whom have profited from the crony capitalism that has come to define Afghanistan's economic order, and nearly brought down Kabul Bank. The game's stakes "aren't too big—a few thousand dollars up or down," one of the participants said.

Betting thousands of dollars a night in a country where most families live off a few hundred dollars a year would seem like a bad play for Sher Khan Farnood, the founder and former chairman of Kabul Bank, the country's biggest. His assets are supposed to be frozen, and he is still facing the threat of prosecution over a scandal that could end up costing the Afghan government—and, by extension, the Western countries that pay most of its expenses—almost \$900 million, a sum that nearly equals the government's total annual revenues.

But Mr. Farnood, who in 2008 won about \$143,000 at a World Series of Poker event in Europe, appears to know a good wager when he sees one. Despite years of urging and oversight by American advisers, Mr. Karzai's government has yet to prosecute a high-level corruption case. And now many American officials say that they have little expectation that Mr. Farnood's case will prove to be the exception—or that Washington will try to do much about it, especially after violent anti-American protests in recent weeks have sowed fresh doubts in the Obama administration over the viability of the mission in Afghanistan.

As Americans pull back from Afghanistan, Mr. Farnood's case exemplifies how the United States is leaving behind a problem it underwrote over the past decade with tens of billions of dollars of aid and logistical support: a narrow business and political elite defined by its corruption, and despised by most Afghans for it.

The Americans and Afghans blame each other for the problem's seeming intractability, contributing to the deterioration in relations that now threatens to scuttle talks on the shape of ties between the countries after the NATO combat mission ends in 2014. What is clear is that the pervasive graft has badly undercut the American war strategy, which hinged on building the Karzai administration into a credible alternative to the Taliban.

Still, the Obama administration has concluded that pressing the fight against corruption, as many American officials tried to do in recent years, could further alienate Mr. Karzai and others around him whom Washington is relying on as it tries to manage a graceful drawdown.

"It's a little late in the game to worry about anticorruption measures because what in the world is the alternative going to be?" said Anthony H. Cordesman, a military analyst at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington. "If you find people who aren't corrupt, it is largely because they haven't had the opportunity."

Some of the corruption will fade organically, as America and its allies cut back on their aid to Afghanistan, which is likely to have a harsh impact on the Afghan economy, Mr. Cordesman said. Efforts by the Amer-

ican-led coalition to better monitor the billions it spends each year in Afghanistan continue and are having an effect, although it remains slight largely because billions of dollars keep pouring in and are likely to do so for years to come.

The limits of the coalition's efforts to police its own spending—and the newfound reluctance of top American officials to push back against Afghan intransigence over prosecuting corruption—were laid bare in December when Mr. Karzai's office demanded that the coalition provide evidence if it wanted the government to prosecute the Afghan Army's former surgeon general, Gen. Ahmad Zia Yaftali.

Coalition officials had in fact provided the evidence a full year earlier. General Yaftali was suspended in December 2010 after Gen. David H. Petraeus, then the coalition commander, told Mr. Karzai that NATO investigators had found that the Afghan officer had stolen tens of millions of dollars' worth of drugs from the country's main military hospital, an institution he ran and where Afghan soldiers regularly died from simple infections because they could not afford to bribe nurses or doctors to treat them.

The running of the hospital, like much of the Afghan Army, is financed by the United States, which last year spent \$11.2 billion to pay, train and equip Afghanistan's security force.

But after the suspension of the politically connected general, the investigation into his conduct remained in limbo—until Mr. Karzai on Dec. 29 unexpectedly demanded to see the evidence he had already seen.

The American officer in charge of the inquiry, Brig. Gen. H. R. McMaster, was furious. The investigation of General Yaftali and the Dawood Military Hospital was one of the major initiatives undertaken by General McMaster's task force, a high-profile coalition effort set up in 2010 to go after corruption that was being financed by coalition spending. Now it appeared as if an officer who was accused of letting his own soldiers die so he could enrich himself would never be tried.

General McMaster and his staff quickly pulled together their evidence and wrote a statement to counter Mr. Karzai's demand. Their draft, a copy of which was obtained by The New York Times, struck both accusatory and conciliatory notes.

It bluntly stated that the coalition had provided the evidence Mr. Karzai was now demanding. It said efforts to investigate had been met with "interference, obstruction, and delay." It quoted a pledge Mr. Karzai had made in December at an international conference in Germany to end a "culture of impunity."

The statement was never released. According to two NATO officials, the commander of coalition forces, Gen. John R. Allen, decided there was little to gain in picking a fight with Mr. Karzai over the matter.

A senior coalition officer who is involved with the case said he believed that it would eventually proceed. NATO is focused on preparing Afghan forces to take over the fight against the Taliban, and will continue to try to clamp down on corruption that undermines that goal, the officer said.

The American officials tracking the bank investigation seem similarly uninterested in challenging Afghan authorities over the status of Mr. Farnood and his former partner, Khalilullah Frozi.

Under pressure from the United States and its allies, Afghan authorities arrested both men in June. Kabul Bank was taken over nearly 10 months earlier amid accusations that its owners used it as their personal piggy bank.

Mr. Farnood spent more than \$150 million of the bank's money on villas in Dubai pur-

chased in his own name. Kabul Bank money helped finance shell companies whose main function was to win subcontracts from businesses doing work for the American-led coalition, siphon a slice of the money and then find other subcontractors to do the actual work, American officials have said. Mahmoud Karzai, a brother of the Afghan president, and Abdul Haseen Fahim, a brother of the first vice president, Gen. Muhammad Qasim Fahim, both received interest-free loans so they could buy stakes in the bank.

News of the takeover prompted a run on the bank that almost led to its collapse. Afghanistan's central bank spent nearly \$900 million to keep it afloat, an outlay that the Afghan government, already short of cash, has since had to cover. While some of that money is likely to be recovered, some Western officials concede that donor funds will eventually be needed to close the hole in the Afghan budget, even if Western dollars do not go directly to cover Kabul Bank's losses.

Deputy Attorney General Rahmat-ullah Nazari said the authorities this past fall gave permission to let Mr. Farnood and Mr. Frozi out of prison during the daytime so they could help recover assets owed to the bank. Mr. Farnood owes the bank \$467 million, he said; Mr. Frozi owes \$78 million.

Mr. Frozi has been helpful in tracking down missing assets; Mr. Farnood less so, Mr. Nazari said, although some Western officials disputed that characterization and said it was Mr. Farnood who was being more helpful.

But it is unclear how hard the Afghan government is pushing either man. The villas and a pair of partly constructed office towers in Dubai are still in Mr. Farnood's name, and Mr. Nazari said the transfer of the property was being held up by a 2 percent tax that the United Arab Emirates levy on such deals. Some Western officials questioned why a routine tax would hold up such an important transaction.

Meanwhile, Mr. Farnood is collecting rent from tenants in some of the villas, Mr. Nazari said.

But, Mr. Nazari insisted, both will be prosecuted once the asset recovery has been completed.

American, European and even some Afghan officials say they doubt that will happen. Despite Mr. Nazari's claim that both spend their nights in prison, the two have rented separate houses in Kabul and rarely, if ever, return to their cells, said people close to the men.

Mr. Farnood's spacious house stands behind high walls in Kabul's most expensive neighborhood, around the corner from the office of the International Monetary Fund, which is overseeing a forensic audit of Kabul Bank.

A pool table, a table for table tennis, a large Samsung flat-screen television and a set of purple faux-leather couches and arm chairs grace the cavernous pink sitting room. A pair of late-model black Toyota Land Cruisers sit in the driveway. The officer from Afghanistan's National Directorate of Security, the country's intelligence agency, who mans the front door functions more like a doorman than a guard.

Mr. Farnood lunches regularly at the Kabul Serena Hotel, where the buffet costs about \$25 a head. Mr. Frozi has his own spot, Boccaccio, an upscale Italian eatery popular with well-heeled Afghans and foreigners, including American and European diplomats.

Lunching there on afternoon last month with four other men, Mr. Frozi declined to talk to a reporter. He said the American press had "destroyed the bank," and he dismissed his questioner with a wave of his hand.

THE PRICE OF GAS

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Americans, it's been 1,044 days since the United States Senate has passed a budget for America. Back in 2009, the average American family spent \$173.80 a month on gasoline. In 2011, that number had risen to \$368.09 a month on gasoline. What could you use that difference, \$194, what could you use that money for?

I guarantee you, with the policies coming out of this administration, gasoline prices are going up. It will be more than \$368 a month for gasoline unless we make changes to American energy policies and be energy independent.

STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 4170, a bill that will forgive student loan debt for millions of hardworking Americans.

This bill provides that if a student loan borrower makes payments equal to 10 percent of their discretionary income for a period of 10 years, the balance of their Federal student loan debt will be forgiven. This provides student loan borrowers with a second chance, those who have been struggling financially. By cutting this debt, this frees up their money to invest on their own. That will create new jobs throughout this country.

It's time for Congress to stand for the rights of student loan borrowers. It's time to forgive these student loan debts.

CONGRATULATING UALR WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Arkansas at Little Rock women's basketball team for securing a spot in this year's NCAA basketball tournament.

The game that put them into the tournament was an exciting one. The Lady Trojans came back from a 22-point deficit in the second half against Middle Tennessee and went on to win by one point in overtime.

With Taylor Ford's game-winning shot, the lady Trojans earned their second straight Sun Belt Conference tournament title and their third straight NCAA berth.

Congratulations to the entire UALR community, to Coach Joe Foley for his leadership this championship season, and to the student athletes on this

year's team. Thank you all for representing your school, the city of Little Rock, and our great State of Arkansas.

Good luck.

□ 1310

IN HONOR OF THE CYSTIC FIBROSIS FOUNDATION

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation. Cystic fibrosis is not a disease that affects a lot of Americans; but of the Americans it does affect, it compromises and, all too often, prematurely ends their lives.

I had the good and great fortune to just meet with a number of my constituents, including some young constituents who are with me in the Chamber today, who are very concerned and involved with cystic fibrosis.

We are an enlightened and good society because we invest the money necessary to solve the problems that affect our children, our people. We spend money on cures to eradicate diseases that compromise and end the quality of life for so many of our citizens. So as we do the hard work of getting our budget in order, I ask that this Chamber not erode that good work that we do.

16TH ANNIVERSARY OF BROTHERS TO RESCUE AIRPLANE SHOOT-DOWN BY CUBAN AUTHORITIES

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

Mr. RIVERA. I am here today to honor four American heroes—Carlos Costa, Mario de la Pena, Pablo Morales, and Armando Alejandro, Jr.—who tragically lost their lives 16 years ago at the hands of the Castro dictatorship.

On February 24, 1996, two planes from the humanitarian organization Brothers to the Rescue were shot down under Fidel Castro's and Raul Castro's direct orders as they conducted air search and rescue missions for Cuban refugees trying to reach freedom.

Raul Castro, himself, has publicly admitted to ordering the shoot-down over international waters so that there would be no evidence of the crime; but the Castro brothers have yet to be indicted for their role in ordering the murders of four innocent Americans, and they continue to commit blatant human rights violations towards peaceful civilians every day.

