



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 2012

No. 117

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

August 2, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Imam Nayyar Imam, Suffolk County Police Department, Yaphank, New York, offered the following prayer:

We beseech God Almighty, calling upon Him by the most noble of His characteristics. We bear witness in testimony that He is the sovereign, the omnipotent, the exalted, the all knowing.

God Almighty, we ask that You bestow upon all of our elected officials guidance and patience required to carry out the solemn task of legislation before them. Grant them commitment to serve before being served, a sense of fraternity before partisanship, and dedication to the interests of our country before the interests of even their own selves.

The final prophet of God, Muhammad, peace be upon him, stated:

The leaders of a people are a representation of their deeds.

We ask God Almighty that He make our elected officials true representatives of honesty, equality, and the values that represent the uniqueness of our Nation.

We ask You, Almighty God, that You look to us with glance of mercy, regardless of gender, ethnicity, religion, or political party. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WITTMAN 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 PRO TEMPORE

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

PROCRASTINATION IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, after today, Congress completes its business until September without finishing critical items, leaving many sectors across this country uncertain about their fiscal future. Looming defense cuts, or sequestration, still hang over the Congress as unfinished business.

I'm extremely disappointed that Congress is leaving town without addressing such pressing issues and with so little time scheduled in the rest of this legislative year. Many Americans in America's First District are frustrated with Washington's lack of action and

accomplishments as this country struggles to rebound from these tough economic times. Virginians, and all Americans, have the right to be upset with such irresponsible procrastination.

Sequestration threatens our country's national security and sends the wrong message to the American people and to the world about our commitment to defend this great Nation in the future. Congress should stay in Washington to finish the business of the people. I am prepared to stay in Washington as long as it takes. These issues are too important to wait.

THE INNOVATION PROMOTION ACT

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ. To strengthen our economic competitiveness in a global economy, we must create the right environment for private sector growth in cutting-edge industries. As we work to reform our corporate Tax Code, it's critical that we consider policies that reflect our 21st century economy, an innovation economy, and promote new domestic manufacturing based on the best ideas developed right here in America.

Today, I will introduce a plan to incentivize manufacturing, innovation, and research and development right here in the United States. The Innovation Promotion Act keeps American businesses competitive by reducing their tax rate on patented products by more than half to 10 percent.

This lower tax rate is a major incentive to keep production here in the United States and will better ensure American companies that choose to stay in the U.S. can compete with foreign competitors, expand to new markets, and hire new workers.

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.

H5633

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting American entrepreneurship, American innovation, and American jobs. Sign on to the Innovation Promotion Act to build America's economic leadership in the world and promote job creation right here at home.

WE HAVE A JOB TO DO

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, traditionally, Members of Congress return to their districts during the month of August to avoid the hottest, muggiest month of the Washington year, but given our current circumstances and the invention of air conditioning, I think we should break that tradition.

Senate Democrats have passed the President's plan to raise taxes. A family of four earning \$50,000 a year will see their taxes increase by more than \$2,000 per year. House Republicans have passed the only plan in Washington to stop the tax hike in its entirety.

A new report finds the tax hike will cost more than 700,000 American jobs. I stand by the House leadership who stated this week that if the Senate takes action to address these threats, the House will be in Washington in August for the purpose of sending solutions to the President's desk.

We have a job to do, and 23 million unemployed Americans are waiting.

GUN SAFETY

(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, I rise today to call attention to the need for stronger gun safety laws in our country. This Congress has not only failed to address the issue of gun violence in the United States, it has actually weakened gun safety laws.

I am proud that my home State of Massachusetts is a leader in gun violence prevention and has the lowest firearm fatality rate per 100,000 population of any urban industrialized State.

I am proud of the work being done by antigun violence advocates across the Commonwealth, including Boston's mayor, Tom Menino, and John Rosenthal, founder of the organization, Stop Handgun Violence. Today, Stop Handgun Violence is hosting a rally in Boston calling on Congress to pass stronger gun safety legislation. I applaud their work and the efforts of other organizations like the Brady Campaign as they continue to educate and advocate for sensible legislation.

What more will it take for this Congress to bring commonsense gun control measures to the floor? How many more tragedies? Silence is no longer acceptable.

TAXES

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I'm a CPA by trade. I've spent many years in my former life wading through volumes of Tax Code trying to ensure my clients followed every last letter of the law while also trying to ensure they don't get stuck paying more taxes than they owe. But the American people and the people of south Mississippi don't need a CPA to tell them that we need a simpler, fairer, and flatter Tax Code.

Last week, the U.S. Senate sent a strong message when it voted to raise taxes on small businesses and families. In south Mississippi alone, the proposed tax hikes would increase taxes by an average of \$2,200 per family. That's a total of more than \$723 million more that south Mississippians would have to pay.

In addition to that extra tax burden, a recent study from Ernst & Young shows that we could lose as many as 710,000 jobs, and wages could decrease by almost 2 percent.

Now, I'm no rocket scientist, but I'm pretty sure that the American people and the people of south Mississippi don't need a rocket scientist to tell them that these tax hikes are the last thing we need right now. That's why the House stepped forward yesterday and passed legislation to stop the tax hike, and that's why we're committed to continue working on tax reform to make our Tax Code simpler, fairer, and flatter for all Americans.

THANKING ERNIE ALLEN FOR A JOB WELL DONE

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

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my respects to a tireless crusader in the quest to protect America's children from violence and exploitation.

Ernie Allen recently retired as the president and chief executive officer of the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, where his mission was to protect our Nation's children.

Under Ernie's leadership, the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children played a crucial role in recovering some 74,000 children. With Ernie at the helm, they saw their recovery rate for missing children climb from 62 percent in 1990 to 94 percent today.

While there's no official record book of what Ernie has accomplished over the years, his record lives on in the lives he has saved and the families he has reunited.

I know I speak for my colleagues in the Congressional Missing, Exploited and Runaway Children's Caucus and for thousands of grateful families all across the Nation in thanking Ernie Allen for a job well done.

□ 0910

LET'S INVEST IN THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, our economic problems are eminently solvable. They just require confidence in the American people. But the American people have lost confidence in Congress, and it's easy to see why.

Exhibit A: the inability to reach a deal on a grand bargain on debt reduction. Last year, the Speaker and the President negotiated a plan to reduce the debt by \$4 trillion through a mix of spending cuts and revenue increases, revenues that would come, not from raising taxes, but closing special deals, institutionalized corruption.

That plan represented a balanced and bipartisan approach. The economy today would be performing much better had that deal been enacted. But the Tea Party-controlled Republican House rejected the deal.

Exhibit B: the refusal to act boldly to create jobs and rebuild the infrastructure of America. We just spent \$89 billion rebuilding the roads of Afghanistan. Last week we passed a bill to spend just \$52 billion a year in rebuilding roads and bridges right here in America. That's a weak plan. In fact, it's pathetically weak. That is why the American people have lost confidence in Congress.

The best tax policy is to invest in America and the American people and to bring lost taxpayers back to work.

OBAMA CARES AND YOU SHOULD, TOO

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Obama cares, and you should, too.

ObamaCare provides access to much-needed contraceptives for women.

First of all, it's my body, not yours. I alone bear the burden, pain, and joy that it brings. Please stop trying to regulate my reproductive organs. They belong to me.

Have you ever had a menstrual period? Have you ever felt unbearable pain in every bone of your body during childbirth?

Will you be there for a mother when she needs prenatal care, formula, diapers? Will you support the Head Start program? Will you focus on creating good public schools again? Will you reform foster care and stop greasing the prison pipeline with unwanted children?

There are grandmothers living in trailer parks and public housing, singlehandedly raising millions of grandchildren. Where are you when Grandmother is trying to feed Jerome, Shaquita, Pedro, Heather, and John?

The only time I see you is on the floor of the House trying to take away

Grandma's Social Security and attacking her Medicare and food stamps.

Grandma doesn't have a car so she has no ID so she can't vote.

For some reason, you care about a baby right up until the minute it is born into the world, and then you disappear and desert the children you claim to protect and love. Shame on you.

Stop the cradle-to-grave neglect and abuse. Let's create jobs, jobs, jobs for the American people. Obama cares, and so should you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to heed the gavel.

IN THE MATTER OF REPRESENTATIVE LAURA RICHARDSON OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ethics, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

IN THE MATTER OF REPRESENTATIVE LAURA RICHARDSON OF CALIFORNIA

H. RES. 755

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 2, 2012

Resolved, That the House adopt the Report of the Committee on Ethics dated August 1, 2012, in the Matter of Representative Laura Richardson.

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

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an equal amount of time in this debate to a lady with whom I am honored to serve, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ), the ranking member of the Committee on Ethics, for purposes of debate only, and I ask unanimous consent that she be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

As chairman of the Committee on Ethics, I rise in support of a resolution before us today which calls for a reprimand for Representative LAURA RICHARDSON of California.

Article I of the Constitution gives Congress the responsibility for punishing Members of our body for disorderly behavior. And in the House, it is the Committee on Ethics, the only evenly divided committee, made up of five Democrats and five Republicans, and served by a completely nonpartisan, professional staff, that has been entrusted with the responsibility to enforce the rules of the House and recommend actions such as that before us today, when a Member or staff acts in a manner that violates the spirit of public trust.

The obligation, therefore, falls to this committee to review those allega-

tions that a Member has violated ethical standards that the American people expect and deserve from those of us who are privileged enough to work for them, men and women who wear the title of Representative of this great Nation.

This unfortunate story begins in October of 2010 when the committee, during the 111th Congress, first began to receive complaints from several members of Representative RICHARDSON's staff, both in the Washington, D.C., and Long Beach, California, offices, that Representative RICHARDSON required her staff to perform campaign work.

The committee began an initial inquiry based on these complaints, as well as from media reports consistent with those complaints.

On November 3, 2011, the committee, now in the 112th Congress, empanelled an investigative subcommittee and appointed Representative CHARLES DENT of Pennsylvania and Representative JOHN YARMUTH of Kentucky to lead this bipartisan subcommittee in reviewing the allegations against Representative RICHARDSON. Joining Mr. DENT and Mr. YARMUTH were two Members pulled from a pool of Members who assist the committee when needed. In this case, they are Representative ROB BISHOP of Utah and Representative BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

These four Members, two Democrats and two Republicans, served on the investigative subcommittee and, over the past 9 months, led an extensive investigation, supported by the committee's dedicated, nonpartisan, professional staff, delving deep into this matter.

In a minute, Mr. DENT, who served as chairman of the investigative subcommittee, will detail the volume of work that the investigative team undertook during this period.

Ultimately, the subcommittee unanimously agreed to a Statement of Alleged Violation against Representative RICHARDSON.

Mr. Speaker, while the full committee report, the investigative subcommittee report, Representative RICHARDSON's responsive views, and all exhibits were filed by the ranking member and me yesterday morning, and have been available to the House and to the American people since that time, here now, in summary, are the seven counts of violation:

First, Representative RICHARDSON violated the Purpose Law, title 31, section 1301, United States Code, by using official resources of the House for campaign, political, personal, and other nonofficial purposes.

Second, Representative RICHARDSON violated House rule XXIII by retaining a full-time employee in her district office who did not perform duties commensurate with their compensation.

Third, Representative RICHARDSON violated House rule XXIII by behaving in a manner that did not reflect credibly upon this House when she unlawfully used House resources for non-official purposes.

Fourth, Representative RICHARDSON violated House rule XXIII by behaving in a manner that did not reflect credibly upon the House when she improperly compelled members of her official staff to do campaign work by threatening, attempting to intimidate, directing or otherwise pressuring them to do such work.

Fifth, Representative RICHARDSON violated House rule XXIII by behaving in a manner that did not reflect credibly upon the House when she obstructed and attempted to obstruct the investigation of this committee into these allegations.

Sixth, Representative RICHARDSON violated clause 2 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service by failing to uphold the laws and legal regulations discussed above and being a party to their evasion.

□ 0920

Seventh, Representative RICHARDSON violated House rule XXIII by failing to abide by the letter and spirit of House and committee rules.

The record should note that anytime a Member is confronted with a Statement of Alleged Violation, he or she has the option of challenging those allegations with a public hearing of an adjudicatory subcommittee or, in the case of Representative RICHARDSON, negotiating a resolution with the investigative subcommittee.

In this instance, Representative RICHARDSON negotiated a resolution in which she admitted to all seven counts in the Statement of Alleged Violation and has waived her rights to any additional process in this matter, including waiving her right to an adjudicatory hearing. Representative RICHARDSON has also agreed to accept a reprimand by the House as well as a \$10,000 fine to be paid out of personal funds to the U.S. Treasury no later than December 1, 2012.

In the history of our country, five Members have been expelled from Congress; 23 Members have been censured; and eight Members have been reprimanded. Representative RICHARDSON negotiated—and we recommend—the sanction of reprimand.

The investigative subcommittee unanimously adopted a report recommending a resolution including these terms to the full committee, and on July 31, 2012, the full committee adopted the recommendations of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to reserve the balance of my time so the distinguished ranking member of the Ethics Committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ), may make any comments she may have.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the chairman for his work in this matter. He has addressed in his opening comments some important aspects of this particular matter.

Representatives CHARLES DENT and JOHN YARMUTH, who led the investigative subcommittee, will speak in greater detail about the facts of this matter and how and why the committee reached the recommendation for sanction that comes before the House today.

I would like to briefly remind our colleagues why we are discussing this matter on the floor today and the importance of the ethics process to the integrity of the House.

As noted before, the Ethics Committee is unique in that its membership is evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans. In that bipartisan spirit, I would like to cite the observations of two former chairmen of this committee about the role of the Ethics Committee and the role that it has in overseeing the House.

A former Republican chairman of the committee once said that the ethics process is not a “trial.” Instead, it is a “peer review process.” In that same vein, a former Democratic chair of the committee said, “The purpose of the ethics process is not punishment but accountability and credibility: accountability for the respondent and credibility for the House, itself.”

The committee followed these important principles in assessing the conduct of our colleague, Representative LAURA RICHARDSON. The recommendation for sanction we present today will ensure that Representative RICHARDSON is held accountable for her conduct. It will also reaffirm the credibility of the House by demonstrating our commitment to upholding and enforcing the ethics standards that apply to all of us equally. How the committee conducted the investigation in this matter reinforces the goals of accountability and credibility.

This matter was begun by the committee at its own initiative in the last Congress. The members of the subcommittee did not prejudge the outcome of this matter nor did the members of the full committee.

Out of fairness to all House Members and staff, it is important to point out that the mere fact that an individual is the subject of an investigation doesn't mean that a violation has actually occurred. The existence of an investigation doesn't reflect a judgment by the committee on the allegations. This is true whether the investigation has been publicly acknowledged by the committee or whether it remains confidential.

The committee conducted a thorough and fair investigation. Representative RICHARDSON was represented by counsel throughout the committee's investigation. She was provided with copies of materials gathered by the subcommittee. Representative RICHARDSON also chose to waive certain procedural rights and steps in the investigative process that were available to her. The subcommittee listened to her views and interpretations of the facts of the investigation as well as appro-

priate sanctions. The full committee also took into account her views.

Ultimately, a dozen Members of the House of both parties weighed the allegations regarding Representative RICHARDSON, and based on the facts, concluded that her conduct did not meet the ethical standards that apply to all of us in a number of respects. That conclusion was bipartisan and it was unanimous. The misconduct in this matter was serious, and in accordance with House precedent it merits the serious sanction of reprimand. Representative RICHARDSON has agreed to accept the sanction of reprimand for her conduct.

Usually, it is the committee's work in investigative matters like this one that receives public attention, but the committee's nonpartisan staff provides advice and education to Members and staff every day. The report issued by the committee in this matter serves both purposes.

If you have not already taken the opportunity to do so, I urge my colleagues and House staff to carefully read the committee's report.

As the report says, the boundaries between our official, political, and personal roles are sometimes clear, and sometimes they are complicated. This matter illustrates the consequences of failing to heed those boundaries.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge and thank my colleagues Representatives CHARLIE DENT, JOHN YARMUTH, ROB BISHOP, and BEN RAY LUJÁN for their hard work on the investigative subcommittee.

In addition, I want to thank all of our committee staff. Although we are a bipartisan committee, we have a professional nonpartisan staff. All of the members of the committee appreciate their continuing hard work and service to the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), who ably served as chairman of the investigative subcommittee, for any comments he may have.

Mr. DENT. I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama and the gentlelady from California for their leadership of the committee.

As a member of the Committee on Ethics and as the chairman of the investigative subcommittee, or ISC, in this matter, I do rise in support of the resolution, which calls for the adoption of this committee's report and will serve as a reprimand of Representative LAURA RICHARDSON for her conduct and will impose upon her a \$10,000 fine.

I do not relish speaking under these circumstances. This is, indeed, a solemn moment—when the House must consider punishing one of its own Members.

As the chairman stated, over the last 9 months, as members of the investigative subcommittee, my colleagues Mr. YARMUTH from Kentucky, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LUJÁN of New Mexico, and

I conducted an extensive investigation into the allegations regarding Representative LAURA RICHARDSON. The subcommittee met on over 20 occasions. In total, the ISC and staff conducted 12 interviews during this phase of the inquiry and reviewed the transcripts of the 17 interviews conducted during the committee's earlier phase of its inquiry. The subcommittee also reviewed thousands of pages of documents.

I appreciate the hard work of each of the subcommittee members, especially of the ranking member, Mr. YARMUTH of Kentucky. He is a pleasure to work with. I would also like to thank the nonpartisan professional staff of the Ethics Committee who conducted the investigation with dignity and professionalism at all times—Deborah Mayer, Cliff Stoddard, Sheria Clarke, Chris Tate, and Brittany Bohren.

At the conclusion of a thorough investigation, the subcommittee unanimously concluded that there was substantial reason to believe that Representative RICHARDSON had violated the Code of Official Conduct and other laws, rules, or standards of conduct. The chairman outlined the seven counts in the Statement of Alleged Violation, which was unanimously adopted by the investigative subcommittee.

Here is a summary of the findings of the report and why the committee recommends that Representative RICHARDSON be reprimanded by the House for her conduct.

As discussed fully in the investigative subcommittee report, fundamentally, Representative RICHARDSON failed to acknowledge the boundaries between the official and political realms. On page 59 of the ISC report, it reads in part:

This case is about boundaries. The House entrusts Members with a great deal of discretion over a large amount of taxpayer resources . . . This constructive trust requires Members to delineate between the official, the political, and the personal in ways that are at times quite tidy and at others tangled . . . Representative Richardson did not acknowledge these boundaries. She acted to consume the resources endowed to her as a Member for whatever purpose suited her whims at the moment, be they official acts, her reelection, or her personal needs . . . The ISC discovered significant evidence suggesting that her wrongdoing continued even after learning that the committee was investigating her.

□ 0930

If the committee fails to exact a steep price for such conduct, the message is one of a set of rules with a toothless enforcement mechanism.

Representative RICHARDSON's misconduct included that, first, she improperly compelled or coerced members of her staff to do campaign work. Representative RICHARDSON required the staff of her district office in Long Beach, California, to perform campaign work each weeknight from approximately 6:30 p.m. through 9 p.m. during at least the 2 months prior to the 2010

primary and general elections. This practice alone accounted for hundreds of hours of conscripted campaign work by public servants who did not wish to perform it and may not be forced to do so. She also required her district staff to perform additional campaign work on the weekends. Representative RICHARDSON applied the same philosophy to her Capitol Hill staff. This demonstrates a blatant disregard for the boundaries between official events and campaign events.

Second, Representative RICHARDSON used official resources of the House for campaign and nonofficial purposes. While the report has a detailed exposition of many of the resources used by Representative RICHARDSON, some of the more significant improper uses of resources included the use of staff time during the official work day to conduct campaign activities, repeated use of the House email system to conduct campaign business, use of the MRA to lease a car, which she parked at her house and used as her only mode of transportation in the district, regardless as to whether her destination was official, campaign, or personal in nature.

Third, Representative RICHARDSON paid her deputy district director as a full-time House employee, but for months before the 2010 elections she directed this employee to conduct campaign work for a significant portion of each day. Additionally, in 2011, nearly a year after Representative RICHARDSON received notice of the committee's investigation into misuse of House resources, Representative RICHARDSON hired a new district director, who, with Representative RICHARDSON's knowledge and approval, spent much of his time performing campaign work.

Taken together, a theme emerges. Representative RICHARDSON used her staff as she saw fit. The evidence does not demonstrate isolated incidents of compelled campaign work. If that were, in fact, the case, we would not likely be here today. It demonstrates a constant effort by Representative RICHARDSON to direct and pressure her official employees to perform as much campaign work as possible, regardless of whether or not they wanted to volunteer.

The environment Representative RICHARDSON cultivated in her office was so poor that one of her employees, a detailee from the Wounded Warrior's program, wrote in her letter of resignation:

As a service-connected disabled veteran, it is sad to say that I would rather be at war in Afghanistan than work under people that are morally corrupt.

Just as concerning as the substantive violations, if not more so, was the significant evidence that Representative RICHARDSON obstructed and attempted to obstruct the investigation. To fulfill our constitutional duty, the House must take action against any Member who improperly attempts to frustrate a committee investigation. The inves-

tigative subcommittee concluded that Representative RICHARDSON obstructed and attempted to obstruct the investigation into these allegations. Specifically, Representative RICHARDSON directed her staff to testify that their campaign work had been voluntary, even in cases where staff had not volunteered. She also attempted to obstruct the committee's investigation by altering or destroying evidence.

Finally, Representative RICHARDSON obstructed the investigation by failing to provide materials responsive to a subpoena issued by the investigative subcommittee. The investigative subcommittee served Representative RICHARDSON with that subpoena only after months had passed with Representative RICHARDSON ignoring numerous requests from the ISC that she provide responsive documents. Even then, the investigative subcommittee discovered documents that Representative RICHARDSON had in her possession, custody, or control and, nevertheless, failed to produce.

Based on these conclusions, the investigative subcommittee found that Representative RICHARDSON committed seven different violations of the Code of Official Conduct or other laws, rules, or standards of conduct.

Throughout this process, Representative RICHARDSON has been afforded every opportunity to defend herself. Ultimately, she initiated a negotiated resolution and admitted to the seven counts in the Statement of Alleged Violation. She received a copy of the investigative subcommittee report 5 days prior to its adoption and was given an opportunity to provide her views to be considered by the committee.

Through her misconduct, Representative LAURA RICHARDSON has violated the public trust. While no Member wants to sit in judgment of a colleague, it is our duty to protect the integrity of the House. Accordingly, on behalf of the committee, Mr. Speaker, I recommend that the House adopt the committee's unanimous report and that the report serve as a reprimand of Representative LAURA RICHARDSON for her misconduct.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a member of the Ethics Committee.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

As a member of the Committee on Ethics and as the ranking member of the investigative subcommittee in this matter, I rise in support of the resolution that calls for the adoption of this committee's report and will serve as a reprimand of Representative RICHARDSON for her conduct and will impose upon her a \$10,000 fine.

After the investigative subcommittee unanimously concluded that there was substantial reason to believe that Representative RICHARDSON had committed

these violations, Representative RICHARDSON initiated formal discussions regarding a negotiated resolution of her matter, which would avoid an adjudicatory hearing.

The investigative subcommittee engaged Representative RICHARDSON in good faith during these discussions, delaying its vote on a Statement of Alleged Violation by more than a week to continue negotiating. On July 18, 2012, Representative RICHARDSON agreed to the terms of a negotiated resolution with the investigative subcommittee. As a part of that resolution, Representative RICHARDSON has admitted to the seven counts in the Statement of Alleged Violation. There is no longer a factual dispute regarding whether these violations have been proven.

On July 26, 2012, the investigative subcommittee unanimously adopted its report and transmitted it to the full committee. Representative RICHARDSON was provided a copy of the report. Pursuant to the terms of the negotiated resolution, she was given 5 days to submit her views. On July 25, 2012, Representative RICHARDSON submitted her views on the report in writing. Those views were transmitted, along with the investigative subcommittee report, and considered by the full committee. As noted in the committee's report, the members were not persuaded by Representative RICHARDSON's submission.

Some of the terms in the negotiated resolution require action only by the Ethics Committee or Representative RICHARDSON, but there are terms that have been brought before the House today, Mr. Speaker, and that is the need for the House to impose the punishment that all parties agree is an acceptable sanction for Representative RICHARDSON's misconduct: a reprimand by the House of Representatives and the imposition of a \$10,000 fine.

It is important for all Members to understand that it is our responsibility to ensure that if our staffs wish to work on our campaigns, they must do it on their own time, outside of their office, and without the use of any official resources. A staffer is free to volunteer, but a Member cannot compel them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it became clear during the investigation that Representative RICHARDSON did not believe that she was compelling her official staff to work on her campaign. It was equally clear, after hearing from members of her staff, that they believed they were being compelled to do so.

There are examples of Representative RICHARDSON providing explicit directions to her staff to work on her campaign. There are more numerous examples when Representative RICHARDSON's actions would lead any reasonable staffer to believe that they were required to do campaign work or face retribution.

The way Members treat and manage their staffs is often as important and significant an influence on employee

understanding and actions as any words a Member may use. Ultimately, it is also the Member's responsibility to know and manage what is being asked of their staff and what isn't. As this case shows, when these rules are broken, Members are not only responsible, they will be held accountable.

□ 0940

Mr. Speaker, I, once again, support the approval of the Ethics Committee report and the sanctions imposed on Ms. RICHARDSON.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the committee has examined the case and reached a conclusion. The subject of the investigation has agreed to accept responsibility and, in fact, has affixed her name to the findings as a confirmation of such.

As a supporter and colleague of the subject of the investigation, I know that she regrets the violations and hopes that the reprimand by the House will allow both her and the House to move on to address the great issues facing the Nation.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close unless there are any further requests for time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am requesting time to speak.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy, on the part of the committee, to yield 5 minutes to Representative RICHARDSON.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman for yielding time, and it's my understanding I will be provided additional time, if needed.

I had no desire or intent to prolong the debate on this report. But given what has now been stated during this debate, which is contrary to what I understood to be agreed to, I want to make sure that my colleagues are aware of several issues critical to understanding the full context of this resolution.

First, I want to assure my colleagues that contrary to the inflammatory suggestions in the full committee report, I do take these findings very seriously and do accept the responsibility for the specific conduct set out in the Statement of Alleged Violations.

Second, I set forth in my statement of views, included in the committee report, several significant concerns about the manner in which the committee conducted this investigation. I find it was interesting that the ranking member stated in the initial discussion that the subject of an investigation does not mean that an individual or a violation has occurred. Well, in fact, in this investigation, there are seven areas where I feel that there has been a vio-

lation—prejudgment and improper influence of witnesses by the Ethics Committee, the very matter that the ranking member just mentioned. And I'll state for the record what specifically was stated in the statement of views.

During the rule 18(a) inquiry at the outset of the committee's process, the committee counsel improperly influenced witnesses by telling them a year before any such decision had been made by the Ethics Committee that the Ethics Committee was likely to impanel an investigative subcommittee, thereby clearly signaling that the Ethics Committee staff at least already believed that I, Representative RICHARDSON, was guilty of misconduct and, given the staff discussions, clearly influenced staff testimony.

For example, during their interview of Angel Macias, a key staff witness, Ethics counsel told Ms. Macias:

It's completely up to the full committee on what they want to do. They make the final decision, which could be anything from dismiss the matter entirely to investigate it by impaneling an investigative subcommittee.

Counsel continued:

If that happens, you will be called. You will be placed under oath. So that is the process. Chances are

—this is important—

Chances are, they are going to want to impanel.

This is according to Macias' transcript on page number 34.

Committee counsel told former district director Eric Boyd during his first interview that "the chances are very likely that you are going to be interviewed again. If you are interviewed again, it will be under oath; and it will be in front of members of the committee. My recommendations could be anywhere from dismiss the matter as being, you know, not a violation or not impanel an investigative subcommittee. I think you probably know which way at this point we are looking?"

Eric Boyd's transcript, page 83 and 84.

Committee counsel told district staffer Candace Yamagawa: The committee choices in this matter are to dismiss the matter because the information received lacks merit or lacks sufficient information to believe a violation occurred; or we recommend that an investigative subcommittee be impaneled.

You actually won't hear back from us until such time we decide to interview you again. And the reason is that, as I said, everything is done confidentially. I expect that we would not be able to impanel an investigative subcommittee until the beginning of the 112th Congress because there is insufficient time left in this Congress to do so. So more than likely, it would be in January we would impanel and begin doing any additional work.

And, finally:

The committee counsel told Kenneth Miller during his first rule 18(a) interview in November 2010 that, "When I present the findings to the Members, I will give them a full briefing on what I believe was violated, be it House rules, campaign law, or Federal criminal statutes."

Miller testimony, page 47.

During these interviews with my staff, the committee attorneys made clear to staff witnesses that the Ethics

Committee staff had already determined that I had committed violations at the very first stages of the preliminary inquiry. Committee staff explicitly requested that my staff not speak with my own counsel, a recognized form of prosecutorial misconduct, which effectively deprived me of an opportunity to actually learn of the specific allegations against me until the final stages of this investigation. And after the resolution had been negotiated, new and additional allegations appeared in the investigative subcommittee report supported by two attorney proffers that I still, to this date, have never seen.

The full committee report takes issue with my raising these concerns, stating that in the resolution of the matter I waived all my procedural rights and that the time for lodging these objections had passed. These concerns should have been taken seriously by the committee, as I brought them forward.

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

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentlelady from California how much additional time does she intend to seek because, as I have heard her comments, respectfully, it sounds like those were all contained in her response which was included in the report submitted to the House.

So I would ask, how much additional time would you be seeking to conclude your comments?

Ms. RICHARDSON. Well, I was told that I would be allowed to continue to request additional time to complete my presentation.

I would say approximately, I think, less than 5 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I will yield the gentlelady 5 additional minutes.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The purpose of me standing today—and I had no intentions of speaking because I believe we had agreed to a certain format of what would have occurred. But the most important issue that I bring forward is the comments of Mr. DENT.

Third, with respect to the count charging obstruction of the committee investigation, I want to make clear that the Statement of Alleged Violations does not assert anywhere that I deliberately failed to produce documents in response to requests for information and a subpoena, as referenced in yesterday's public statement by the chair and the ranking member. I did not admit to this conduct, and I certainly do deny it. And it's my understanding that the committee is aware that, in fact, it was not included.

With respect to the conduct to which I did admit, my statement of views explains that my office calendars were adjusted retroactively but only to accurately reflect the history of the time worked by my deputy district director. Discussions about that adjustment, in

fact, took place before the committee commenced its inquiry.

I did at the very beginning of the committee's preliminary inquiry suggest—and, Mr. Chairman, I think this is very important—I acknowledge the Statement of Alleged Violations. In fact, much of what has been said today has been, in fact, true.

But what I want to make emphatically clear and what I want to emphasize is that I have never taken or threatened any action against any staffer who did not volunteer to work on my campaign.

There is no doubt that a number of staff felt compelled or coerced to do so. That was not my intent, and I deeply regret that this occurred. And because I want to make sure it is very clear to the committee, I will repeat that statement. There is no doubt that a number of staff felt compelled or coerced to do so, and that was not my intent, and I deeply do regret that this occurred. I never told any staff member that they would be out of a job if they did not work on the campaign. And it is undisputed that I was not present at the staff meeting at which time the statement was made.

With that context and these clarifications, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that my colleagues refer, as was stated by the committee, to my public reference to this matter, my statement of views, which are included in the report.

As I conclude, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, I look forward to the resolution of this matter. In fact, I have sought the resolution of this matter for well over a year.

□ 0950

And I have agreed to the items that were set forward; however, some of the details that were said in the language that was said today was not what had been discussed. And so, for the record, I wanted to clarify that.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may not reserve her time. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Alabama.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just feel it is important to point out several important issues that were raised by Ms. RICHARDSON in her comments on the floor today.

Much of what she has stated on the floor today was included in the views that she filed after reviewing the report that was issued. She raised these points in her views of the report. And I feel compelled to add that the committee took those views very seriously, and they responded and refuted those points in its response to her views, which is all included in the report which has been made publicly available.

Everything that has been stated on the floor today by any Member, but

most especially Mr. DENT, are statements that are already included in the report to which Representative RICHARDSON has responded. And again, many of the points that she raised we investigated, took very seriously, and included in response to those views.

I don't think that there is anything further to add other than she has been given an opportunity to voice her concerns at every step of the process, and we have scrupulously adhered to a process to try to take her views and her suggestions into account and we have arrived at the report which is unanimously agreed on by all of the committee members.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to close if the ranking member has no further speakers.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to once again thank members of the committee, as well as members of the pool, for their tremendous service that they render to this institution. And on behalf of the entire House, I want to again thank the nonpartisan, professional committee staff for their extraordinary hard work and commitment to the House of Representatives and to the American people that we all serve.

As it is often noted on the floor, especially during somber moments like this, public office is a public trust. And for the vast majority of Members who have been honored with the opportunity, the privilege to serve in this, the people's House, there is an unspoken duty to hold ourselves up to a higher standard.

Unfortunately, as Representative RICHARDSON has admitted, she did not live up to that higher standard. And as such, she did a disservice to her staff, to her colleagues. And while it is ultimately up to her constituents in California to be the final judge of her actions, I think it is safe to say she did a disservice to the hardworking taxpayers from all corners of this country who expect and deserve more from their elected leaders.

Throughout the course of this matter, the investigative subcommittee heard desperate, sometimes emotional pleas for help from members of Representative RICHARDSON's staff. Representative DENT has shared at least one of the stories with the body today. And even since word first broke yesterday of this resolution this morning, the committee has received calls from other staffers thanking us for bringing this matter to a public resolution.

As a former Hill staffer myself, I have great respect for those staffers who were willing to come to the Ethics Committee with their stories and heartfelt concerns. That is not an easy thing to do against a Member of Congress, particularly when that person claims to be your boss and you're made to feel that your job is in jeopardy. At

the end of the day, however, we must remember and never forget that the real employer for us all are the American people.

I was particularly moved by one of Representative RICHARDSON's former staffers who testified:

This certainly should not be an example as to the way an elected official for this country should conduct themselves under any circumstance.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am simply haunted by the statement of another staffer that Mr. DENT referenced, a lady who was part of the Wounded Warrior program, someone who was willing to risk her life in service to her country, and ended up coming home a disabled veteran. She told the committee, and it bears repeating:

It is sad to say that I would rather be at war in Afghanistan than work under people who are morally corrupt.

Mr. Speaker, while some might prefer a harsher sentence, perhaps a few might even think a reprimand is too severe, I urge my colleagues to support the unanimous recommendation of the only evenly divided committee in this House of Representatives.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 755.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles.

H.R. 1369. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1021 Pennsylvania Avenue in Hartshorne, Oklahoma, as the "Warren Lindley Post Office".

H.R. 1560. An act to amend the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act to allow the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo Tribe to determine blood quantum requirement for membership in that tribe.

H.R. 3276. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2810 East Hillsborough Avenue in Tampa, Florida, as the "Reverend Abe Brown Post Office Building".

H.R. 3412. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1421 Veterans Memorial Drive in Abbeville, Louisiana, as the "Sergeant Richard Franklin Abshire Post Office Building".

H.R. 3501. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 125 Kerr Avenue in Rome City, Indiana, as the "SPC Nicholas Scott Hartge Post Office".

H.R. 3772. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 150 South Union Street in Canton, Mississippi, as the "First Sergeant Landres Cheeks Post Office Building".

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill and agreed to a joint resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1409. An act to intensify efforts to identify, prevent, and recover payment error, waste, fraud, and abuse within Federal spending.

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Barbara Barrett as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1905) "An Act to strengthen Iran sanctions laws for the purpose of compelling Iran to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons and other threatening activities, and for other purposes".

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1005

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EXTENDING CERTAIN TRADE PROGRAMS

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5986) to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to extend the third-country fabric program and to add South Sudan to the list of countries eligible for designation under that Act, to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States relating to the textile and apparel rules of origin for the Do-

minican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5986

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENTS TO AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) EXTENSION OF THIRD-COUNTRY FABRIC PROGRAM.—Section 112(c)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking "2012" and inserting "2015";

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking "2012" and inserting "2015"; and

(3) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking "2012" and inserting "2015".

(b) ADDITION OF SOUTH SUDAN.—Section 107 of that Act (19 U.S.C. 3706) is amended by inserting after "Republic of South Africa (South Africa)," the following:

"Republic of South Sudan (South Sudan)."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 102(2) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 3701(2)) is amended by striking "48".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATIONS TO TEXTILE AND APPAREL RULES OF ORIGIN FOR THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC-CENTRAL AMERICA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term "Agreement" has the meaning given the term in section 3(1) of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 109-53; 19 U.S.C. 4002(1)).

(2) CAFTA-DR COUNTRY.—The term "CAFTA-DR country" has the meaning given the term in section 3(2) of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 109-53; 19 U.S.C. 4002(2)).

(3) HTS.—The term "HTS" means the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(4) TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—The term "Trade Representative" means the United States Trade Representative.

(b) MODIFICATIONS TO THE TEXTILE AND APPAREL RULES OF ORIGIN.—

(1) INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF RULES OF ORIGIN.—Subdivision (m)(viii) of general note 29 of the HTS is amended as follows:

(A) The matter following subdivision (A)(2) is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: "Any elastomeric yarn (except latex) contained in the originating yarns referred to in subdivision (A)(2) must be formed in the territory of one or more of the parties to the Agreement."

(B) Subdivision (B) is amended—

(i) in the matter preceding subdivision (B)(1), by striking "exclusive of collars and cuffs where applicable," and inserting "exclusive of collars, cuffs and ribbed waistbands (only if the ribbed waistband is present in combination with cuffs and identical in fabric construction to the cuffs) where applicable,";

(ii) in subdivision (B)(2), by inserting "or knit to shape components" after "one or more fabrics";

(iii) by amending subdivision (B)(3) to read as follows:

"(3) any combination of the fabrics referred to in subdivision (B)(1), the fabrics or knit to shape components referred to in subdivision (B)(2), or one or more fabrics or knit to shape components originating under this note."; and

(iv) in the matter following subdivision (B)(3), by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: "Any elastomeric yarn (except latex) contained in an originating fabric or knit to shape component referred to in subdivision (B)(3) must be formed in the territory of one or more of the parties to the Agreement."

(C) Subdivision (C) is amended—

(i) in subdivision (C)(2), by inserting "or knit to shape components" after "one or more fabrics";

(ii) by amending subdivision (C)(3) to read as follows:

"(3) any combination of the fabrics referred to in subdivision (C)(1), the fabrics or knit to shape components referred to in subdivision (C)(2) or one or more fabrics or knit to shape components originating under this note."; and

(iii) in the matter following subdivision (C)(3), by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: "Any elastomeric yarn (except latex) contained in an originating fabric or knit to shape component referred to in subdivision (C)(3) must be formed in the territory of one or more of the parties to the Agreement."

(2) CHANGE IN TARIFF CLASSIFICATION RULES.—Subdivision (n) of general note 29 of the HTS is amended as follows:

(A) Chapter rule 4 to chapter 61 is amended—

(i) by striking "5401 or 5508" and inserting "5401, or 5508 or yarn of heading 5402 used as sewing thread,"; and

(ii) by inserting "or yarn" after "only if such sewing thread".

(B) The chapter rules to chapter 61 are amended by inserting after chapter rule 5 the following:

"Chapter rule 6: Notwithstanding chapter rules 1, 3, 4 or 5 to this chapter, an apparel good of chapter 61 shall be considered originating regardless of the origin of any visible lining fabric described in chapter rule 1 to this chapter, narrow elastic fabrics as described in chapter rule 3 to this chapter, sewing thread or yarn of heading 5402 used as sewing thread described in chapter rule 4 to this chapter or pocket bag fabric described in chapter rule 5 to this chapter, provided such material is listed in U.S. note 20 to subchapter XXII of chapter 98 and the good meets all other applicable requirements for preferential tariff treatment under this note."

(C) Chapter rules 3, 4, and 5 to chapter 62 are each amended by striking "nightwear" each place it appears and inserting "sleepwear".

(D) Chapter rule 4 to chapter 62 is amended—

(i) by striking "5401 or 5508" and inserting "5401, or 5508 or yarn of heading 5402 used as sewing thread,"; and

(ii) by inserting "or yarn" after "only if such sewing thread".

(E) The chapter rules to chapter 62 are amended by inserting after chapter rule 5 the following:

"Chapter rule 6: Notwithstanding chapter rules 1, 3, 4 or 5 to this chapter, an apparel good of chapter 62 shall be considered originating regardless of the origin of any visible lining fabric described in chapter rule 1 to this chapter, narrow elastic fabrics as described in chapter rule 3 to this chapter, sewing thread or yarn of heading 5402 used as sewing thread described in chapter rule 4 to this chapter or pocket bag fabric described in

chapter rule 5, provided such material is listed in U.S. note 20 to subchapter XXII of chapter 98 and the good meets all other applicable requirements for preferential tariff treatment under this note.”.

(F) Tariff classification rule 33 to chapter 62 is amended to read as follows:

“33. A change to pajamas and sleepwear of subheadings 6207.21 or 6207.22, tariff items 6207.91.30 or 6207.92.40, subheadings 6208.21 or 6208.22 or tariff items 6208.91.30, 6208.92.00 or 6208.99.20 from any other chapter, provided that the good is cut or knit to shape, or both, and sewn or otherwise assembled in the territory of one or more of the parties to the Agreement.”.

(G) Chapter rule 2 to chapter 63 is amended—

(i) by striking “5401 or 5508” and inserting “5401, or 5508 or yarn of heading 5402 used as sewing thread.”; and

(ii) by inserting “or yarn” after “only if such sewing thread”.

(H) The chapter rules to chapter 63 are amended by inserting after chapter rule 2 the following:

“Chapter rule 3: Notwithstanding chapter rule 2 to this chapter, a good of this chapter shall be considered originating regardless of the origin of sewing thread or yarn of heading 5402 used as sewing thread described in chapter rule 2 to this chapter, provided the thread or yarn is listed in U.S. note 20 to subchapter XXII of chapter 98 and the good meets all other applicable requirements for preferential tariff treatment under this note.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this subsection apply to goods of a CAFTA-DR country that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that the Trade Representative determines is the first date on which the equivalent amendments to the rules of origin of the Agreement have entered into force in all CAFTA-DR countries.

(B) PUBLICATION OF DETERMINATION.—The Trade Representative shall promptly publish notice of the determination under subparagraph (A) in the Federal Register.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF AND RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

(a) EXTENSION OF BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.—Section 9(b)(3) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-61; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking “nine years” and inserting “twelve years”.

(b) RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) and section 3A (b)(1) and (c)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall be deemed to be a “renewal resolution” for purposes of section 9 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act or July 26, 2012, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 4. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(1) in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year), the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2017 shall be 100.25 percent of such amount; and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in

paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF CUSTOMS USER FEES.

Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “August 2, 2021” and inserting “October 22, 2021”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “December 8, 2020” and inserting “October 29, 2021”;

(3) by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this legislation to strengthen trade and investment ties with Africa and the CAFTA-DR countries and support well-paying jobs in the United States. The legislation also extends the President’s authority to impose the import ban on products from Burma for an additional 3 years and reauthorizes the actual imposition of the import sanctions for 1 year. The legislation has broad bipartisan support and is supported by all stakeholders.

AGOA has succeeded in deepening trade and investment ties with sub-Saharan Africa and underscoring U.S. commitment to the region. The apparel industry has been a major driver of employment growth in Africa under AGOA. In Lesotho alone, jobs in the textile and apparel industry have more than doubled—growing from 19,000 to 45,000—because of AGOA. This bill extends the third-country fabric provisions which are vital to ensuring the continued success of the AGOA program and ensures that the new Republic of South Sudan is eligible to benefit from AGOA.

Under the CAFTA-DR trade agreement, trade has grown substantially. And since the implementation of this agreement, the trade deficit the United States previously had with these countries has turned into a trade surplus. Today’s legislation builds upon that success by further improving the agreement’s textile rules of origin. These changes encourage greater use of U.S. inputs in the CAFTA-DR countries, which supports U.S. jobs and improves trade integration in our hemisphere.

In 2003, Congress passed the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, which included an import ban on products of

Burma renewable once a year for a total of 3 years. The law has been extended twice. This legislation extends the President’s authority to impose the import ban for an additional 3 years and reauthorizes the actual import sanctions for 1 year.

Now, I want to acknowledge the positive developments in Burma over the last year, but much work remains ahead with respect to political and economic reforms, human rights, the release of political prisoners, freedom of speech, press, association, as well as religion, and the treatment of ethnic groups within the country—all factors required for full termination of the import sanctions and other restrictions in the 2003 law.

I encourage the Burmese Government to continue its current reforms and commence others to fully address the concerns that led Congress to pass the 2003 law. For all of these reasons, we urgently need to pass this important legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

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

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, which extends expiring provisions of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, adds the country of South Sudan to a list of countries eligible for trade preferences, implements technical fixes for the CAFTA agreement, and renews the Burma sanctions.

The expiring third-country fabric provision is the cornerstone of AGOA and one of the most valuable parts of our trading relationship with Africa. Tens of thousands of workers and hundreds of companies depend on this provision.

□ 1010

It is critical that we extend it now before it expires next month. We have delayed this extension for a year, and this unnecessary delay has cost thousands of jobs and millions in investment. It has hurt progress in Africa. We could have avoided these senseless job losses here and in Africa.

I introduced this legislation to extend third-country fabric and add South Sudan over a year ago. The delay was just politics. We are, unfortunately, in an era when commonsense things can’t get done. As usual, the political games accomplished nothing.

AGOA itself was truly bipartisan. We all worked together to compromise it and get a good thing done. That was a different era. At least today’s vote will reflect some of the bipartisanship that has been a hallmark of AGOA from the start.

The bill also adds South Sudan to the list of AGOA-eligible countries. South Sudan deserves every opportunity and

every vote of confidence we can muster.

This package also contains important technical fixes for CAFTA textiles—that's from Central America—the fixes that businesses and workers have been waiting for since February of last year.

I also am pleased that we are renewing our evolving policy on Burma. Burma has made important steps in the last 18 months, but there's still a long way to go.

I'm particularly pleased with the investment transparency measures that the State Department has put forward. They are innovative, common sense, and exactly what investors and the American public need and expect.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in strongly supporting passage of this important bipartisan legislation to deepen trade ties with sub-Saharan Africa and the Central American-Dominican Republic countries and renew sanctions on Burma. As Chairman CAMP pointed out, this legislation is strongly supported by America's textile industry and will help build more integrated supply chains between the United States and both Africa and Central America, maximizing the benefits of the agreements we describe as AGOA and CAFTA-DR.

These provisions support well-paying U.S. jobs and jobs in sub-Saharan Africa and Central America.

I was honored to help lead with Chairman CAMP the effort to pass CAFTA-DR, and I'm pleased now to see this successful agreement be further improved through the legislation we are considering today.

This bill also extends the President's authority to continue the import ban under the 2003 Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act. I am not normally a fan of unilateral sanctions, but I believe these programs must be evaluated carefully to determine their effectiveness and implications for America's economy, and this does. I also recognize that as the sole remaining superpower, we have the responsibility to show our disapproval of rogue states and human rights abusers. The sanctions regime under the 2003 law is a model in this regard, and I can say that recent developments in Burma confirm the need for continuous evaluation.

Although the Burmese Government has taken many positive steps, these reforms must continue and grow so the citizens of Burma can gain true political and economic freedom—the goals very much at the heart of the original 2003 law. For that reason, I believe we should continue the current sanctions regime as the international community keeps a watchful eye on developments.

At the end of the day, this is a jobs bill, and a bipartisan one at that. I

urge my colleagues to support this essential legislation.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you so much. It was such a pleasure hearing the word knocked around here, "bipartisanship," and well there should be. I hope we can explain what it means to some of the newer Members.

As I was talking with JIM McDERMOTT, whose ideas first created this legislation, some on the other side were Mr. Crane from Illinois, who was the cosponsor; Speaker Gingrich who was the first witness for this bill as I introduced it; and, of course, President Clinton, who took a bipartisan group of Members to Africa not only to help these African countries but to help American industry and the textile industry. But more importantly than anything, the United States became a symbol of being able to help people not just by handouts but by teaching them exactly what has to be done.

Oh, yes, JIM McDERMOTT is right that when it comes to picking up the pieces and moving forward in terms of expiration dates and people not knowing how to invest. But let's face it, JIM, in today's climate, this is some sort of legislative miracle.

And it was completed with the help of KAREN BASS, who came here and she worked the devil out of people on the other side of the aisle. They got so annoyed with her that I had to come in and to let the committee members know that she's new here, but when she gets involved in something, that the Senate, the other body, doesn't mean that much. I got a call from BOB MENENDEZ saying it was his idea all along to get this thing through. And we have done it.

I do hope, Chairman CAMP, that we might snatch what this means in bipartisanship. It may be long and difficult before this session ends to find something else. But I know that those who played a role in this over a decade ago and see that we are moving forward in that bipartisan way with the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, that we all leave here as better legislators.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I just have one remaining speaker, so I'm going to reserve. But before I do that, I just want to acknowledge Mr. RANGEL's remarks and acknowledge his leadership on this issue over many years. He was at the forefront of making this AGOA agreement a reality, and I want to thank him for that and for all of his hard work over a very long period of time.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, JOE CROWLEY.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend and colleague from Washington for yielding his time, and I want to thank

all those involved in bringing this important legislation to the floor and doing it, albeit maybe a little late in some components, but getting it here all the same. And I understand it was not necessarily the House of Representatives that was the reason for the hold-up, but I am very pleased to be here today.

I also want to make note of the baby steps we may be taking here in terms of bipartisanship, Chairman CAMP, as well as my colleagues on my side of the aisle. I think those watching today may see a little glimmer of hope that more can be accomplished in the weeks to come before the elections. I, for one, am not necessarily holding my breath, but I want to make the offer that I'm interested in seeing that happen. But even though they are baby steps, it should not diminish the importance of the legislation that we have before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan measure. Part of the legislation is a provision that I introduced to maintain the ban on imports from Burma for 1 additional year. Its passage will demonstrate America's ongoing commitment to the advancement of human rights.

When I traveled to Burma last January, I was the first Member of Congress to officially travel to that country in 12 years. I saw the possibilities for change with my own eyes. I saw the families of political prisoners hoping for a genuine and permanent freedom. I saw ethnic minority leaders expressing the belief that reconciliation was possible. And I saw the tremendous courage of Aung San Suu Kyi, a leader so dedicated to her people that she was undeterred for nearly two decades of house arrest.

No, she did not demand that this bill be passed into law. In fact, Aung San Suu Kyi has urged a decrease in international pressure.

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

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Aung San Suu Kyi has urged a decrease in international pressure on Burma. But by renewing this bill today and keeping this measure on the books even as we are open to new flexibilities, we will help send a strong signal to those in Burma that the United States will continue to focus on the need for the immediate release of all political prisoners and prisoners of conscience, an end to violence against all minorities, including the Kachin and the Rohingya, and the adoption of genuine democratic reform in Burma.

□ 1020

I stand in strong support of this bill, and I urge its immediate adoption.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the original authors of this measure,

along with JIM McDERMOTT and CHARLIE RANGEL, and I know how much work over the last week has gone into this in terms of the work by Chairman DAVE CAMP, by KAREN BASS, and by others who have worked to get this bill out of the Senate.

I wanted to make a few observations on this measure and the impact it has had. I chaired the Africa Subcommittee when we passed the African Growth and Opportunity Act. It was bipartisan. It was historic.

Before, Africa policy was just aid policy. With AGOA, we created a trade policy for Africa. With AGOA, we have seen exports and imports double into sub-Saharan Africa. And I have had the opportunity to see this program's benefits, hundreds of thousands of jobs, most held by women, created in the apparel sector, boosting very poor countries in Africa.

And AGOA has also strengthened the rule of law in Africa because that's one of the conditions, that when we wrote this bill and marked it up, we put that conditionality on, that eligibility criteria.

And I just wanted to remind the Members for a minute, and this is testimony from Jas Bedi, chairman of the African Cotton and Textile Industry Federation, the eligibility criteria of AGOA compelled most African countries to embrace the rule of law, to allow for political pluralism, and respect democracy and basic human rights. Those were requirements. And the move toward independent judges and independent judicial systems separate of the government in order to enforce the rule of law was very, very important across the continent.

And if we didn't act today, because today is the last day to extend the third-country provision, these jobs would have shifted to Asia. And that's what we were told in the hearings that we held on both the House and Senate sides on this issue. Already, a number of jobs have been lost to Asia because of uncertainty over whether Congress would act.

There's a second provision that I think is very important, and that's the South Sudan eligibility. South Sudan became an independent country in July of 2011. And for those of us who have visited South Sudan and have been in Sudan to see the situation, it's very important that South Sudan get this opportunity.

Prior to its independence, exporters in South Sudan were eligible for AGOA benefits as part of Sudan, and this legislation ensures that these exporters continue to be eligible for AGOA benefits, very important to the new economy in that new country.

Both bodies must act today. Both bodies must do this so that we can put this bill on the President's desk. We have worked, over the years, our coalition, with both President Clinton and President Bush. We have traveled to Africa with the former President in order to help sell him on this idea and to sell our colleagues on this concept.

Today, with the changes that we're seeing, with the economic growth that we're seeing across sub-Saharan Africa, I think we can be jointly proud of this bipartisan effort. So I think it is a lesson in doing the right thing.

And I, again, want to congratulate Chairman DAVE CAMP and his staff and our friends on the other side of the aisle, especially KAREN BASS, for the flurry of activity over the last 72 hours with our meetings with our Senate colleagues in order to get this done.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California, (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS of California. I want to thank the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. McDERMOTT) for his leadership, and I also want to acknowledge Congressman RANGEL for his historic commitment to AGOA.

But, in addition, I want to thank, as I stand here next to two men who I consider giants in the House of Representatives, I want to thank them for their patience and their guidance with me as a new Member here. It's been pretty amazing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL—as they all worked with me to make sure that we were able to be here this moment and pass AGOA.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of African growth and opportunity legislation, H.R. 5986. Passage of today's legislation comes as a result of strong and widespread bipartisan and bicameral support. It's been a pleasure to work alongside Mr. ROYCE in this bipartisan effort, and I also want to thank my friend from the Senate, Senator COONS, who has been a stalwart advocate.

I want to acknowledge the African Diplomatic Corps. Thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of African jobs will be saved as a result of your efforts.

Mr. Speaker, Africa is on the rise. Today, six of the world's fastest growing economies are in Africa. Opportunities abound, and we see increased political stability.

Today's House vote on the extension of AGOA's fabric provision is, by all measures, a success for the U.S. and Africa alike. But we must not stop here. Let us take a moment to acknowledge this accomplishment, but also prepare ourselves for AGOA's reauthorization in 2015.

Africa, a continent of opportunity, for too long has been overshadowed and ignored. While humanitarian, governance, and health challenges remain, we are the observers of remarkable growth and stability across the continent that exemplify positive strides that Africans themselves have made.

Africa, and its many nations, stand on the critical precipice of extraordinary change. Increasingly, Africa's resource mineral wealth attracts investments by countries like China, Brazil, and India. We must, in the United States, increase our invest-

ment. We cannot allow our Nation to be left behind.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, who's been active in trade issues his entire career in Congress.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have enjoyed saying over the past several years that if we don't shape the global economy, we will be shaped by it. And we also have, as we all know, so much attention focused on divisions that exist in this institution. We know that the media like to cover pictures, mistakes and conflict. And, obviously, conflict here is something that the media like to focus attention on.

Well, here we are, Democrats and Republicans, coming together under the great leadership of my friend DAVE CAMP, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, we have the ranking member of the Trade Subcommittee, Mr. BRADY, was here earlier, the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, working to focus on this notion of our shaping the global economy.

As I look over and see my friend from New York, Mr. RANGEL, I'm reminded of December 1999. He and I were with President Clinton in Seattle, Washington, at the ministerial meeting of the World Trade Organization. You know, that meeting itself turned out to be an abject failure. The meeting itself was an abject failure.

In fact, I'll never forget, the week after that ministerial meeting in 1999, the cover of the Economist magazine said: "Who Lost in Seattle?" And the photograph was a starving baby in Bangladesh.

But the good thing that did emerge from that meeting in Seattle that we attended back in 1999 was the fact that we were vigorously pursuing the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act; and we had laid the groundwork, again, working in a bipartisan way, to say that pursuing trade, not aid, was the best thing for everyone.

□ 1030

Now, Mr. CAMP was testifying before the Rules Committee the other day, and we were talking about this issue of a zero sum game when it comes to taxes. We also have to recognize, when it comes to the issue of trade, it is not a zero sum game. It is a win-win for us if you look at all of the issues covered in this measure—whether it's the African Growth and Opportunity Act, whether it's focusing on our great friends to the south, the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic, whether it's looking at the area where I'm going to be next week.

Next week, I'm headed to Burma, and I'm so enthused about the changes that are taking place. We need to encourage that, and I believe that the actions we

are taking here can play a role in continuing to encourage the positive reforms that we are seeing take place in Burma. We're not there yet—that's why we need to take this action—but we are moving in the right direction.

My fellow Californian Mr. ROYCE mentioned South Sudan—the newest country in the world. Last month, I was there when they marked their first anniversary of existence. This is a country that is seeking to get its sea legs. I was pleased to be there with my colleague Mr. PRICE, who cochairs our House Democracy Partnership. We are looking at the idea of possibly putting together a partnership between this new parliament, with a very impressive speaker, in South Sudan and the United States House of Representatives. The idea of incorporating South Sudan as part of the African Growth and Opportunity Act is again an indication that we very much want to strengthen ties with new and re-emerging democracies around the world, not just politically but commercially as well.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this effort, and I congratulate my friends on both sides of the aisle who are making it happen. I especially express appreciation to my very, very good friend Mr. CAMP, who has championed this and so many other important issues. He and I will be together again this afternoon when we get to, I hope, put together a strong bipartisan effort to implement the notion of bringing about real meaningful tax reform.

Mr. McDERMOTT. May I inquire as to how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The gentleman from Washington has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Does the gentleman from Michigan have any more speakers?

Mr. CAMP. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, many people played a part in all of this. Nothing in Congress ever gets done by one person. Nothing ever gets done by one side or the other, and the good things that happen here always happen on a bipartisan basis. I'm sorry ED ROYCE left, because ED ROYCE and I worked together.

One day, he called me. He said, JIM, I'm going out to Africa to look at some of the places in which the AGOA Act is working. Will you go with me?

I said, Why?

Well, he said, I need a Democrat on the trip.

That kind of relationship is rare around here, unfortunately, and I think that people need to recognize that it is still going on—that this place runs on trust.

Very early on in this session, I said to DAVE CAMP, When are you going to bring up the AGOA Act?

He said, It's going to come up.

I've asked him many times since, and he has said it's going to come up. So I told all of my African friends, It's going to come up because DAVE CAMP said it's going to come up.

I'm really pleased to acknowledge that he kept his word, because what this place runs on is trust. If you don't trust somebody in here, then you don't do business with him. If you trust him, even if it takes him a long time and you have to poke him a bunch of times, you know that ultimately he's going to do what he said he was going to do. I want to acknowledge Chairman CAMP for that because I think it is reflective of what can make it possible for us to do tax reform in this House.

It is something that took a long time the last time they did it, but it was built on the trust between Reagan and Rostenkowski and Tip O'Neill. It took a bit of time, but it will happen again if we learn to act on the behalf of the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank the ranking member of the Trade Subcommittee for his kind comments and for his leadership as well over the years. This really was a team effort. A lot of people on both sides of the aisle came together to make this a reality.

I'll just briefly say that this is bipartisan legislation that does deepen our trade and investment ties with Africa and with the CAFTA-DR countries. It also supports well-paying jobs here in the United States as well as in other countries, as Mr. DREIER stated. This is not a zero sum game. This will help both of our nations as well as Africa. Also, this legislation reauthorizes the import ban on Burmese products.

I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5986.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6233, AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2012

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 752 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 752

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6233) to make supplemental agricultural disaster assistance available for fiscal year 2012 with the costs of such assistance offset by changes to certain conservation programs, and for other purposes.

All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 752 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 6233, the Agricultural Disaster Assistance Act of 2012.

As a lifelong farmer myself, including operating a nursery and being a beekeeper, I can certainly empathize with being vulnerable to Mother Nature and the plight caused by unpredictable weather.

Without a doubt, the good Lord has blessed this country with an abundance of natural gifts, and I am very thankful for America's farmers, who work to utilize and protect these blessings to help feed our country and others throughout the world. Unfortunately, the drought devastating so much of the United States this year has yielded a tremendous amount of financial hardships not only for these farmers but also for those throughout the rest of the economy that depend on their products.

Mr. Speaker, it's important to remember that it is not just farmers affected by this drought. The consequences of this disaster impact all Americans, from those living in the biggest cities to those living in the most remote areas of this country. Not only does drought aggravate the risk of wildfires that have raged throughout the West, but it compromises our crops, which are used to feed our livestock and even fuel our cars.

□ 1040

The effects will last long after rain brings much-needed relief. With the price of corn jumping 50 percent since June, grocery costs continue to climb. The Department of Agriculture now estimates food prices could climb between 2.5 percent and 3.5 percent this year, and between 3 percent and 4 percent next year.

Also of consequence to price conscious energy consumers is how the

drought impacts the price of gasoline. Federal law provides that 10 percent of gasoline to be composed of ethanol. The increasing price has led some ethanol refineries to cut production, which, in turn, increases what drivers pay at the pump.

While many will suffer from inflated costs of staples they use every day, there are millions of Americans who live in communities throughout this country that are economically dependent on agriculture activity. Many of those living in sparsely populated regions work in businesses that thrive on the income associated with agricultural sales.

If anything positive is to come from this drought, my hope is that Americans gain a renewed appreciation for all the different ways agricultural productivity touches everyone's lives every day.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 6233, the supplemental agriculture disaster assistance.

Look, weather impacts our lives. I'm going to talk a little bit about climate change and some of the driving factors that are causing more severe weather conditions, be they droughts or floods. Yes, they affect businesses, but the solution is not another Republican Big Government government bailout of yet another industry. The Republicans have bailed out Wall Street. The Republicans have bailed out the banks. Now the Republicans are seeking to bail out cows. Yes, Mr. Speaker, another Big Government solution to another problem, in part, of their own creation by refusing to take up action and reducing our carbon emissions for climate change.

Where does this all end, when it's too cloudy? The solar industry might suffer. Are we going to bail them out? When it's not windy enough, the wind industry might suffer. Are we going to bail them out? We have restaurants on Pearl Street Mall in Boulder that have rooftop lounges. When it's too hot, less people go up to the rooftop lounges. We've had a drought in May and June and not enough people went to rooftop lounges. I would like to ask my colleague, Ms. FOXX, if there could be government bailout money for those rooftop lounges.

I yield to the gentlelady from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. I'm sorry. I don't understand the analogy that you're making.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, there's just a particular sector. Maybe they have a lot of lobbyists. Maybe they're a big special interest, they own cows. We're going to bail them out because the price of hay has gone up. That's what we're talking about here today.

We're talking about a closed rule. We're talking about a closed process. This is nothing new, this lack of transparency, this limited debate, pushing through a Big Government Republican bailout on short notice without even giving Members enough time to offer improvements to the bill, to change the bill. The first time that Republicans and Democrats even saw this bill was late Tuesday night, and here we are on the floor of the House without a single hearing, without a single markup, pushing through this bill, shutting out opportunities for Democrats or Republicans to offer improvements to this bill.

This is one of the worst and widest droughts we've seen in decades. I see that firsthand in Colorado. We have had devastating fires this summer coupled with extreme heat in the West. This is indicative of a need to address the true culprit: climate change. The evidence that recent droughts and heat waves are linked to climate change is growing suddenly and represents the strong scientific consensus.

We need the very conservation programs in the farm bill that are being gutted for this Big Government bailout of cows. The very programs cut by this bill are needed to help farmers and ranchers conserve soil, conserve water to make their farms and ranches more resilient to the devastating impacts we see from climate change and to mitigate that impact.

Look, American farmers, ranchers, and environmentalists have all been waiting for months to see a farm bill come to the floor. To the disappointment of many, instead of a farm bill, which I understand for at least 5 weeks we're not going to see in the House of Representatives, we're presented with a cow bailout, which is yet another Republican Big Government bailout of an American industry.