The United States should move immediately to indict the Castro brothers for this crime. We must not turn our backs on the Cuban people, who so tirelessly fight for freedom. I also ask, on

this tragic anniversary, that we continue to push forward for democratic change in Cuba.

THE FACTS ABOUT THE PRICE OF GAS IN AMERICA

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

Ms. FOXX. It is time that we emphasize the facts about the price of gas in our country.

On inauguration day for President Obama, the average price of gasoline was \$1.84 per gallon. Today, it's \$3.75. That's an increase of 103 percent. The estimate is that it will be \$4.50 by May. A 1-cent increase in the cost of gas equals \$1 billion out of the economy, and it's a \$4 million-per-day cost to consumers.

As the price of oil continues to rise at an alarming rate, the President and the congressional Democrats have tried to deflect the blame of their failed energy policies and point the finger at Wall Street speculators for the rise of the cost of a barrel of oil. But that's not the problem, Mr. Speaker. The Obama administration's energy policies are creating uncertainty in the marketplace and are driving up costs.

We need this President to assume the responsibility for the problems that he has caused the average hardworking American taxpayer and to do something about the price of gas.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PRESIDENT'S EXPORT COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to Executive order 12131, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, of the following Members of the House to the President's Export Council:

Mr. REICHERT, Washington
Mr. GERLACH, Pennsylvania
Mr. TIBERI, Ohio
Ms. SUTTON, Ohio
Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California

THE PREMEDITATED MURDER OF NEW-BORN BABIES JUSTIFIED AS MORALLY EQUIVALENT TO ABORTION

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Late last month, two bioethicists—Dr. Alberto Giubilini and Francesca Minerva—published an outrageous paper in the Journal of Medical Ethics, justifying the deliberate, premeditated murder of new-born babies during the first days and even weeks after birth.

Giubilini and Minerva wrote: "When circumstances occur after birth that

would have justified abortion, what we call after-birth abortion should be permissible.”

Madam Speaker, they’ve just coined a brand-new phrase, “after-birth abortion,” which is the killing of newborns, the killing of little children—boys and girls—immediately after their births and up to weeks later. These bioethicists argue that if a newly born child poses an economic burden on a family or is disabled or is unwanted that that child can be murdered in cold blood because the baby lacks intrinsic value, and according to Giubilini and Minerva, it is simply not a person.

Giubilini and Minerva write: “Actual people’s well-being—” and you and I, Madam Speaker, are actual people; adults are actual people according to them “—could be threatened by a newborn, even if healthy child, requiring energy, money and care which the family might happen to be in short supply of.”

As any parents—especially moms—will tell you, children in general, and newborns in particular, require an enormous amount of energy, money, and boatloads of love. If any of those things, however, are lacking or pose what Giubilini and Minerva call a “threat,” does that justify a death sentence? Are the lives of new-born children and new-born babies so cheap? so expendable?

The murder of newly born children is further justified by Giubilini and Minerva in this renowned journal’s article—why they carried it is certainly suspect—because new-born infants, like their slightly younger sisters and brothers in the womb, “cannot have formed any aim that she is prevented from accomplishing.” In other words, no dreams, no plans for the future, no “aims” that can be discerned, recognized or understood by adults equal no life at all.

This preposterous, arbitrary, and evil prerequisite for the attainment of legal personhood is not only bizarre; it is inhumane in the extreme. Stripped of its pseudo-intellectual underpinnings, the Giubilini and Minerva rationale for murdering newborns in the nursery is indistinguishable from any other child predator wielding a knife or a gun.

Giubilini and Minerva say the devaluation of new-born babies is inextricably linked to the devaluation of unborn children. Let me say that again. The devaluation of new-born babies, even into weeks of their lives outside their mothers’ wombs, is inextricably linked to the devaluation of unborn children and is, indeed, the logical extension of the abortion culture. They also write this: that they “propose to call the practice after-birth abortion rather than infanticide in order to emphasize that the moral status of the individual killed—” that is to say the baby “—is comparable to that of a fetus . . . Whether she will exist is exactly what our choice is about.”

So let’s again get this right because the unborn child has been deemed to be

a nonperson and can be killed at will. For the new-born child, who is very, very similar in almost every aspect except dependency and its not being a little bit more mature, the choice is, if it is unwanted, that the parents can order the killing, the execution, of that child.

□ 1320

Madam Speaker, these anti-child, pro-murder rationalizations remind me of other equally disturbing rants from highly credentialed individuals over the years. Princeton’s Peter Singer suggested a couple of years ago—and I quote him in pertinent part:

There are various things you can say that are sufficient to give moral status to a child after a few months, maybe 6 months or something like that, and you get perhaps a full moral status, really, only after 2 years.

Break that down. Only after 2 years, Madam Speaker, should we really confer a sense of personhood to a child who is no longer a baby anymore because of this particular intellectual’s perspective.

Dr. James Watson, the Nobel Laureate for unraveling the mystery of DNA many, many years ago, wrote in *Prism Magazine*:

If a child were not declared alive until 3 days after birth, then all parents could be allowed the choice only a few have under the present system. The doctor could allow the child to die if the parents so choose and save a lot of misery and suffering. I believe this view is the only rational, compassionate attitude to have.

Compassionate to allow a newborn to die? I think not.

In like manner, Dr. Francis Crick, who received the Nobel Prize along with Watson said:

No new-born infant should be declared human until it has passed certain tests regarding its genetic endowment and that if it fails these tests it forfeits the right to live.

Madam Speaker, the dehumanization of unborn children has been going on for decades. What is less understood and appreciated is the dehumanization of new-born and very young infants. That too has been going on for years, but it has gotten in the last few years demonstrably worse.

Giubilini and Minerva’s article must serve as a wake-up call. The lives of young children who are truly the most unprotected class of individuals in our society are under assault. Hard questions need to be asked and answered and defenders of life must be mobilized. I truly believe we have a duty to protect the weakest and the most vulnerable from violence; and now even the hospital nursery is not a place of refuge or sanctuary.

Madam Speaker, we must strive for consistency. I have been hearing about it for 32 years, and I’ve worked every single day of my congressional life on human rights issues, from human trafficking to religious freedom. I’ve written the Trafficking Victims Protection Act back in 2000 to combat modern-day slavery. I work against torture all over the world, wherever and whenever it

rears its horrific head. That is especially in places like China, North Korea, and elsewhere.

But I am left to wonder why so many who claim to be proponents of human rights systematically dehumanize and exclude the weakest and the most vulnerable human beings from legal protection.

Why the modern-day surge in prejudice and ugly bias against unborn children and now, by logical extension, new-born children? Why the policy of exclusion rather than inclusion? They are indeed part of the human family. We should embrace them, love them, and protect them. Why is lethal violence against children, abortion, and premeditated killing of new-born infants marketed and sold as somehow benign or progressive, enlightened, and compassionate? Why have so many good people turned a blind eye and looked askance as mothers are wounded by abortion and their babies in the womb pulverized by suction machines 20 to 30 times more powerful than household vacuum cleaners or dismembered with surgical knives or poisoned with chemicals? Looking back, how could anyone in the House or the Senate or President Clinton justify the hideous procedure called “partial birth abortion”?

Madam Speaker, since 1973, well over 54 million babies have had abortion forced upon them. Some of those children have been exterminated in the second and third trimester. These are known as pain-capable babies. Those kids have suffered excruciating pain as the abortionist committed his violence upon him or her. Why are some surprised that now the emerging class of victims, new-born kids, new-born children, are being slaughtered in Holland and elsewhere while a perverse proposal to murder any new-born children, sick or healthy, is advanced in an otherwise serious and respected ethics journal?

I urge Members to read this article. It will make you sick. It certainly is the opening salvo in an assault on new-born children.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, children born and unborn are precious. Children sick, disabled, or healthy possess fundamental human rights that no sane or compassionate society can abridge. The premeditated murder of new-born babies, those who are 1 day old after birth, 2 weeks, 3 weeks old is now being justified as being morally equivalent to abortion.

I respectfully submit, Madam Speaker, that the Congress, the courts, the President, and society at large have a sacred duty to protect all children from violence, murder, and exploitation. We don’t have a moment to lose. The child predators are working overtime to create more victims.

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

TYRANTS AND DESPOTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 48 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, yesterday a good friend of mine, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, became the first U.S. Senator to publicly call for U.S.-led air strikes to halt the violence in Syria.

Respectfully, I disagree with the Senator from Arizona. Our main goal in the Middle East is to protect our interests and the interests of our major ally, Israel.

If we are to be dragged into a civil war in Syria for humanitarian reasons, I would respectfully remind Senator MCCAIN and the President that they do not have the power to unilaterally start a war. The authority to initiate war is vested by the Constitution exclusively in Congress. The War Powers Act was enacted into law over a Presidential veto—not an easy thing to accomplish—to fulfill the intent of the Framers of the Constitution of the United States in requiring that the President has to seek the consent of Congress before the introduction of the United States Armed Forces into hostile action.

Section 2(c) of the War Powers Act provides that no attempt by the President to introduce the United States Armed Forces into hostile action may be made under the War Powers Act unless, number one, there is a declaration of war; number two, a specific authorization; or, number three, a national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possession, or its Armed Forces.

□ 1330

The Constitution and the War Powers Act are not a list of suggestions; they are the law of the land, the law the President of the United States and every Member of Congress swears to protect and defend. Contrary to Defense Secretary Panetta's assertion before the Senate Armed Services Committee the other day, international permission does not trump congressional permission. If the President is even remotely entertaining the idea of engaging in military action in Syria, he must seek formal authorization from Congress to attack Syria first.

While the violence in Syria is appalling and Syrian President Bashar al-Assad is certainly no friend of the United States, before any military action is taken, the President must tell Congress and the American people by what right we attack Syria. Syria has not declared war on the United States nor attacked the United States, our territories, possessions, or Armed Forces. It is not our responsibility to intervene simply because violence erupts in another nation. If it were, then bombs should be falling on a number of countries, including Yemen,

Zimbabwe, Uganda, Sudan, Rwanda, North Korea, Burma, and I could go on and on.

In fact, just this past Tuesday, March 6, the former top United Nations humanitarian official in Sudan warned that the country's military is carrying out crimes against humanity in the country's southern Nuba Mountains in acts that remind him of the 2003-2004 genocide in Darfur. Sudan President Omar al-Bashir is under indictment for war crimes by the International Criminal Court for killings and rapes committed in Darfur. Roughly 5,000 people have died in Syria compared to 400,000 in Darfur. How are the actions of al-Assad any worse than the actions of al-Bashir? Where is the call to bomb Sudan?

Madam Speaker, we could have a war of the week if we went after every tyrant that is committing these kinds of atrocities. Well-respected organizations, including Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, have documented the crimes committed by Burma's military. Many of the abuses committed by the Burmese regime represent some of the world's most horrific ongoing atrocities. For example, the regime has destroyed over 3,300 ethnic minority villages in eastern Burma alone, recruited tens of thousands of children, child soldiers, forced up to 2 million people to flee their homes as refugees and internally displaced, and used rape as a weapon of war against the women of Burma. How is the violence going on in Syria any worse than the destruction and degradation committed by the Burmese junta?