When the Senate passed their farm bill over a month ago, the House majority couldn't even manage to bring a package to the floor for Members to debate. Earlier this week, the Republicans were looking at a 1-year extension of the farm bill and have now decided to pull that 1-year extension in favor of a cow bailout.

Let me once again stress that our severe concerns around droughts in the West and across the country are critical, but we mustn't gut programs that are some of the very programs that can help prevent the impact of droughts in seeking to bail out a particular industry. When we look at drought assistance funding, we need to have a bipartisan discussion about how we're going to structure it and where it's going to come from and why certain industries are going to be favored over others.

Why is there going to be a cow bailout instead of a rooftop terrace bailout? When it's too hot, businesses suffer. If you're going to have a big Republican bailout, why don't you discuss who it goes to and not just give it to who has the most lobbyists here or who gives the most campaign contributions.

Furthermore, the conservation provisions that are cut by this bill do have strong bipartisan support in both Chambers. Both the Senate and the House Agriculture Committees understand the importance of the farm bill's conservation title. Both farm bills retain funding for the conservation title because many folks on both sides of the aisle agree that conservation practices are critical to protect our soil, the future production of our agriculture, water, and wildlife resources. That's yet another reason to consider a comprehensive bill, to help ensure the strength of agriculture and protect American jobs, rather than another Republican bailout.

Instead of voting on the underlying bill, instead of even talking about a 5-year extension of the agriculture bill, here we are today gutting critical programs with bipartisan support to bail out yet another industry with a centrally planned Big Government solution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, again, we all grieve for the people in this country who are willing to farm, who are willing to deal with the vicissitudes of mother nature and do their best to provide food and other products for the American people and people all around the world.

We obviously don't have a lot of control over the weather. We have no control over the weather. We have no control over the climate, basically, but we need to respond to our fellow human beings, our fellow Americans when there is a need to do that.

The drought would not be as exacerbated and the effects would not be so exacerbated were it not for the overall job climate in this country. We are really suffering from the effects of our colleagues having been in charge of the Congress for 4 years and an administration that is totally out of touch with what is happening, not only in this country, but around the world, in terms of our economic situation. We have record unemployment in this country, Mr. Speaker. We have record deficits. We have record debts. It seems like everybody recognizes that except for our liberal colleagues across the aisle.

We know there's something wrong with the American job climate in this country. Whereas most people recognize the government should not wall off entrepreneurship with oppressive taxes, a costly, overcomplicated, and unnecessarily burdensome regulatory apparatus, we have a liberal President who is so out of touch that he said:

If you've got a business, you didn't build that. Somebody else made that happen.

It would be bad enough if that were the first Freudian slip from liberal leaders here in Washington, but this comes on the heels of both President Obama and Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID decreeing on separate occasions that the private sector is doing

just fine. Apparently, the two highest ranking Democrats in the country are trying to convince themselves of an alternative reality where unemployment would no longer be a problem if only more Americans worked for the government. Fortunately, we still have a lot of Americans working out there trying to produce food for all of us.

□ 1050

I recognize there are many government workers, teachers, police officers, firefighters, who provide critical services to this country. But to suggest that the unemployment problem in this country can be solved by continuing an unending, demonstrably failed liberal spending spree ignores the reality that it's the private sector that generates the wealth which provides revenue for government to work through an increasing seizure of personal earnings, as was displayed on the floor yesterday.

Liberal elites would have us all believe that the only way to promote job growth is through a perpetual expansion of special handouts and concessions to government employee unions and politically favored industries.

Less we forget that a centrally planned government-sponsored green jobs revolution was the only solution for unemployment worries during the height of the recent recession, I want to remind my colleague of the Solyndra loans and the many loans in that area that were made that have created crony capitalism in our country. The liberal Democrats promised to solve these problems by ramming through a \$1 trillion stimulus bill, financed exclusively by our posterity through deficit spending and quickly shifted their focus on other crises vulnerable to exploitation, such as a new \$800 billion energy tax that sought to crush millions of jobs while sending hundreds of billions overseas as well as the now-infamous government takeover of health care, otherwise known as ObamaCare.

We're actually fortunate for these striking statements which reveal a peek into the mystifying mindset of liberal elites who apparently believe that government dependence is a necessary condition for economic health.

Well, here's a news flash for the liberals who remain stubbornly unaware of the hardships that continue to grip Americans: the results are in, and everyone else knows that Big Government cannot simply prescribe economic prosperity and have it be so.

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

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

I listened very carefully to the gentelady from North Carolina. I didn't hear her defend this bovine bailout that the Republicans are proposing here today. Now, I'm going to take a few minutes and address some of the mischaracterizations of the President of the United States that were in some

of those comments, but then I do want to bring it back to this Big Government bovine bailout that the Republicans are proposing here before us today.

Look, the President understands and I understand, as somebody who started several businesses before I got here—I created several hundred jobs—that of course I didn't do it alone. If we didn't have roads so that employees could get to work, I wouldn't have been able to start a company. I wouldn't have been able to have any employees to get to work. If we didn't have schools that help prepare programmers and technicians to work technology companies—tech companies that I started that hired programmers, that were good-paying jobs—I wouldn't have been able to start a company. If we didn't have investors and shareholders and the right level of securities regulation to prevent fraud and to give them the confidence to invest in the companies that I started, we wouldn't have capital formation and venture capital flowing to the companies that needed it.

If we didn't have the rule of law, if we didn't fund our courts, if we didn't invest in basic research, if the government hadn't provided the funding to start the Internet, I wouldn't have been able to start a single company.

And most of my friends who are entrepreneurs, who have started companies, who are corporate executives agree. Yes, the entrepreneur is critical. And the President's Jobs Council recognizes that, and this President has been more friendly to entrepreneurship and to business than any President in my lifetime, working to ensure that small businesses have the opportunity to succeed and grow and create jobs in the private sector.

But without that basic infrastructure, we have to ask ourselves what separates the United States of America from a country like Somalia or even a centrally planned country like North Korea. A lot separates us. But a big part of that is this collaboration of a public sector role that enables entrepreneurship, enables success in the private sector, enables people to create fortunes, enables people to create jobs. That's the proper role of government.

Government doesn't stand in the way of job creation. The government's policy framework, courts people can trust, roads for people to get to work, good public schools, good health care—that's what enables success. As somebody who reached some degree of success in the private sector before I got here, I agree completely with President Obama that I couldn't have achieved that degree of success without the public infrastructure that played a role in allowing me and so many other entrepreneurs to succeed.

Now, moving back to the topic, the topic of the bovine bailout that the Republicans have proposed here today. The gentelady from North Carolina said, We have no control over climate,

basically. That was the quote that she just said. Well, the vast majority of scientific consensus and agreement would indicate otherwise.

We don't control weather. But climate is different than weather. And, yes, humans are contributing to climate change through carbon emissions and emissions of other greenhouse gases. The global climate has warmed. The average climate in Colorado now is two to three degrees warmer than it was a century ago, and it continues to accelerate. Now, that doesn't cause a drought or a flood in any one particular year, but it causes an increased incidence of severe weather patterns that cost us all money, which is why we're even talking about a bovine bailout here today.

Now, look, I wish this had come to the floor under an open process. I would have offered an amendment just to talk about it to say, why don't you bail out rooftop restaurants, rooftop terraces?

Look, we're talking about the role of the government, the role of the private sector. I find it ironic and to the point of being bizarre—almost like I'm in an alternative universe—that in the very same remarks that the gentelady from North Carolina railed against a President who dares to say that the public sector has a role in creating the landscape for private businesses to succeed, at the same time, she is advocating for a bovine bailout of a particular industry.

Now why this particular industry? Why not rooftop terraces? Why not solar, if it's too cloudy? Why not wind, if it's not windy enough? Many, many, many businesses are affected by weather. Retail stores are affected when it snows too much. Should they be coming to Washington, clamoring for a bailout?

Look, both sides respect the role of the private sector. And when you have government preempting the private sector by picking out a particular industry and elevating it above all others, by giving it government subsidies and a big bailout, you are upsetting the very market forces that the gentelady from North Carolina espoused support of in another context.

This bill today gives us a terrible choice between drought assistance and conservation. Now, both might be worthy; but disproportionate cuts to conservation programs that are used to fund this bill undermine the continued success of conservation programs that have bipartisan support and are helping farmers mitigate the impact of climate change in their businesses.

There are so many other issues of relevance for farmers that this House could be taking up. Why aren't we talking about the estate tax, which affects small farmers across this country? If we don't act by December 31, the estate tax will go to a 55 percent tax above \$1 million in assets, forcing many small farmers out of business and preventing them from being passed down from one generation to the next.

Are we going to leave it until the last minute? Is that a plan for the lame duck session? Are the Republicans scared to take on the estate tax before the election?

I would advocate that we get down to work and start addressing issues that actually affect farmers. We should be voting to provide for the success of American agriculture, opening new markets, investing in basic research, helping to ensure that families have access to healthy food and nutrition.

We need to make sure that farmers' and ranchers' needs are addressed. And if we don't address the fundamental drivers of climate change, we're only going to be faced with more and more difficulties, more and more requests for bailouts. It may be cows this time. It may be chickens next time. It may be corn the next time. There are always going to be folks here in Washington, hat in hand, coming to Republicans, saying, Give us a Big Government solution.

And the question will come to this Congress, Are we going to do something about the underlying problem? And whether that approach is through a cap-and-trade system or a carbon tax or incentives for renewables, what are we going to do to prevent farmers in this country from being driven out of business? This bill does nothing.

Sure, you can hand them government money. You can hand them taxpayer money, if that's the lack of regard that you have for taxpayer money, you want to hand it out to whoever comes to town and begs for it. Go right ahead. And I have some rooftop terrace restaurant owners in my district. Give them some while you are at it.

□ 1100

That's not a solution. That's what got us into this budget deficit. That's what got us into this hole. Let's address the underlying issue of climate change in a scientific manner, have the real political discussions that are necessary to negotiate a bipartisan solution that reduces our carbon emissions, reduces the impact of climate change on American farmers, reduces the incidence and severity of droughts across the United States of America, and also be the global leaders that we need to be on this critical issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of my colleague if he has any more speakers or if he is ready to close.

Mr. POLIS. I am the only remaining speaker, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I will close after the gentleman closes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order an amendment which proposes that Congress will not adjourn until the President signs middle class tax cuts into law.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD along with ex-

traneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. This will give us the opportunity to renew middle class tax cuts. When we talk about job creation, when we talk about growing our economy, the need to make sure that we don't increase taxes on the middle class during a recess is something economists from both sides of the aisle agree on, something Democrats agree on. I hope Republicans agree, too, that we shouldn't raise taxes on at least 98 percent of Americans.

Then let's have the discussion about the other 2 percent. But let's agree on what we agree on. Let's not raise taxes on 98 percent of American families before Congress goes on break. Before the Republicans send us all home to enjoy our summers, let's do something about jobs. Let's do something about the economy, and let's demand that we give middle class families across America the surety and the security to know that they're not going to need to pay an additional \$1,000 a year in taxes, an additional \$2,000 a year in taxes.

I think it is critical, and I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so that we can bring forward this critical amendment to provide the certainty that America needs to grow our economy and create jobs.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleague across the aisle, I don't understand why our friends can't take yes for an answer. We want to extend the tax cuts that were begun over 10 years ago to everyone in this country. We agree with that, and that's what we're doing. We don't want to raise taxes on anyone.

I would also like to commend to my colleague across the aisle, who represents a group of people who only ask for bipartisan cooperation when they're in the minority, a book by Australian geologist Ian Plimer who wrote a book called "Heaven and Earth," which I think really does do a scientific presentation of what is happening in terms of climate change.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that my colleague is trying to deal with a chicken and egg issue relative to infrastructure and how does infrastructure get funded. He wants to say that this all comes from the benevolent government, but he conveniently leaves out the fact that the government doesn't create wealth. All our government does is spend wealth, and in many cases waste the fruits of hardworking Americans by doing things often very inefficiently. Public infrastructure is funded by the taxes that we take away from hardworking Americans.

Entrepreneurs predated the government in our country. And we all know that the Constitution was written to try to establish a limited government in our country so that the entrepreneurial spirit could thrive, as it has in most cases. My colleague talks about the government enabling entrepreneurs. Excuse me, I don't believe the government does a lot to enable the private sector. What most people in the private sector will tell you is just get the government out of my way. Get the foot of the government off my neck, and I will do just fine.

I know my colleague has been in the private sector and created a lot of wealth for himself, and I applaud him for doing that. But most of the people that I know, Mr. Speaker, who are in the private sector would simply say the government isn't enabling me at all. Leave me alone, and I'll do just fine.

Mr. Speaker, talk about taking the President's words out of context, as I think my colleague knows, when you put the President's words in context, they are even more disturbing than outside of context. I do believe that our President does believe that the government is the solution, and most of us think the government is the problem. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 752 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 746) prohibiting the consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment or adjournment sine die unless a law is enacted to provide for the extension of certain expired or expiring tax provisions that apply to middle-income taxpayers if called up by Representative Slaughter of New York or her designee. All points of order against the resolution and against its consideration are waived. (The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

Ms. FOXX. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were 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 adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 182, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

YEAS—236

Adams	Amodei	Barletta
Aderholt	Austria	Bartlett
Alexander	Bachmann	Barton (TX)
Amash	Bachus	Bass (NH)

Benishak	Hanna
Berg	Harper
Biggert	Harris
Bilbray	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Hayworth
Blackburn	Heck
Bonner	Hensarling
Bono Mack	Herger
Boustany	Herrera Beutler
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp
Brooks	Huizenga (MI)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren
Buchanan	Hunter
Bucshon	Hurt
Buerkle	Issa
Burgess	Jenkins
Calvert	Johnson (IL)
Camp	Johnson (OH)
Campbell	Johnson, Sam
Canseco	Jones
Cantor	Jordan
Capito	Kelly
Carter	King (IA)
Cassidy	King (NY)
Chabot	Kingston
Chaffetz	Kinzinger (IL)
Coble	Kline
Coffman (CO)	Labrador
Cole	Lamborn
Conaway	Lance
Cravaack	Landry
Crawford	Lankford
Crenshaw	Latham
Culberson	LaTourrette
Denham	Latta
Dent	Lewis (CA)
DesJarlais	LoBiondo
Diaz-Balart	Long
Dold	Lucas
Dreier	Luetkemeyer
Duffy	Lummis
Duncan (SC)	Lungren, Daniel
Duncan (TN)	E.
Ellmers	Mack
Emerson	Manzullo
Farenthold	Marchant
Fincher	Marino
Fitzpatrick	Matheson
Flake	McCarthy (CA)
Fleming	McCaul
Flores	McClintock
Forbes	McHenry
Fortenberry	McIntyre
Fox	McKeon
Franks (AZ)	McKinley
Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Gallely	Rodgers
Gardner	Meehan
Garrett	Mica
Gerlach	Miller (FL)
Gibbs	Miller (MI)
Gibson	Miller, Gary
Gingrey (GA)	Mulvaney
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)
Goodlatte	Myrick
Gosar	Neugebauer
Gowdy	Noem
Granger	Nugent
Graves (GA)	Nunes
Griffin (AR)	Nunnelee
Griffith (VA)	Olson
Grimm	Palazzo
Guinta	Paul
Guthrie	Paulsen
Hall	Pearce

NAYS—182

Ackerman	Capps
Altmire	Capuano
Andrews	Carnahan
Baca	Carney
Baldwin	Carson (IN)
Barber	Castor (FL)
Barrow	Chandler
Bass (CA)	Chu
Becerra	Cicilline
Berkley	Clarke (MI)
Berman	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Clay
Bishop (NY)	Cleaver
Blumenauer	Clyburn
Bonamici	Connolly (VA)
Boren	Conyers
Boswell	Cooper
Brady (PA)	Costa
Braley (IA)	Courtney
Brown (FL)	Critz
Butterfield	Crowley

Pence	Fudge
Petri	Garamendi
Pitts	Gonzalez
Platts	Green, Al
Poe (TX)	Green, Gene
Pompeo	Grijalva
Posey	Gutierrez
Price (GA)	Hahn
Quayle	Hanabusa
Reed	Hastings (FL)
Rehberg	Heinrich
Reichert	Higgins
Renacci	Himes
Ribble	Hinchee
Rigell	Hinojosa
Rivera	Hirono
Roby	Hochul
Roe (TN)	Holden
Rogers (AL)	Holt
Rogers (KY)	Honda
Rogers (MI)	Hoyer
Rohrabacher	Israel
Rokita	Johnson, E. B.
Rooney	Kaptur
Ros-Lehtinen	Keating
Roskam	Kildee
Ross (FL)	Kind
Royce	Kissell
Runyan	Kucinich
Ryan (WI)	Langevin
Scalise	Larsen (WA)
Schilling	Larson (CT)
Schmidt	Lee (CA)
Schock	Levin
Schweikert	Lewis (GA)
Scott (SC)	Lipinski
Scott, Austin	Loeb sack
Sensenbrenner	Lofgren, Zoe
Sessions	Lowe y
Shimkus	Lujan
Shuler	Lynch
Shuster	
Simpson	
Smith (NE)	
Smith (NJ)	
Smith (TX)	
Southerland	
Stearns	
Stivers	
Stutzman	
Sullivan	
Terry	
Thompson (PA)	
Thornberry	
Tiberi	
Tipton	
Turner (NY)	
Turner (OH)	
Upton	
Walberg	
Walden	
Walsh (IL)	
Webster	
West	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Wolf	
Womack	
Woodall	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	
Young (IN)	

Maloney	Ryan (OH)
Markey	Sánchez, Linda
Matsui	T.
McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta
McCollum	Sarbanes
McDermott	Schakowsky
McGovern	Schiff
McNerney	Schrader
Meeks	Schwartz
Michaud	Scott (VA)
Miller (NC)	Scott, David
Miller, George	Serrano
Moore	Sewell
Moran	Sherman
Murphy (CT)	Sires
Nadler	Slaughter
Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Neal	Speier
Oliver	Stark
Owens	Sutton
Pallone	Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)	Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi	Pelosi
Perlmutter	Perlmutter
Tonko	Kildee
Towns	Peters
Tsongas	Peterson
Van Hollen	Pingree (ME)
Velázquez	Polis
Visclosky	Price (NC)
Walz (MN)	Quigley
Wasserman	Rahall
Schultz	Rangel
Waters	Reyes
Watt	Richardson
Waxman	Richmond
Welch	Ross (AR)
Wilson (FL)	Rothman (NJ)
Yarmuth	Roybal-Allard
	Ruppersberger
	Rush

NOT VOTING—12

Akin	Costello	Jackson Lee
Black	Fleischmann	(TX)
Burton (IN)	Graves (MO)	Johnson (GA)
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Yoder
Cohen		

□ 1132

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PETRI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. 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—yeas 235, noes 181, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—235

Adams	Bilirakis	Canseco
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Cantor
Alexander	Blackburn	Capito
Amash	Bonner	Carter
Amodei	Bono Mack	Cassidy
Austria	Boustany	Chabot
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Chaffetz
Bachus	Brooks	Coble
Bartlett	Broun (GA)	Coffman (CO)
Barton (TX)	Buchanan	Cole
Bass (NH)	Bucshon	Conaway
Benishak	Buerkle	Cravaack
Berg	Burgess	Crawford
Biggert	Calvert	Crenshaw
Bilbray	Camp	Culberson
	Campbell	Denham

Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan

NOES—181

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Bralley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn

Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg

Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Loggren, Zoe
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez

Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—14

Akin
Black
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Cardoza

NOT VOTING—14

Cohen
Costello
Fleischmann
Graves (MO)
Jackson (IL)

Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

□ 1140

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL TO ESTABLISH BATTERY RECHARGING STATIONS UNDER JURISDICTION OF SENATE

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (S. 739) to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to establish battery recharging stations for privately owned vehicles in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the Senate at no net cost to the Federal Government, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 739

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

SECTION 1. BATTERY RECHARGING STATIONS FOR PRIVATELY OWNED VEHICLES IN PARKING AREAS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE SENATE AT NO NET COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this Act, the term “covered employee” means—

(1) an employee whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate; or

(2) any other individual who is authorized to park in any parking area under the jurisdiction of the Senate on Capitol Grounds.

(b) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), funds appropriated to the Architect of the

Capitol under the heading “CAPITOL POWER PLANT” under the heading “ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL” in any fiscal year are available to construct, operate, and maintain on a reimbursable basis battery recharging stations in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the Senate on Capitol Grounds for use by privately owned vehicles used by Senators or covered employees.

(2) VENDORS AUTHORIZED.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Architect of the Capitol may use 1 or more vendors on a commission basis.

(3) APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION.—The Architect of the Capitol may construct or direct the construction of battery recharging stations described under paragraph (1) after—

(A) submission of written notice detailing the numbers and locations of the battery recharging stations to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate; and

(B) approval by that Committee.

(c) FEES AND CHARGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Architect of the Capitol shall charge fees or charges for electricity provided to Senators and covered employees sufficient to cover the costs to the Architect of the Capitol to carry out this section, including costs to any vendors or other costs associated with maintaining the battery recharging stations.

(2) APPROVAL OF FEES OR CHARGES.—The Architect of the Capitol may establish and adjust fees or charges under paragraph (1) after—

(A) submission of written notice detailing the amount of the fee or charge to be established or adjusted to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate; and

(B) approval by that Committee.

(d) DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES, CHARGES, AND COMMISSIONS.—Any fees, charges, or commissions collected by the Architect of the Capitol under this section shall be—

(1) deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriations account described under subsection (b); and

(2) available for obligation without further appropriation during—

(A) the fiscal year collected; and

(B) the fiscal year following the fiscal year collected.

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report on the financial administration and cost recovery of activities under this section with respect to that fiscal year to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

(2) AVOIDING SUBSIDY.—

(A) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 3 years thereafter, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate determining whether Senators and covered employees using battery charging stations as authorized by this Act are receiving a subsidy from the taxpayers.

(B) MODIFICATION OF RATES AND FEES.—If a determination is made under subparagraph (A) that a subsidy is being received, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a plan to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate on how to update the program to ensure no subsidy is being received. If the committee does not act on the plan within 60 days, the Architect of the Capitol shall take appropriate steps to increase rates or fees to ensure reimbursement for the cost of the program consistent with an appropriate schedule for amortization, to be charged to those using the charging stations.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2011 and each fiscal year thereafter.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL TO ESTABLISH BATTERY RECHARGING STATIONS UNDER JURISDICTION OF HOUSE

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1402) to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to establish battery recharging stations for privately owned vehicles in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the House of Representatives at no net cost to the Federal Government, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1402

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

SECTION 1. BATTERY RECHARGING STATIONS FOR PRIVATELY OWNED VEHICLES IN PARKING AREAS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AT NO NET COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this Act, the term “covered employee” means—

(1) an employee whose pay is disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; or

(2) any other individual who is authorized to park in any parking area under the jurisdiction of the House of Representatives on Capitol Grounds.

(b) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), funds appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol under the heading “CAPITOL POWER PLANT” under the heading “ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL” in any fiscal year are available to construct, operate, and maintain on a reimbursable basis battery recharging stations in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the House of Representatives on Capitol Grounds for use by privately owned vehicles used by Members of the House of Representatives (including the Delegates or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) or covered employees.

(2) VENDORS AUTHORIZED.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Architect of the Capitol may use 1 or more vendors on a commission basis.

(3) APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION.—The Architect of the Capitol may construct or direct the construction of battery recharging stations described under paragraph (1) after—

(A) submission of written notice detailing the numbers and locations of the battery recharging stations to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives; and

(B) approval by that Committee.

(c) FEES AND CHARGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Architect of the Capitol shall charge fees or charges for electricity provided to Mem-

bers and covered employees sufficient to cover the costs to the Architect of the Capitol to carry out this section, including costs to any vendors or other costs associated with maintaining the battery recharging stations.

(2) APPROVAL OF FEES OR CHARGES.—The Architect of the Capitol may establish and adjust fees or charges under paragraph (1) after—

(A) submission of written notice detailing the amount of the fee or charge to be established or adjusted to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives; and

(B) approval by that Committee.

(d) DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES, CHARGES, AND COMMISSIONS.—Any fees, charges, or commissions collected by the Architect of the Capitol under this section shall be—

(1) deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriations account described under subsection (b); and

(2) available for obligation without further appropriation during—

(A) the fiscal year collected; and

(B) the fiscal year following the fiscal year collected.

(e) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report on the financial administration and cost recovery of activities under this section with respect to that fiscal year to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report on the financial administration and cost recovery of activities under this section with respect to that fiscal year to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

(2) AVOIDING SUBSIDY.—

(A) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 3 years thereafter, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives determining whether Members (including any Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress) and covered employees using battery recharging stations as authorized by this Act are receiving a subsidy from the taxpayers.

(B) MODIFICATION OF RATES AND FEES.—If a determination is made under subparagraph (A) that a subsidy is being received, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a plan to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives on how to update the program to ensure no subsidy is being received. If the committee does not act on the plan within 60 days, the Architect of the Capitol shall take appropriate steps to increase rates or fees to ensure reimbursement for the cost of the program consistent with an appropriate schedule for amortization, to be charged to those using the recharging stations.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2011 and each fiscal year thereafter.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DANIEL E. LUNGREN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the bill at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1(e) to read as follows:

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report on the financial administration and cost recovery

of activities under this section with respect to that fiscal year to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

(2) AVOIDING SUBSIDY.—

(A) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 3 years thereafter, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives determining whether Members (including any Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress) and covered employees using battery recharging stations as authorized by this Act are receiving a subsidy from the taxpayers.

(B) MODIFICATION OF RATES AND FEES.—If a determination is made under subparagraph (A) that a subsidy is being received, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a plan to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives on how to update the program to ensure no subsidy is being received. If the committee does not act on the plan within 60 days, the Architect of the Capitol shall take appropriate steps to increase rates or fees to ensure reimbursement for the cost of the program consistent with an appropriate schedule for amortization, to be charged to those using the recharging stations.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2012

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 752, I call up the bill (H.R. 6233) to make supplemental agricultural disaster assistance available for fiscal year 2012 with the costs of such assistance offset by changes to certain conservation programs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6233

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Agricultural Disaster Assistance Act of 2012”.

SEC. 2. SUPPLEMENTAL AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE PRODUCER ON A FARM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “eligible producer on a farm” means an individual or entity described in subparagraph (B) that, as determined by the Secretary, assumes the production and market risks associated with the agricultural production of crops or livestock.

(B) DESCRIPTION.—An individual or entity referred to in subparagraph (A) is—

(i) a citizen of the United States;

(ii) a resident alien;

(iii) a partnership of citizens of the United States; or

(iv) a corporation, limited liability corporation, or other farm organizational structure organized under State law.

(2) FARM-RAISED FISH.—The term “farm-raised fish” means any aquatic species that is propagated and reared in a controlled environment.

(3) LIVESTOCK.—The term “livestock” includes—

- (A) cattle (including dairy cattle);
- (B) bison;
- (C) poultry;
- (D) sheep;
- (E) swine;
- (F) horses; and
- (G) other livestock, as determined by the Secretary.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) LIVESTOCK INDEMNITY PAYMENTS.—

(1) PAYMENTS.—For fiscal year 2012, the Secretary shall use such sums as are necessary of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make livestock indemnity payments to eligible producers on farms that have incurred livestock death losses in excess of the normal mortality, as determined by the Secretary, due to—

(A) attacks by animals reintroduced into the wild by the Federal Government or protected by Federal law, including wolves and avian predators; or

(B) adverse weather, as determined by the Secretary, during the calendar year, including losses due to hurricanes, floods, blizzards, disease, wildfires, extreme heat, and extreme cold.

(2) PAYMENT RATES.—Indemnity payments to an eligible producer on a farm under paragraph (1) shall be made at a rate of 75 percent of the market value of the applicable livestock on the day before the date of death of the livestock, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR PAYMENTS MADE DUE TO DISEASE.—The Secretary shall ensure that payments made to an eligible producer under paragraph (1) are not made for the same livestock losses for which compensation is provided pursuant to section 10407(d) of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8306(d)).

(c) LIVESTOCK FORAGE DISASTER PROGRAM.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COVERED LIVESTOCK.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term “covered livestock” means livestock of an eligible livestock producer that, during the 60 days prior to the beginning date of a qualifying drought or fire condition, as determined by the Secretary, the eligible livestock producer—

- (I) owned;
- (II) leased;
- (III) purchased;
- (IV) entered into a contract to purchase;
- (V) is a contract grower; or
- (VI) sold or otherwise disposed of due to qualifying drought conditions during—
 - (aa) the current production year; or
 - (bb) subject to paragraph (3)(B)(ii), 1 or both of the 2 production years immediately preceding the current production year.

(ii) EXCLUSION.—The term “covered livestock” does not include livestock that were or would have been in a feedlot, on the beginning date of the qualifying drought or fire condition, as a part of the normal business operation of the eligible livestock producer, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) DROUGHT MONITOR.—The term “drought monitor” means a system for classifying drought severity according to a range of abnormally dry to exceptional drought, as defined by the Secretary.

(C) ELIGIBLE LIVESTOCK PRODUCER.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term “eligible livestock producer” means an eligible producer on a farm that—

(I) is an owner, cash or share lessee, or contract grower of covered livestock that provides the pastureland or grazing land, including cash-leased pastureland or grazing land, for the livestock;

(II) provides the pastureland or grazing land for covered livestock, including cash-leased pastureland or grazing land that is physically located in a county affected by drought;

(III) certifies grazing loss; and

(IV) meets all other eligibility requirements established under this subsection.

(ii) EXCLUSION.—The term “eligible livestock producer” does not include an owner, cash or share lessee, or contract grower of livestock that rents or leases pastureland or grazing land owned by another person on a rate-of-gain basis.

(D) NORMAL CARRYING CAPACITY.—The term “normal carrying capacity”, with respect to each type of grazing land or pastureland in a county, means the normal carrying capacity, as determined under paragraph (3)(D)(i), that would be expected from the grazing land or pastureland for livestock during the normal grazing period, in the absence of a drought or fire that diminishes the production of the grazing land or pastureland.

(E) NORMAL GRAZING PERIOD.—The term “normal grazing period”, with respect to a county, means the normal grazing period during the calendar year for the county, as determined under paragraph (3)(D)(i).

(2) PROGRAM.—For fiscal year 2012, the Secretary shall use such sums as are necessary of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide compensation for losses to eligible livestock producers due to grazing losses for covered livestock due to—

(A) a drought condition, as described in paragraph (3); or

(B) fire, as described in paragraph (4).

(3) ASSISTANCE FOR LOSSES DUE TO DROUGHT CONDITIONS.—

(A) ELIGIBLE LOSSES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An eligible livestock producer may receive assistance under this subsection only for grazing losses for covered livestock that occur on land that—

(I) is native or improved pastureland with permanent vegetative cover; or

(II) is planted to a crop planted specifically for the purpose of providing grazing for covered livestock.

(ii) EXCLUSIONS.—An eligible livestock producer may not receive assistance under this subsection for grazing losses that occur on land used for haying or grazing under the conservation reserve program established under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.).

(B) MONTHLY PAYMENT RATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the payment rate for assistance under this paragraph for 1 month shall, in the case of drought, be equal to 60 percent of the lesser of—

(I) the monthly feed cost for all covered livestock owned or leased by the eligible livestock producer, as determined under subparagraph (C); or

(II) the monthly feed cost calculated by using the normal carrying capacity of the eligible grazing land of the eligible livestock producer.

(ii) PARTIAL COMPENSATION.—In the case of an eligible livestock producer that sold or otherwise disposed of covered livestock due to drought conditions in 1 or both of the 2 production years immediately preceding the current production year, as determined by the Secretary, the payment rate shall be 80

percent of the payment rate otherwise calculated in accordance with clause (i).

(C) MONTHLY FEED COST.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The monthly feed cost shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

(I) 30 days;

(II) a payment quantity that is equal to the feed grain equivalent, as determined under clause (ii); and

(III) a payment rate that is equal to the corn price per pound, as determined under clause (iii).

(ii) FEED GRAIN EQUIVALENT.—For purposes of clause (i)(II), the feed grain equivalent shall equal—

(I) in the case of an adult beef cow, 15.7 pounds of corn per day; or

(II) in the case of any other type of weight of livestock, an amount determined by the Secretary that represents the average number of pounds of corn per day necessary to feed the livestock.

(iii) CORN PRICE PER POUND.—For purposes of clause (i)(III), the corn price per pound shall equal the quotient obtained by dividing—

(I) the higher of—

(aa) the national average corn price per bushel for the 12-month period immediately preceding March 1 of the year for which the disaster assistance is calculated; or

(bb) the national average corn price per bushel for the 24-month period immediately preceding that March 1; by

(II) 56.

(D) NORMAL GRAZING PERIOD AND DROUGHT MONITOR INTENSITY.—

(i) FSA COUNTY COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine the normal carrying capacity and normal grazing period for each type of grazing land or pastureland in the county served by the applicable committee.

(II) CHANGES.—No change to the normal carrying capacity or normal grazing period established for a county under subclause (I) shall be made unless the change is requested by the appropriate State and county Farm Service Agency committees.

(ii) DROUGHT INTENSITY.—

(I) D2.—An eligible livestock producer that owns or leases grazing land or pastureland that is physically located in a county that is rated by the U.S. Drought Monitor as having a D2 (severe drought) intensity in any area of the county for at least 8 consecutive weeks during the normal grazing period for the county, as determined by the Secretary, shall be eligible to receive assistance under this paragraph in an amount equal to 1 monthly payment using the monthly payment rate determined under subparagraph (B).

(II) D3.—An eligible livestock producer that owns or leases grazing land or pastureland that is physically located in a county that is rated by the U.S. Drought Monitor as having at least a D3 (extreme drought) intensity in any area of the county at any time during the normal grazing period for the county, as determined by the Secretary, shall be eligible to receive assistance under this paragraph—

(aa) in an amount equal to 2 monthly payments using the monthly payment rate determined under subparagraph (B); or

(bb) if the county is rated as having a D3 (extreme drought) intensity in any area of the county for at least 4 weeks during the normal grazing period for the county, or is rated as having a D4 (exceptional drought) intensity in any area of the county at any time during the normal grazing period, in an amount equal to 3 monthly payments using the monthly payment rate determined under subparagraph (B).

(4) ASSISTANCE FOR LOSSES DUE TO FIRE ON PUBLIC MANAGED LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible livestock producer may receive assistance under this paragraph only if—

(i) the grazing losses occur on rangeland that is managed by a Federal agency; and

(ii) the eligible livestock producer is prohibited by the Federal agency from grazing the normal permitted livestock on the managed rangeland due to a fire.

(B) PAYMENT RATE.—The payment rate for assistance under this paragraph shall be equal to 50 percent of the monthly feed cost for the total number of livestock covered by the Federal lease of the eligible livestock producer, as determined under paragraph (3)(C).

(C) PAYMENT DURATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), an eligible livestock producer shall be eligible to receive assistance under this paragraph for the period—

(I) beginning on the date on which the Federal agency excludes the eligible livestock producer from using the managed rangeland for grazing; and

(II) ending on the last day of the Federal lease of the eligible livestock producer.

(ii) LIMITATION.—An eligible livestock producer may only receive assistance under this paragraph for losses that occur on not more than 180 days per year.

(5) NO DUPLICATIVE PAYMENTS.—An eligible livestock producer may elect to receive assistance for grazing or pasture feed losses due to drought conditions under paragraph (3) or fire under paragraph (4), but not both for the same loss, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR LIVESTOCK, HONEY BEES, AND FARM-RAISED FISH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2012, the Secretary shall use not more than \$20,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide emergency relief to eligible producers of livestock, honey bees, and farm-raised fish to aid in the reduction of losses due to disease (including cattle tick fever), adverse weather, or other conditions, such as blizzards and wildfires, as determined by the Secretary, that are not covered under subsection (b) or (c).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds made available under this subsection shall be used to reduce losses caused by feed or water shortages, disease, or other factors as determined by the Secretary.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Any funds made available under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(e) TREE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ELIGIBLE ORCHARDIST.—The term “eligible orchardist” means a person that produces annual crops from trees for commercial purposes.

(B) NATURAL DISASTER.—The term “natural disaster” means plant disease, insect infestation, drought, fire, freeze, flood, earthquake, lightning, or other occurrence, as determined by the Secretary.

(C) NURSERY TREE GROWER.—The term “nursery tree grower” means a person who produces nursery, ornamental, fruit, nut, or Christmas trees for commercial sale, as determined by the Secretary.

(D) TREE.—The term “tree” includes a tree, bush, and vine.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—

(A) LOSS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), for fiscal year 2012, the Secretary shall use such sums as are necessary of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide assistance—

(i) under paragraph (3) to eligible orchardists and nursery tree growers that planted trees for commercial purposes but lost the

trees as a result of a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary; and

(ii) under paragraph (3)(B) to eligible orchardists and nursery tree growers that have a production history for commercial purposes on planted or existing trees but lost the trees as a result of a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) LIMITATION.—An eligible orchardist or nursery tree grower shall qualify for assistance under subparagraph (A) only if the tree mortality of the eligible orchardist or nursery tree grower, as a result of damaging weather or related condition, exceeds 15 percent (adjusted for normal mortality).

(3) ASSISTANCE.—Subject to paragraph (4), the assistance provided by the Secretary to eligible orchardists and nursery tree growers for losses described in paragraph (2) shall consist of—

(A)(i) reimbursement of 70 percent of the cost of replanting trees lost due to a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary, in excess of 15 percent mortality (adjusted for normal mortality); or

(ii) at the option of the Secretary, sufficient seedlings to reestablish a stand; and

(B) reimbursement of 50 percent of the cost of pruning, removal, and other costs incurred by an eligible orchardist or nursery tree grower to salvage existing trees or, in the case of tree mortality, to prepare the land to replant trees as a result of damage or tree mortality due to a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary, in excess of 15 percent damage or mortality (adjusted for normal tree damage and mortality).

(4) LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE.—

(A) DEFINITIONS OF LEGAL ENTITY AND PERSON.—In this paragraph, the terms “legal entity” and “person” have the meaning given those terms in section 1001(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308(a)).

(B) AMOUNT.—The total amount of payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity (excluding a joint venture or general partnership) under this subsection may not exceed \$100,000 for any crop year, or an equivalent value in tree seedlings.

(C) ACRES.—The total quantity of acres planted to trees or tree seedlings for which a person or legal entity shall be entitled to receive payments under this subsection may not exceed 500 acres.

(f) PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS OF LEGAL ENTITY AND PERSON.—In this subsection, the terms “legal entity” and “person” have the meaning given those terms in section 1001(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308(a)).

(2) AMOUNT.—The total amount of disaster assistance payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity (excluding a joint venture or general partnership) under this section (excluding payments received under subsection (e)) may not exceed \$100,000 for any crop year.

(3) AGI LIMITATION.—Section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-3a) or any successor provision shall apply with respect to assistance provided under this section.

(4) DIRECT ATTRIBUTION.—Subsections (e) and (f) of section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) or any successor provisions relating to direct attribution shall apply with respect to assistance provided under this section.

(g) APPLICATION.—This section shall take effect as of October 1, 2011, and apply to losses that are incurred as the result of a disaster, adverse weather, or other environmental condition that occurs on or before September 30, 2012, as determined by the Secretary.

(h) DETERMINATIONS BY SECRETARY.—A determination made by the Secretary under this section shall be final and conclusive.

(i) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation, as appropriate, shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement this section.

(2) PROCEDURE.—The promulgation of the regulations and administration of this section shall be made without regard to—

(A) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;

(B) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”); and

(C) the Statement of Policy of the Secretary of Agriculture effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall use the authority provided under section 808 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 3. MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.

(a) CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 1238G(d)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838g(d)(1)) is amended by inserting “(except that for fiscal year 2013, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, enroll in the program an additional 11,000,000 acres)” before the semicolon.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INCENTIVES PROGRAM.—Section 1241(a)(6) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (E) and inserting the following:

“(E) \$1,750,000,000 in fiscal year 2012;

“(F) \$1,400,000,000 in fiscal year 2013; and

“(G) \$1,750,000,000 in fiscal year 2014.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 752, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 6233, which provides disaster aid to livestock and other producers.

I am sure all of my colleagues are keenly aware of what is happening all across this great country. A drought of epic proportions is gripping a large majority of the Nation, and it is endangering vast areas of agriculturally productive land. The map behind me illustrates just how widespread and how bad this drought really is. Just yesterday, in my home State of Oklahoma, we had temperatures topping out at 115 degrees. Vast areas of productive pastureland are burning up, and our ranchers are in dire need.

But also let's be very clear as to why we are here on the floor today. In 2008, Congress passed a farm bill that did not provide a final year of disaster assistance. I have heard people call this “extending disaster assistance by a

year." No. What we are doing is fixing a problem. We are backfilling a hole—or fixing a deficiency.

I'm not here to point fingers. I was elected to fix problems. We have a drought. We don't have a disaster program, and I am here to provide a solution. Now, in past years, we might just wave our hands and declare this to be emergency spending, but we tend not to do that anymore, thank goodness. This bill pays for itself. Not only does it pay for itself, but it gives more than \$250 million to deficit reduction. To me, that sounds like fixing a problem.

Amazingly, that's not the end of the story.

Some people do not like how we paid for the bill. Quite frankly, I don't either. I was the subcommittee chairman for conservation programs in 2002 when we gave an extra \$17 billion to conservation programs. I am a proponent of voluntary, incentive-based conservation programs, but let me give you a little history on EQIP funding.

Ten years ago, in fiscal year 2002, we authorized \$200 million in EQIP spending. In fiscal year 2009, we authorized \$1.34 billion, and for fiscal year 2013, we authorized \$1.75 billion. Yes, we are cutting real dollars: \$350 million will not go to our farmers and ranchers to help comply with the enormous regulations facing them. But, at the end of the day, this will still be the largest amount of money ever spent on the EQIP program, seven times what we spent in 2002.

The other offset is the CSP program, which was vastly, I might note for the record, improved in 2008. For those of you here in 2008 who voted for the farm bill, the CSP program in the House bill had zero dollars when it left the House. In the just-passed Ag Committee farm bill, we limited CSP to 9 million acres. I greatly respect the conservation community, but to hear them say we are destroying conservation programs could not be farther from the truth.

You will also hear people complain that this isn't the full farm bill. My priority remains to get a 5-year farm bill on the books and to put those policies into place.

□ 1150

But the most pressing business before us today is to provide disaster assistance to those producers impacted by drought conditions who are currently exposed. It is as simple as that. There is a problem out there. Let's fix it.

Let me address the farm bill that my colleagues seem to either love or hate or love to hate or hate to love. The bill is not perfect. No legislation is. We can spend our time trying to chip away at the Federal deficit \$1 million at a time, coming down to the floor on every appropriations bill, or we can spend our time writing opinion pieces for *The Wall Street Journal*, or we can do something about it. The farm bill that passed out of my committee, the Agriculture Committee, saves \$35 billion. Let me repeat that: \$35 billion.

Tell me another piece of legislation that has bipartisan support and a chance to pass the United States Senate that saves that much money. My friends on my side of the aisle will say we don't cut enough while, my friends on the other side of the aisle will say we cut too much. This is the perfect case of letting the perfect be the enemy of the good. I believe in the legislative process. I believe in letting the House work its will. We did it in the House Agriculture Committee, and we can do it here, too.

Mr. Speaker, let me say again: I am committed to giving certainty to our farmers. I plan to work towards the goal when we get back in September, but we are here today to fix a problem. Let's do it without partisan bickering. There's a disaster happening out there. Let's give the tools to our ranchers who are the most exposed. The bill is paid for. Let's do what the American people sent us here to do: fix problems. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 6233.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Today is the last session before the August recess, and once again the House will adjourn without finishing its work. It's no wonder nobody likes Congress anymore. Members will now have to explain to their constituents why the House did not even try to consider a new 5-year farm bill. Frankly, we're in this position because the House leadership has refused to bring the 5-year farm bill to the floor.

Working in a bipartisan tradition on the Agriculture Committee, Chairman LUCAS and I have crafted a new 5-year farm bill making many important and needed reforms. I appreciate the efforts of the chairman in trying to enact a long-term policy, and I know that if he had his way, as he just said, we would have already passed a farm bill. The chairman and I were ready to mark up our bill at the end of June, but the Republican leadership stepped in and said that they wanted us to consider the ag approps bill. So we held off for a couple of weeks, and then they didn't even bring the ag approps bill to the floor. The committee completed their work then on July 11, passing a new bill, a 5-year bill, 35-11 in a bipartisan vote. But rather than bring this bill to the floor, the House instead focused on messaging bills that are going nowhere.

I understand that this is an election year and the majority wants to promote their message, and I've even voted for some of these bills. You would think that after delaying us for 2 weeks, the leadership could have found 2 days on the House calendar to consider the committee's farm bill before the August recess.

Instead of bringing up the 5-year farm bill, the Republican leadership last week put forth a 1-year farm bill extension hoping to delay action until the next Congress, with hopes, for some

people, that they're going to dismantle the farm and food safety nets. Fortunately, under intense opposition from those in agriculture and others, the leadership had to pull the bill. This brings us to today's consideration of H.R. 6233. This measure will provide some assistance to a few livestock producers affected by drought conditions across the country. Providing assistance to livestock producers, primarily cattle and sheep, is necessary and important, but this is not a comprehensive disaster package. Dairy and specialty crop producers are going to be left hurting, and there's no assistance for pork and poultry producers.

The Ag Committee's farm bill not only includes the livestock provision we're considering today, it also strengthens the farm safety net on a wide-ranging list of commodities. The 5-year farm bill will do a better job of providing certainty for American agriculture and assistance during this period of drought.

Additionally, I have concerns about the conservation cuts that are used to pay for this assistance. I don't think cutting conservation programs to offset the cost of disaster is the right approach. If there was more time, maybe we could find a better way to do this. But in the rush of putting this bill together, it didn't give us the necessary time to explore all of the options. This is yet another reason that I think bringing up a 5-year bill makes more sense.

It's just mystifying to me why House leaders can't take "yes" for an answer. I don't know how many times I've heard from the other side complaints about the Senate not being able to get our bills passed. We passed a lot of bills, most of which I supported, that are over in the Senate and they never took them up. Now the Senate has passed a bill, and this may be the only time that we will ever be able to get a farm bill through the Senate. They passed it on a bipartisan basis. We passed it on a bipartisan basis. Now the leadership doesn't want to bring it up. I don't understand it.

The farm economy is the one part of the economy that is actually working, doing well, has been solid for the last few years. This is due in part, I believe, to the strong farm bill that we passed in '08. Weathering a natural disaster without the certainty of a 5-year bill could jeopardize one of the bright spots we have in this economy.

With all that said, I do recognize the effects the drought is having on our farmers, and I will vote in favor of H.R. 6233. However, this bill is a sad substitute for what is really needed—a long-term farm policy. So I'll continue to urge my colleagues to bring up the House agriculture 5-year farm bill and to ensure that all producers will have necessary assistance during these times of disaster.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 6233, the supplemental agriculture disaster assistance bill.

As we look across the United States, many areas, including South Dakota, are facing a serious drought. While many of our producers are covered by crop insurance, our livestock producers don't have the same safety net in place to weather this drought. That's why the livestock disaster programs are so important.

The last farm bill was in place for 5 years, while the livestock disaster programs were only put into place for 4. That's why back in April I introduced legislation that would reauthorize those programs and retroactively look at 2012, recognizing that it was a dereliction of our duty, and to make sure that there was a safety net for our livestock producers, as well. The 2008 farm bill did not extend that disaster coverage for this year, but today we have the chance to make that right.

This House should not go home while literally hanging our ranchers out to dry without a safety net to get through this drought. This need is immediate, which is why we need to get this done. Beyond this, I'm going to continue to advocate for a 5-year farm bill, knowing it's the right thing to do, making sure that these programs are put into place for the lifetime of that farm bill so that we can avoid situations like this.

The full 5-year farm bill is the best way to get a long-term safety net for our livestock producers, and for our commodity producers, as well. We can't wait another day with this drought going on without giving our ranchers some needed certainty. That's why I'm going to urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" today, and to continue to work to get a 5-year farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, one of our ranking members, Mr. BOSWELL.

□ 1200

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of farmers and producers in Iowa and in my district and across the country. And I want to thank you, Chairman LUCAS, and you, Ranking Member PETERSON, for working together to try to resolve the need for the farm bill. As you know, we are suffering because of the drought that continues to beat down on our land and our livestock.

While I'm not 100 percent pleased with this bill, I will vote today to move it forward on behalf of my producers in need. And for those who have been grappling for hay and have begun to liquidate cattle, I will support this disaster aid bill. However, I do it with a heavy heart, yet with the eternal opti-

mist of a farmer, as you are, Mr. Chairman and Mr. PETERSON.

As a cow-calf producer myself, I can tell you exactly what our farmers and ranchers across America want. They want a farm bill, a 5-year farm bill that will provide long-term certainty in a changing market with an uncontrollable climate.

Producers in my State want a farm bill that invests in expansions and research for insurance programs, like the provisions we worked on in the House committee for livestock insurance and for specialty crops. They want to see a bill that will help them beyond 2012 and 2013, a bill that shows what we know: not only must we react to this drought, but we must prepare for the future.

Since July 11, I have expressed my support for a farm bill every chance I have had. I hope for a conference the same way I hope for rain. However, the Republican leadership has taken every chance they get to block debate on the 5-year farm bill.

It is clear this is not a perfect bill; but these happen to be imperfect times, and I believe we must respond to the drought that is impacting more than half of our Nation, as was depicted by the chairman a few moments ago.

I have reservations regarding the cuts to conservation, particularly since conservation programs have been one option to help feed the cattle under our current drought. Furthermore, if we could bring the farm bill to the floor, we could respond to drought issues, we could debate issues that are critical to all Americans, and we could advance a bill that saves tens of billions of dollars.

It is imperative that we pass a comprehensive, long-term farm bill. Farmers and ranchers always face decisions that carry very serious financial ramifications, such as planting a crop, buying land, upgrading machinery, building a herd. And we know that if we don't have a farm bill, that there are going to be a lot of ramifications on those out there that depend on the agriculture economy for a lot more than producing cattle or corn and beans or wheat or whatever. The machinery is a big part of it.

Both the Senate and the House Agriculture Committees have produced reform-minded, bipartisan bills that address plenty of the core principles that are important, such as strengthening crop insurance and ensuring strong agricultural research and development.

We have heard time and again in this House how uncertainty in the marketplace hinders job creation and economic growth. Not passing a long-term farm bill is bringing uncertainty to family farmers across Iowa, across the Nation, and this uncertainty must end.

We must pass a 5-year farm bill as soon as possible. Therefore, I remain hopeful—my eternal optimism, as I stated—that after providing relief to our producers impacted by this drought, that when we return from the

August work period, that Speaker BOEHNER will welcome us back with a farm bill on the floor.

I support this resolution.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), one of the most experienced and knowledgeable members of the Agriculture Committee.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank Chairman LUCAS for his leadership on this issue and Ranking Member PETERSON for his support of this effort to take action to help livestock producers who are being devastated by the drought. Livestock farmers in the Sixth District of Virginia have been hit hard by the heat and the derecho that swept through the Shenandoah Valley last month.

This disaster relief was included in the 2008 farm bill but, unfortunately, did not last the full length of the farm bill. I am pleased that the Congress has found a way to provide relief for these livestock farmers; and not only do we provide the relief, but we pay for it. And not only do we pay for it, but we also achieve additional savings that are applied to the deficit. If every bill passed by the Congress reduced spending overall, we would be in much better fiscal condition in the Federal Government.

While the Congress is taking an important first step in providing relief for drought-stricken livestock farmers, the administration has at hand a tool that they should use right now to provide drought relief as well.

The Obama administration has at its disposal an easy relief valve that would provide drought relief, if only temporarily—a reduction in the government-mandated Renewable Fuel Standard. I have long been a critic of the RFS that has increased food and feed stocks being diverted into fuel, leading to diminished supplies for livestock and food producers. In fact, last year, 40 percent of the U.S. corn crop was used for ethanol production. There is no doubt that this policy has driven up the price of corn, which today is hovering around \$8 a bushel. This, in turn, drives up the cost of food.

Unfortunately, because of the drought, we no longer have the luxury of being just worried about the price. This drought is so devastating that we have to be increasingly worried we do not have a large enough corn supply to meet all of our competing demands.

As we confront the reality of the tightening corn supplies, there are real concerns about having enough to satisfy the RFS and the needs of our food producers. We should not be in a position where we are choosing between fuel and food. In fact, the government has chosen: they've chosen fuel over food with a policy that mandates a certain amount of corn production going to ethanol production each year.

As the drought further shrinks the corn supply, we are unfortunately also going to see livestock herds shrink. This shrinking herd will affect consumers' grocery bills, resulting in consumers having to spend more in the grocery store. Rural communities that depend on livestock will be hit hard as producers affected by both the availability and high price of corn are being forced to limit their production or are being squeezed out of business.

The law allows the Administrator of the EPA to reduce the required volume of renewable fuels in any year based on severe harm to the economy or environment of a state, a region or the United States, or in the event of inadequate domestic supply of renewable fuel. This drought and the shrinking corn crop are causing severe economic harm in the countryside and on grocery store shelves.

The Administrator of the EPA has already received a petition to waive the RFS for a year. Today, over 150 bipartisan members, from coast to coast, joined in calling for Administrator Jackson to waive the RFS. The Congress is acting today to help drought stricken livestock farmers, but now the Obama Administration must act to use their authority to help these same farmers. This relief is not only desperately needed, but I believe is required by the law.

I urge all members to join today in supporting this bill to help provide much needed drought relief, and I urge the Administration to join the Congress in acting to provide drought relief by waiving the RFS.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It is a first start toward addressing a longer-term problem that requires other action.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reluctantly oppose this measure—not because drought relief is not desperately needed in many parts of this country, but because we have a far better vehicle to do this in the form of the farm bill that Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON have worked so tirelessly to produce, a good, good 5-year farm policy on behalf of American agriculture.

We need to do the job that we were sent here to do. The drought relief package that we are voting on today, I believe, is sadly more about giving the Republican leadership relief when they go back to their districts in August than helping our Nation's farmers, ranchers, and dairymen.

There is no denying that action is needed to offer relief, and we must do that; and hopefully we'll come to an agreement in September. But the best action, I believe, is passing the bipartisan farm bill.

If we were serious about helping agriculture make it through this drought, we would have brought up the bipartisan farm bill, which came out of the United States Senate, passed the House Agriculture Committee by a vote of 35-11, and followed regular order.

The fact is that instead of working on a conference committee, as we should be doing at this time because we certainly have had enough time to do

that, we are voting on a patchwork measure that, in my opinion, is more about politics than policy and, more likely than not, will go nowhere in the United States Senate.

The dairymen, poultry producers, and cattle feeders in my district have seen their feed prices skyrocket 30 to 35 percent in the last 6 to 8 weeks. And, yes, we ought to provide relief through the Renewable Fuel Standard.

Bankruptcies are increasing at an alarming rate among the dairy industry in California. When these businesses are already struggling to stay afloat, they look to Congress for leadership. They look to Congress for real action to produce a 5-year farm bill. Drought relief alone is not enough. Lord knows we dealt with a drought in California that was devastating in 2009 and 2010.

Passing a farm bill would give farmers, ranchers, and dairymen the certainty that they need for the next 5 years in a part of the economy that has been doing, generally speaking, fairly well over the last several years. This includes long-term authority for disaster assistance along with all the other support from a farm bill that helps them do their work in the conservation programs, in the EQUIP programs, market-access programs, and in research that is vital to American agriculture.

This bill, sadly, would pit disaster relief against the conservation programs that farmers in my district rely on.

We need real solutions; and that solution, in my opinion, is passing a farm bill—not half-hearted actions to protect our political interests.

My colleagues, we have the time. Let's go to a conference committee and produce a bipartisan farm bill. It's traditionally the most bipartisan thing we do in this Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) who's been dealing with drought issues for 2 years in a row now.

□ 1210

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6233. Like the chairman and the ranking member, I wish we were here debating the 5-year farm bill that was passed out of the House Ag Committee, which would have brought certainty and reform and would have saved the American taxpayers over \$35 billion.

But the truth is we have a drought across this country. Over 75 percent of the areas that produce agriculture in this country are reporting either abnormally dry or worse conditions. That doesn't just impact farmers and ranchers; that impacts Americans who consume food products all across this country, driving food costs up.

So what we are doing today is doing something we should have done when we wrote the previous farm bill, and that is making sure that this program is extended for an additional year, and

doing it in a way that is very fiscally responsible. In fact, we're going to save the American taxpayers \$256 million by making some shifts, moving some money around and making sure that these farmers and ranchers that are going through this tremendous drought have the resources they need to continue and to help somewhat mitigate the increased cost of food for our country.

I hope that my colleagues will vote for this; but also, I hope in the future we will be back down on this floor debating a very important farm policy for American consumers and American farmers and ranchers.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend the bipartisan leadership on this committee, Chairman LUCAS and the ranking member, Mr. PETERSON, for the hard work they have done and the leadership they've provided.

We are faced with sort of a dilemma here. The right thing for us to do, that we should be doing right now, that we should have been doing 2 or 3 days ago, was dealing with the 5-year extension of the farm bill. That is exactly what we need to be doing. It gives consistency. It will give uniformity to our very vital food industry. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that it is needed very desperately at this time.

But at the same time, we are faced with a very serious drought situation that is pummeling our country, the likes of which we haven't seen in over 60 years. So the immediate and responsible thing for us to do is to respond to this drought crisis and pass this bill immediately and then resolve that the first order of business we will do when we return is take up the 5-year farm bill.

Might I add that while we have this disaster facing us, which is the drought, we have another, and that is the food issue in this country, especially the issue of the SNAP program, what we refer to as the food stamp program, if we do not come together with a good conference committee report that looks at this issue with the necessity that the problem presents.

Under the current bill on the House side passed by the Agriculture Committee, according to CBO, there will be over 300,000 children who will go without food. There will be 155,000 veterans who will go without food, and nearly 200,000 of our seniors. What I'm saying is we have not just a drought crisis, which we are going to respond to today, but we have got to come back and deal with this other crisis as we work to put together a very effective 5-year farm bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), one of the most active members of the committee.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the leader of the

Ag Committee for his important leadership on this issue and many, many others.

Mr. Speaker, just like in Nebraska where we're hoping for rain, I'm actually hoping for a long-term farm bill. Agriculture remains the only bright spot in the American economy, and it is critical that we build a multi-year farm bill that is built upon our strengths and provides certainty for our Nation's agriculture producers.

Last month, with bipartisan support, the House Agriculture Committee, under Chairman LUCAS's leadership, approved such a bill. The House should act on it before the current farm bill expires this September.

While the 5-year proposal is not perfect, it provides adequate protections for farmers and ranchers. It supports young and beginning farmers and embraces new market opportunities domestically and internationally while also reducing spending. The proposal charts a new way forward for America's farmers and ranchers while respecting the Federal Government's severe budgetary constraints.

Mr. Speaker, agricultural policy is essential to America's food security. But agriculture is also critical to our energy policy, environmental policy, even our national security policy. A new farm bill is imperative for the future of the agriculture sector, but also for the well-being of our country.

While I'm disappointed that we are not acting on a long-term bill, it is important that we consider this legislation, and I support its passage. Drought conditions are affecting many parts of the Nation. This bill reinstates past legislative provisions—there's nothing new here—and it gives relief to livestock producers. The measure is paid for and actually reduces spending, while attempting to remain appropriately sensitive to important conservation programs. I urge its passage.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), one of my lead subcommittee chairmen who put a tremendous amount of effort into this farm bill process.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and I rise today in strong support of this disaster relief bill. To fully appreciate the need for this legislation—and it's going to pass the House today, we hope, and be signed into law by the President this week—just turn on your television or look at the front page of any newspaper to see the details of the drought gripping our countryside today.

As a west Texan from cattle country, I know a little bit about droughts. The record-breaking drought that we faced last year in Texas, that's still being felt this year, by the way, was heart breaking for all of us, especially those

who make their living raising livestock and growing crops that feed and clothe our Nation.

I'm sometimes called upon to explain how good can come out of a bad situation. Maybe this is one of those times. I hope my colleagues who doubt the need for farm policy might think a little bit about what our country's farmers and ranchers are going through right now, and then imagine what many of them are going through without crop insurance, which is the one and only reason why we are not in here today debating a multi-billion dollar disaster package. In other words, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Unfortunately, our livestock producers do not have crop insurance. They have to depend on disaster programs instead. Regrettably, the authority for this disaster relief has expired and must be renewed in order for livestock producers to receive relief, and that's what this bill does.

But the need for farm policy goes beyond addressing droughts and whatever else Mother Nature might throw at us. It also is responding to high foreign tariffs and subsidies that are climbing higher and higher, breaking records, while funding for U.S. farm policy is at an all-time low. Agriculture matters to our economy, to our balance of trade, to U.S. jobs, and to our national security.

Importantly, the bill before us is fully paid for so it doesn't increase the deficit. We offset the costs of using dollars from two conservation accounts that have never been spent on the conservation purposes that they were intended for. So there is zero impact on conservation programs, but it'll be helping farmers and ranchers.

I know many of my colleagues say we should be passing a 5-year farm bill instead of disaster relief. No one is more committed to enacting long-term farm policy than I am. I will continue to work that way. We passed a good one in the House Agriculture Committee under the leadership of Chairman LUCAS, but I think everyone appreciates the time it will take to pass this House and get to conference. That is extensive, and something our producers don't have the time.

I'm disappointed in some of our farm groups that they've objected to the various ways the House is working and attempting to advance our Nation's farm policy. A number of these groups are the very same groups that insisted on dragging out this debate by trying to advance farm policy that only works, if at all, for one region of the country, or only for a couple of crops. Our livestock producers need help now, and that's what the House is about to do, I hope, and that is always respond in times of natural disaster. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) who does very important work for agriculture on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for allowing me the time here to speak, and I rise in support today of H.R. 6233, the Agricultural Disaster Assistance Act. As we all know, farmers and ranchers are really suffering from one of the worst and most widespread droughts to have occurred in decades.

□ 1220

While over half of Iowa has been designated as a disaster area because of the drought, farmers at home are really hurting and really feeling the pain of the drought.

While the forecasts are not good for the future as far as rain and the conditions appear to be worsening every day out there—the temperatures near 100 degrees—we're at a critical point. Congress can't legislate rain like we'd like to, but we can certainly provide farmers the certainty that they need to address the disaster, which is the worst in decades.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the livestock producers have no safety net to fall back on because the disaster programs expired last year. Extending these programs to the end of fiscal year 2012 will give farmers the confidence and the certainty to prepare for what's going to be a very difficult year.

We're all pushing as hard as we can, doing everything possible to get a new farm bill done, and I would encourage everyone to work to that end. In the meantime, this is what we have to do. We need to do this immediately to give certainty to those livestock producers all over the country that are facing a very, very difficult situation with the drought.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6233. Let's move this today and then get on to a new farm bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), a tireless voice for rural American production of agriculture.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, the drought which is devastating U.S. producers of agriculture throughout the Nation poses a serious, serious threat to every American family who plans on visiting the grocery store this year. American farmers and ranchers are on the ropes right now, and this legislation is desperately needed.

I can't tell you how important the leadership and cooperation of Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON has been on this issue because, statistically speaking, this is the worst drought since the 1950s. The forage situation for livestock is the worst since 1933.

In southern Missouri, the drought is breaking the life's work of dairy farmers like Stacey McCallister, who wrote this to me:

I've been talking to some farmers, and the feed prices are going to put us out of business. Milk isn't coming up at all on price and feed costs are doubling in cases. The sorriest

hay that you could feed a heifer is at \$200 a ton; I used to buy it at \$30 a ton. I feel like my heart is in my stomach right now.

This picture of his farm tells the heartbreaking story. According to Stacey, even if you want to sell off part of your herd, you're out of luck. There's no more room for cows at the sale barn where they hold livestock auctions. There is about one penny of profit margin on the milk he's selling today. Our response to this disaster must begin with this effort to reinstate the emergency programs which were allowed to expire last October. We've paid for the reauthorization of these four programs in this legislation, and there's no reason not to renew them.