North Korea is widely acknowledged to be the worst violator of human rights in the world. The regime cares so little for its people that authorities are imprisoning, for 6 months in labor training camps, anybody who did not participate in the organized gatherings during the mourning period for the late Kim Jung Il, or who did participate but didn't cry and didn't seem genuine. Six months in a labor camp for not crying? North Korea is a recognized state sponsor of terror, a proliferator of nuclear weapons, and a direct threat to United States forces in South Korea, yet no one is urging the bombing of North Korea.

The world is full of despotic and oppressive regimes. The sad fact is that even in 2012, more of the world labors in the shadow of tyranny than in the daylight of democracy and the rule of law. Many of the world's leaders are at least as bad as Qadhafi and al-Assad, and many are even worse. We are not the world's policeman.

Even if we are willing to ignore the hypocrisy of using military force in Syria for "humanitarian reasons" while we turn a blind eye to the other equally pressing humanitarian crises around the world, there are several practical issues surrounding an operation in Syria that make it ill-advised, and this case should be made to the

Congress if the President or Senator MCCAIN push for military action against Syria.

Libya and Syria are very different countries with different geographies and different militaries. The Libyan army of Qadhafi was far less capable than Syria's army under al-Assad. Its forces were not as well-trained, well-fed or well-armed. In fact, Qadhafi had decisively turned on his military forces after a series of military coup attempts in the 1980s and 1990s. In the place of a professional military, Qadhafi increasingly relied on the revolutionary committees, many of whom defected en masse within days of protests breaking out against his rule.

Even against such a weak opposition, NATO's bombing campaign only succeeded in pushing the loyalist forces back. The rebels were unable to advance very far. As the battle turned in a stalemate, NATO and others were forced to raise their commitment, and the United States spent billions of dollars in that conflict as well, without congressional approval. Trainers were sent in, and NATO personnel shared space in the rebels' operations room in Benghazi. Qatar had to ship in approximately 30 consignment of Milan anti-tank cannons and Belgian FN rifles. During the final assault on Qadhafi's compound, Qatari forces even found themselves leading the charge.

Nearly a year into the civil war to oust President al-Assad, the Syrian army remains largely intact. In addition, Syria has a substantial chemical and biological weapons capability and thousands of surface-to-air missiles and shoulder-launched missiles, making Syria much more of a threat to attacking air forces than anything Libya had. How will the American people react if an American pilot is shot down and captured by the Syrian army, or worse, Syria's terrorist proxy, Hezbollah? And that's why Congress must be consulted before we take any action; and I would urge any of my colleagues who are considering urging the President to take unilateral action, that they remember the War Powers Act and the Constitution.

In addition, if air power is to be used against Assad's regime, as it was to overthrow Qadhafi's, then it is certain that the venture will take longer than the 6 months it took in Libya. The price in Syrian blood on both sides, the rebels and the government, will be higher, and the geography of the country, without the vast stretches of desert between towns that were turned into shooting galleries when Qadhafi tried to remove his forces, would guarantee more civilian casualties from NATO bombs than occurred in Libya. How many civilian casualties are acceptable to prevent a humanitarian crisis?

Other questions that need to be addressed: What will Israel do if Hezbollah responds to Western military actions against Syria by launching rockets into Israel? What will Iran do to protect its ally in Damascus?

Finally, brutally, we must ask the question: Is the devil we know better than the devil we don't know? And here I'd like to divert just a minute from my prepared text.

When we saw the changes in Libya, we didn't know who was going to take over. We didn't know that sharia law was going to be the rule of law there, which took them back into a more radical stance.

In Egypt, the elections that have taken place after Mubarak was removed from power have led to the suspicion, very strong suspicion, that sharia law will be imposed in Egypt as well. We don't know what that will do to the Camp David Peace Accords and whether or not that could cause our ally, Israel, to be in more danger. We need to know, before we get into a war to change regimes, what we're getting in place of the people we are removing.

Qadhafi, as bad as he was, and I didn't like him at all and I think he should have been removed, was no threat to the United States or our allies. He was a threat to his own people. And yet we decided unilaterally to go in and get him, and we did, along with the French and our NATO allies. And now some of my colleagues are talking about going into Syria and removing al-Assad without congressional approval, unilaterally by the President, and we don't know what we'll be getting.

We have found recently from reports that al Qaeda forces are in Syria assisting the rebels. Now we have to make sure that if al-Assad goes, that we don't have a base of operations for the enemies of freedom in Syria. We know what we've got. We don't like it, but we better be careful before we start making a regime change there that al Qaeda doesn't take over or have a big influence in Syria that will cause problems for the United States, our ally Israel, and others in the Middle East later on.

While Senator McCAIN, my good friend, may angrily deny it, the assessment of the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, and half a dozen intelligence reports and independent news agencies is that al Qaeda has inserted themselves inside armed operations groups in Syria, as I just said. Al Qaeda is there. They're the mortal enemy of everything that we believe in, and they're involved with the rebels, and we need to be sure that we're doing the right thing if we participate and if the Congress approves of some action in Syria.

Do we really want to undertake a "significant military commitment"—those are the words of Marine General James Mattis, head of the U.S. Central Command—to create so-called safe havens in Syria to deliver weapons and supplies to al Qaeda fighters from Iraq?

□ 1340

I believe that the sun is slowly setting on the Assad regime in Syria. I sincerely hope that we are not pushed

into a war we do not fully understand and that we don't really need to be in.

I must remind my colleagues in both the House and the Senate one more time: Neither the President nor a few Senators nor Members of Congress have the right to demand or push for unilateral action by the United States without the Congress of the United States being involved in the decision-making process. That has happened in other countries in the past. It happened in Libya. But it should not happen anymore because the Constitution, the War Powers Act, and the rule of law must be maintained by the Congress of the United States.

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

HOW TO GROW THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate the time and your staying with me late on a Thursday afternoon to do this. Is it Thursday afternoon, Madam Speaker, or Friday afternoon? It's Thursday afternoon. I'm losing track of my days because I'm on the Budget Committee, Madam Speaker, I'm on the Budget Committee, and this is budget season, and we are going nonstop meeting after meeting after meeting after meeting to try to find that budget that not only guarantees that our safety net programs like Medicare and Social Security will be there for generations to come, but that also guarantees that America will be here for generations to come. Because if you've looked at the deficits that we're running, if you've looked at the economic circumstances that we're in, if you've looked at the \$15 trillion—now \$16 trillion—that we've passed on to our children and our grandchildren, you know that our economic future is at risk.

We talk so much, Madam Speaker, about the things that divide us in Washington. I sometimes think that's unfortunate. There's really a lot that unites us. And I brought with me today some quotes from President Obama in the State of the Union speeches that he's given right here between where you and I stand today, Madam Speaker, when he has come to the Joint Session of Congress to deliver.

This is what he said in 2010. The President said:

We should start where most new jobs do, in small businesses, companies that begin when an entrepreneur takes a chance on a dream or a worker decides it's time that she became her own boss. Through sheer grit and determination, these companies have weathered the recession and they are ready to grow.

Wow. Who is that talking, Madam Speaker? Is that a Republican? Is that a Democrat? That's an American.

That's an American talking about the American Dream of being your own boss and growing a business, employing your neighbors and growing the American economy. The President understood that when he gave his State of the Union speech in 2010.

In 2011, Madam Speaker, the President returned right here to this very same room, and he said this:

At stake right now is not who wins the next election. At stake is whether new jobs and industries take root in this country or somewhere else.

He was exactly right. He's exactly right about the grit that it takes for entrepreneurs to grow jobs in this country, and he is right that the question is not who wins the next election; the question is how do we ensure that new jobs and new industries take place in America instead of somewhere else around the globe.

Again, in 2011, Madam Speaker, the President said this in the State of the Union speech:

We measure progress by the success of our people, by the jobs they can find and the quality of life those jobs offer; by the prospects of a small business owner who dreams of turning a good idea into a thriving enterprise, and by the opportunities for a better life that we pass on to our children.

Madam Speaker, we see so much in the newspaper about what divides us in this country. These are words that unite us, words that Republicans, Democrats—Americans from north and south, east and west—can all get behind. They don't stop in 2011.

Here he is in 2012, just 2 months ago, Madam Speaker, right here in this Chamber:

To reduce barriers to growth and investment, I've ordered a review of government regulations. When we find rules that are unnecessary, that put an unnecessary burden on business, we will fix them.

He said that two months ago, right here in this Chamber.

Madam Speaker, you know, as I know, that business in this country is under assault. And when business in this country is under assault, American families in this country are under assault, entrepreneurship in this country is under assault, the very basis of the American Dream, of being able to put in a hard day's work for a hard day's wage, to be able to change your station in life by the power of your ideas and the sweat of your brow, is at risk. And why?

I have here, Madam Speaker, a chart that shows the regulatory burden in this Nation. What it actually charts is those regulations that come out of Washington, D.C., where implementation costs alone are \$100 million a year—the implementation costs alone. Not what it burdens businesses with in terms of lost revenues, not the number of jobs that it kills, not how many jobs it pushes overseas to China, to India and elsewhere instead of keeping those jobs in America, but just what it costs out of someone's wallet to actually implement that regulation, and this is what we see.

In 1995, of course, there was a Republican Congress with Newt Gingrich leading as Speaker and a Democratic President with Bill Clinton. You see this kind of level line at about 80 regulations a year—80 regulations a year. It goes along and along, through the Clinton administration, through the Bush administration. And then we get to 2006, when America decided they could tell no difference between Republicans and Democrats, and they threw the Republicans out of control of the Congress—as well they should have, as well they should have—but what happened—elections have consequences—when they threw Republicans out of the leadership of the U.S. House of Representatives, the number of regulations began to skyrocket. Even with President Bush in the White House, this Congress is where that legislation begins, the number of regulations on small business begins to skyrocket. Then we get to 2008, when President Obama is sworn in to the White House, when Democrats rule both the House and the Senate, and you see regulations and the burden they cause rise right to the top.

Madam Speaker, the decisions we make in this Chamber have consequences. It's not nothing to tell a small business that there's a new rule or regulation that that small business has to comply with because it takes money and it takes time to comply with those regulations. They need to be important, and we need to take a look at it. The President says all the right things. I just couldn't agree with him more.

To reduce barriers to growth and investment, I've ordered a review of government regulations. When we find rules that are an unnecessary burden on business, we will fix them.

The speech says all the right things, Madam Speaker. But the evidence suggests that we are on a regulatory spending spree the likes of which this country has never seen. And if you think for a minute we cannot destroy the entrepreneurial spirit in this country, you're mistaken.

Do you know that entrepreneurial activity, Madam Speaker, is at a historic low in America today? I'm not talking about the number of businesses that succeed. I'm talking about the number of Americans who dare to try.

Economic good times come, and economic bad times come. The economy will always ebb and flow. But when Americans are afraid to try, when the regulatory burden is such that Americans do not dare to try, we are threatening the future of this Nation and the economic success of our children and our grandchildren.