These programs are a safety net for our livestock producers in free fall. They need this assistance, and we need to give it to them or else risk losing the heart and soul of the agricultural backbone of this Nation, the families who literally put food on our tables.

I urge support for this legislation at a crucial hour of need for America's livestock producers.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to support this bill. It's better than nothing, but it's not what we should be doing.

People need to understand that this is not going to solve any problems for anybody over August, other than the political problem that they have where they go home and can't point to anything that got done, so they'll be able to say they voted for a bill.

This bill is not going anywhere in the other body. They have passed through the other body a bipartisan bill that has a better disaster provision in it than what we're considering here today. Their position is my position, and that is that we should be moving this bill and getting it enacted into law.

So, out of my friendship and respect for the chairman, I am supporting this bill. But I think he'll probably agree with me that we need to get this bill to conference. We need to get it moved. We need to get it done so we can get it in place by September 30, so producers can get what they really need out of this bill, and that is a long-term policy they know they can count on.

So I ask my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I think the bill we address today is very straightforward. We are going to help a group of producers who, when the '08 farm bill passed, thought they had something they could depend on, but because of budget issues, the 5th year is not funded. We need to help them by fulfilling our commitment that what we said would be there will be there. We do it in a responsible way. We do it in a way that does not truly affect the dollars going to additional conservation programs, based on recent years.

But my colleague's right. This addresses an issue that matters to pro-

ducers who, for the last 10 months and for the next approximately 2 months, are not able to use a program they thought would be there. But the underlying issue still is passing a comprehensive 5-year farm bill; a farm bill that is such that all commodities and all regions can participate; a farm bill that will provide certainty; a farm bill that will make sure that the food and fiber that meet the needs of American consumers and, yes, consumers around the world can be on the books.

My friend and I have worked very hard, and we have made more progress this year than many pundits would have ever given us credit for, but we're not quite there yet. We may not exactly agree on every footstep to get there, but we agree we have to get there. Let's take care of the folks who are hurting today, and let's work to get that farm bill process completed.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 6233, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6233, the Agricultural Disaster Assistance Act. I agree that we must take steps to assist farmer and rancher families affected by extreme drought conditions, but doing so at the expense of national conservation programs is a shortsighted approach. Conservation programs help preserve farms and ranchlands, improve water quality, and enhance soil conservation, air quality, and wildlife habitats. These funds have been essential to Maryland farmers in protecting the quality of the Chesapeake Bay. Maintaining funding for these programs and providing farmers and ranchers with the opportunity to do long-term conservation planning is one of the best investments we can make to mitigate the impact of future droughts and disasters. Instead of pitting disaster assistance against conservation programs, let's focus on our efforts on reauthorizing a five-year farm bill. Farmers in my district and across the Nation agree that a farm bill reauthorization will give them the clarity and economic certainty they really need to plan for their futures. I urge my colleagues to reject today's bill and move forward with passing comprehensive reauthorization.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a devastating drought—impacting the viability of our nation's crops and the livelihood of farmers in 65% of the country, including Virginia. In response today, I supported the Agriculture Disaster Assistance Act, reauthorizing disaster assistance programs, and allowing producers to effectively manage risk, while providing certainty to producers who are generally ineligible for crop insurance.

This assistance does not come without a cost—one that is absorbed by some of our nation's agriculture conservation programs. These programs have been instrumental in aiding Virginia's agricultural community, and I support their efforts to protect our rivers, streams and waterways that make up the important Chesapeake Bay watershed.

I believe that we must work to ensure the stability and future of our economy, including our nation's food sources. However as we do, we must remain mindful of the need to conserve our natural resources which are critical for agricultural production throughout the

country. It is my hope Congress can move to pass a comprehensive Farm Bill which will support our nation's rich agricultural heritage while giving our farmers the tools they need to protect our vital natural resources.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the so-called Agricultural Disaster Assistance Act.

This bill is anything but disaster assistance agriculture. It is a bill by Republican leadership to provide cover for not bringing up a real farm bill.

Farmers and ranchers do not need a temporary disaster bill—they need a farm bill that provides disaster assistance but so farmers and ranchers can make sound future business decisions.

Republicans often say uncertainty about "regulation" is harming the economy.

Yet here we are considering a temporary measure when American agriculture needs certainty.

It is ironic we are here considering a temporary measure that creates uncertainty because about a year ago the United States' credit rating was downgraded. Why? Republicans created uncertainty in the financial markets during the debt ceiling debacle.

By taking up temporary disaster aid and not a farm bill, Republicans must want to downgrade American agriculture.

This bill kicks the can down the road, as Republicans have done far too often.

The House should stay and do the people's work instead of running off on a recess.

We won't stay though, because Republicans refuse to compromise with Democrats on paying the bills due and now the farm bill languishes.

This refusal shows us that Republicans are not serious about a farm bill or deficit reduction, creating jobs and growing our economy.

If Republicans were serious about deficit reduction, they would bring up one of two farm bills that are out there.

While neither bill is perfect, the Senate farm bill would reduce the deficit by \$23 billion and the House farm bill cut spending by \$35 billion.

If Republicans were serious about creating jobs and growing the economy, they would bring up a farm bill.

Just one Title of the farm bill, the energy title, has the potential to generate \$88.5 billion in economic activity and create nearly 700,000 jobs.

Finally, I oppose this temporary disaster bill not only because it shows lack of leadership in passing a farm bill but because of its shortsightedness in slashing conservation programs.

I represent Lake Erie, which is part of the Great Lakes region that is responsible for more than 1.5 million jobs and generates \$62 billion in wages.

Lake Erie is under assault by a massive bloom of algae that is turning the water into a bright green pea soup.

The substance is enough to kill a pet dog, and makes people seriously ill. As the summer goes on, the stench will drive tens of thousands of tourists and local residents inside with closed windows.

The Environmental Quality Incentives Program and Conservation Stewardship Program are two of the most effective programs in helping farmers and ranchers do their part to help reduce nutrient runoff fueling the algae bloom.

Cutting these programs are penny wise and pound-foolish.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. Let's pass a real farm bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Chairman for his relentless leadership to get some relief to America's farmers and ranchers who are dealing with this drought. In my home state of Iowa we now have 42 counties that have been declared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) as primary natural disaster areas.

The latest crop conditions report in Iowa has 18 percent of the corn declared as "very poor." Only one percent is rated as "excellent". Soybeans are in a very similar situation.

Our pasture lands are in terrible condition with 55 percent of pasture being "very poor." While lands in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) are being opened today for haying and grazing, it really isn't going to amount to much.

As a result of these conditions, our livestock producers are going to have a really hard time getting feed. I appreciate that this disaster package will bring some relief, especially to those who have lost animals due to the extreme heat.

However, let us not forget that we have work to do on a real farm bill. We need to get the 2012 farm bill done and in proper order, so that we do not have to do ad hoc disaster assistance packages and so that farmers can plan for the future. I appreciate the Chairman and Ranking Member's work on this bipartisan bill that we reported out of Committee and look forward to us finishing our work and bringing the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management (FARRM) Act to the House Floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 752, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 6233 is postponed.

PATHWAY TO JOB CREATION THROUGH A SIMPLER, FAIRER TAX CODE ACT OF 2012

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 747, I call up the bill (H.R. 6169) to provide for expedited consideration of a bill providing for comprehensive tax reform, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 747, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6169

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pathway to Job Creation through a Simpler, Fairer Tax Code Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that the following problems exist with the Internal Revenue

Code of 1986 (in this section referred to as the "tax code"):

(1) The tax code is unfair, containing hundreds of provisions that only benefit certain special interests, resulting in a system of winners and losers.

(2) The tax code violates the fundamental principle of equal justice by subjecting families in similar circumstances to significantly different tax bills.

(3)(A) Many tax preferences, sometimes referred to as "tax expenditures," are similar to government spending—instead of markets directing economic resources to their most efficient uses, the Government directs resources to other uses, creating a drag on economic growth and job creation.

(B) The exclusions, deductions, credits, and special rules that make up such tax expenditures amount to over \$1 trillion per year, nearly matching the total amount of annual revenue that is generated from the income tax itself.

(C) In some cases, tax subsidies can literally take the form of spending through the tax code, redistributing taxes paid by some Americans to individuals and businesses who do not pay any income taxes at all.

(4) The failure to adopt a permanent tax code with stable statutory tax policy has created greater economic uncertainty. Tax rates have been scheduled to increase sharply in 3 of the last 5 years, requiring the enactment of repeated temporary extensions. Additionally, approximately 70 other, more targeted tax provisions expired in 2011 or are currently scheduled to expire by the end of 2012.

(5) Since 2001, there have been nearly 4,500 changes made to the tax code, averaging more than one each day over the past decade.

(6) The tax code's complexity leads nearly nine out of ten families either to hire tax preparers (60 percent) or purchase software (29 percent) to file their taxes, while 71 percent of unincorporated businesses are forced to pay someone else to prepare their taxes.

(7) The cost of complying with the tax code is too burdensome, forcing individuals, families, and employers to spend over six billion hours and over \$160 billion per year trying to comply with the law and pay the actual tax owed.

(8) Compliance with the current tax code is a financial hardship for employers that falls disproportionately on small businesses, which spend an average of \$74 per hour on tax-related compliance, making it the most expensive paperwork burden they encounter.

(9) Small businesses have been responsible for two-thirds of the jobs created in the United States over the past 15 years, and approximately half of small-business profits are taxed at the current top 2 individual rates.

(10) The historic range for tax revenues collected by the Federal government has averaged 18 to 19 percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), but will rise to 21.2 percent of GDP under current law—a level never reached, let alone sustained, in the Nation's history.

(11) The current tax code is highly punitive, with a top Federal individual income tax rate of 35 percent (which is set to climb to over 40 percent in 2013 when taking into account certain hidden rates), meaning some Americans could face a combined local, State and Federal tax rate of 50 percent.

(12) The tax code contains harmful provisions, such as the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT), which was initially designed to affect only the very highest-income taxpayers but now threatens more than 30 million middle-class households because of a flawed design.

(13) As of April 1, 2012, the United States achieved the dubious distinction of having

the highest corporate tax rate (39.2 percent for Federal and State combined) in the developed world.

(14) The United States corporate tax rate is more than 50 percent higher than the average rate of member states of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)—a factor that discourages employers and investors from locating jobs and investments in the United States.

(15) The United States has become an outlier in that it still uses a "worldwide" system of taxation—one that has not been substantially reformed in 50 years, when the United States accounted for nearly half of global economic output and had no serious competitors around the world.

(16) The combination of the highest corporate tax rate with an antiquated "worldwide" system subjects American companies to double taxation when they attempt to compete with foreign companies in overseas markets and then reinvest their earnings in the United States.

(17) The Nation's outdated tax code has contributed to the fact that the world's largest companies are more likely to be headquartered overseas today than at any point in the last 50 years: In 1960, 17 of the world's 20 largest companies were based in the United States; by 2010, that number sank to a mere six out of 20.

(18) The United States has one of the highest levels of taxation on capital—taxing it once at the corporate level and then again at the individual level—with integrated tax rates on certain investment income already reaching roughly 50 percent (and scheduled to reach nearly 70 percent in 2013).

(19) The United States' overall taxation of capital is higher than all but four of the 38 countries that make up the OECD and the BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India and China).

(b) PURPOSES.—It is the purpose of this Act to provide for enactment of comprehensive tax reform in 2013 that—

(1) protects taxpayers by creating a fairer, simpler, flatter tax code for individuals and families by—

(A) lowering marginal tax rates and broadening the tax base;

(B) eliminating special interest loopholes;

(C) reducing complexity in the tax code, making tax compliance easier and less costly;

(D) repealing the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(E) maintaining modern levels of progressivity so as to not overburden any one group or further erode the tax base;

(F) making it easier for Americans to save; and

(G) reducing the tax burdens imposed on married couples and families;

(2) is comprehensive (addressing both individual and corporate rates), so as to have the maximum economic impact by benefitting employers and their employees regardless of how a business is structured;

(3) results in tax revenue consistent with historical norms;

(4) spurs greater investment, innovation and job creation, and therefore increases economic activity and the size of the economy on a dynamic basis as compared to the current tax code; and

(5) makes American workers and businesses more competitive by—

(A) creating a stable, predictable tax code under which families and employers are best able to plan for the future;

(B) keeping taxes on small businesses low;

(C) reducing America's corporate tax rate, which is currently the highest in the industrialized world;

(D) maintaining a level of parity between individual and corporate rates to reduce economic distortions;

(E) promoting innovation in the United States;

(F) transitioning to a globally competitive territorial tax system;

(G) minimizing the double taxation of investment and capital; and

(H) reducing the impact of taxes on business decision-making to allow such decisions to be driven by their economic potential.

SEC. 3. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF A MEASURE PROVIDING FOR COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term “tax reform bill” means a bill of the 113th Congress—

(1) introduced in the House of Representatives by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means not later than April 30, 2013, or the first legislative day thereafter if the House is not in session on that day, the title of which is as follows: “A bill to provide for comprehensive tax reform.”; and

(2) which is the subject of a certification under subsection (b).

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—The chair of the Joint Committee on Taxation shall notify the House and Senate in writing whenever the chair of the Joint Committee determines that an introduced bill described in subsection (a)(1) contains at least each of the following proposals:

(1) a consolidation of the current 6 individual income tax brackets into not more than two brackets of 10 and not more than 25 percent;

(2) a reduction in the corporate tax rate to not greater than 25 percent;

(3) a repeal of the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) a broadening of the tax base to maintain revenue between 18 and 19 percent of the economy; and

(5) a change from a “worldwide” to a “territorial” system of taxation.

(c) **EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—

(1) Any committee of the House of Representatives to which the tax reform bill is referred shall report it to the House not later than 20 calendar days after the date of its introduction. If a committee fails to report the tax reform bill within that period, such committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the bill.

(2) If the House has not otherwise proceeded to the consideration of the tax reform bill upon the expiration of 15 legislative days after the bill has been placed on the Union Calendar, it shall be in order for the Majority Leader or a designee (or, after the expiration of an additional 2 legislative days, any Member), to offer one motion that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the tax reform bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except 20 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. If such a motion is adopted, consideration shall proceed in accordance with paragraph (3). A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 4 hours, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. At the conclusion of general debate, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. Any committee amendment shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be

considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to reconsider with or without instructions. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the bill shall not be in order.

(d) **EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.**—

(1) **COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.**—A tax reform bill, as defined in subsection (a), received in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Finance. The Committee shall report the bill not later than 15 calendar days after receipt of the bill in the Senate. If the Committee fails to report the bill within that period, that committee shall be discharged from consideration of the bill, and the bill shall be placed on the calendar.

(2) **MOTION TO PROCEED.**—Notwithstanding rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order, not later than 2 days of session after the date on which the tax reform bill is reported or discharged from committee, for the majority leader of the Senate or the majority leader’s designee to move to proceed to the consideration of the tax reform bill. It shall also be in order for any Member of the Senate to move to proceed to the consideration of the tax reform bill at any time after the conclusion of such 2-day period. A motion to proceed is in order even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to. All points of order against the motion to proceed to the tax reform bill are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone.

(3) **CONSIDERATION.**—No motion to reconsider shall be in order and debate on any motion or appeal shall be limited to one hour, to be divided in the usual form.

(4) **AMENDMENTS.**—All amendments must be relevant to the bill and debate on any amendment shall be limited to 2 hours to be equally divided in the usual form between the opponents and proponents of the amendment. Debate on any amendment to an amendment, debatable motion, or appeal shall be limited to 1 hour to be equally divided in the usual form between the opponents and proponents of the amendment.

(5) **VOTE ON PASSAGE.**—If the Senate has proceeded to the bill, and following the conclusion of all debate, the Senate shall proceed to a vote on passage of the bill as amended, if amended.

(e) **CONFERENCE IN THE HOUSE.**—If the House receives a message that the Senate has passed the tax reform bill with an amendment or amendments, it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or a designee, without intervention of any point of order, to offer any motion specified in clause 1 of rule XXII.

(f) **CONFERENCE IN THE SENATE.**—If the Senate receives from the House a message to accompany the tax reform bill, as defined in subsection (a), then no later than two session days after its receipt—

(1) the Chair shall lay the message before the Senate;

(2) the motion to insist on the Senate amendment or disagree to the House amendment or amendments to the Senate amendment, the request for a conference with the House or the motion to agree to the request of the House for a conference, and the motion to authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate shall be agreed to; and

(3) the Chair shall then be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate without intervening motion, with a ratio agreed to with the concurrence of both leaders.

(g) **RULEMAKING.**—This section is enacted by the Congress as an exercise of the rule-making power of the House of Representa-

tives and Senate, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such procedures supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such rules; and with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as any other rule of that House.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore.** The bill shall be debatable for 3 hours, with 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, and 2 hours on the subject of reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

After debate, it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of House Report 112-641, if offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. **SLAUGHTER**) or her designee, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. **DREIER**).

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **DREIER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 6169.

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

There was no objection.

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

An exorbitant amount of ink has been spilled chronicling the many divisions here in the United States Congress. I was just speaking a couple of hours ago in the well about the bipartisan consensus we were able to put together on the trade issue. And I’ve got to say that the differences of opinions between and within the Democratic and Republican Parties are extraordinarily well documented, and too little attention is focused on the kind of bipartisanship that we’ve had on issues like the one that we were debating earlier today. But, having said that, even though it doesn’t get much attention, there are a number of issues, Mr. Speaker, on which we can all agree.

We all agree, for example, that dramatic reform of our budget process is needed. We may diverge significantly on the kinds of reforms and the manner in which they should be implemented, but none of us looks at our skyrocketing deficit, anemic economic growth rate, or persistent unemployment and thinks that the status quo, when it comes to the Federal budget process, is acceptable.

I, personally, believe very strongly in the notion of our going to a 2-year

budget cycle so that we could have both the Appropriations Committee and the other authorizing committees expend time, energy, and effort meeting their constitutional responsibility of oversight.

So again, there are a wide range of views as to how we deal with the issue of budget process reform, but there is a consensus. Democrats and Republicans alike believe that it is necessary.

We also all understand that budget challenges must be addressed within two specific areas: both taxing and spending. Again, we disagree greatly on the level and the structure of both, but we agree that it needs to be addressed. We know that meaningful budget reform must consist of both reform of the budget process, itself, as well as reform of the tax structure.

Mr. Speaker, the exponential rise in spending in recent years infused our reform agenda with a great sense of urgency, which is why we, as Republicans, have focused so intently on reversing that trend and bringing about meaningful spending cuts. In fact, when I announced that I would be leaving here at the end of this year, one of the things that I had wanted to accomplish was that I made the choice, even though I wasn't originally planning to run again—this was 2 years ago. One of the things I said we had to do was reverse that trend we'd been on with an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending that we'd seen the years before. Well, I'm happy to say that we have been able to at least begin the process of reversing that trend.

Now we face a new level of urgency on the tax side of the equation. As we face the prospect of stark tax increases at the end of this year, while unemployment is stuck, as we've had pointed out to us by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP, an unemployment rate in excess of 8 percent, which has gone on for more than 40 months—and we've just gotten the report at the end of last week that our GDP growth rate was revised downward from 1.9 to 1.5 percent. Tomorrow we're due to get these unemployment numbers. We all hope and pray that we will see improvement. But even if we do see some improvement, we know that the length of this challenging economic period is something that needs to be dealt with, and one of the best ways to deal with it is meaningful tax reform.

The legislation that we have before us, H.R. 6169, represents one-half of our two-pronged approach for preventing the enactment of catastrophic tax increases that would further paralyze our economy. The first step that we must take, Mr. Speaker, is to put a stop to the tax increases looming at the end of this year, which is precisely what this institution, the House of Representatives, did yesterday with the passage of H.R. 8. That bill will keep in place our current tax rates, as we all know, for 1 additional year. Now, that's an essential step.

The President of the United States has said increasing taxes during difficult economic times is bad policy. In fact, not just President Obama, but even the traditional Keynesian economists will argue that the notion of increasing taxes during slow economic growth is a prescription to exacerbate the economic downturn.

So it's very important that we do that. Again, that's one very important step. But on its own, it's just a stopgap solution, what we have done yesterday, here, for that one period of time.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of our two-pronged approach creates a pathway to a long-term solution. Now, this legislation puts in place a structure that will facilitate consideration and passage of meaningful, comprehensive tax reform.

Again, Democrats and Republicans alike regularly say they are for meaningful tax reform. We have talk from both sides of the aisle about it. What we're doing here with this compromise that we have is putting into place a structure that can lay the groundwork to have action taken rather than, simply, simply talk.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that our Tax Code is not working for the American people. I think that it's another point on which we can all agree. I would say to my friend from Worcester, he knows very well that the Tax Code that we have today is not working. We believe on our side that the Tax Code we have today is not working. It's unfair, and it is Byzantine in its complexity. And we all know, too, that the Tax Code that we have, Mr. Speaker, is clearly a drain on our economy.

I'd like to make a couple of points on this.

Since 2001, that's basically a decade plus a year, a little over a decade, there have been nearly 4,500 changes made to the U.S. Tax Code, so within that decade, 4,500 changes made to the Tax Code. Now, Mr. Speaker, that works out to one change a day, one change a day over that 10-year period of time. Now, the resulting complexity leads nearly 9 out of 10 families to seek assistance in filing their Federal income taxes. And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, the majority of small business owners, small business men and women in this country, 71 percent, 71 percent of all unincorporated businesses are forced to pay someone else to prepare their taxes.

Now, dealing with the Tax Code under these circumstances forces individuals, families, and employers in this country to spend—are you ready for this, Mr. Speaker?—over 6 billion—6 billion—hours, costing over \$160 billion every single year in an effort to faithfully comply with the burdensome and complicated Federal tax system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've talked to tax attorneys and accountants—tax attorneys and accountants—and they acknowledge that these wasted resources are a drain on economic growth and on

our shared bipartisan quest for job creation.

Furthermore, the current system is injecting a great deal of uncertainty in our economy. Many of us like to point to the fact that uncertainty is the enemy of prosperity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the uncertainty that has existed over the past several years. Tax rates have been scheduled to increase sharply in 3 of the last 5 years, requiring the enactment of repeated temporary extensions. What does that create for job creators and for investors out there? It creates that uncertainty. And that uncertainty, again, is the enemy of prosperity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as you know, dozens of other major tax provisions expired in 2011 or are currently scheduled to expire by the end of this year. Working families and small business owners are not able to plan for the future or make rational business decisions, including hiring decisions, in this extraordinary environment of uncertainty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of these challenges argue forcefully for comprehensive reform. Unfortunately—unfortunately—real results in this quest have proved, so far, to be elusive. We are all aware of the challenges of moving comprehensive legislation through the Senate. Here in the House, we have, as we all know, a majoritarian body where a simple majority is able to work its will.

□ 1240

The nature of the Senate is fundamentally different, far slower, far slower, by design. Frustrating though its inactions may often be, I do believe that the Framers of our Constitution were actually right to structure these two bodies differently.

However, at times throughout our Nation's history, we've recognized the need to come together, the two institutions to come together to facilitate decisive action on critical matters. And, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what we are doing here today, recognizing that the imperative for tax reform, something that has been discussed for literally decades, is going to be able to have something other than just talk, but action. And we're going to facilitate that with this effort here.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, lays out a roadmap for reform and helps to ensure its timely consideration in both the House and the Senate. It provides for consideration of a bill that is introduced by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee by April 30 of next year, and then incorporates five key pillars of comprehensive reform.

First, the reform package should provide individual filers with much needed clarity and simplicity by consolidating the current individual income tax rates into no more than two brackets, 10 and 25 percent.

Second, it should spur job creation and growth by limiting the corporate

tax rate to no more than 25 percent. And again, focusing on the bipartisan nature of this, I've regularly said that I appreciate the fact that President Obama has come forward and called for a reduction in the top rate on corporations in this country.

Third, it should protect middle class families by repealing the alternative minimum tax. We all know how onerous that has been, and we all know that more and more Americans have, unfortunately, been drawn into this alternative minimum tax, which was designed to focus on very, very few people.

And fourth, Mr. Speaker, it should broaden the tax base to maintain revenue between 18 and 19 percent of our gross domestic product. And so, as we look at our economy, the goal of 18 and 19 percent.

And finally, one of the things, again, I was talking about earlier is our global leadership role. We need to make sure that we shift from a worldwide to a territorial system of taxation to have greater equity, to allow for those who want to invest and participate to be able to do so on a global basis.

These are broad outlines of the tax reform agenda, Mr. Speaker, and they're an outline that I think will lay the groundwork, again, for the details to be put into place. The legislation provides for expedited procedures in the House and the Senate, so that comprehensive reform can receive its due consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the House, under this structure, any committee that receives a referral on the tax reform bill must report the legislation to the House within 20 calendar days. Failure to do so within that time period will result in an automatic discharge of that legislation. Our Rules Committee will then have 15 legislative days to provide a special order for consideration of the bill before the majority leader is automatically empowered to offer a motion to proceed with floor action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to underscore how important the right of every member of this institution is, after 2 days, any Member of the House will be able to do so if action has not been taken by the majority leadership. These procedures will help to ensure that no committee or Member has the power to prevent or indefinitely delay consideration of comprehensive tax reform.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the Senate, which is where this is really needed because, of course, we have a Rules Committee here in the House and so it's not absolutely essential that we do this. But in the Senate, where this is really needed, the bill, tax reform bill must be referred to the Committee on Finance, understandably, which will then have 15 calendar days to consider and report the bill before the legislation is automatically discharged.

Mr. Speaker, in the Senate, the Majority Leader can then offer a motion to proceed to the bill. After two more

days, any Senator will be empowered to do so, again, ensuring that people will not be able to stand in the way of moving ahead with tax reform. Now, that motion will not be debatable, and cloture is not required before a vote on a motion to proceed; basically meaning, Mr. Speaker, that a super majority will not be necessary to allow to move ahead on the debate on tax reform in the Senate.

Now, each amendment will be limited to 2 hours of debate in the Senate, and cloture will also not be required before votes on individual amendments. However, cloture, a very important power that does exist in the Senate, cloture on the underlying bill may still be required prior to the vote on passage of the bill.

So what this does, Mr. Speaker, these procedures ensure timely consideration in the Senate, while maintaining that last hurdle of a potential cloture vote on to final passage.

I believe very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that this agreement strikes the right balance between facilitating action while preserving the very core nature of the Senate process. The magnitude and the urgency of our current economic challenges demand that we create this clear pathway to comprehensive tax reform.

Our proposal provides a real solution to the uncertainty, the complexity, and the burdensome nature of our Tax Code. And, Mr. Speaker, it unleashes a powerful source of new revenues.

Now, you know this very well, Mr. Speaker. There is a common misperception out there, and you hear it reported from people in the media, and I don't believe that it's normally meant as a pejorative, but what they say is, Republicans don't want to increase revenues. Republicans don't want new revenues to the Federal Treasury. We hear this drumbeat over and over again.

I'm here to say, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. Republicans want new revenues to the Federal Treasury. We absolutely must find a way to bring greater revenue. We've got to find a way to bring revenue into the Federal Treasury. We all decry the \$15-plus trillion national debt that we have and the massive deficit spending. We've got to have greater revenue to the Federal Treasury.

Where we diverge, between the two political parties, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, is the manner in which we see these new revenues actually achieved.

Rather than raising tax rates on any one set of individuals or businesses, we want to raise revenues through greater gross domestic product growth. We want to expand the overall size of our economy, creating opportunity for all Americans. We've done this as a Nation many times in the past.

I always like to point to President John F. Kennedy, who pioneered this approach by cutting marginal tax rates and growing revenues as a result. Now,

I acknowledge the marginal tax rates when President Kennedy did this were significantly higher than they are today, when he was able to reduce marginal rates for individuals and reduce capital gains. But we still can put into place pro-growth tax policy.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan did the same thing 20 years after John F. Kennedy did it, and we all know what happened. We all know what happened, Mr. Speaker, when President Reagan, with the support of many Democrats, through what was known as the Conable-Hance tax package, it was a Democrat and a Republican, a then-Democrat and Republican. Mr. Hance has since seen the light and become a Republican, but he was a Democrat at the time. He offered this measure that brought about major marginal rate reduction. And what did that do?

During the decade of the 1980s, contrary to so many reports, we saw a nearly doubling, a nearly doubling of the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury, bringing even greater results than we saw following President Kennedy's cuts. So, Mr. Speaker, we want to follow the Kennedy-Reagan tradition of expanding the Federal Treasury by implementing pro-growth tax reform.

Now, we all know that our friends on the other side of the aisle do take a different point of view. I wish that they would follow President Kennedy's great example on this. But, unfortunately, the leadership on the other side of the aisle does take a different point of view, which brings me to the final point on which we all agree.

The Democratic approach to the considerable economic challenge we face is to raise taxes. I mean, we all agree that that's what our friends on the other side of the aisle are arguing. I've been watching television ads with President Obama on there talking about increasing taxes on working Americans. Yes, they're in the upper income, but these are people who are creating jobs and investing, and he wants to increase the tax burden on those people.

□ 1250

They readily admit that their solution is to allow a large portion of the tax increases to proceed. They want the tax increases that are scheduled to go into place in January to succeed.

So I come back to my points on the fact that uncertainty is the enemy of prosperity, and the statements of President Barack Obama, who as we all know has in the past agreed to an extension of these tax cuts to keep the economy growing. We also know that Keynesian economists have again made it clear that increasing taxes during a slow economy is a prescription for disaster.

So this is where the disagreement lies.

Democrats and Republicans alike recognize that Democrats want to increase marginal tax rates and that we

as Republicans want to grow the economy to enhance the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury. We as Republicans argue that making the Tax Code more burdensome for some and more complicated for all is not the solution. Raising taxes when our economy and our job market are flagging is not the solution. The only way for us to create opportunity for all Americans is to reignite our engines of economic growth, but we cannot spark new growth without addressing both the immediate crisis of impending tax increases and the long-term need for comprehensive tax reform.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very, very critical legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

It is true that Democrats believe that we need comprehensive tax reform. There is no doubt about that.

But I want to say to my good friend from California, when he used words like “bipartisan,” “consensus,” and “compromise” in the context of describing this piece of legislation, I have to respectfully disagree with him. It couldn’t be farther from the truth. Those words do not apply to what we are talking about here today.

This is a very, very partisan bill. This bill was referred exclusively to the Rules Committee. I am a member of the Rules Committee. I don’t recall the gentleman ever reaching out and asking my opinion on what a bill like this should be about. Perhaps my invitation to join the discussion was lost in the mail. If that’s the case, I certainly will give the gentleman a pass, but I’m willing to bet that Ranking Member SLAUGHTER was never consulted, that Mr. HASTINGS from Florida was never consulted, that Mr. POLIS from Colorado was never consulted. In fact, this bill was given to us less than 48 hours before we considered it in the House Rules Committee, and every single amendment the Democrats had to try to influence this bill was defeated on a strictly partisan vote—every single one of them.

So this is not in any way shape or form about bipartisanship or consensus or compromise. This is a very partisan bill. I regret that very much because we do need tax reform in this country, but this approach of shutting out the minority party entirely, I think, is the wrong way to go.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this very partisan Republican bill. Actually, I use the term “bill” very loosely here because this isn’t really much of a bill. It’s a press release masquerading as a meaningful piece of legislation.

H.R. 6169 would create expedited procedures for the Republican version of comprehensive tax reform. It lays out a whole bunch of criteria that tax reform has to meet in order to get fast-track protection in both the House and the

Senate. It’s sort of like reconciliation, but my Republican friends don’t like to admit that. There are two very big problems with the Republican approach here.

First, there is nothing—nothing—in this bill that would prevent their version of “comprehensive tax reform” from containing anything else they want to do: Turn Medicare into a voucher program or eliminate Medicare altogether? That would be allowed. Repeal patient protections under the Affordable Care Act? Yes, they could do that, too. Eliminate the Department of Education? Sure, that would get special treatment. Or they might want to privatize Social Security—one of their oldies but goodies. It is absolutely outrageous.

The second big problem is that, under this bill, the Republican author of the tax passage, as the chairman of Ways and Means and as the person who is supposed to certify that the package is eligible for expedited process as chair of the Joint Committee on Taxation, can and likely will be the very same person. Now, I like Chairman CAMP—I think he’s a terrific guy—but I do not believe he should be allowed to serve as prosecutor, judge, and jury on the issue of tax reform. You don’t put the fox in charge of guarding the henhouse.