They published an editorial in *The Wall Street Journal*, Madam Speaker. It was written by one of the four founders of Home Depot. Now, Madam Speaker, as you know, I'm a freshman Congressman from the great State of Georgia, birthplace of Home Depot. I hope folks have an opportunity to go and shop there. I hope you've had an

opportunity to take your kids over and do some of the morning craft projects that they do there at the Home Depot and wear the orange apron.

□ 1350

But this is what that founder said:

If we got together today—the four of them who got together to found Home Depot—if we got together today with our same idea, our same intellect, our same capital, if we gathered together today, we could not make Home Depot succeed. Why? Because the regulatory burden in America is too great to allow for business growth.

Madam Speaker, these challenges that we face are not global challenges about which we have no control. They are domestic challenges about which we have complete control. We choose, Madam Speaker, which regulations we pass and which ones we say no to. I'm proud to say, Madam Speaker, since this new Congress was sworn in, we have not implemented one more regulation on this line. We are trying to turn back. We had the JOBS Act this week to turn back the clock on that regulatory burden to allow folks with energy and creativity to begin to grow jobs again, but it's a team sport.

Let me take you back to the rhetoric, Madam Speaker. You know, rhetoric has a pejorative term to it. I shouldn't say rhetoric, Madam Speaker. Let me take you back to the State of the Union speech that the President gave right here in this Chamber. Again, I listened to those State of the Union speeches. And I confess, I may be a rock-solid conservative Republican from the Deep South, but those speeches move me from time to time. They move me because I agree with the words that the President says. I just disagree with the actions that he does.

Here we go, 2009. State of the Union speech again, Madam Speaker, right here in this Chamber. The President said this:

Given these realities, everyone in this Chamber, Democrats and Republicans, will have to sacrifice some worthy priorities for which there are no dollars, and that includes me.

He says leadership begins with him, and he's absolutely right. You know, Madam Speaker, we don't have control over the whole government in this Chamber, but we do have control over the budget of this Chamber. The budget that you've allocated to my office, to the Seventh District of Georgia, is lower this year than the budget that the Seventh District of Georgia had in 2008. These things about which we have control, Madam Speaker—we know leadership begins at home, and we are starting with the tough budget cuts right here in the House Chamber.

The President said the same thing in 2009. He said there has to be some sacrifice of worthy priorities for which there are no dollars. And when we have a \$16 trillion deficit, Madam Speaker, we know that there are no dollars.

This is 2010—same President, same State of the Union speech right here in

this Chamber, and the President says this:

Families across the country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions. The Federal Government should do the same.

He's absolutely right. He is absolutely right, Madam Speaker. Families across this country are absolutely making changes, absolutely doing what it takes to balance their budgets. The Federal Government can and must do the same. He said it in 2009. He said it in 2010. Madam Speaker, here we are in 2011, same State of the Union speech, he says this:

Every day, families sacrifice to live within their means. They deserve a government that does the same.

Madam Speaker, again, he's absolutely right. He was right when he said it in 2009, he was right when he said it in 2010, he was right when he said it in 2011. But, Madam Speaker, he hasn't done anything about it. That's the challenge. It's an election year, and folks like to say all the right things, Madam Speaker. But I didn't come to this Chamber as a freshman to say the right things. I came to this Chamber to do the right things.

What I have here is a chart of the President's budget that he submitted this year. Now, let me first say, Madam Speaker, that as you know, the United States Senate has ignored the laws of the United States of America and has not submitted a budget to this Congress in 1,044 days, and they have said they're not going to do it again this year. HARRY REID said it would be foolish, foolish to do a budget. It just so happens the law requires them to do a budget, but foolish he said. The President, to his credit, did put forward a budget.

I say "to his credit" because it's hard. A budget is a moral document. I didn't bring a copy of the President's budget with me today, Madam Speaker, but it's about 12 inches tall. You have to go line by line by line and talk about what's important to you. Is there enough money to go around for everything? No, there's not. So, what's important to you? Where are you going to put your dollars? The President, to his credit, went through that very hard process and sent a budget to Capitol Hill.

What I have here is a visual representation of the budget that he sent, Madam Speaker. As you can see, I have a white dotted line here that represents current law. This white dotted line that runs right through here is the current law. If we do nothing, Madam Speaker, if we do absolutely nothing, this is the trajectory on which American debt will grow—if we do nothing.

The President submitted his budget in February. I've represented the President's budget by this large red line, by this large red triangle. The red line is what the President proposes that the deficit be. I mean, we can go back to his 2011 State of the Union address where he said, "Every day, families sacrifice to live within their means."

The government must do the same.” We can go back to 2010 when he said the same thing. We can go back to 2009 when he said the same thing. But in 2012, when he submits his budget, he actually runs the deficit up in 2012, up in 2013, up in 2014, up in 2015—and ’16 and ’17 and ’18 and ’19 and ’20 and ’21.

What I’ve done, Madam Speaker, is I’ve blown up a little circle way out there at 2022, this little green space right here. Way out there in 2022 the President’s budget begins to reduce the deficit that this country faces from what it is under current law today.

Madam Speaker, that’s my frustration. How often is it in this body that we hear folks say all the right things: “Families sacrifice to live within their means,” said the President. “They deserve a government that does the same.” 2011. 2010: “Families across the country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions. The Federal Government must do the same.” 2009: “Given these realities, Democrats and Republicans will have to sacrifice some worthy priorities for which there are no dollars, and that includes me.” But, Madam Speaker, the evidence reveals exactly the opposite.

What folks may not know—and I encourage you to go and read the President’s budget. Again, he did the right thing by submitting it, and I admire him for doing that. It’s located at www.omb—Office of Management and Budget—omb.gov. It’s got charts and graphs and all the numbers. But what happens in that budget, Madam Speaker, is taxes go up by \$2 trillion; \$2 trillion taxes go up on the American people.

Now listen, we’re in deficit times, we have revenue issues here. We need to have that debate about taxation. But my question to the White House is: How can you raise taxes by \$2 trillion on the American people and not reduce America’s deficit by one penny for 9 years? The answer is that you raise those taxes by \$2 trillion, and then you go and you spend it on other priorities.

The President knows and has said in State of the Union Address after State of the Union Address that we have to curb the appetite for spending in Washington. And yet here in the fourth budget, the last budget of his first term—and, candidly, the most serious budget of his administration—he still has not found those items that he is willing to be honest with the American people about and say, we can’t afford this, this puts our children and our grandchildren—and, in fact, our entire Republic—at risk.

Now, there’s a lot of blame that goes on in this town, Madam Speaker. I don’t take any pride in pointing out the challenges of other people’s ideas, but I do take pride in pointing out the merit of our own ideas. What I have here, Madam Speaker, is another graphical representation of the tough choices that we in this House, Madam Speaker, with your support and my

support and the support of Members on both sides of the aisles, the tough choices that we agreed to make on behalf of America.

What I have here is a chart that shows America’s debt as a percentage of GDP, as a percentage of the entire economy. Down here in black, Madam Speaker, is the historic debt. You see down here in the World War II era, the 1940s and coming down in the 1950s, this is the historic debt of America. During the global conflict that was World War II, we ran America’s debt up to 100 percent of the size of the entire economy. Why? Because we were fighting a madman overseas and everything depended on us winning.

□ 1400

And so we borrowed to the hilt, Madam Speaker, 100 percent of GDP, to invest in the war effort that saved freedom around the globe.

Well, then we began to pay those debts down, Madam Speaker. Come forward to 2000, 2010. This red line is the current path of America. This red line—if, as the President dodged the tough decisions this year, if the Congress dodges those tough decisions, this red line represents where America is headed.

Here we have at 100, Madam Speaker, that level of debt during the largest conflict this world has ever seen, at which the freedom of the planet hung in the balance. We are headed to that level and higher, Madam Speaker, 100 percent higher, 200 percent higher, 300 percent higher, 400 percent higher, with absolutely no conflict of that size on the horizon. We’re just spending it here. Not to fight a national emergency, not to rise to meet an international challenge, but just spending it here.

The green line here, Madam Speaker represents the plan that you and I and this House have passed. You know, it’s the only budget that’s passed anywhere in the city of Washington, D.C., in the last 3 years?

Only one budget has passed anywhere in the city of Washington, D.C., in 3 years, and it was this one, the one that we did right here, Madam Speaker, that changes the trajectory of America’s economic path; that takes us from a path to ruin back to a path of possibility and opportunity, ultimately paying down our Federal debt.

Well, how did we do that?

We did that by making tough decisions. We did that by going into the budget and asking the question, how can we do better?

You know, Madam Speaker, in the great State of Georgia, if you talk to our Department of Transportation, they will tell you that we can build a Georgia road, same mile of pavement, same safety specifications, same everything, we can build a mile of Georgia highway for about 60 percent of the exact same mile of Federal highway?

Why? Because of the regulatory burden that begins in Washington, D.C.,

and flows downward. Because every agency that touches every dollar this town sends back to the people that it took those dollars from skims just a little bit off the top for administrative costs, just a little bit off the top.

We have to find ways to do better, and we have to find ways, Madam Speaker, to behave differently.

This is one example. How many town hall meetings, have you had, Madam Speaker, where folks have come up to you and said, dag gummit, Madam Speaker, I’ve paid into Medicare all my life. I need those benefits to be there for me when I retire. I hear that all the time.

Shoot, I’ve been paying into Medicare all my life. I need those benefits to be there too. I absolutely agree and understand why it is when folks have invested through their taxes, through their paychecks, in a promise that the government committed that would be there for them in their time of need, why it is that Americans believe the government should come through on that.

But there are things about Medicare we don’t like to talk about, Madam Speaker. I have here a chart of Medicare revenue, where it is the dollars come in to pay for Medicare. Because if you haven’t looked at the numbers recently, Madam Speaker, you know we’re spending about 40 percent of every penny in the Federal Government, about 40 percent of every penny in Federal spending goes to Medicare and Medicaid. Medicare and Medicaid, just two programs, consume 40 percent of every dollar that we spend.

In 1964 there was no Medicare and Medicaid; didn’t spend a penny in those directions. Now we spend 40 cents out of every dollar, and that number’s growing.

Well, what you learn when you get to Congress, Madam Speaker, and you start going through all these committee hearings, is there’s a lot that they didn’t tell you back home. Medicare part A, that’s the hospital program. That’s the part for our parents and our grandparents when you go into the hospital. In fact, when we designed the Medicare program in 1965, as Americans, we said folks should not lose everything they have when they have a catastrophic illness and get hospitalized. We should have a support system to protect them in their time of need. And we did. We created Medicare part A. And that’s what every working American, whether they started working at 15 or 16 or 17 or 18, they see that FICA line on their check, Madam Speaker, those dollars are coming out of every American’s check, no matter how much they earn, all the way to the top of the income spectrum. Every paycheck has about 3½ percent taken out to fund Medicare.

Now, what happens? That amount that’s taken out of all the American paychecks is represented in this light blue line here. It covers about 84 percent of Medicare part A costs, Medicare part A, this hospital insurance

that we're providing. Every penny that we've taken from every American covers about 84 cents of the cost of the program.

But you know, after we created Medicare part A, Madam Speaker, we created Medicare part B. Medicare part B is funded with zero dollars out of your and my paycheck, zero dollars out of any paycheck of anyone in America. Not one penny in Medicare taxes is taken out to fund Medicare part B.

Now, we charge Medicare part B premiums, Madam Speaker. Part B is what pays for your doctor visits and supplies, things like that.

We ask Medicare beneficiaries to write the government a check to cover 25 percent of those part B costs. But the other 75 percent—74 here because there's a little interest that gets picked up in there—74 percent of all of those costs are picked up by the American taxpayer, just out of general revenues.

You wonder where the money goes. Understand, we have told America that you pay into Medicare, and so you shall receive from Medicare. You've paid in all your life so it will be there in your time of need, and so we will ensure that it is there in your time of need. But that's just Medicare part A, about \$200 billion.

Medicare part B is exactly the same size, at \$200 billion, and we never paid a penny for it, but the government is pushing all those dollars out the door.

Move on to Medicare part D, Madam Speaker. Medicare part D, that largest expansion of entitlement programs in the history of the country since 1967, implemented by a Republican Congress and a Republican President.

Yes, we charge Americans. We ask Americans to pay some beneficiary premiums to get Medicare part D. About 11 percent of all Medicare part D revenue comes from beneficiaries' premiums. Eighty-three percent is picked up by the American taxpayer at large. No one ever paid a penny out of their pocket to deposit in a trust fund for that benefit. It's just a benefit that sprang up out of thin air, Madam Speaker, and 83 percent of it is subsidized by American taxpayers across this country.

Now, I bring up these numbers for two reasons, Madam Speaker. Number one, because folks just don't know. Folks just don't know. You're at home, and you're talking about Medicare. You're looking at your paycheck. You see that you're paying Medicare taxes. You think those taxes are going into the trust fund to fund the Medicare program. Well, they are. They're just going into the trust fund to fund the Medicare part A program. Medicare part B and Medicare part D have absolutely no trust funds at all. They never have. They get funded out of general revenues. We have made promises to people about benefits that they will receive for which they never paid a penny.

Madam Speaker, we have \$16 trillion in debt that we're passing on to our

children and our grandchildren. The days of being able to promise people something for nothing are long gone. We have to be able to have candid conversations with today's seniors, with tomorrow's seniors—I'm in my forties—with my generation, Madam Speaker, and we have to renegotiate the Medicare contract with folks my age and younger. We have to do it.

America cannot, Madam Speaker, sustain this path of debt. You know, I feel a little disingenuous putting this chart up here, Madam Speaker. This is the one of the current path of debt. The truth is, that if you're running the computer models, they really break down somewhere right about here. They really say that the laws of economics, what we know about the world banking system, what we know about commerce in this country, what they really say is right about here America's going to cease to exist anyway; that the numbers just don't work; that the economy just won't function; that America, as we know it, will be over here.

It's not going to get as bad as I've presented, Madam Speaker, because the Republic, as we know it, will have gone away.

You know, we talk so much about the debt limit on this floor, Madam Speaker, the debt limit, as if it's something that Congress passes. Every American knows a debt limit is not a law on a piece of paper. A debt limit is when you can't find anyone to lend you money anymore. The debt limit comes when the Chinese say, No, America, you're a bad credit risk, we're not going to give you anymore. When the Germans say, No, America, you're a bad credit risk, we're not going to give you anymore.

On the Budget Committee we had that hearing, Madam Speaker, and we brought in economists from the left and economists from the right, and we asked them all, folks, tell us how much longer do we have? When does the real debt limit get here, when the American economy can no longer find anyone willing to lend to them?

And this is what they said. Madam Speaker, the liberal economist that came to talk to us said we think you have 5 years, 5 years before that day comes. The conservative economists said we think you have 2 years before that day comes. So we have a window, Madam Speaker, between 2 and 5 years, when the entire economy is going to begin to come unraveled, when American jobs and businesses are going to be at risk, when our entire experiment as a Republic will be challenged.

□ 1410

The President in his budget this year introduced a \$2 trillion tax increase and found a way to save us just a little bit of money 9 years from now. Madam Speaker, we don't have 9 years.

Every day that passes makes the problem harder to solve. Every day that passes removes arrows from our quiver of solutions. Every day that

passes threatens the survival of our Republic, and that is why we presented the path to prosperity, Madam Speaker, as a solution.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for providing me the time today to talk a little bit about this budget. I hope folks will go to the Web and learn for themselves the truth of the challenges facing this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PRODUCING AMERICAN ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it's always a pleasure to get to address the House in your presence.

I tell you what. There was quite an election in November of 2010. One of the results was a freshman named ROB WOODALL from Georgia, and the gentleman from Georgia does his constituents proud. It's a pleasure to serve with him.

His comments, most meaningful. When we think of what is going on today in the world of energy and the world of constitutional rights, in the world of religious freedom, there are things to be excited about, and there are things to be greatly saddened about.

When I came to Congress as a freshman, was sworn in in January of 2005, it looked like our days of being an energy giant in the world were over. Sure, we were the kings of technology, but we were hearing from people that use natural gas for most of the stuff it seems like—you look around the room and see whether it's plastics, or if you've got food, probably had fertilizer, natural gas used to make the fertilizer—it has had such a role in many things.

In recent months I've asked some scientists, do you see anything on the horizon that might replace natural gas for the use as a feed stock for so many things we make, and manufacture, in this country. I was told not for at least 30 years or so.

The amazing thing, though, in the last 7 years that should have everybody in America excited, is all the energy that's been found in America. Here we are having to all wring our hands, lower our heads, oh, woe is us, gas prices going up. We've got a President, unfortunately, seems like a nice fellow, but he doesn't know anything about energy other than what's handed to him that he could read about. I wish that it was otherwise, but the fact is he keeps making statements that are not borne out by the facts with regard to energy.

I've been excited as a member of the Natural Resources Committee to find out all of the things that are being found. In east Texas, where I am, we are fortunate because there was a natural gas formation that Louisiana was

kind enough to share with us. It's called the Haynesville shale. For that reason, there's more natural gas being produced in east Texas than any of the other 31 congressional districts in America.

There's the Marcellus shale, Pennsylvania, runs up into New York State. But a massive natural gas formation. The ability of hydraulic fracking, which has never been shown by a single scientific study to pollute water, despite some of the stories—once they're investigated people find out they're not true. Because the purpose of hydraulic fracking is to push oil or natural gas out of the formation and up. There is a vested interest in making sure that everything is sealed thousands of feet below where drinking water would be found. There is no scientific study that finds hydraulic fracking has polluted drinking water.

Yet, you look at the things it's done. Depending on who you believe, we probably have at least 300 years of natural gas, even at an accelerated rate. People are now looking at having their cars running on natural gas.

Then, just when we think, well, natural gas is the thing of the future, now we've got 300 years in which to find a suitable alternative without bankrupting the country trying to create something in the way of solar power or wind power—one day solar power I think will be a very viable source, but in the meantime, this President, in supporting his cronies who are manufacturing solar panels, some of them not doing anything but enriching themselves—but the market will take care of these things.

When it is economically feasible and economically viable, then we'll see things like solar power become a reality. But it's no time soon. In the meantime, the President's friends are being enriched, the country is being taken to the poorhouse on a fast track. There is no need for that.

Natural gas is the cleanest burning form of energy we could hope for.

We're the largest repository of coal in the world.

Then we find all of this oil, this huge place in North Dakota. I've met with a third group now who tells me that in Utah, this hard reddish brown rock that you wouldn't think has oil, when put under intense heat, without oxygen, you get oil. They say it's \$60 a barrel. They can make \$10 or more a barrel. They're doing it right now in Estonia. The same kind of rock, the same kind of thing. Now the third group has told me they believe they think they can get 3 trillion barrels of oil from just one area of Utah. Then it goes into northwest Colorado and southwest Wyoming, from what I'm told.

We know that there have been enough wells drilled in the Middle East that all the oil that is there, we pretty well know where it is. We have a good idea from the way the wells and the fields are being depleted about how much is left.

□ 1420

Information that I've been given indicates that there is probably somewhere around a trillion barrels of oil left in the Middle East—a trillion. Yet, in one area of Utah, we're told there may be three times that much. Sadly, however, this administration does what it has done repeatedly for over 3 years: they put more and more of our resources off limits. So when the President reads the teleprompter and says, There's just nothing I can do to change the price of gasoline, would that we could get information to him to show him how wrong that is. There is oil; there is natural gas; there is coal.

We've also been given the information that when gasoline hits \$4 a gallon, normally at least 25 percent a third or so is purely speculation. So I realize the President wouldn't say there's nothing he can do about the skyrocketing price of gasoline. He surely means that, or I'm sure he wouldn't say it.

Yet the truth is, if the President were to go on television tonight and announce, Do you know what, folks? My Secretary of the Interior in January of 2009 immediately on coming into office announced that he was sending back the checks for leases in this small area. It may have involved some in northwest Colorado, but it was certainly in Utah. He sent back the checks and said that we're not going to allow leases on these areas that were let at the midnight hour by the Bush administration. Well, we'd give him the benefit of the doubt and just say, apparently he didn't know at the time what he was saying was not true.

Those leases, as he admitted in one of our hearings as I had to keep pushing to get the answer, were part of a 7-year process. Companies can't just come in and bid massive amounts of money on a lease on which they expect to produce oil or gas until they've had a chance to study the information. It was a 7-year process—not the midnight hour, but 7 years. Secretary Salazar finally admitted that. It was 7 years just to get to the point where people could bid on those leases—a massive amount of Federal land. The majority of Utah is Federal land. He put it off limits and returned the checks after the 7-year process was completed. Fortunately, during the prior 7, 8 years of the Bush administration, there were other areas where leases were let and permits were granted and drilling commenced.

I don't think we ought to be allowing anybody to drill who has had as many safety violations as British Petroleum had in the gulf. If you can't have less than 800 egregious safety violations in your drilling, you've got no business drilling on American soil or over American waters. Yet they were allowed to drill when, during comparable times, Exxon and others had one, two, none. They had about 800.

It appears the reason they were allowed to keep going, even though there was such a great lack of safety, is that

they were about to come out publicly as being a big energy company that embraced the President's cap-and-trade bill. That was going to be big news, so they didn't want to alienate a big energy company. Of course, they were going to be getting even richer dealing in the carbon credits. Consistent with the crony capitalism, they were going to be thrown lots of bonuses through that.

But anyway, this ought to be an exciting time in American history. We have energy galore. A man from China told me that he thought they had figured out what we were doing for our energy policy. We keep declaring all of our energy off limits, more and more of it. We don't use the energy we've got. We do have more energy, when you consider all of the resources, than any other country in the world.

While the President is busy out there deriding America for using too much energy, we make the world safer; we make the world more peaceable; we make the environment cleaner. When manufacturers leave America and go to other places in the world, they pollute four to 10 times more in most of the places that those manufacturers are going to. If you really care about the environment, then keep them here. Many of them are union jobs. You'd think the unions would embrace what we're trying to do rather than what the President is doing, but I understand loyalty runs deep.