But this debate is about much more than the terrible process outlined in this bill. This debate is about priorities. The choices here are very simple, and the contrasts are very clear.

Democrats want to give every American family a tax break. On the first \$250,000 of income, everybody—including Donald Trump and including all of those friends of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who give millions and millions to Super PACs—gets a tax break on the first \$250,000 of income. The problem is the Republican approach to tax reform is to raise taxes on millions of American middle class families—raise them.

Democrats want the wealthy to keep some of their tax cuts, but we believe during this time of budgetary crisis that we all have to sacrifice, including the millionaires and the billionaires. So we are asking them to contribute just a little bit. Everybody else is contributing. They should, too. Republicans say, no, that they want to protect those tax breaks for the wealthiest individuals and increase the deficit—in order to protect, again, the 2 percent wealthiest Americans in this country.

Democrats want to pass a tax cut bill that has already passed the Senate. That’s the one I was talking about, the one that gives everybody a tax break on the first \$250,000 of income. We want to pass that. It could be on the President’s desk at the end of the week, and we could actually have done something for the American people. Republicans want to hold that bill hostage. There is an old saying that you don’t have to agree on everything to agree on something. I mean, it seems to me—again, if I am to believe the rhetoric on the

other side of the aisle—that there is no objection to protecting tax breaks on the first \$250,000 of someone’s income.

If there is consensus on that, then we ought to get that done, and then we could have the other fight about whether or not Donald Trump and Sheldon Adelson and all those other guys get tax breaks. We could have that debate later, but we could actually do something before we recess for August that would actually help people in this country. What a radical idea in this Republican Congress to do something to help somebody—to help middle-income families. We could do that, but they are saying no. We all agree that the economy continues to struggle. Of course the Republican strategy of rejecting President Obama’s jobs bill and manufacturing a debt ceiling crisis contributed greatly to this economic crisis that we are in right now.

My Republican friends like to talk about tough choices, about how there needs to be sacrifice in order to get our fiscal house in order. But why is it, time and time and time again, that their tough choices always seem to hurt the most vulnerable Americans? Why does their idea of sacrifice always mean poor people getting less food, or students getting less help with their tuition, or States getting less help with their roads and their bridges? It takes no political courage—zero—to say to the very wealthy, You can keep all of your tax cuts, all of your special tax breaks, and we’re going to protect all of those loopholes. It takes no courage. It takes no guts to help out millionaire hedge fund traders who write giant checks to shadowy Super PACs.

Mr. Speaker, this is a debate about fairness. That’s what this debate should be about. It’s about standing with the middle class instead of always standing with the millionaires and the billionaires.

If my Republican friends were so certain about the rightness of their priorities, they would put the so-called “principles” in this bill into legislative language and bring it to the floor. I think the American people would cringe once they saw what those numbers would mean, but they have the ability to do that. I should remind them—and I regret this very much—but they’re in charge, they run the House right now. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee could come up with a comprehensive tax reform bill—he could have at any time the Republicans have been in control and brought it to this floor. My friends on the other side of the aisle have enough votes to pass anything. They could have done it. If they did, and if it were clear what the priorities of this Republican majority really were, and if it were there in print, I think the American people, quite frankly, would be horrified.

□ 1300

Democrats stand ready, willing, and able to work with Republicans and all

of our colleagues to enact meaningful, fair tax reform. This bill doesn't get us an inch closer to that goal. If my friends on the other side were sincere about achieving comprehensive tax reform, they would reach out to us in the drafting of a bill like this. They would have consulted with us. As I said, this legislation before us was referred exclusively to the House Rules Committee. Not a single Democrat on the House Rules Committee was consulted about this bill. My guess is not a single Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee was consulted about this bill. We will go through this exercise today. My friends on the other side of the aisle have the votes to pass it. But I'm going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, this is much ado about nothing because this is not meaningful tax reform. This is a very partisan approach to this issue, and I regret that very much.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I'm prepared to close. If my friend has speakers, I'd certainly sit here patiently and look forward to hearing any thoughtful comments that they might make.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to talk about our vision for the future and the path our country must set upon in order to remain competitive in the global economy and also to get our fiscal house in order.

The tax reform proposals that we are debating today could not be in starker contrast. Today, I will vote against the Republican plan that is before us, and instead I will vote for the Democratic plan which I believe is a balanced approach to move our country forward. It gives everyone the opportunity to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is about choices. The Republicans want to give more tax cuts to the wealthy, quite frankly, at the expense of everyone else. Democrats, on the other hand, propose a balanced plan that asks the wealthiest to sacrifice just a little bit more so that we can provide tax relief for the middle class taxpayers, we can bring our debt down, and invest in economic growth. We will protect our most vulnerable. We will repeal the alternative minimum tax. We will discourage tax haven abuse and eliminate the tax breaks that ship jobs and profits overseas.

Far too many of us, Mr. Speaker, have experienced the hardship and loss of employers shuttering their operations in our districts, and we know that when a business closes, it's not just direct jobs that are lost. It is an

entire community which is affected. The grocery store has less business, people don't go to the movies, they're not going out to eat at the local diner, they postpone home repairs, and they don't buy that new car. This is as a result of Republican tax policies that have, quite frankly, incentivized companies moving jobs overseas.

Democrats propose to change that. That's why we've made promoting domestic manufacturing such a top priority. We want to rewrite the Tax Code in such a way that it incentivizes job creation here or bringing jobs back from overseas. That means that not only are we going to create jobs in that particular business that comes back to America or that starts up here in our country, but also the ancillary jobs that are created as a result that filter out into the community. Some estimate that for every one job that is created in manufacturing, for example, there's at least four or five jobs that are created in other industries.

We all agree that comprehensive tax reform is urgently needed. Where Democrats and Republicans fundamentally disagree is how we get there. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican plan that is before us and vote for the Democratic substitute to reduce our debt, protect the middle class, promote American products that are made by American workers, and invest in our national priorities: infrastructure, education, research, and security. Let's keep America competitive and create jobs the right way, right here at home.

With that, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has no more speakers, I will close.

Let me repeat some of what I said in my opening statement, because I think it's important for my colleagues to understand this.

The Republican pathway to this tax reform is a path, as I said, for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to draft and to certify a bill that would receive extraordinary fast-track procedures with virtually no limit on what can be contained in it. Republicans have promised that its fast-track bill would contain at least four proposals based on the Ryan budget, in addition to the repeal of the AMT. Together, these four provisions would shift the tax burden from the wealthiest to the middle class, and it would ship jobs overseas.

Let me just read one of the proposals in this bill. The Republican proposal is "a consolidation of the current six individual income tax brackets into not more than two brackets of 10 and not more than 25 percent." What does this mean? It means that the average millionaire would lock in an annual \$331,000 tax cut under the Ryan plan. To pay for these tax cuts, the Ryan plan would potentially eliminate provisions that are vital to the middle class, including tax deductions for mortgage

interest, State and local taxes, and charitable contributions, as well as the tax exclusions for employer-sponsored health insurance and contributions to 401(k) plans. The source of this is the Joint Economic Committee. And the plan would necessarily have to raise taxes on middle class families by approximately \$4,500.

Another proposal in this bill is "a reduction in the corporate tax rate to not greater than 25 percent." What does this mean? It means eliminating every corporate tax credit and deduction would generate only enough savings to reduce the corporate tax rate to 28 percent. To get to even 28 percent, the Republican tax plan would require wiping out every provision in the Tax Code that encourages domestic job creation, investment, and innovation. In order to raise additional revenues for a corporate tax cut, the Republicans will go after individuals or small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle have made their priorities known in the budget that they all voted for. I think it's a radical approach to our economy. It's an approach that I believe and my colleagues on the Democratic side believe will be devastating to middle-income Americans. It is really unfortunate that we are here not in the spirit of bipartisanship, not in the spirit of compromise or trying to find consensus, but in a very partisan way moving this bill forward. At the end of the day, we're leaving here really doing nothing for the American people.

I was listening to the debate on the drought relief and listening to Democrats and Republicans both lament that there's no farm bill. We're going on vacation, and there's no farm bill. There's no jobs bill, no jobs agenda, no tax cuts for the middle class. We all agree that we should preserve the tax breaks on people earning up to \$250,000. We seem to agree on that. My Republican friends are saying, No, we're going to hold that hostage until you make sure that Donald Trump and the people that give these exorbitant amounts to super PACs, they get their tax breaks. We could agree on that. We could actually do something for the American people, and we're leaving. No farm bill, as I mentioned, no Violence Against Women Act, no cybersecurity plan, no bipartisan plan to prevent sequester.

I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle complaining about the sequester which, by the way, they caused that terrible idea to be a reality when they brought this economy almost to a collapse during the debt ceiling debate. But we're leaving. We're leaving town today to give away tomorrow. We're leaving town with all this unfinished business. We're leaving town not doing anything meaningful for the American people, especially for those in the middle and those struggling to get into the middle.

This has to be one of the least effective, least productive Congresses, I

think, in the history of our country. When you read these public opinion polls, there's a reason why Congress is held in such low esteem. It's because people are watching what we're doing here and wondering why we're not on their side. People who are struggling to hold on to their jobs or to get jobs are wondering why aren't we moving forward with a jobs agenda, why aren't we passing a middle class tax cut. Instead, we are here basically to pass a press release that says that at some point we're going to do tax reform, and they don't want to tell you the details of the tax reform because they think that would be very unpopular and would frighten a lot of people in this country when they see the devastating impact on the middle class.

□ 1310

So having said that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my distinguished Rules Committee colleague for his very thoughtful, warm, and loving mischaracterization of where we stand on this issue.

This is not about Donald Trump. This is not about Donald Trump at all. We continue to hear the two words "Donald Trump" invoked in the tax debate.

What this is about, Mr. Speaker, is the 253,484 women-owned small businesses in this country who are seeking to ensure that they can continue to have the ability to hire people and grow their businesses. This is about the potential of losing 710,000 jobs, based on the Ernst & Young report that has come forward. This is about ensuring that we turn the corner on our economy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I came here in 1981, one of the first bills that I introduced was a bill calling for a flat rate tax. People talked about that all the time. I mean, there was a standard joke out there. It was, well, the simple tax form asks, How much did you earn last year? The second line was, Send it to Washington. I mean, those are the kinds of things that people have said might be in the direction of tax reform. But what we need to do is we need to recognize that everyone has talked about the problem of taxes. Famously, the former chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator Long, would say, Don't tax you. Don't tax me. Tax the guy behind the tree.

We all know, Democrats and Republicans alike, that there is a desire to make this happen. There is always talk from Democrats and Republicans. Again, President Obama has said we need to bring about tax reform. President Obama has said we need to reduce the top corporate rate from that 35 percent level. I congratulate him for acknowledging that we have the highest corporate tax rate of any nation on the

face of the Earth, now that Japan has lowered theirs, Mr. Speaker.

Everybody talks about it, but the question is: How do we actually get it done? Now, my friend said that if we really wanted to do it, we could have done it. Well, there are specifics in this measure. There are specifics. We have five of them. Included among them: ensuring that we repeal the alternative minimum tax, and everyone acknowledges how terrible that is; ensuring that we have two rates of not more than 10 and 25 percent; and, yes, doing what President Obama has said we need to do, and that is reducing the top corporate rate, this calls for 35 to not more than 25 percent; and then also dealing with the global aspect.

This has specifics in it. And what it has, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day is: Let's get the job done. Action, action, action. We can continue to hear all kinds of talk—press releases and all this sort of stuff, talk about what this is. This is about actually doing what Democrats and Republicans say needs to be done.

I think that by working with our colleagues in the Senate—we ensured, by the way, under this structure that no Democrat is denied the opportunity to offer amendments. My friend said that we don't have this great bipartisanship. Well, we're pursuing a bipartisan goal of comprehensive tax reform and the structure to make that happen. But as this process begins, we will have, clearly, amendments in both the House and the Senate offered by any Member who wants to participate in this process at the committee level as it goes through.

I see we have the ranking Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee, my very dear friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), here on the floor. I'm sure that as we proceed with tax reform under this structure that Mr. LEVIN will be offering many thoughtful amendments to this measure. His right is guaranteed under these expedited procedures.

So what we're arguing, Mr. Speaker, is that we need to make sure that, rather than simply talking, we get things done. And I think we've got a chance to do that now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure. We're going to go into a debate now with our friends on the Ways and Means Committee; and from there, we will have a vote on the substitute, which I'm happy to say that we made in order, that will be offered by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; and then we will proceed with a vote on this measure.

So I urge my colleagues to support action, action, action over talk, talk, talk when it comes to the imperative of growing our economy and reforming taxes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6169, the Pathway to Job Creation through a Simpler, Fairer Tax Code Act of 2012.

Yesterday, House Republicans, joined by 19 House Democrats, voted to extend current tax policies through the end of next year. That was an important, responsible step to provide Congress the time to pass and enact comprehensive tax reform without risking further damage to a fragile economy.

The failure to stop the tax hike that's looming at the end of the year could push us over a jobs cliff. I know many Democrats want to raise taxes, but an independent study by Ernst & Young shows the Democrat tax hike would eliminate over 700,000 jobs. We can't afford to lose more jobs in the United States, and that is why we voted to extend the current tax policy.

Instead of raising taxes on small businesses and making it harder to create jobs, as the Democrat plan did, Republicans are focused on creating jobs, reforming the Tax Code to make it simpler and fairer for all Americans, and strengthening our economy. The bill before us today provides a pathway to that goal.

This bill forces Congress to do its job, something I think all Americans will support. It provides a specific time line for the House and the Senate to act next year on a comprehensive tax reform bill. It also ensures an open process. A bill is introduced and then the appropriate committees may amend it. Democrats and Republicans, alike, will have an opportunity to debate and offer changes.

And this bill tells the American people exactly where we want the debate to start. We say that tax reform should: eliminate special interest loopholes to reduce rates for families and employers, reducing the current six tax brackets down to just two (10 and 25 percent); help America be competitive in the global economy by setting a corporate rate of 25 percent and updating a 50-year-old international tax code to a modern and more competitive territorial system; and get rid of the alternative minimum tax that's currently looming over 31 million middle class families.

We also don't think we should ask taxpayers to bail out Washington's wasteful spending. Tax reform should not result in the Federal Government taking more out of the economy and more out of taxpayer pockets than the tax system historically has.

□ 1320

Tax reform is not about making the government bigger, it's about creating jobs. That's why this bill says Federal tax revenues should remain within historic norms of 18-19 percent of gross domestic product.

Independent economists have noted, when paired with appropriate government spending cuts, comprehensive tax reform that includes these policies could lead to the creation of 1 million Americans jobs in the first year alone.

Compare that to the Democrat plan offered yesterday—a tax hike that would eliminate over 700,000 American jobs. The choice could not be clearer. Do we want and does America need Democrat tax hikes that destroy jobs? Or do we want, and does America need, Republican-backed tax reform that creates a simpler, fairer code and 1 million jobs in the first year alone?

Today, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have one more opportunity to stand with families and job creators by joining House Republicans to demonstrate their commitment to passing and enacting comprehensive tax reform next year. We can and should work together to revive our economy and get the unemployed back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this legislation. And in doing so, take an important step to creating a simpler, fairer Tax Code and more jobs for American families.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. Yesterday, Republicans voted to make tax cuts for millionaires their priority over giving 114 million middle class Americans certainty.

Today, they are doubling down on that agenda. The so-called principles laid out in this bill would rig tax reform to shift the burden of taxes further onto the middle class and ship jobs overseas.

The Joint Economic Committee analysis—it's described here—found that the average millionaire would get another \$331,000 in tax cuts, while middle class families making less than \$200,000 would see their taxes go up by an average of \$4,500. For millionaires, a tax break of \$331,000; for middle class families, a tax increase of more at \$4,500. That's the Joint Economic Committee's analysis.

Why? Because the only way to finance these massive tax cuts for the highest earners is to eliminate or significantly curtail provisions that support the middle class. These are not loopholes. These are policies that in many cases help made the middle class of this country. Seventy percent of the benefit of the mortgage interest deduction, for example, goes to those who make less than \$200,000. And 82 percent of the benefit of the exclusion for employer-provided health insurance goes to those making less than \$200,000. And likewise, the provisions relating, for example, to education.

Republicans like to say they will eliminate loopholes—and we just heard that language—and special interest provisions to pay for lower rates. But the provisions I mentioned are not loopholes. They are the policies that helped to build the middle class of America. They are basically middle class provisions, and now they are on

the chopping block under this Republican plan. One way, among other ways to describe it, H.R. 6169 is Grover Norquist on steroids.

We need tax reform, but not as a tactic to sock it to the middle class and help the very wealthy. Yet that is exactly what Republicans in Congress want to do.

We recently received an analysis of the plan of Governor Romney. It's also a plan highly offensive to the middle class. A report from the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center yesterday made no bones about what it would do to the middle class. They wrote that it is not mathematically possible to write a plan like the one drafted by Governor Romney “that does not result in a net tax cut for high-income taxpayers and a net tax increase for lower- and/or middle-income taxpayers.”

The House Republican plan to lower the corporate rate to 25 percent would require eliminating every provision that encourages American manufacturing—the R&D credit, accelerated depreciation, and the manufacturing deduction. Every one of those.

And, the Joint Committee on Taxation has found that even if you eliminated everything, you could only lower the rate to 28 percent on a revenue-neutral basis.

We need tax reform—indeed, we do—but not a tax rewrite that discourages companies from making it in America and that would move us to a territorial system that taxes our businesses' offshore income and helps to ship jobs overseas.

Well, surely a plan this radical—and that's really what it is, a radical Republican proposal—should be subject to the full scrutiny of regular order and full debate. But not under this bill. Under this bill, the pathway Republicans are setting up is really a railroad to shift the tax burden onto the middle class and ship jobs overseas.

It creates a tax czar, and I'm opposed to any of us being a tax czar, Republican or Democrat, Mr. CAMP, myself, or anybody else. It would be a tax czar who creates the plan and then certifies their plan, that it achieves their goals. It would allow him or her to add any other proposal to this high-speed train through Congress. Social Security privatization, that could become part, not of this fast track, but this railroad. Repeal of health reform, or anything else.

We should reject that path and adopt the Slaughter substitute, which would articulate principles for tax reform that would strengthen the middle class, create jobs in the U.S., and reduce the deficit.

You know, we continue to hear about small businesses. 97 percent would receive the full tax benefit under what was rejected yesterday and that we put forth. And in terms of this report about 700,000 jobs, every fact checker has said it's essentially bogus. And I think that's how bankrupt the majority is.

Coming forth, I'd like them to answer the Joint Economic analysis.

I'd like them to answer the study that came out from three people about Governor Romney's proposal. One of the Romney spokespersons said: It's a liberal think tank that analyzed it that way. Oh, no; two of the three authors served in Republican administrations. It's not a partisan analysis, it's a bipartisan analysis, and it shows essentially what's being proposed here, and what Governor Romney is proposing, is, sock it to middle class America in order to help the very, very wealthiest. That isn't the America that we want.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would just say to my friend that I don't know whose plan that is. Somebody made that up because that's not our plan. A plan that increases middle class taxes isn't something that I could agree with.

What we envision is an open process that Republicans and Democrats can offer amendments on. But the point is this: comprehensive tax reform that creates jobs and gets the economy moving and gets us back on track can be accomplished.

I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, I would point out that that was a partisan report—very partisan report on the Republican tax proposal developed by the Ways and Means Committee and included in the Republican budget.

But let me ask you this, because here's the real question: As hard-working Americans, when you open the mailbox and see a letter from the IRS, what do you think? How frightened are you? If you're a small business owner and you get a call from the IRS saying it's time to audit you, how fearful are you?

The truth of the matter is, Americans are frightened of their own tax law, of their own Tax Code. They know it's unfair; they know it's too complicated. They know if they make a mistake, who knows how damaging it would be for them.

We now have one full of special loopholes so complicated the best tax lawyers in America—including the IRS—don't quite understand it. And now we've gone from first to worst in the world. America's tax rates are the worst among our competitors. So this is why jobs are going overseas. And you will hear Members of Congress, you will hear the President, you will hear candidates for Congress say we need to fix this Tax Code, but they don't do it. House Republicans are going to act to fix this broken Tax Code.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, DAVE CAMP, has held 24 very thoughtful, very solid hearings to find ways to move forward on tax reform. Today, the House has the opportunity to lay out principles for a far

more simple Tax Code, a far more fair Tax Code, one that doesn't frighten us to death and one that doesn't frighten our jobs overseas.

More importantly, in this bill is a simple provision that says: Congress, you also have to do your job. It sets up a timetable for the House and Senate next year to have a guaranteed up-or-down vote on comprehensive tax reform.

So no more stalling, no more delaying, no more talking about the need to fix this Tax Code. In the House today we will act to guarantee that Congress must take this up. And it's about time because we are losing jobs, we're dragging our own economy down, we're frightening hardworking taxpayers who are just trying to live by the law, but no one actually understands this Tax Code. We're determined to act; and when we do act, both today and next year, at fundamental reform that is lower and fairer and simpler, our economy is going to grow, this Nation is going to grow, and we're going to be back on top of the world when it comes to the best business climate and strongest economy in the world. But today we first have to act.

I strongly support this bill, and I encourage Members of this House to do so as well.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 30 seconds. The gentleman from Texas talks about loopholes. Is the mortgage interest deduction a loophole? Is the charitable contribution deduction a loophole? State and local taxes a loophole? Municipal bonds a loophole? The health care provision a loophole? You keep using that word, I think, demagogically.

I now yield 4 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is a wonderful body. It's one of the most amazing places in the whole world. It's where we make decisions for 300 million people, and we make them for a lot of other places that we're going to influence around the world. And every once in a while you sort of come here and say, I think I've seen everything, and then we've got one more.

Here we are today, the last day of the session, with no debate whatsoever on this bill—anywhere. It's just brought out here de novo. I guess it came from God, or from the Speaker's Office, or someplace. I don't have any idea where it came from. But it seems to me that the House of Representatives is working hard to forget every positive lesson we have learned in the history of governing this country about how to get things—big things—done for the American people.

Today's bill sets up a process to ram through whatever bill Congressman LEVIN writes in 2013, because he'll be

chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. He will sit in a closed room, using arbitrary rates, with no input and no debate. It will be a disaster. Did I say LEVIN? I meant CAMP. What am I talking about?

It would be a disaster to have one person sit somewhere in a room and decide what the bill is and bring it out. And this power grab will destroy any attempt that we have or any chance we have of having tax reform. We used to know better.

I got here in 1988—that was 2 years after the tax reform of 1986. Now, roll back the clock a little further. In 1980, Ronald Reagan won, 44-State mandate. He was in power. But there were also strong majorities on the Democratic side in the Congress, just like today.

In 1980, just like today, the government was divided. And just like today, both sides wanted to get tax reform done. It wasn't any different in 1980 when President Reagan came in. But today we're debating a power grab bill where it's introduced by one Republican Member—I guess he didn't have time to get anybody else to sign it before he had to drop it in to bring it out here and discuss it—scored by one Member and given an up-or-down vote by one Member. In every case, unfortunately, the lot falls to Mr. CAMP.

I don't think Mr. CAMP did this. This isn't Mr. CAMP. I know him. This isn't the kind of bill he would sit down and write, because we've seen him when he writes bills. This was written somewhere, and this is how we're going to ram through the House of Representatives, and the point of the sword is Mr. CAMP.

Now, this appalling breach of procedure is the worst try to get anything done in the House of Representatives. I can't be more clear: comprehensive tax reform simply will not happen if the process and the bill are autocratic and rabidly partisan. That's the end of it right there.

Back in the 1980s, both the Republicans and the Democrats knew that this was true. Tip O'Neill sat up here, he was Democratic Speaker of the House, and Ronald Reagan sat down at the end of Pennsylvania as the President. They fiercely disagreed with each other on just about everything when they started, but they knew that they had to find areas of agreement and compromise to get anything done as big as tax reform.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. These two were not cut from the same piece of cloth. Tip O'Neill was a working class Irishman. He was passionate about fairness, knew how to get things done, and, well, he liked to have a glass of whiskey now and then. Ronald Reagan believed in a pure sense of individualism. To Ronald Reagan, tax reform was about lowering taxes. He also liked to tell jokes and occasionally have a glass of whiskey. They both liked to play golf.

Then there was Rostenkowski. He was the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. He also played golf, and he liked a glass of whiskey occasionally. They all got to know each other. They pulled other people in. They discussed issues in detail. It was bipartisan. It was not done on one side or the other or simply by one person—wouldn't, couldn't, never would have happened in those days. They did the people's business that way.

Now, lots of voters are angry these days. They don't think Washington works. Well, it doesn't work when you get this kind of legislation brought out here.

□ 1340

If people from both sides can't sit down—it took Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill and Rostenkowski 6 years, from 1980 to 1986, talking about this issue by the time they finally got it all done. And here we have a bill that, I guess this could pass by—well, when we get back from Labor Day I suppose it will be a couple days and then it will be through the House.

That's not going to happen. You know it's not going to happen, and I know it's not going to happen. And the public is angry about this because Washington is not dysfunctional because Members of Congress aren't extreme enough. They're not getting things done because we're not working together.

To do tax reform well, to do it right, in fact, to do it at all, we will have to work together. It will take time, it will take debate, and it will take thoughtful consideration. There is no other way.

This bill we are considering today guarantees failure. It's bad for America. I ask Members to vote "no."

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the Chair for yielding. And I enjoyed listening to the stories of lore from my colleagues who hearken back to the good old days when we had smoke-filled backroom deals where laws were written. That's not what we are interested in achieving here. What we want to achieve is a process done in plain view, transparent to the public, that maximizes the opportunity for Congress to actually fix the mess that has become the United States Tax Code.

At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, I think there's a difference in philosophy here. One side likes to think of the idea of everybody sending their money to Washington, then we go into a backroom and we slice up the money and then we send it out to favored groups, favored constituents, and people that we want to be as winners versus those who might be losers.

We've got to get out of the game of Washington picking winners and losers

in the Tax Code. Because what we do is we stifle that entrepreneur who has an idea, who might not have connections, but can actually have an idea and make a business grow. We want to remove those barriers to opportunity. We want to remove those barriers to upward mobility. We want a system of entrepreneurs where we have true entrepreneurial capitalism, not this crony capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, both political parties are guilty of this. Republicans and Democrats for decades were party to the process of tucking into the Tax Code all these various special interest loopholes which end up rewarding a few while raising tax rates on the many. Well, we've got to get through those days, because if we haven't noticed, we're in global competition. Ninety-seven percent of the world's consumers live in other countries. If we want to have a good, strong growing entrepreneurial economy, we need to make things here in America and sell things overseas. But if we keep taxing our successful small businesses, our businesses all around at much higher tax rates than our foreign competitors tax theirs, they win and we lose.

I come from Wisconsin. We're a manufacturing State. That's how we survive. We grow things, and we make things in Wisconsin. Our chief competitors right over Lake Superior are the Canadians. Canada just lowered their tax rate for all of their businesses to 15 percent last January. Well, the substitute that the gentleman brought to the floor, the substitute that the President is asking for, will bring the effective top tax rate for those most successful small businesses in Wisconsin to as high as 44.8 percent.

Mr. Speaker, how on Earth are our businesses, our manufacturers, our successful small businesses going to compete when we're taxing them at a Federal level almost as high as 45 percent and our competitors are at 25 or 15 or lower? We won't. That's why we want to reform the tax system.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. The difference in philosophy is this. Some here like the idea of bringing more money out of people's paychecks, more money out of our successful small businesses, and then parceling it out in favors. We prefer the opposite. Let people, let families and let businesses keep their money in the first place so they can decide what they want to do with it.

By having high tax rates with lots of loopholes, all we end up doing is we say, you can have some of your money back if you do what we approve of in Washington. Even with the best of intentions behind such ideas, it gets corrupt. The powerful and the connected are the ones who call the shots.

So, yes, we need to clear the brush out. And, yes, there are popular provi-

sions in the Tax Code, and that is why we want to have a process in front to debate those things. There will be fiscal space left for things like charities and such the like. Let's have a clear—in public, not a backroom—process where we debate just how best to go forward. And what we want is a clean up-and-down vote so that we can get this country going again, we can get this economy back on track, and we can look at our children and know that we left them better off.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 15 seconds.

The Republican bill indeed picks winners and losers. The winners are the very wealthy, and the losers are the middle class Americans of this country.

I now, with pleasure, yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first, I note that the chairman of the Budget Committee said that we want to get this out of the backrooms. Then I reread the bill, and the bill says that one person, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, will draft this bill, certify it, and present it to the Congress with very limited time to debate. So it is true. They do want to replace the backroom, but with a telephone booth. Now, that's hard to do because there aren't that many phone booths left. But there will apparently be one in which the chairman of Ways and Means will single-handedly draft this bill without a great deal of input.

What is it they're going to draft? What we're told is it will include reductions in the rates paid by the wealthiest, and it alludes in the most—not even close to specific terms—to getting rid of some loopholes. But we don't know what those are. This great courageous effort to deal with the special interests begins by ignoring it, by promising goodies to the wealthiest people will reduce your taxes, and we'll somehow make it up in a vague way. With how they don't know, because they don't want to say.

Procedurally and substantively, the bill is a disaster. That's the bad news. The good news is that no one thinks it is a serious legislative effort. This is one more bumper sticker from the gang that cannot legislate. We are here today with the Republican leadership having backed down on passing a bill that the Agriculture Committee came forward with.

Now, it's popular on the Republican side to talk about the Senate. Oh, the Democrats run the Senate, and they're choking everything off. Exactly the opposite is the case. The Senate passed a transportation bill. The House couldn't. The House couldn't even take one up because there is such division within the Republican Party. So here, in a procedural maneuver that smacks of a very undemocratic way, they sneaked into conference—a conference report came with the Senate transportation bill, the only bill that passed ei-

ther House, and then Members obediently passed an omnibus bill, including a transportation bill, that this House never got to concede.

But even that looks good compared to postal issues. The Postal Service is now in default. Yeah, it is de fault—it's de fault of de Republicans, who are, again, so ideologically driven, so unable to deal with the basics of government because of their dominance by a faction that does not understand the role of our coming together to do things in a society, and the post office, that's a pretty controversial one. That radical George Washington set it up. It's a great unifier in this country, and it continues to be. One of the things we do here, people scoff at it, we name post offices. But those are great symbols of the community. And I've got to say, with all of the new communications, no one has ever asked me to name an iPod after anybody. We use the post offices.

But what happened? The Senate passed a postal bill. This House can't take one up, once again, because this Republican Party is so divided between their extremist wing and other people that—so we got transportation, we have postal, they can't do a postal bill, and the Postal Service is now in default while we debate this bill that no one takes seriously, that the chairman of Ways and Means will single-handedly put on his cape and fly down here with this bill that will help the rich, and it will do some unmentioned things regarding popular tax breaks, because they don't want to mention them. And then we have the agriculture bill.

□ 1350

So on the fundamental functions of government, an agriculture bill, a transportation bill, and a postal bill, the party that couldn't legislate didn't legislate, again, because they cannot get people on their own side to understand what we need in this society.

We need a postal service. We need transportation. We need an agriculture bill; although, I'd like to see one different than the one the committee brought out. But we didn't even get a chance to vote on them. Instead, we get a bumper sticker. Oh, we're going to cut taxes for the wealthy.

And I did notice, too, they said they're going to get the taxes to be 18 or 19 percent of the GDP. We have Mr. Romney committing that we will spend 4 percent of the GDP on the military, whether that's what's needed or not, whether we go to more wars or not.

So look at what's left. Take what they want to put in taxes, take what Romney wants to commit to the military, and there's no room for anything else. There's not much room for a good Medicare program. Social Security gets squeezed, the environment, clean water, transportation.

That's why they can't legislate, because they're locked into an ideological mindset that reduces, they say,

the revenues and increases the military beyond what is needed and leaves us unable to do those things which a civilized society wants to come together to do.

So, yeah, the bad news is that this is a crazy bill, but the good news is that after today's bumper sticker waving, no one will pay attention to it.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, every single day we see more proof of the President's failed economic policies. We just have heard that last quarter's GDP was revised down. It's probably two-thirds of what it ought to be. Forty-one straight months of 8 percent-plus unemployment. Millions can't find jobs; millions more only can find part-time work. Real disposable income of working families down under this President's failed policies.