We've got health care that has been rammed down the throats of Americans. The majority didn't want it. The elections revealed that in November of 2010. All of the polls revealed that throughout 2009 and 2010. We got it forced upon us when, really, what this government does best is play referee. It makes sure everybody is playing fair and playing by the rules. The problem is, when we become a player, when we become a coach and the referee, we're terrible at all three. When we get so involved in owning part of Wall Street that we're not watching what's going on, you have things like Madoff ripping people off right and left. We should be the referees, making sure everybody plays fairly—not the players, not the coaches, but the referees. The government, Federal Government especially, is a terrible coach when trying to tell people how to make a business work.

The best thing that could happen is if we get insurance companies out of the health care management business that they're in now. They're really not in the insurance business anymore; they're in the health management business. If we don't get them back into the insurance business and out of managing our lives and our health, then they'll be out of business, and the government will take over it all just as ObamaCare anticipates. That's where it's all headed. If we don't get the Federal Government out of being a player and a coach and a referee in health care, then the government will ultimately be the only player and coach

and referee, and that does not bode well for Americans.

We have a chance now, for the first time since the sixties, since Medicare was thought up, to allow our seniors to take control of their own health care and to give them the resources to do it. There would be nothing like a real test: Medicare here. If you want Medicare, have it just the way it is or we'll buy you health care, a private insurance policy; and we'll be referees and make sure they pay fair. We'll make it a high-deductible policy because those are so much cheaper. Then we'll give you cash in a health savings account that will be enough to cover the amount of your deductible each year.

In the end, it will be cheaper, and it will give people the dignity and patience—the control—of their health care so they don't have to beg the Federal Government, so they don't have to beg this board that ObamaCare has set up, so they don't have to beg some insurance company—please, please, let me have this treatment. You'll have insurance; you'll have the money to cover the high deductible; and we will move people into being in charge of their own lives, because the alternative is rather grim.

But let's be clear: this government wants to control people's lives. As soon as ObamaCare were to be fully operational, then the Federal Government has every right to tell people what they can eat; to tell people what medicines they can have; to tell people when they won't get that pacemaker, as the President told a lady at the White House during a town hall.

Maybe it's time we tell people like your mom, who would have 10 extra years of life with a pacemaker, you don't get the pacemaker—just take a pain pill. If we don't get this turned around, the government will have every right to tell you what to eat, what to drink, how much you have to exercise, what you can and can't do.

Our freedoms will be gone.

□ 1430

I've got a great quote here from one of the Founders, a man named Thomas Jefferson:

If people let the government decide what foods they eat and what medicines they take, their bodies will soon be in as sorry a state as are the souls of those who live under tyranny.

Those that say: Gee, I want to have unlimited sex, and I want the government to pay for it. Somebody's got to. I want the government controlling my life. People that feel like they need the government telling them what to do whatever it is, whatever aspect of life.

Sam Adams is given credit as being one of the most influential Founders in giving us this great Nation:

If ye love wealth better than liberty, the tranquility of servitude better than the animating contest of freedom, go home from us in peace. We ask not your counsels or arms. Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you. May your chains set lightly upon you, and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen.

Now, once the government has the right to control everybody's health care, it will have the right to tell you what freedoms it will recognize and you can practice and which you can't. That's why one of the reasons ObamaCare is so objectionable. It's the government intrusion into so many areas of our lives.

The First Amendment:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

We're not supposed to make a law prohibiting the free exercise of religion. ObamaCare does that. It gives this government the power to say: You know what? People ought to be able to get abortions paid for by the government, which means the taxpayers pay for it. They ought to be able to get contraceptives as they wish. So never mind the fact that right now if there is somebody in America that needs contraceptives, they can be obtained, plenty of sources, still the President feels the need to intrude upon religious belief and say: Folks, you can't practice this belief. If you believe abortion is murder, it's murder of an unborn child, well, I will tell you what we'll do. We'll just say your money doesn't go for abortions.

Yet in ObamaCare, it's very clear there will be clinics, there will be policies that will provide abortions, and people that pay into policies, those policies insure across the board and they will cover that. And money is fungible; it will be used for abortions; it will be used for contraceptives, even though there are people putting in money to the system that object and feel they are violating their religious beliefs.

So it struck me that the President recently found time to apologize to someone who had been up here on the Hill testifying, but he never found time to apologize to those whom he told: You cannot practice your religious beliefs. Oh, yes, he tried to make an accommodation for a church and a hospital, but Catholics that have these closely held beliefs—I'm a Baptist, but, good grief, if you're going to tell a Catholic they can't practice their religion because, as some in this body have said, a majority think you shouldn't, you're going to tell people they can't practice their religious beliefs? For heaven's sake, at least give them an apology. But not so, no apology there. So I thought, well, maybe it would be helpful to track exactly what deserves apology and what doesn't.

Well, we remember when the President first came into office, the first thing he did was take what a lot of people refer to as the apology tour. He went around the world apologizing for America's arrogance toward countries where we had Americans buried who gave their last full measure of devotion

to free those countries. But the President found time. Do they get an apology or no apology? Yes, you got an apology.

All right. There were Bush policies that our President said—toward countries that we actually give a tremendous amount of money to but who vote against us over half the time in the U.N. Do they get an apology? Bingo. He found time to give them an apology.

The family of Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry, murdered by an Operation Fast and Furious gun that our government forced to be sold to criminals, well, well, no time for an apology. They don't get one.

The CIA enhanced interrogation that saved lives and led to finding Osama bin Laden, we do have time to apologize to them. They get one. All right.

Detaining terrorists who killed or conspired to kill Americans at Guantanamo, even though there hasn't been a single incident of waterboarding or torturing of any kind remotely at Guantanamo, even though when they throw feces or urine on our guards, we will take away 2 hours of their movie watching, still, they get an apology from this White House.

The accidental 2012 burning of these Korans that were desecrated by the writing of detainees, yes, they got an apology.

The families of the American soldiers who were killed after President Obama said he "calmed things down" by apologizing to Afghanistan. No, didn't get an apology. No apology there. Our own soldiers, but, no, no apology.

Death of two Pakistani soldiers in Pakistan and the death of four other Pakistanis in 2010 when a plane, we were told, made a mistake. Yes, Pakistanis, they get apology; but Americans don't, Pakistanis do.

The President's support for the Ground Zero mosque at 2010 White House Iftar dinner opposed by most Americans, including 9/11 survivors, most Americans didn't want a mosque at Ground Zero. The President said it was a matter of religious freedom. So, basically, the word "apology" I don't believe was used, but it was an apology. We believe in them being allowed to do that, even though it offends most Americans and victims' families, yes, yes. They were at the White House hearing how sorry he was that Americans opposed that.

Comments in 2011 that Israel should return to its 1967 borders that would have subjected it to relentless attacks and vulnerability, as Prime Minister Netanyahu explained, no, Israel doesn't get one. No apology for Israel.

His good friends Bill Ayers and Bernadine Dohrn, the first people to have a fundraiser at their house for him, they were part of a radical left-wing group, Weather Underground, detonated a bomb at the Pentagon in 1972. And we know there are still people serving in the military that were

around when the Pentagon was attacked by his biggest, earliest supporters. They don't get an apology. No apology there.

Ordering many Christians to violate their religious beliefs and pay for abortion, drugs, and contraceptives, no, no apology there. Violates your religious beliefs; too bad, no apology.

Comments by President Obama and President Sarkozy in 2011 at the G-20 summit where they belittled Prime Minister Netanyahu. He's Israeli. No apology for that.

□ 1440

Comments made by Rush Limbaugh in his radio program about pro-abortion activist and Georgetown law student Sandra Fluke, yes, the President found time for that apology.

The President's support for not allowing nurses to save babies that were born alive after a botched abortion, we've heard from some of those—at least one of those nurses—how broken-hearted they were sitting there and being forced to watch a baby die. No apology for those folks.

Attendance for 20 years at Trinity United Church of Christ where radical pastor Reverend Jeremiah Wright used racial and anti-Semitic terms, inflammatory rhetoric and insulting comments about Hillary Clinton from his pastor—I believe the comment was he could no more disown that fine gentleman, which he later did. No apology for anybody offended by that.

And inflammatory and indecent comments of one of President Obama's biggest supporters, Bill Maher, regarding Sarah Palin and MICHELE BACHMANN, tens of times worse than anything Rush Limbaugh would have ever dreamed of saying. That's right, no apology for that.

So I think it helps to chronicle exactly what deserves an apology from the White House these days, you know, just so we know where policies lie and where this President stands and with whom he stands.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLIC POLICY ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HAYWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 30 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

CONGRATULATING JOE QUATTRONE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank my colleague from Texas, and I would like to say that she is a pleasure to travel with. She is a real gentledady.

The reason I take the floor for just a couple of minutes is one of our dearest friends in the Capitol is a fellow named Joe Quattrone. He is a barber down in the House barber shop, and on March 1 he celebrated 42 years cutting hair in

the Capitol of the United States. He came to the United States when he was 18 years old from Italy. He said he has lived the American Dream, and he's one of the nicest people that I think you'll ever meet.

Everybody who has ever worked with him or had their hair cut by Joe understands that he is a very caring person and one that they respect. He has cut the hair of every Speaker of the House except two—NANCY PELOSI, and I don't think she goes to the men's barber shop; and JOHN BOEHNER, the current Speaker. And I'm going to talk to Speaker BOEHNER as soon as we get back from break and get him down there so Joe can say he's cut every Speaker's hair since he has been a barber at the House barber shop.

He has cut the hair of Vice Presidents, Presidents, the President of Italy, the Secretary of Transportation, ambassadors, Governors, admirals, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; but his favorite person, besides me, is Tip O'Neill, the Speaker of the House when Tip was the Speaker sometime back.

He worked before he came here at Andrews Air Force Base and the Pentagon.

I would just like to say to Joe the Barber, because I'm going to give him a copy of this floor statement, Madam Speaker, that he has been a credit to the institution of Congress. He is liked by everybody who has ever been in his chair, and I just want to congratulate him on 42 years of working here in the Capitol. And I don't think anybody has ever complained about him. He's really a nice guy. He started March 1, 1970, and he's here now 42 years later.

I just say Joe, congratulations. I'll be down to see you in 2 weeks.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I was very happy to yield to the gentleman, and I indicated to you in the spirit of bipartisanship, although I've not had the privilege of having Joe cut my hair, let me congratulate Joe the Barber because he is the epitome of a public servant. He has worked for this august institution for 42 years, and I'm very proud to say that he can claim that he has cut the hair of all of our Speakers. And I don't think our Speaker, who has outstanding Italian heritage, our former Speaker, Speaker PELOSI, would in any way shy away from congratulating this distinguished gentleman who came to this country and literally is a walking, if you will, American Dream.

So I want to congratulate you, Joe the Barber, on behalf of a bipartisan Congress and join my colleague, Mr. BURTON, in congratulating you for your service. You are truly a public servant, an inspiration to all of your family members, and we wish you a long life.

Again, congratulations for 42 years to Joe the Barber.

With that, I will continue my remarks and thank the Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I look forward to addressing these very important issues to you, and certainly we want to make sure that we address questions.

In the coming weeks, we will be discussing the attributes of the Affordable Care Act, and I will look forward to coming to the floor of the House and again acknowledging how much money the Affordable Care Act, the health care act, has in fact saved this Nation: how it has preserved Medicare, how we focus on medical education, medical school education, medical providers' education, how we have talked about issues dealing with health care disparities, and in particular how we have expanded the community health clinics that have saved lives, how we have worked on issues dealing with children's health care, how we have provided access to health care for many, many people.

That allows me, or calls upon me, to again follow up to again distinguish the Georgetown law student who spoke before Members of Congress who got in the crosshairs of a commentary that was not very flattering. I just want to distinguish the commentary that came against the Georgetown law student from comments that will be made by entertainers and others across the Nation in the course of their comedic work.

The question about the Georgetown law student, Madam Speaker, was that she was called before Members of Congress to speak. She was not speaking on a television program or an interview. She was actually called by Members of Congress to testify to the question of access of health care to women.

And I will tell you that right now documentation shows that women who are 24 years old and above, their health plans today cost 84 percent more than a male similarly situated. So we know without health insurance how devastating it would be for women not to have health insurance.

Many of the Planned Parenthood family clinics and others are focused on health care. We want to have a firewall, as Planned Parenthood has, and that is that the firewall is that access to health care is a distinguishable factor of their service, and that's what this young woman was speaking about, the importance of access to health care.

It was in the course of that testimony that made her a victim of public ridicule. That's why I believe President Obama appropriately acknowledged the right of a citizen to petition his or her government and that if they do so, they should not be subject to public ridicule. There lies the basis of the President of the United States calling this Georgetown law school student. And I applaud that because no matter how high you are, the highest office in

the land, the Commander in Chief, isn't it appropriate, isn't it befitting of an individual who represents all of the people of the United States to have the humanity to be able to call people, citizens, families, when they are at their lowest ebb, when they have been in the course of public service or they have been in a position of presenting their public case to the United States Congress or even to the President of the United States of America.

□ 1450

I hope that we, no matter what our position and station in life, particularly those of us who hold roles in the most powerful lawmaking body of the world, the United States Congress—the highest office is considered the Commander in Chief, also the leader of the free world—that we would have the capacity to offer an apology to someone who has felt offended.

I want to move into an apology that I want to offer, and that is to the families in my district whose loved ones have been buried in our veterans' cemetery in Houston, off of Veterans' Memorial, who have now faced this tragic circumstance of having headstones misplaced or moved. I don't think there should be any tolerance for that. I believe that when an individual takes an oath to serve in the United States military, for those who, through God's grace, are able to return from battlefields, who are able to retire out of the military as veterans, that we owe them a great deal of respect for their benefits. And then to those families who experience a fallen loved one, either in battle or that they ultimately die as a veteran of the United States military, they should expect that the sacredness of their burial be respected.

I will be visiting our cemetery in Houston, Texas, and asking, Can we not get it right? Can we not fix the problem that moves headstones, that has misplaced headstones and mislabeled headstones? I frankly believe that our men and women in the United States military deserve better, and I'm going to ask for better and insist on that.

I have been working over the last couple of weeks meeting with a very prominent Syrian American in my district, having met with him and others in months past on this whole question of Syria. Just last week, I presented a letter to the representative of the Syrian Embassy demanding that President Assad resign and step down from office, demanding that the Red Cross be allowed, at that time, to come in and provide humanitarian relief, demanding that women and children be protected and taken to safe places so they could receive health care and food, and, at that time, asking for the respectful removal of the deceased, the bodies of the two fallen Western reporters and the others that have been wounded.

Some progress has been made. In the immediate hours of that visit, we saw that the Red Cross and the Red Cres-

cent were able to come in, or the International Red Cross. Then shortly thereafter we saw that Syrian forces were bombing the humanitarian relief efforts. And we heard an interview from one of the Western reporters that clearly indicated that the two reporters that died were actually murdered, because the Syrian forces actually targeted the location where they were, where journalists were. Everyone knows that there is an effort to maintain a firewall or respect for journalists no matter where they are, on a battlefield or in the area. It's known where they are allegedly trying to be in a safe place, and then you directly bomb that area, then you know that there's certainly basis for someone, an interview that took place on CNN that indicated that they thought it was direct murder. However we define it, we know that there is enormous loss of life.

I want to just say that having had the privilege of serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee, now a ranking member on the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, having served on that committee for a number of years since 9/11, the tragedy of 9/11, having gone to a number of war zones, from Bosnia to Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq, having gone to Mumbai right after the horrific terrorist bombing, and knowing what conflicts around the world mean in terms of either sending our military personnel, or even after we engage. If you look at the NATO engagement, which included the United States and Libya, there are many who will say right now, look at the confusion. But I think it's important to understand that the intent of the NATO allies was to stop the brutality.

The aftermath we would want to be better. We would want there to not be the conflict that is going on, the tribal conflict, the instability of the Libyan Government as we speak. To be very truthful with you, of course we don't want that to be happening. But no one took to the NATO alliance or took to the air to bomb Libya in agreement in a coalition to create confusion afterward. The call and the response was to stop what was the apparent slaughter and the killing of Libyan citizens en masse.

We know it is not perfect now. Iraq is not perfect, frankly, and we made it worse by going into Iraq because at that time there was not that kind of immediate conflict. But that was the basis for Libya.

Now we have a situation where the argument is that Syria is too complicated, in the region that it's in, the impact of a direct hit is too complicated. Today, I am calling upon the very body that was established at the very end of the 1940s after we ended World War II, another horrific and heinous world conflict which we did not expect, based upon historical perspectives when many argued that World War I was the "War to End All Wars," and, of course, that did not happen, and we've had conflicts and wars since.

But right now, the brutality of violence against the Syrian people, the desperation of killing children in the streets, of slaughtering babies and of not allowing the wounded to get health care, calls upon the world to respond. And I think it is very clear that it is complex enough that a direct attack by the United States, as the administration has acknowledged, would not be appropriate. A direct attack, a direct hit by the United States may not get the results that we would like. But there is no doubt that we cannot leave in good conscience this Congress without someone calling for an immediate response and relief from the United Nations, which was organized to draw together world support.

Whether it is appropriate for U.N. peacekeepers, whether it is appropriate for the U.N., working with some of the Arab States out of the Arab League, it is absolutely ludicrous, tragic, disastrous, and heinous for us to watch night after night the violence that is going on against the Syrian people.

One may argue that there is violence everywhere. But it is a call upon our humanitarian position in the world to be able to call out for assistance. So, today, I am calling for actions by the United Nations in establishing or reaching out for a coalition that would provide military response. What does that mean? Providing weapons, if you will, so that those individuals who are defending themselves against slaughter—let's be very clear. These individuals are trying to defend themselves against slaughter, one city after another is under direct attack by the Syrian national forces, ordered by President Assad, who refuses to leave, and no one has been able to make him leave. The violence and the bloodshed continues on and on and on and on.

So I don't think that we can stand and do nothing. I have already indicated I fully understand that a direct hit by the United States would not be the appropriate direction to take. But that does not leave us helpless, and it does not leave the United Nations helpless. And as a Member of Congress who has supported the United Nations over and over again for the value of its presence in terms of a world force, to insist upon some coming together of nations to the Secretary-General—don't shame yourself with inaction. Don't shame the United Nations with inaction by not calling upon those who have resources in the region to be able to prevent those rebels, or those who are defending themselves, or those men and young boys who are defending themselves, who are picking up sticks and whatever they are using, from being slaughtered in the streets, from having amputated legs, from having no ability to be able to attend to the wounded.

□ 1500

Today, March 8, it is imperative that you begin to assess the violent situation and you stop this slaughter now.

As we leave to work in the districts, I will be pushing back on this issue,

continuing to push back to the United Nations, asking the Arab League for their help through different states to provide this care.

How do I put a backdrop on this? This happens to be the week in which we commemorate what we call, in this Nation, Bloody Sunday. For many who don't understand that date, it was yesterday. It was the day that those individuals who were pleading for the right to vote in this country—similar to the concept of democracy and freedom, in a different way, in a different era, the Syrians are saying that they are oppressed by this regime. But in the day that we were in the midst of civil rights, there were regions and places and people that could not vote in this country; and so citizens from all backgrounds took to Selma, Alabama, and proceeded nonviolently after being violently pushed back and, in essence, bloodied, came back and walked peaceably over that bridge in Selma, Alabama, which was commemorated last Sunday, but the actual date was this Wednesday. I will be commemorating it Houston, Texas, on this Sunday, March 11.

But the concept simply was, when people felt that they were oppressed, in this Nation they found a way to find relief through a nonviolent approach. Ultimately, as those who are historians will know, we passed, in a bipartisan way, with the signature of President Lyndon Baines Johnson, both the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act, which I maintain today is a protector of every citizen's right to vote no matter what your racial background, where you live. The Voting Rights Act simply says: One person, one vote. We protect you. We protect America. We believe in voting.

We have since tried to expand that to ensure that there are election laws that don't stop people or oppress people from voting, and any number of things, like voter IDs, when there is no fraud. Where people have a registration card and have lived in the community, we should be allowing citizens to vote.

But I put that in the context, because now this is 2012, and I think Americans feel with some, if you will—how shall I call it?—some mishaps and laws that probably don't work, that we can vote. Well, just think of a society that feels that they can't speak, that they cannot act upon a free government. Just think of that kind of society. And then you want to petition your government, and what happens? What happens, you're slaughtered. You're slaughtered.

There is no peaceable marching, because if you studied Syria, you will know that they started peaceably marching. What happened? The Syrian forces came and attacked them with weaponry and with violence. They killed them, plain and simple, when they were marching for freedom.

So I would ask that we, again, not allow this to happen. I will proceed with my petitioning to the United Nations. I will be prayerful as well, be-

cause as we stand here today, I will assure you that there are those in Syria that are dying as I am on this floor today, that there are those that are losing their lives, that they are being attacked by the Syrian national forces who are killing people in the street. I don't think that we can allow that to occur anymore in this month when we celebrate Women's History Month and the fact that we've celebrated some of the women peacemakers. Right now, today, women are being wounded, women are being hurt, their children are being hurt in Syria.

I want to thank the Speaker for yielding this time and allowing me to call upon the good graces of the international family to be able to lift up the souls and the spirits and the lives of the Syrian people.

As you reflect on this, let me just say, when you thought there was no hope—and you can look at the Arab Spring, although governments are not perfect and we are struggling for these governments, such as Egypt and others, to establish themselves, who would have ever thought that individuals could have brought about a change in Egypt and Tunisia and Libya? Who would have ever thought that democracy would be raising its head? As difficult as it is, don't give up on the Syrian people. Don't give up on those children, those babies, those young men, those men and those families. Don't give up on Syria, and don't stand by idly while bloodshed continues and Syrians are slaughtered in the street.

I look forward to a final relief and a lifting of our humanitarian spirit as we, as a Nation, celebrate the democracy and the freedom in which we are able to live.