And because his policies have failed, he resorts to the politics of diversion, division, and envy. Change the subject. Let's talk about taxes. Let's divide Americans into smaller groups and make them envious of each other.

So the President comes and says, Let's increase taxes. Let's increase taxes on a million small businesses.

Fact: Ernst & Young has said this will cost our economy 700,000 jobs.

Fact: Small businesses now say, for the first time in almost 4 years, the greatest threat is not lack of sales; it's taxes. And that's why House Republicans voted yesterday to stop the tax increases. Stop the tax increases.

Today we take the next step, and that is to create a process for a fair, flatter, simpler, and more competitive Tax Code, one that will assure that the family budget doesn't go broke paying for the Federal budget, one that ensures that the success of working families depends on how hard they work in their hometowns and not the size of their tax loopholes in Washington, D.C.

Now, my friends from the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, they have great theories that we're going to tax our way into economic growth. If only we will tax small businesses more, then somehow they'll create more jobs. Beatings will continue until morale improves is their theory.

Well, we have history. We have history. Go to the Coolidge administration, the Kennedy administration, the Reagan administration, the Bush administration. Every time we have lowered marginal rates, every time that we have simplified the Tax Code, not only have we ignited economic growth, but we've actually received more tax revenues.

And yet my friends from the other side of the aisle and the President, they want to defend the status quo, only more so. And now I wake up this morning to discover that, as they defend the global system, that even our

Olympians are going to be taxed on their Olympic medals. So we've had a President who told every small business man in America, every small business woman, You didn't build that, by defending this global system, they now tell our Olympians, You didn't win that. That belongs to the Internal Revenue system.

This is what it is about today: less taxes and more jobs; more taxes, fewer jobs.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this bill.

It's interesting. Today's the 1-year anniversary of the enactment of the Budget Control Act, and that came about and left us with this impending sequestration. So let's remember why we passed the Budget Control Act.

We passed it because it was a compromise reached in order to raise the debt ceiling, which the House majority was refusing to allow to be raised. They were refusing to raise the debt ceiling because they said that they were concerned and they cared about our Nation's debt.

But just yesterday, that same House majority passed a bill that will add over \$400 billion to our national debt in just 1 year, a bill that continues tax cuts that added \$3 trillion to our debt over the last decade and that history has shown didn't help economic growth. Now we have this bill on the floor to mandate strict parameters of tax reform.

I want to do tax reform, Mr. Speaker. There isn't any one of us who doesn't want to do tax reform, but this is the wrong way to go about it. Locking in certain rates and certain rules is not how tax reform is done and can lead to very serious unintended consequences, like exploding our national debt.

Yesterday, the Tax Policy Center released a review of Mitt Romney's tax plan, which is not dissimilar to the principles in this underlying bill. The study found, and I quote:

It is not mathematically possible to design a revenue-neutral plan that preserves current incentives for savings and investment and that does not result in a net tax cut for the highest-income taxpayers and a net tax increase for lower- and middle-income taxpayers.

The Joint Economic Committee confirmed today that the plan in this bill would mean that people who make under \$200,000 a year would see their taxes raised, in this case, by about \$4,500, while millionaires would see tax breaks of over—hold on to your hat—\$300,000. And there's nothing in this bill that says that tax reform will not increase our debt.

We should do tax reform, and we should do it in a deliberative, thoughtful way, rather than by passing bills saying that we should do tax reform. For this reason, I strongly urge every-

one to vote "no" on this piece of legislation.

Mr. CAMP. I would just yield myself 15 seconds and say that the plan the gentleman refers to is a made-up plan. What we're looking at is the model set up in the Bowles-Simpson Commission, which has been endorsed in a bipartisan way, that will be an open process that will allow amendments so we can debate these ideas in that process, not this made-up bill that they went and are discussing on the floor today.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), the distinguished chairman of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. HERGER. Yesterday, this House voted to stop the job-destroying tax hike that threatens to hit every American taxpayer at midnight on December 31. Today, we have an opportunity to build on that. We have an opportunity not only to do the right thing for jobs and job creators in the short-term, but to begin building the foundation for a more stable and prosperous economy in the future.

Few would argue that our current Tax Code is ideal. It's far too complicated, with taxpayers spending over \$160 billion each year just to figure out what they owe. Even the Commissioner of the IRS has acknowledged that he hires a professional tax preparer to do his own taxes.

It's often unfair, with some taxpayers enjoying the benefits of narrow tax breaks that are not available to others. It has increasingly become a patchwork of temporary rules that fail to provide America's small businesses and job creators with the certainty they need to plan for the future.

□ 1400

Many of its features actually penalize the work, investment, and savings that are necessary to economic growth. Furthermore, an outdated international tax system, combined with the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world, places American companies at a disadvantage against their competitors based in Europe and China.

The bill before us lays out a pathway to a simpler, fairer, and more pro-growth Tax Code. With the right kind of tax reform, our Tax Code can become a means to support job creation rather than an obstacle standing in the way. In fact, it has been estimated that the tax reform would free up American businesses to create as many as 1 million new jobs in the first year alone.

I want to commend Chairman CAMP for his outstanding leadership on this issue and for making it clear that House Republicans are serious about tax reform. Today's vote will send a strong message that tax reform is moving forward. I urge all Members to vote "yes."

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 5 minutes to a veteran of negotiations on taxes and tax reform, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. First, let me thank Ranking Member LEVIN for giving me this opportunity, and let me thank the chairman for bringing up the idea that this Congress is concerned about taxes. I say that because some of us will go home, and our friends and constituents will say, Well, how long are you going to be home? I guess we have to say for close to a month.

They say, Do you mean that Thursday, today, was the last day for over a month?

Yes.

So what were you doing?

I'll say, We were doing taxes.

Oh. What were you doing about taxes? Were you talking about reforming it?

I would say, I heard the word "reform" being used, but no. We are being asked by the Republican majority to vote for a pathway to reform.

I wish I had some of the Republican statements on this floor stapled to my press release so that I could explain what the heck is a "pathway to reform."

Since 1986, what we had thought "reform" was was to cut out from that Tax Code obscene provisions—some shouldn't have been in there, and certainly there is no reason for them to be in there now—to save trillions of dollars and to take that savings by reducing the high rate that we pay corporations and so that we can be competitive in the international market; but someone outside of the Congress said that to close these loopholes and to raise revenue are the wrong things to do. I don't know where this wiggly path is to reform, but I know one thing—we're not going to be dealing with this path in August or in September. It's hard for me to believe that we're going to do it this year.

So what the heck do we need a path for when the American people are jobless and looking for a way to some type of relief and when the only thing they believe is that, somewhere along the line, the Republicans want to get rid of Obama and don't care how they get rid of him? The Republicans don't care whether it's jobs, education, science, air pollution. Don't let the Congress be cooperative and be involved with anything that's good for the country as long as the President gets a chance to sign it for the United States of America.

Now, how in the heck can we be on a path to reform when basically what we're talking about is that tax reductions that were supposed to be temporary expire at the end of this year? What reform is there for those people who see a dramatic increase in their taxes in order for liberals and conservatives to say, We don't want that to happen? If we don't want that to happen, why don't we do something about it today so that they and businesses will know what tomorrow is going to

look like beyond today, which for all practical purposes is the end of our legislative session?

It is my understanding that 98 percent of the people will get dramatic increases under this pathway, this roadway. Their taxes will go up. Now, we have to admit there are some wealthy people who belong to the less than 2 percent. It's abundantly clear, if the reason they have to hold hostage the 98 percent is that they have created all of the jobs, well, they certainly haven't proved it in the past; they aren't proving it now; and very few of them hold small businesses so that they will be adversely affected. I would assume that that is the controversial 2 percent. I would assume that that's what we should fight about.

I would hate to be a Republican who has to go back home to his district and explain that the reason 98 percent of hardworking taxpayers are going to get an increase in their taxes is that we felt so strongly about the top wealthiest people that we said, The heck with them. We're not giving that up until we make certain that you are protected.

Wow. Sometimes the party asks too much of its members, and I really hope that somewhere along the line the hatred and animosity for this President at least will be reduced to the voting booths and not to the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Someone once said that the goal of the Republican Party is to get rid of Obama and to make him a first-term President.

I understood that. I started saying these things about Nixon and Bush—all of those things—but I never dreamed that it meant having the country go down with the captain. I never dreamed that it meant that you don't let the President increase the debt ceiling. I never dreamed that it included millions of jobs and tax relief for people as it seems that they mean. I hope things change in September.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was listening to the gentleman from New York, and I sincerely appreciate his warm, heartfelt advice for the Republican Party.

I am amazed at the characterization of being in opposition to a President's policies as somehow being in opposition to the country. I fundamentally reject that. I think that that is a gross characterization. I think, on behalf of everybody on the GOP side, that that is an absurd argument.

I want to pick up on a thread and a subtext of what we heard from our friends on the other side of the aisle. It's a very interesting thing, and I'm

not being sarcastic. It is a very hopeful thing, which is this, Mr. Speaker:

Did you notice today that there is nobody who is defending the status quo of our current Tax Code? Nobody. We will not hear any voice from our friends on the other side defending the current Tax Code. We will hear no voice today on this side or on the other side among all of those Members—and I haven't listened to our friends on the other side of the dome, but I'm hunching that there is nobody—who is defending the status quo.

So what does that mean for us today?

That means there is an unbelievable opportunity. There is an opportunity that is born of recognition of a failed system. Some characterize it as "crony capitalism," which is, if you're connected, if you're somebody of means, if you're able to come into this town and with a sharp elbow insert something into the Tax Code and manipulate it, then you get an economic win at the expense of everybody else.

The gentleman from New York asked a rhetorical question a couple of minutes ago, and I jotted it down. He asked: What do we need a path for?

We need a path to get out of this. That's what we need a path for. With all due respect to the President, the President is not leading on a pathway that shows us how to get out of this.

So what do you have the chairman of the committee and the GOP in the House doing right now?

They're saying, look, let's not defend the status quo. Let's instead completely transform this debate, and let's focus in on one word, and that is the word "competitiveness." How do we create in this country the most competitive tax jurisdiction in the world?

□ 1410

Could you imagine how great it could be? Could you imagine what it would be like if our Tax Code were a foundation upon which—what could happen? You could have entrepreneurs who are willing to take risks because there is a possibility of reward in the future. Right now, they're being told from this town that if you built it, you didn't really build it, and we don't want to have you take credit for it. That's ridiculous. That's absurd. That's a world view that we should shun and reject and move away from.

We need to pass this. We need to pass this urgently, and I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 4 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

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

Mr. NEAL. In quick reference to the previous speaker, I don't know how you can say how do we get out of this, and then simultaneously embrace the Romney tax plan, which is \$5 trillion more of tax cuts and propose at the same time the extension of the Bush tax

cuts. That's a \$7 trillion tax cut proposal. Has anybody heard about those million new veterans we have, the 45,000 that have been wounded? What's going to happen to the veterans system for years to come? It's a \$4 trillion cost of the war in Iraq when you factor all of that together.

We've had some really good hearings this year on both sides. We've talked fundamentally about the best path forward to tax reform, and we all agree that the current system is creaking of its own weight. But that's contrary to the idea of fast-tracking, what needs to be a deliberative procedure for understanding what the elimination of some of these expenditures really means.

Despite the talk here today, I'll bet you a year from now that we will not have eliminated the homeowner deduction, and a year from now we will not have eliminated employer-based health insurance, and we will not have eliminated the tax expenditure for charitable deductions. The question is: What's the framework that we're taking up today? The response to that is: not much.

Let me start by saying that what's striking about this proposal is that we all acknowledge that over 6 billion hours a year and \$160 billion is too much in trying to comply with the current system. My favorite target is the alternative minimum tax. I've proposed eliminating that tax for a decade and actually have come up with pay-fors for addressing it, by shutting down some of the off-shoring accounts that currently companies who decide to expatriate and give up their American address take advantage of. They are not former citizens of the United States. They are current citizens of the United States. Sophisticated tax avoidance should be addressed.

The AMT, it was enacted in response to—by the way, there were only two Republicans in Congress who voted against it. It was a bipartisan assault on AMT when first addressed; 155 high-income individuals weren't paying any taxes, so Congress responded. President Reagan also embraced the idea that people ought to pay something. Today, 30 million middle class families are caught in the alternative minimum tax, and we patch it each year.

Here's where the American people really should get upset. Since 2001, this is what the patch has meant. I want you to listen to this number. We have spent \$400 billion patching alternative minimum tax. The Romney proposal, coupled with the Republican proposal to extend the Bush tax cuts, will take us in 2012 and 2013, when surely we're going to patch this again, to \$600 billion of patches for a \$1.2 trillion problem. We've spent \$50 billion of patching it. You know what that's like? That's like taking a credit card and saying you're only going to make the minimum payment every month and trying to figure out why the principal has not been reduced.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts an additional 1 minute.

Mr. NEAL. The point here is that if we all agree that tax reform needs to take place and we need to assess what current expenditures mean in the system, but also have some enthusiasm for taking up the off-shoring issue, and taking up those that willfully hide money overseas in bank accounts and they don't want the IRS to know what they've set aside, that's part of fundamental tax reform.

There's an opportunity here to do something similar to what Ronald Reagan and Speaker O'Neill did in 1986 in a bipartisan fashion with both sides getting together in an effort to figure out what to do about building a tax system that keeps America, as the former speaker noted, "competitive going forward." This is not the procedure, Mr. Speaker, to undertake that sort of initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Democrats' middle class tax cut substitute that would extend tax cuts for 98 percent of Americans—and in opposition to the Republicans' legislation that would extend all of the Bush tax cuts.

Congress has a responsibility to protect middle class Americans from getting hit with a big tax hike next year—a tax hike of \$2,200 for the typical family. Last week, the Senate passed a bill that would extend for one year the Bush tax cuts for 98 percent of Americans. And now it's up to us in the House to provide certainty to middle class Americans that their taxes will not go up next year.

But instead of doing what's right for middle class families and extending the Bush tax cuts for 98 percent of Americans, the Republicans are holding these tax cuts hostage until we extend tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans. If the middle class tax cuts expire, it would result in a tax hike for over 100 million American families, including 2.5 million families in Massachusetts. Let's not let that happen.

Even more troubling, the Republican tax package ends President Obama's tax cuts that make college more affordable and help working families with children. So not only are our Republican colleagues holding the middle class tax cuts hostage to extending tax cuts for the wealthiest, the Republicans would actually raise taxes on 25 million families with an average tax increase of \$1,000.

I introduced legislation last week that would extend these enhancements to the child tax credit and earned income tax credit. But the Republicans' tax package fails to include many of the enhancements in my bill and, therefore, would raise taxes on millions of low and moderate-income families next year. Even though the Republicans tell us that they're against raising taxes, what they really mean is they're against raising taxes on the wealthy. I ask the American people—does this seem fair to you?

I urge my colleagues to learn from past experiences. We tried the Republicans' approach to taxes for 8 years during the Bush years and it didn't work. Let's stand up for middle class Americans and pass the Senate-passed tax extension bill. We all agree that we should extend the middle class tax cuts—so let's put

aside politics and pass this important bill and provide certainty for American families.

I'd like to close by talking about one final issue that's very important to Massachusetts—the AMT. I've been a long time advocate of addressing the problems with the AMT. The first AMT was enacted in 1982 to ensure that the wealthiest Americans paid their fair share. However, because the Bush Tax Cuts decreased tax rates without making corresponding changes to the AMT, millions of Americans become subject to the AMT each year even though they do not make a lot of money. To avoid this result, for the past few years, Congress has enacted an "AMT patch" that prevents these higher taxes from hitting middle income families.

Unfortunately, the most recent AMT patch expired at the end of last year. And so millions of middle class families could pay thousands more in taxes when they file their returns in April 2013 if we don't enact an AMT patch for 2012.

This is a huge deal for my home State of Massachusetts. About 975,000 families in Massachusetts, including about 80,000 in my district, will be hit with the AMT if we don't enact a patch for 2012. This includes about 785,000 middle income families who make less than \$200,000 a year.

To address this issue, both the Democratic and Republican tax bills include AMT patches. But we need to move beyond the patches and really address the problems with the AMT. Since 2001, we've spent about \$407 billion on AMT patches—and if we pass a two year AMT patch for 2012 and 2013, we'll have spent about \$600 billion on patches. Repealing the AMT would cost about 1.2 trillion—so for the amount of money Congress has spent on patches over the past few years, we could have paid for half the cost of repealing the AMT. I call on my Republican colleagues to work with me on a bipartisan basis to address the AMT problem.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the majority leader of the House.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, the choice before us is very clear. The priority for all of us is jobs, and the choice of how to best create an environment to create jobs is are we going to have taxes go up or not. Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans have put forward solutions to stop the tax hike so we can help create jobs for small businesses and beyond.

Given that economic growth has stalled under President Obama's policies, it is downright puzzling that he and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would push for raising taxes on working families and small business owners. Nearly 2 years ago, President Obama opposed the same small business tax hike he now supports. Back then, he acknowledged that raising taxes was the wrong thing to do if you want to bring about job creation in a tough economy.

This raises the question: Does the President actually think that the economy is doing so well that we should now tax job creators? Our Democratic colleagues offered their own tax proposal. Instead of offering a plan that

would spur economic growth, the minority put forward the President's small business tax hike. As we saw, Mr. Speaker, the only plan with bipartisan support that passed this House this week was the plan to ensure that taxes do not go up on any American.

As many on both sides of the aisle have made clear, the last thing small businesses need right now is a tax hike. There's no mystery as to how small business owners will respond when faced with higher taxes from Washington. They're rational actors, Mr. Speaker. And when something costs more, you get less of it. With less money to the bottom line, small businesses won't be able to grow as much, and they will not be able to expand as easily.

As was said before by my colleagues from Michigan and Illinois, I think all of us agree on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol that we need tax reform. This bill before us paves the way for pro-growth tax reform. This measure puts us on a path toward a simpler, flatter, fairer Tax Code. If you support comprehensive tax reform that will spur economic growth and make this country more competitive, you will vote for the bill. It's that simple.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan and for his leadership this week and in many others in his shepherding the movement for tax reform in this body. Ultimately, today's vote on this bill should be the easiest vote we take all year. Do we believe small business owners are the backbone of our economy? Do we want them to grow their businesses and create jobs? If the answer is "yes," then you will support this bill.

□ 1420

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 30 seconds.

The majority leader continues to use a tool of propaganda, grabbing small business as his mantra. I want to repeat a fact given to us by Joint Tax: under our bill, 97 percent of small businesses would keep all of their tax cuts—97 percent.

I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Reviewing this Republican bill before us, I found that there were many of its findings and purposes with which I fully agree. "The Tax Code is unfair." . . . "The Tax Code violates fundamental principles of equal justice." . . . "Exclusions, deductions, credits, and special rules make up tax expenditures that amount to over \$1 trillion per year. . . ."

And then I reflected on who has been in charge of this Tax Code for 14 of the last 18 years, and it is the very people who offer us this bill today. And of the other 4 years, in 2 of those, President Bush was "the decider." So they've had ample opportunity to correct these deficiencies in our Tax Code. But the problem is that rarely over the course of the last couple of decades have they

met a lobbyist peddling a loophole to whom they could say "no."

They talk to us about a fast track. Well, that would, indeed, be a new track for them because they've had almost two decades to put in place a Tax Code that would resolve the problems about which they complain today, and they've been inactive through that period.

Oh, yes, there was a time when Republicans controlled essentially all three branches of the American Government, and they flirted with a flat tax. It had great appeal to the Flat Earth Society that dominates the Republican caucus on most issues, but they couldn't make it work.

Then they said they wanted a Fair Tax, and a fair tax sounded like something all of us could support. The only problem was that it would hike the cost of just about everything we buy—from food to a car to a home—by over 20 percent. And when you really get into the details, it wasn't all that fair, except to those at the top who have already benefited so much from the existing Tax Code.

So Republicans have been in charge now for another year and a half in this Congress. They've had an opportunity to come forward not with a pathway to something they would do after the election but with a specific plan of how they would reform our Tax Code. And instead of that specific plan for this Tax Code that has grown by hundreds, if not thousands, of pages under Republican rule of complexity and with exceptions for those lobbyists who were powerful enough to have their voice heard and acted upon in this Capitol. Instead, they come forward with this flimsy little bill, principles with which most Americans could agree; it's just the action that counts. And they say, We want to go on a fast track, but we'd rather wait until after the election to start the track. Well, haven't we heard that story before when they were talking "fair," when they were talking "flat"? Today they're just talking about what they might do in the future.

So we have to look for clues within this flimsy little bill of what, in fact, they would do if they were in the majority with President Romney, heaven forbid. And we got clue number one yesterday when they approved a bill to extend all of the tax breaks that President Bush approved for the very most privileged people in our society. And the effect of what they proposed and the approach they took was that those who were sitting comfortably on top of the economic ladder, they would gain. If they were a millionaire, they'd gain by more in their tax break than a police officer or a nurse or a small business owner in San Marcos or Schertz or New Braunfels or Lockhart—more than they make in a whole year, these privileged few would get for themselves in lower taxes.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the eloquent gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. But the marine corporal, the single mom who is trying to get her daughter or son through college, they would actually see their taxes go up under this simplified fast-track Republican approach.

So those who are trying to get their foothold, their foothold into the first or second rung of that economic ladder, they end up having to pay for more tax breaks for those at the top.

And now today, through this bill, we see that what Mitt Romney was a part of in exporting jobs abroad, he was really just getting started because what they propose is a "territorial" tax system. What is that? A territorial tax system is when you create jobs in somebody else's territory.

Here's how it works. Here's the plan that they're talking about: you are a manufacturer, and you are trying to decide, where will I create my new plant and locate it? I could locate it in San Antonio, Texas. I could locate it in Shanghai. Under their territorial plan, if you locate it in Shanghai, it's tax free.

Guess where the incentive is under their plan to create new jobs? It's not in Texas. It's not in America. It's someplace else. That's what the territorial tax system is all about. But of course with all the loopholes that their lobbyists have been able to get through the decades, many, many corporations aren't paying the 35 percent statutory tax rate.

Many of our largest corporations, like General Electric, they're not only paying a lower tax rate than the hardware store in Lockhart or in Austin that's selling their products, but they're paying a lower tax rate than the cleaning crew that cleaned up the board room at General Electric. Because they found all these loopholes, we have hundreds of large no-tax corporations that are paying next to nothing in terms of their taxes already. They would simply expand that with great inequity.

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would just say that the gentleman from Texas just described current law as long as you don't bring it back. So what we're looking for is really—we are in a crossroads. I agree with him on that. We really have a choice. Do we follow their path of a tax hike that costs us 700,000 jobs, or do we follow our path of comprehensive tax reform that grows our economy and creates up to 1 million jobs?

At this time, I will yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

And I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) be permitted to control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of the underlying bill. And I think that the American people expect us to have a debate here in Washington that is about better policy and not one-upmanship and various 30-second sound bites.

But we know that there are many barriers in our economy. There are barriers to moving our economy again and going forward, and we know that comprehensive tax reform is one of the most important issues we need to face. It isn't always the most popular issue. It is not always the most tangible issue. But we know, whether it's farmers or ranchers—incidentally, from my district, small businesses everywhere, or anything relating to the economy—we know we have work to do.

We know that our current Tax Code, as we have heard most recently, is very costly, confusing, and complicated. The current Tax Code is comprised of more than 10,000 pages of ever-changing laws and regulations. It is a patchwork of various credits, deductions, exemptions, tax hikes, and expiring provisions. This makes responsible business and financial planning next to impossible.

The cost of compliance is obviously a burden. Compliance costs with the current Tax Code falls disproportionately on small businesses, which spend an average of \$74 per hour on tax-related compliance, making it the most expensive paperwork burden they will encounter.

Additionally, our onerous, excessive system is a system with an out-of-control spending addiction that has dominated Washington for far too long under both parties, I would add. It is time for a system which lowers the rate, broadens the base, and addresses global competitiveness.

□ 1430

The Ways and Means Committee has held a series of hearings soliciting input on tax reform, and we will continue in that direction toward fundamental tax reform. The bill before us today provides an important path forward to ensure Congress acts in a timely manner to reform this convoluted Tax Code, and it outlines a framework for comprehensive reform. I urge my colleagues to support the Pathway to Job Creation Act.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my real pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), a veteran of many battles on this floor.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

As Americans watch their Olympic favorites this week, House Republicans are handing out gold medals to all their favorites right out here on the House floor.

In London, speed, agility, and strength determines who gets the gold. But in the Republican-controlled

House, it's the wealthiest Americans and the most profitable corporations who secure all of the gold medals.

Two weeks ago, Republicans awarded the gold to America's defense contractors by actually increasing defense spending. Despite sequestration, despite our ballooning deficit, despite the looming fiscal cliff, they increased defense spending.

Then last week, oil companies scored a gold medal by securing new drilling rights off of America's coastline, off of our beaches in California and New England and Maryland to drill. And the Republicans refused yet again, even though Big Oil's margin of victory was enormous on that issue, Republicans refused to end \$4 billion in annual tax breaks to the oil companies we cannot afford, despite the fact that the oil companies made \$137 billion in profits last year, the most profitable industry in the history of the planet.

And today, it's millionaires and billionaires who will cross the finish line and secure the biggest gold medal of all, as the Republicans double down on the Bush tax cuts by rewriting the Tax Code to include \$331,000 in additional tax cuts for the average millionaire in this country, a tax break they do not need and America cannot afford.

House Republicans are setting a world record in rigging the tax system for the ultra-rich while cutting middle class priorities like education and investing in good American jobs. The big losers in the Republican Olympics: the middle class, whose taxes will go up. The middle class, where the Medicare guarantee for millions of seniors will ultimately be destroyed. The big losers: investment in finding cures for Alzheimer's and cancer and Parkinson's, which will have to be drastically cut so the Republicans can crown billionaires, Big Oil, and nuclear bomb builders the big gold medal winners. The losers: the American people, and their families' health and well-being.

Vote "no" on this fixed Republican Olympics. Vote "no" to take care of the billionaires in our country as ordinary families suffer. Nostalgia for a past that never existed has overtaken the idealism which should animate our debates here on the House floor. For the poor, the sick, and the elderly, the past is just a memory and the future is their hard reality. And this Republican budget makes that future all the more difficult for the middle class in our country. Vote "no" on this fixed Republican Olympics.

Mr. TIBERI. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Tax reform may not be as exciting as watching Team USA win a gold medal, but for a CPA who specialized in tax, comprehensive tax reform is the Olympics, and we want to win a gold medal for the American taxpayers.

Our Tax Code is a disaster. At around 15,000 pages, it's too long, it's too complicated, and it's chock-full of loop-

holes favoring some taxpayers at the expense of others. Temporary tax provisions alone have increased from 14 in 1986 to 132 today. U.S. taxpayers and businesses spend 7.6 billion hours simply complying with the code. Tax compliance as an industry is one of the country's largest, requiring 3.8 million workers. That's just too much.

We need a code that is more fair, equitable, and efficient. We need to broaden the base, lower rates, and ignore special interests who fight to block reform, reform that will save us billions of dollars and create a million jobs.

Our friends across the aisle believe increasing the top rate will restore fairness. But how can further complicating the code with more exclusions for certain folks while making it more complicated for others make it more fair?

We have the means and the tools to reduce the tax rates here, and we need to get busy. Overhauling the entire Tax Code is the only way to restore fairness. What we've learned from the 1986 reforms is that broadening the base, eliminating loopholes, and lowering the rates will grow the economy and raise revenues.

This bill not only supports comprehensive tax reform, but it lays out a plan to ensure that it actually happens. Tax reform is a no-brainer. It's a win/win for the economy, our businesses, and our hardworking American families.

Mr. LEVIN. It's now my real pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LEVIN for all of his good work here.

Mr. Speaker, let's start with a point of agreement. We should simplify the Tax Code. We should reform the Tax Code. It's an overly complicated mess, and it needs to be streamlined and reformed. We could start with some really simple things like getting rid of the special tax breaks and giveaways to Big Oil companies, but our Republican colleagues on this House floor have voted time and again against that.

What we should not do is what we are hearing from a lot of our colleagues today, which is use the language of tax reform as a Trojan horse to provide another huge windfall to the wealthiest Americans at the expense of the rest of America, and yet that is exactly the direction that this bill takes us in.

The main principle enshrined in this bill is the old Republican principle of trickle-down economics, the failed idea that we need to give more tax cuts to the folks at the very, very top, and somehow those benefits are going to trickle-down to everybody else.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is the American people have seen this movie before. That's no longer a theoretical idea. We ran a real-world experiment on that idea. It was called the 8 years

of the Bush administration. We had tax cuts that disproportionately benefited the very wealthy in 2001 and 2003. At the end of those 8 years, what was the state of the economy? Net loss of private sector jobs, less than zero.

The one number that did go up, it wasn't jobs, it was the deficit. That number went through the roof, and the rest of the country is left to pick up the tab. And that's what the American people are beginning to focus on, Mr. Speaker: that these tax cuts for the wealthy are not a free lunch for the rest of the country but that they come at the expense of everyone and everything else. Because the math is pretty simple. If you refuse to ask the wealthiest Americans to pay one penny more for the purpose of deficit reduction, for everybody else it gets harder. Seniors on Medicare have to pay more even though their median income is under \$23,000. It means deep cuts to investments in our economy and our kids' education, in science and research, and in infrastructure.

Now with today's bill, our Republican colleagues, as Mr. LEVIN said, are doubling down on an idea that we know does not work.

□ 1440

They're providing another round of tax cuts to millionaires and directly asking middle class taxpayers to pick up the tab.

Let's do the math. Let's do the math—that's what we try and do in the Budget Committee. When you drop the top tax rate from 35 percent to 25 percent, first of all, you provide huge breaks to the folks at the very top, but that loses \$4 trillion over 10 years, in other words, the deficit grows by \$4 trillion.

Now, our Republican colleagues say, Oh, no, we don't want to do that. We really care about the deficit. We're going to make up those \$4 trillion through tax reform. Of course they won't tell us one thing about what they would do in tax reform.

But the good news is the Tax Policy Center, an independent group here in Washington, has told us what the Romney plan would do, a plan very similar to this plan. What they make clear is that when you start removing all those deductions and all the benefits, for example, for health plans or for mortgage interest deduction, what you end up doing is providing a big tax increase to middle-income taxpayers, financing tax breaks for the folks at the top by increasing the burden on—

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. That's the simple math of the situation.

Now, I know that we've heard from the Romney campaign that that's a liberal think tank. Well, here's what the Romney campaign spokesman said about an earlier analysis from the same Tax Policy Center when they

liked the results. Then they called it an "objective third-party analysis"—Romney spokesman of an earlier Tax Policy Center analysis.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is a group here in Washington that does good, nonpartisan work, and that is the result that they found. And it makes common sense; you're trying to make up \$4 or \$5 trillion through tax reform, you're going to switch that burden.

Now, we've also heard that this is somehow going to help "make it in America," that this is going to incentivize companies to do more business here in America. The reality is just the opposite in this bill. You move to a pure territorial system, your slogan might as well be "Make It Overseas: Offshore American Jobs."

Again, let's just look to the analysis done by another nonpartisan group. Mr. LEVIN has talked about the Joint Committee on Taxation analysis. They've already said that if you move to a pure territorial system, "you will erode our domestic tax base and increase our deficits."

Why will you erode our domestic tax base? Because more companies will ship their investments and operations overseas. That means more American jobs overseas.

In fact, another nonpartisan study found that this particular proposal, Republican proposal, which Mr. Romney also supports, would create 800,000 jobs. The problem is they found it would create 800,000 jobs overseas, not here in America, by setting up companies in places like the Cayman Islands and Switzerland.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say: Let us come up with a tax reform plan that works for all of the American people. Let's come up with a plan that will help grow our economy from the middle out, not this failed idea of trickle-down economics from the top down. That is what this debate is all about. Because what we want to do through tax reform is empower the middle class and empower small business men and women.

You do not empower the middle class by creating a situation where, by giving tax breaks to the wealthy, you increase the deficit for the rest of the country. Because when you increase the deficit, you're asking everybody else to pay for those breaks at the very top. And people will pay by fewer investments in education, fewer investments in science and research, fewer investments that are important to empower our economy. And everybody else will be left to pick up this deficit tab while folks at the very top get another break. Let's not do that.