I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE, THE HONORABLE SHELLEY BERKLEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Jan Churchill, District Representative, the Honorable SHELLEY BERKLEY, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 24, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Las Vegas Justice Court, for witness testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JAN CHURCHILL,
District Representative.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of personal reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 9, 2012, at 11 a.m.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5217. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Business Conduct Standards for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants With Counterparties (RIN: 3038-AD25) received February 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5218. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluopyram; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0364; FRL-9336-9] received February 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5219. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Metaflumizone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0168; FRL-9333-4] received February 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5220. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mevinphos; Order Revoking Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0423; FRL-9338-3] received February 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5221. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flazasulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0494; FRL-8883-1] received February 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5222. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Investment Adviser Performance Compensation [Release No. IA-3372; File No. S7-17-11] (RIN: 3235-AK71) received February 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5223. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Hazardous Substances; Designation, Reportable Quantities, and Notification [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0965; FRL-9635-9] received February 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5224. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Hawaii State Implementation Plan [EPA-R09-OAR-

2012-0082; FRL-9634-1] received February 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5225. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's "Major" final rule — Revisions to Federal Implementation Plans To Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0491; FRL-9631-8] (RIN: 2060-AR22) received February 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5226. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's "Major" final rule — Revisions to Federal Implementation Plans To Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone; Part II [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0491; FRL-9632-8] (RIN: 2060-AR35) received February 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5227. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-319, "Uniform Collaborative Law Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5228. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-320, "District of Columbia Public Schools and Public Charter School Student Residency Fraud Prevention Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5229. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Clarification of Policy Regarding 14 CFR part 135 Approved Training Programs [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1397] received February 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5230. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Enstrom Helicopter Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1382; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-053-AD; Amendment 39-16900; AD 2011-26-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5231. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0996; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-068-AD; Amendment 39-16899; AD 2011-26-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5232. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Martin Corporation/Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0919; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-088-AD; Amendment 39-16903; AD 2011-27-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5233. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company (GE) GE90-110B1 and GE90-115B Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0278; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-10-AD; Amendment 39-16901; AD 2011-26-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5234. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Continental Motors, Inc. (CMI) Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1341; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-41-AD; Amendment 39-16891; AD 2011-25-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5235. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0494; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-20-AD; Amendment 39-16884; AD 2011-25-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5236. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Thielert Aircraft Engines GmbH Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0948; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-16906; AD 2010-06-12R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5237. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0904; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-16902; AD 2011-27-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5238. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation Airplanes Equipped with a Certain Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1420; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-035-AD; Amendment 39-16905; AD 2011-27-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3992. A bill to allow otherwise eligible Israeli nationals to receive E-2 non-immigrant visas if similarly situated United States nationals are eligible for similar non-immigrant status in Israel (Rept. 112-410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1741. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State to refuse or revoke visas to aliens if in the security or foreign policy interests of the United States, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to review visa applications before adjudication, to provide for immediate dissemination of visa revocation information, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-411, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Homeland Security discharged from further consideration.

H.R. 1741 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. HALL (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 4165. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to cover screening computed tomography colonography as a colorectal cancer screening test under the Medicare program; 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. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 4166. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to prohibit the manufacture, processing, distribution in commerce, and use of coal tar sealants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 4167. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a refundable credit for increasing employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. TURNER of New York):

H.R. 4168. A bill to direct the American Battle Monuments Commission to provide for the ongoing maintenance of Clark Veterans Cemetery in the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas):

H.R. 4169. A bill to require the development of a comprehensive strategy to end serious human rights violations in Sudan, to create incentives for governments and persons to end support of and assistance to the Government of Sudan, to reinvigorate genuinely comprehensive peace efforts in Sudan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and 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 Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4170. A bill to increase purchasing power, strengthen economic recovery, and restore fairness in financing higher education in the United States through student loan forgiveness, caps on interest rates on Federal student loans, and refinancing opportunities for private borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 4171. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to repeal certain provisions relating to criminal penalties and violations of foreign laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 4172. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to insure mortgages that provide former homeowners who are a reasonable credit risk a second chance at homeownership; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. STARK, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas):

H.R. 4173. A bill to direct the President of the United States to appoint a high-level United States representative or special envoy for Iran for the purpose of ensuring that the United States pursues all diplomatic avenues to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, to avoid a war with Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 4174. A bill to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century with respect to the Interstate System Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Pilot Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DENT (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 4175. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Public Health Service Act to provide parity under group health plans and group health insurance coverage for the provision of benefits for prosthetics and custom orthotics and benefits for other medical and surgical services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 4176. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to clarify that the value of certain funeral and burial arrangements are not to be considered available resources under the supplemental security income program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHILLING (for himself, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 4177. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide equity between regular and reserve component members of the Armed Forces in the computation of disability retired pay for members wounded in action; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TURNER of Ohio (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 4178. A bill to strengthen the strategic force posture of the United States by ensuring the safety, security, reliability, and credibility of the nuclear weapons stockpile; 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 Mr. SHERMAN (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 4179. A bill to strengthen the multilateral sanctions regime with respect to Iran, to expand sanctions relating to the energy sector of Iran, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by Iran, and human

rights abuses in Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FLORES, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCLEINTOCK, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 4180. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to improve the functioning and transparency of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4181. A bill to amend title 9, United States Code, to exclude employment contracts and employment disputes from such title; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. RIBBLE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 4182. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to acquire and place a historical plaque to be permanently displayed in National Statuary Hall recognizing the seven decades of Christian church services being held in the Capitol from 1800 to 1868, which included attendees James Madison and Thomas Jefferson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 4183. A bill to change the date for regularly scheduled Federal elections and establish polling place hours; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4184. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require contractors and subcontractors working on military construction projects to comply with licensing requirements for employees working at the project location; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 4185. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a loan guarantee program to assist small business concerns that manufacture clean energy technologies in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 4186. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the provision of law preventing certain State and local employees from seeking elective office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4187. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to place certain lands in trust

for the Zuni Tribe and Navajo Nation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROSS of Florida (for himself, Mrs. ADAMS, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 4188. A bill to reduce the discretionary spending limit for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2013 by an amount equal to the amount obligated by the Department in fiscal year 2012 to provide recreational facilities to Guantanamo detainees; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 4189. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual certification that all programming on the American Forces Radio and Television Service represents the best-faith efforts by the Department of Defense to provide programming for members of the Armed Forces and their families that communicates the policies, priorities, programs, goals, and initiatives of the Department while avoiding airing programming that exhibits values contrary to the values of the Armed Forces and the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 4190. A bill to enhance criminal penalties for straw purchasers of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 4191. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act and the Small Business Act to improve small business lending, improve cooperation between the National Credit Union Administration and the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. REYES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 4192. A bill to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 to provide for the trial of covered persons detained in the United States pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force and to repeal the requirement for military custody; 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 Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 4193. A bill to provide that there shall be no net increase in the acres of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service, or the Forest Service unless the Federal budget is balanced for the year in which the land would be purchased; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4194. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide that Alexander Creek, Alaska, is and shall be recognized as an eligible Native village under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H. Res. 578. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Right to Keep and Bear Arms Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H. Res. 579. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding hydroelectric power; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. Res. 580. A resolution to prohibit the use of the Members' Representational Allowance for air travel expenses of any individual unless the individual provides an itemized description of the expenses, including the specific flight number, and uses a credit card provided by the House of Representatives to pay for the expenses; to the Committee on House Administration.

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. HALL:

H.R. 4165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 4166.

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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 4167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 4168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

per Article I Section 8

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 4169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—And Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 4171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 4172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Article 1

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 4173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 4174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 4176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section. 8. Clause 1 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. SCHILLING:

H.R. 4177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16 of the United States Constitution the bill is authorized by Congress' power over the care of the Armed Forces.

By Mr. TURNER of Ohio:

H.R. 4178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 4180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Constitution provides the legal foundation for the Federal Reserve in Article I, Section 8, Clause 5, which give Congress the power "to coin money [and] regulate the value thereof," and Clause 18, which gives Congress the power to make laws "necessary and proper for carrying [out] the foregoing powers."

For a more thorough legal brief on power of the federal government to charter a cen-

tral bank, see Alexander Hamilton, "Opinion on the Constitutionality of a National Bank" in Alexander Hamilton: Writings (New York: Literary Classics, 2001), pp. 613-646.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 4182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, providing Congress with exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, providing Congress with the authority to enact legislation necessary to execute one of its enumerated powers, such as Article I, Section 8, Clause 17.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4184.

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 Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 4185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 4186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment I to the United States Constitution, which states "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. ROSS of Florida:

H.R. 4188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution; "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. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 4189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 4190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Straw Purchaser Penalty Enhancement Act is constitutionally authorized

under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. The Necessary and Proper Clause supports the expansion of congressional authority beyond the explicit authorities that are directly discernible from the text. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4191.

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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 4192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and Amendments IV and V to the Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 4193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 66: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 104: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 192: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 300: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 385: Ms. NORTON and Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 420: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 459: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. NUNNELEE.
 H.R. 645: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 683: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 726: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 787: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 870: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 891: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 893: Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 931: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
 H.R. 941: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1092: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 1116: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 1204: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 1332: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 1339: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. REYES, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 1386: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1404: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 1537: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 1549: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 1578: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 1612: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1639: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 1648: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1704: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 2159: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 2179: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 2187: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2206: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 2238: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 2245: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 2310: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 2328: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2364: Mr. GRUJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 2524: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 2555: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 2669: Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. KEATING, Mr. OLVER and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 2717: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 2738: Mr. GRUJALVA.
 H.R. 2875: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 2938: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 2948: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 2957: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 2960: Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 2969: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 2980: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 3057: Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 3059: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 3118: Ms. FOXX.
 H.R. 3164: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 3236: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 3264: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 3269: Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 3283: Ms. SEWELL.
 H.R. 3308: Mr. QUAYLE.
 H.R. 3319: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3353: Mr. GRUJALVA.
 H.R. 3399: Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 3418: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 3461: Mr. SHULER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. QUIGLEY Mr. RIVERA, and Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 3485: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 3522: Ms. MOORE and Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 3523: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.R. 3627: Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 3653: Ms. BASS of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 3662: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 3676: Mr. FLEMING.
 H.R. 3713: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 3783: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.R. 3790: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
 H.R. 3798: Ms. HAHN, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. CHU, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 3820: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 3839: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 3875: Mr. RUSH and Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 3903: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 3904: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 3905: Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 3974: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 3981: Mr. COLE and Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 4010: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. FUDGE.
 H.R. 4040: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms.

BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HALL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SULTZ, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 4077: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 4083: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4089: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 4094: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 4103: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4104: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LONG, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. FINCHER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HURT, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. CANSECO, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WATT, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BACA, Mr. DOLD, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. QUIGLEY Mr. KELLY, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 4106: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 4117: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 4120: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 4122: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 4125: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4134: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 4135: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4153: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4160: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. PETERSON.

H.J. Res. 103: Mr. MICA.

H. Res. 490: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H. Res. 503: Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H. Res. 526: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. DUFFY.

H. Res. 560: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H. Res. 564: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 568: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. HURT, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H. Res. 573: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. HINOJOSA.