Mr. TIBERI. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland is attacking two Republican

plans that are not our plans. The gentleman knows that, for instance, the proposed territorial system that we have proposed is not a pure territorial system, for instance; it has anti-abuse rules. And we can broaden the base by getting rid of deductions and credits without impacting middle class taxpayers.

I yield, with that, Mr. Speaker, 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), the new acting chairman of the Income Security Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, that little word "tax" that we've been talking about today is really, in reality, 3.8 million words that make up the entire U.S. Tax Code. Over the past 10 years alone, Congress has made over 4,428 changes to the Tax Code, averaging about one change each and every single day. It's time, Mr. Speaker, that we find consensus and provide a simpler, fairer, and more competitive Tax Code for everyone.

Over the past 2 years, the Ways and Means Committee has held over 20 hearings laying the groundwork for comprehensive tax reform. We've had meetings jointly with the Senate as well. This legislation that we will vote on today now gives us a path forward that will allow small businesses and all American families the opportunity to have a simpler, fairer, and more competitive Tax Code, not one that actually picks only winners and losers.

We need to close loopholes. We need to eliminate and reduce the number of expenditures and deductions and exemptions that bestow preferential treatment for varying interest groups and primarily only benefit a few.

Business leaders and economists across the country agree that, in order to create more jobs, we've got to make sure that America stays globally competitive, but the complexity of the Tax Code has put America at a disadvantage.

Back in 1960, 85 percent of all the top 20 world firms were in the United States; by 1985, there were only 13; by the year 2010, this number was cut in half again to a meager six. Putting it simply, Mr. Speaker, the Tax Code's antiquated features have diminished the attractiveness for the United States to become the premier country in which to locate and found and start a business. This means fewer small businesses, it means less manufacturing, and it means fewer jobs.

Today's vote shows that we are serious about moving forward on tax reform to help get our economy back on track. Let's make the United States the number one destination for entrepreneurs, for innovators, and job creators. Let's put this motion in place to pass this measure.

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

Mr. TIBERI. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. BERG), a member of the Ways and

Means Committee and a distinguished member of the Select Revenue Subcommittee.

Mr. BERG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this critical piece of legislation to stop the tax hike.

We have a choice to make here: We can support job creators like small business men, farmers, and ranchers that have made North Dakota's economy so strong, or we can abandon them and allow our Nation to go over the so-called "fiscal cliff."

I have to remind my friends on the other side, this is something we talked about in a recent Ways and Means hearing. Small businesses are not "the wealthy." They are not pocketing huge profits. They are trying to grow their businesses by reinvesting back into their business. That's what's creating jobs.

At a time like this, we need to create jobs. We can't afford the Democrat plan which will increase taxes and decrease over 700,000 jobs. We need stability. We need certainty. And we need to pass this legislation so we can provide stability and certainty to our job creators until we complete comprehensive tax review.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, could I ask how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 30½ minutes, while the gentleman from Michigan has 9 minutes.

Mr. TIBERI. With that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to another distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and a member of the Select Revenue Subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

□ 1450

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in strong support of the proposed legislation before us this afternoon. The reason why is we have to stop with the rhetoric down here in Washington, D.C.

Hardworking taxpayers across America demand that we get this right and we get the business of the people done. We need to listen to our fellow Americans that our Tax Code that we both, on each side of this aisle, have argued for the last hour, have agreed is broken. It's time to set a path forward.

I have a picture here, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to display for all of us in this Chamber and across America. There's a clear path forward that we need to go down. And it is a path to go forward on a Republican plan that sets forth comprehensive tax reform in an open and honest fashion and makes sure that we get the comprehensive tax reform done in the upcoming year and do it in a way that brings the American people into the debate and we listen to the American people.

We no longer can pick winners and losers in our Tax Code. We need to focus on a Tax Code that is simple, that is fair, and that is competitive because, like it or not, we live in a world economy in which our hardworking Americans have to compete. Our Tax Code needs to be updated to make sure that we put our individuals and our corporations in the most competitive position possible so that when they go out on the world economic stage that they can compete and win, and that we stand with them rather than engage in the bitter rhetoric and partisan divide that is on display, in my opinion, today.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that, I ask support for the underlying legislation, and I ask my colleagues to join us and join hands and engage in a substantive spirited debate, but at the end of the day come up with a comprehensive tax reform package that is going to protect Americans and preserve America for generations to come.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, with that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, here we are 20 months removed from December 2010 when we last had this debate, 20 months removed from when the President, 91 current House Democrat Members, and 39 sitting Democratic Senators all agreed that our economy couldn't survive a new round of tax increases; 20 months removed from unemployment of 8.9 percent that has continued, quarterly GDP growth of just 2½ percent; and 20 months from a President who proclaimed it wasn't wise policy to raise taxes during a recession.

Well, what has changed, Mr. Speaker? Not much. Unemployment is still over 8 percent, GDP growth has actually worsened to 1.5 percent, and politicians and Presidents from both sides of the aisle are, once again, saying it is not wise economic policy to increase taxes.

Yet one thing has changed. Earlier this summer, the President reversed his decision, decided our economy had undergone some sort of significant improvement and called for massive tax increases on American small businesses, a call which Senate Democrats responded to and which, according to independent analysis, would shrink our economy by 1.3 percent.

The rhetoric used to advocate for increasing taxes by the other side is the same populist grandstanding we have been hearing for years: everyone needs to pay their fair share.

We need to increase taxes on those millionaires and billionaires.

Only 3 percent of America's job creators will be affected.

Well, the late Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan once famously said:

Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but everyone is not entitled to their own facts.

Just like before, none of the claims made by my friends on the other side are supported by fact but, instead, only by campaign commercial-made opinion.

Here are the facts by independent analysis. According to the independent Joint Committee on Taxation, 900,000 small businesses will be subject to these higher taxes, 53 percent of small business income would be hit by these tax increases, 710,000 fewer jobs in America if this tax increase is implemented. And investments, many of which senior citizens live on, dividend income, will increase by as high as 40 percent with this tax increase.

Simply put, there is no bigger "pants on fire" argument than that being put forward by our President proclaiming that these proposed tax increases would only affect 3 percent of our Nation's small businesses.

Now, look, the decision is very clear. We can vote "no" on both of the proposals, H.R. 8 and H.R. 6169, to follow the President and the Senate Democrats towards a vision that has been proven to cost our economy jobs and growth, or we can alternatively vote "yes" on these two proposals which will ensure that the Bush-Obama tax rates stay in effect for a year and we get the comprehensive tax reform we're looking for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan will control the balance of the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I want to say to you, as I said to you in the Rules Committee yesterday, how much I appreciate your leadership on fundamental tax reform.

I've been watching this body for 20 years, and I think some of the criticisms of my friends on the Democratic side were right on target. A lot of lip service has been paid to doing it, but the action has not happened. But what you have been able to accomplish in your committee in 18 months truly makes me believe that fundamental tax reform is now right around the corner for all Americans, and I'm grateful to you for your work there.

I had two questions about the bill that's before us today, this expedited procedures bill. It does lay out a framework, but it seems to me to lay out a framework that is broad enough that we will have a robust discussion about how to bring and what to bring in terms of fundamental tax reform to the floor.

Do you view this framework as one that is broad enough to have a full discussion on fundamental tax reform?

Mr. CAMP. I do, Mr. WOODALL. I envision with this framework an open debate, as I've said on the floor, one that will entertain a variety of proposals and one that will include amendments

so that we can move forward as a Congress on enacting comprehensive and bipartisan reform.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the chairman. And I know that in the Ways and Means Committee you will always have a robust debate. As you know, I'm a big fan of the Fair Tax proposal. I thank my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle for mentioning it earlier. I hope it made it out across the airwaves. But even if we can't all win in terms of our different ideas, America will win in the end if fundamental tax reform is passed. But lots of those competing ideas, even as only one idea, can be certified within this framework to begin in your committee, you view even after that introduction, that certification by the Joint Tax Committee, a full and robust discussion that would include ideas like consumption taxes in your committee.

Mr. CAMP. Absolutely, there will be a full and robust discussion because, as I said, there will be amendments in committee, and there will be an opportunity for Members to weigh in. And, obviously, this will be a national debate. So this is about getting us on that path and moving forward. Because as we know, the alternative is, do we have taxes go up and cost us 700,000 jobs, or do we try to get us on a path of reform that will create the million jobs that we need to get this country moving again? So absolutely.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the chairman. I appreciated my colleagues' chart down there of that path of two futures. There is no question that our future is in good hands with our chairman on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House plan to stop this massive tax hike on the American people that is set to take place at the end of this year.

The people of central and Southside Virginia know that our economic outlook is bleak. Spending is on the increase, unemployment is high, high fuel prices have left lasting damage to our economy, and the government take-over of health care is raiding our pocketbooks at a time when we can least afford it.

And now, Mr. Speaker, they want more. Now the President and the Senate say that they want to raise taxes and dig deeper into the pockets of the hardworking American people.

I have said time and again that we have a spending problem in D.C. We don't have a "we don't tax people enough" problem. This is now more clear than ever as our national debt ticks upward towards \$16 trillion.

□ 1500

Now is not the time to raise taxes on anyone. It will only lead to more job

loss and more spending at a time when the American people are counting on us to get our economy back on track. And while we have addressed this tax issue in the House for today, it is equally pressing that we address the issue of our long-term prosperity.

This country has long needed comprehensive tax reform. History has shown that temporary tax extensions will not fix the problem; they simply apply a Band-Aid. That is why the House plan has taken a thoughtful approach to stopping the impending tax hike and laying out our framework for reforming the Tax Code in a way that will make it simpler and fairer.

The House plan also puts in place expedited procedures to insure that Congress does its job once and for all and addresses the dire need for comprehensive tax reform.

I was proud to support the legislation yesterday to stop the massive year-end tax hike, and I am proud to support this bill today to reform our Tax Code. It's the right thing to do for our country, and it's the right thing to do for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, we just have one final speaker to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I can be very brief, in part, because so many of us have come forth on the Democratic side with real conviction, with real passion, and not basically reading from prepared speeches that simply go over and over the same themes, but really talking about what's at stake for this country and why this proposal is worse than flawed; it's flagrant.

I bring back that chart. No one has refuted it. It's based on the work of the Joint Economic Committee.

Essentially, what this bill would do is to say to America, if you're very wealthy, you get a \$331,000 tax cut. But for the typical family, it's a \$4,500 tax increase. And so tax cuts for the very wealthy is, essentially, this Republican plan.

Tax increases for the middle class, more and more deficits, jobs overseas instead of making it in America, this is the Republican plan and, essentially, it's Governor Romney's plan. It's, as I said, worse than misguided. It would be a terrible mistake for this House to adopt it, and even a worse mistake for the American people to embrace it.

I don't have confidence in the House Republicans. I have confidence that the American people will say "no." Vote "no" here today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your leadership. You have done more to advance the cause for comprehensive tax reform and stopping tax increases on Americans than anyone in

America, and we certainly appreciate your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois reminded us that after the election in 2010, the President of the United States said, in this economy, we cannot let tax rates go up for any American because the economy was too weak.

Well, today, ladies and gentlemen, the economy is weaker than it was in December of 2010. In fact, it's been weaker the last 4 months than it was, with little hope that it will get better soon.

Ladies and gentlemen, Americans are long overdue in having comprehensive tax reform. They want it, 9 out of 10 Americans. Nine out of 10 Americans now use a tax preparer. My father, a retired steelworker, my mother, a retired seamstress, use a tax preparer.

And ironically, Mr. Speaker, my father came to America, my mother came to America for a better life. And when I got my first job, my first job at McDonald's, when I was 16 years old, my dad said, Son, we have a really crazy Tax Code that doesn't encourage you to save, that doesn't encourage you to invest. And you know what? You're going to save a little bit of that paycheck because it's the right thing to do, even though we have a crazy Tax Code.

Well, my immigrant dad today thinks we have even a crazier Tax Code than we did back in the early 1980s, and it's time that we change that. The process in this bill will force people in this town to do what we haven't done for over 25 years, and that's fix the Code.

There's been talk on this floor about small business owners. I was a realtor. I had small business income. I didn't employ anybody. I'm proud of what I did.

But there's a guy that I know. His name is RJ. He's a small business owner. He would be impacted tremendously, and so would his 50 employees, if we allowed his taxes to go up on January 1.

Or William, a small retailer who hires people. He would see his taxes go up.

Ladies and gentlemen, House Republicans believe that jobs are created not in Washington, D.C., but by entrepreneurs and risk takers throughout America. And there are two roads that we can choose to go down. And this chart couldn't be better in showing everybody out there those two roads. One road leads to danger. One road leads to a failing and falling economy with 700,000 jobs to be lost. We don't want to go down that road. We've seen too much misery already.

No, Mr. Speaker, the road that we want to go down, led by our chairman of our committee, is the one to the right, now hiring, in green, with a million new jobs, not created in Washington, but created by people like RJ and William, entrepreneurs, risk takers and, ladies and gentlemen, people like

my dad who came to America with nothing, who understand that hard work and risk taking should be rewarded, not penalized.

That's why, today, the process that this bill puts in this motion will lead us finally to say to the American people, yes, we heard you, loud and clear, and we're going to simplify our Tax Code. We're going to simplify it for every American taxpayer so we can have an economy that creates jobs, doesn't pick winners and losers, and, ladies and gentlemen, gets us to a place where we have a Tax Code that people like my mom and dad don't have to go hire a tax preparer to do their taxes.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 6169, a partisan bill that would put in place a contrived and expedited procedure for tax reform, a challenging issue that would benefit from a full and robust debate.

Tax reform is a very complicated, very difficult endeavor. This bill, which attempts to limit debate in both the House and the Senate, will not become law. It wastes time that the House could better apply to the multitude of challenges facing our country.

Over the past several years, taxes have been lower than at any time since the 1950s. Yet the United States—with military commitments around the world, a badly underfunded commitment to domestic infrastructure, and growing obligations to the Baby Boomer generation—also faces a substantial budget deficit. We are also grappling with a yawning gap between our wealthiest and our neediest. Tax expenditures have grown faster than the rate of inflation and now give away nearly half of all income that the income tax would otherwise collect.

It is imperative that Congress begin the difficult work of tax reform in earnest. This bill represents a failure to have an honest conversation about tax reform and for that reason, I oppose this legislation and had I been present, I would have voted no.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6169, the Pathway to Job Creation through a Simpler, Fairer Tax Code Act. This bill will allow for expedited consideration of a bill that lays out tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, this bill lays out a schedule for an early introduction and swift markup and consideration of a tax reform bill in the 113th Congress. While this would be effective in ensuring that a bill gets passed in a reasonable amount of time, the expedited consideration provided in H.R. 6169 only applies to tax reform bills that contain certain key components.

One requirement for this tax reform bill is that it consolidates the current six individual tax brackets into two brackets of 10 and 25 percent. This provision would allow for an additional \$331,000 tax cut for the average millionaire, while American families earning less than \$200,000 would see their taxes increase by an average of \$4,500. For the sake of reducing rates for the wealthy, this tax reform bill would vastly curtail tax provisions that benefit the middle class.

Another required component of the future tax reform bill is a reduction of the corporate tax rate to 25 percent. In order to achieve

such a significant reduction, this plan would require eliminating every provision in our current tax code that encourages domestic job creation, investment, and innovation.

My Republican colleagues assert that this component of the legislation will create jobs by allowing corporations to hold onto a larger portion of their profit. However, this new tax code would provide no incentive to purely domestic businesses or investors, and would result in an increase in the off-shoring of jobs and income. This will stifle our country's economic recovery, and contribute to a continually high unemployment rate.

Mr. Speaker, not only will the proposed requirements of this future tax reform bill unfairly benefit wealthy households and corporations, it will plunge the United States deeper into a budget deficit. If my colleagues across the aisle are so committed to reducing our nation's debt, they should be working on bipartisan legislation to promote progressive and productive tax reform. Instead, they have introduced a H.R. 6169, which expedites future handouts to corporations and the wealthy under the guise of tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to getting the opportunity to vote for true, progressive tax reform when it is brought to the House floor. Until then, I urge my colleagues to join me in continuing to oppose attempts to unfairly burden America's working class, now and in the future.

Thank you. I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, supporters of low taxes and limited government should enthusiastically embrace most of the principles of tax reform laid out in H.R. 6169. However, one tax reform principle contained in this bill contradicts the goal we all share, namely lowering the American people's tax burden. I'm referring to the bill's finding that seems to imply tax reform should aim to maintain federal tax revenue at 18–19% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

The historical average of tax rates as a percentage of GDP in the post World War Two era is 17.7%. Thus, the current tax bill says that the total amount the federal government takes from the American people should be higher than the amount the government took during the time when the federal government was fighting the Cold War and establishing the programs of the so-called Great Society! Of course, this is reasonable only if one assumes Congress will never, or should never, consider reducing the federal government's size and scope.

H.R. 6169 is thus further proof that if one is serious about reducing taxes one must be willing to reduce federal spending in all areas. Instead of trying to ensure that the federal tax collection is set at a level to ensure a perpetual stream of revenue for the welfare-warfare state, Congress should stop spending trillions on an interventionist foreign policy, shut down unconstitutional federal bureaucracies, and begin to wind down federal welfare and entitlement programs.

While the ultimate goal of supporters of liberty is to reduce the federal government to constitutional size, the fact is that Congress need not shut down the entire welfare-warfare state to achieve meaningful tax reduction. In fact, the federal government could eliminate income taxes on individuals and still fund all of its current functions simply by reducing federal spending to Clinton-era levels!

Unfortunately, the sad fact is that neither party truly wants to cut spending consistently. Anyone who doubts my analysis should examine the hysteria over the relatively minuscule "cuts"—which are merely reductions in projected rates of spending—contained in the sequester legislation scheduled to go into effect this January. One party screams that a failure to increase military spending enough will leave America vulnerable to her enemies, while the other party cries that even minimal reductions in the rate of growth of welfare spending will create poverty of Dickensian proportions. Until this mindset changes, any efforts to reduce or eliminate federal income and other taxes will remain an effort in futility.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 6169, the Pathway to Job Creation through a Simpler, Fairer Tax Code Act of 2012. This bill serves as the bridge to tax simplification in 2013.

As families and businesses across America know all too well, our tax code discourages work, burdens entrepreneurship, deters savings and investment, and distorts the allocation of capital. The best growth agenda for America is not a short-term policy fix. What America needs is a clear, long-term policy path that minimizes economic uncertainty and delivers results.

H.R. 6169 does just that. This bill provides for the enactment of comprehensive tax reform next year. Taxpayers deserve a tax code that is simpler, flatter, fairer and easier. This bill isn't just a nice gesture—it's a common sense solution that, according to some economists, will create 1 million jobs in the first year.

I am proud to support, and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support, this bill that bridges tax reform for our country.

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

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. FINDINGS REGARDING COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.

Congress finds that—

(1) legislation to reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is both necessary and desirable, and

(2) the House of Representatives and the Senate should move quickly under regular order to proceed with a bill which—

(A) identifies revenue sources that in conjunction with targeted spending reductions will provide the long-term means to reduce the national debt significantly and make investments in national priorities such as infrastructure, education, research, and defense that are critical to future American competitiveness and job growth,

(B) adopts a rate structure that distributes the tax burden in a more progressive manner,

(C) discourages tax avoidance, including tax avoidance accomplished using entities or accounts in tax haven jurisdictions,

(D) preserves and improves those provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that support middle class home ownership, education, retirement savings, and healthcare,

(E) repeals the alternative minimum tax (commonly known as the AMT),

(F) retains and improves refundable tax credits that encourage work and education while lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

(G) eliminates tax breaks for businesses that move jobs and profits overseas in combination with a reduction in tax rates for American manufacturers, which are vital to innovation and job growth, and

(H) preserves and improves incentives for small business investment and growth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 747, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

□ 1510

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

We all agree that the Tax Code needs to be updated and reformed—and my Democrat colleagues and I are ready to work in a bipartisan manner to accomplish that goal—but the flawed and entirely partisan priorities reflected in this majority's bill make a very bad start. Their principles seem to point in one direction: less fairness and less of the burden shouldered by the people who have the most; fewer brackets, lower top rates, lower corporate taxes, less revenue, and higher deficits.

My Democrat colleagues and I have a different vision for tax reform, a vision that is reflected in our alternative proposal today. My amendment would replace the principles found in the majority's bill with a different set of priorities for a fairer and simpler Tax Code. I would like to take a minute to outline these priorities.

First, we must identify sources of revenue that, in combination with smart and targeted spending reductions, will provide the long-term means to reduce the national debt significantly while making investments in national priorities such as infrastructure, education, research, and defense, which are critical to the future of American competitiveness and job growth.

I would note that nothing in the Republican bill says tax reform needs to lower the deficit or to even hold it level. On the contrary, there are indications that Republican tax reform would make the deficit worse. I think that they believe, along with Vice President Cheney, who memorably said, "Deficits don't matter." My Democrat colleagues and I disagree with that approach.

Second, we believe that there should be a rate structure that distributes the tax burden in a more progressive manner. We support a Tax Code that discourages tax avoidance, including the use of entities and accounts in tax haven jurisdictions, such as Swiss bank accounts or assets hidden in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands, all done simply to avoid paying United States taxes.

We believe in preserving and improving the provisions of the Tax Code that

support middle class homeownership, education, retirement savings, and health care. In addition, we agree that the time has come to repeal the alternative minimum tax, and we want to retain and improve refundable tax credits that encourage work and education while lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

We support eliminating tax breaks for businesses that move jobs and profits overseas in combination with a reduction in tax rates for American manufacturers, which are vital to innovation and job growth—in other words, reward the people who stay here.

Finally, we want to preserve and improve incentives for small business investment and growth. These businesses are the engine of job creation, and we must do all we can to support their success.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican bill can be explained in one sentence: House Republicans want special procedures that allow them to force their rightwing legislative agenda through the Senate.

Why are we wasting time in trying to change the rules of the Senate—trying to force the other body to accept partisan Republican priorities—rather than just sitting down together and working out a bipartisan path forward?

It's a major question, I think, in this congressional term that, like others have said, is the most poorly productive in history. Our amendment would remove the flawed expedited procedures and misguided Republican principles, and it would replace them with the principles that I have laid out.

Let me end by expressing my utter disbelief at how difficult House Republicans are making it to pass the middle class tax cuts right now. They make clear they intend to hold the middle class tax cuts hostage to the tax cuts for the top 2 percent of Americans, though we agree that earnings of \$250,000 and below should not see any tax increases.

Yesterday, I offered a simple amendment that would say we would delay our departure for the August break until we got this proposal signed into law. It was defeated. Cutting taxes should not be that hard, and I hope my colleagues will join me to support my amendment and to help in our effort to create a fair and simple Tax Code that works for all Americans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by extending my congratulations and to associate myself with the very thoughtful remarks of my dear friend from Rochester, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules. As she at the beginning said, Democrats and Republicans alike agree on the need for comprehensive tax reform.

She is right on target when she says that, Mr. Speaker, and that's exactly what we're doing. The problem that we have is that the amendment that she is proposing undermines the ability for us to get that done.

Now, as I think about this issue that is before us, we have virtually everyone talking about the need to get this done. We have Democrats talking about it, and we have Republicans talking about it. We have the President of the United States talking about it. In fact, it's very interesting. As I heard my friend characterize the "misguided principles" set forth by the Republicans, I am struck by the fact that at least one of those principles has been called for by President Barack Obama. President Obama has said that we need to reduce the top corporate rate from 35 percent. He acknowledges the fact that we have the highest corporate tax rate of any nation on the face of the Earth now that Japan has very wisely reduced its top corporate rate. So what my friend from Rochester describes as "misguided" is actually one of the proposals submitted by President Obama.

So, again, talk is great. I've talked about tax reform myself for the three decades that I've been privileged to serve here. My friend has just talked about the need for tax reform, but there is a time, Mr. Speaker, when we need to step up to the plate and take action.

The Framers put into place a very, very good structure, a differentiation between the rules and operations of the House and the Senate. We know that the House of Representatives is the coffee cup into which the coffee simmers. As President Washington said so eloquently to Thomas Jefferson as they were sitting down at the Willard Hotel and were describing the Senate—Jefferson was the really smart guy, but it was Washington who was describing to Jefferson what that "saucer" is. It's where the simmering of the coffee takes place, and he said that that's what the Senate is. That was a great vision put forth by our Framers, Mr. Speaker, but there comes a time on some important issues when we need to streamline operations, expedite procedures, and that's what we're doing.

What my friend from Rochester said is absolutely right. We need to put into place comprehensive tax reform. I totally agree with that. Now let's get it done. Yes, we put forth some guidelines. We say two rates, no more than 10 or 25 percent. I mean, let's deal with the globalization issue by shifting from a worldwide to a territorial tax system. Let's do what we can to obliterate the alternative minimum tax, which we all know has impacted so many of our fellow working Americans who are struggling to make ends meet. It was never designed to do that. And as President Obama has said, let's reduce that top corporate rate.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at this issue, we can talk about tax reform until we are blue in the face, but this structure

is one that's going to actually get it done. I say very sadly that this measure that is being proposed by my friend is a measure which simply extends the talking, and it undermines the ability for us to actually take action.

Let's move ahead. Obviously, we need to make sure that we maintain the tax structure for everyone, the tax cuts for all. We did that yesterday. There is this notion of saying let's just proceed with what we all agree on, which is that we all agree on keeping taxes low for those in the middle class. Well, if we do what it is that they're saying, what we would end up doing is actually imposing a massive tax increase on job creators. So we can't come to an agreement on that because, as President Obama again has said, increasing taxes during difficult economic times is bad public policy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1520

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, all this discussion is about priorities. As I said, we all agree the Tax Code has to be reformed, but the majority has not come to the floor today with a serious proposal to get us there.

My amendment would put us all on record in favor of the priorities of the middle class: more fairness, a simpler Tax Code, a lower deficit, and incentives to keep jobs here in the United States. I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to say that I've said it all.

With that, I urge a "no" vote on my dear friend's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 246, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

AYES—176

Ackerman	Becerra	Brady (PA)
Altmire	Berkley	Bralely (IA)
Andrews	Berman	Brown (FL)
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Baldwin	Bishop (NY)	Capps
Barber	Blumenauer	Capuano
Barrow	Bonamici	Carnahan
Bass (CA)	Boswell	Carney

Carson (IN)	Hochul	Polis
Castor (FL)	Holden	Price (NC)
Chandler	Holt	Quigley
Chu	Honda	Rahall
Cicilline	Hoyer	Rangel
Clarke (MI)	Israel	Reyes
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Richardson
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Cleaver	Kaptur	Ross (AR)
Clyburn	Keating	Rothman (NJ)
Connolly (VA)	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Conyers	Kind	Ruppersberger
Costello	Kucinich	Rush
Courtney	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Critz	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Crowley	Larson (CT)	T.
Cuellar	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cummings	Levin	Sarbanes
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Loebsack	Schrader
DeFazio	Lofgren, Zoe	Schwartz
DeGette	Lowe	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Luján	Scott, David
Deutch	Lynch	Serrano
Dicks	Maloney	Sewell
Dingell	Markey	Sherman
Doggett	Matsui	Sires
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
Edwards	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Ellison	McDermott	Speier
Engel	McGovern	Stark
Eshoo	McNerney	Sutton
Farr	Meeks	Thompson (CA)
Fattah	Michaud	Thompson (MS)
Filner	Miller (NC)	Tierney
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Tonko
Fudge	Moore	Towns
Garamendi	Moran	Tsongas
Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)	Van Hollen
Green, Al	Nadler	Velázquez
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Visclosky
Grijalva	Neal	Walz (MN)
Gutierrez	Olver	Wasserman
Hahn	Owens	Schultz
Hanabusa	Pallone	Waters
Hastings (FL)	Pascrell	Watt
Heinrich	Pastor (AZ)	Welch
Higgins	Pelosi	Wilson (FL)
Himes	Perlmutter	Woolsey
Hinchee	Peters	Yarmuth
Hinojosa	Peterson	
Hirono	Pingree (ME)	

NOES—246

Adams	Cooper	Grimm
Aderholt	Costa	Guinta
Alexander	Cravaack	Guthrie
Amash	Crawford	Hall
Amodei	Crenshaw	Hanna
Austria	Culberson	Harper
Bachmann	Denham	Harris
Bachus	Dent	Hartzler
Barletta	DesJarlais	Hastings (WA)
Bartlett	Diaz-Balart	Hayworth
Barton (TX)	Dold	Heck
Bass (NH)	Donnelly (IN)	Hensarling
Benishek	Dreier	Herger
Berg	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Biggert	Duncan (SC)	Huelskamp
Bilbray	Duncan (TN)	Huizenga (MI)
Bilirakis	Ellmers	Hultgren
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	Hunter
Blackburn	Farenthold	Hurt
Bonner	Fincher	Issa
Bono Mack	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins
Boren	Flake	Johnson (IL)
Boustany	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Brady (TX)	Flores	Johnson, Sam
Brooks	Forbes	Jones
Broun (GA)	Fortenberry	Jordan
Buchanan	Fox	Kelly
Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Buerkle	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Burgess	Gallegly	Kingston
Burton (IN)	Gardner	Kingzinger (IL)
Calvert	Garrett	Kissell
Camp	Gerlach	Kline
Campbell	Gibbs	Labrador
Canseco	Gibson	Lamborn
Cantor	Gingrey (GA)	Lance
Capito	Gohmert	Landry
Carter	Goodlatte	Lankford
Cassidy	Gosar	Latham
Chabot	Gowdy	LaTourette
Chaffetz	Granger	Latta
Coble	Graves (GA)	Lewis (CA)
Coffman (CO)	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
Cole	Griffin (AR)	LoBiondo
Conaway	Griffith (VA)	Long

Lucas	Petri	Sessions
Luetkemeyer	Pitts	Shimkus
Lummis	Platts	Shuler
Lungren, Daniel	Poe (TX)	Shuster
E.	Pompeo	Simpson
Mack	Posey	Smith (NE)
Manzullo	Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)
Marchant	Quayle	Smith (TX)
Marino	Reed	Southerland
Matheson	Rehberg	Stearns
McCarthy (CA)	Reichert	Stivers
McCaul	Renacci	Stutzman
McClintock	Ribble	Sullivan
McHenry	Rigell	Terry
McIntyre	Rivera	Thompson (PA)
McKeon	Roby	Thornberry
McKinley	Roe (TN)	Tiberi
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Turner (NY)
Meehan	Rogers (MI)	Turner (OH)
Mica	Rohrabacher	Upton
Miller (FL)	Rokita	Walberg
Miller (MI)	Rooney	Walden
Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh (IL)
Mulvaney	Roskam	Webster
Murphy (PA)	Ross (FL)	West
Myrick	Royce	Westmoreland
Neugebauer	Runyan	Whitfield
Noem	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (SC)
Nugent	Scalise	Wittman
Nunes	Schiff	Wolf
Nunnelee	Schilling	Womack
Olson	Schmidt	Woodall
Palazzo	Schock	Yoder
Paul	Schweikert	Young (AK)
Paulsen	Scott (SC)	Young (FL)
Pearce	Scott, Austin	Young (IN)
Pence	Sensenbrenner	

NOT VOTING—8

Akin	Cohen	Jackson Lee
Black	Fleischmann	(TX)
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Waxman

□ 1546

Mr. LABRADOR, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. HAYWORTH, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. ROONEY, CULBERSON, and COSTA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. TOWNS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. In its current form, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bishop of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6169 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 3(a), strike "and" at the end of paragraph (1), strike the period at the end of paragraph (2) and insert "; and", and add at the end the following:

(3) which does not repeal, reduce, or otherwise eliminate the existing deductions for mortgage interest or charitable contributions.

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

□ 1550

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 6169. It will not kill the bill nor will it send it back to committee. If adopted, H.R. 6169 will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment is simple and straightforward and is a reasonable, additional parameter to a bill, the purpose of which is to set the parameters for tax reform during the 113th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment simply preserves two of the most important, popular, and widely supported deductions in a future tax reform package to be considered under expedited procedures in the House: the mortgage interest tax deduction and the charitable contribution tax deduction.

The mortgage interest tax deduction helps millions of American families achieve that most celebrated and sought-after part of the American Dream: homeownership. Nearly every Member of this body benefited from this deduction and nearly every homeowner in our districts has utilized this critical tax deduction to buy a home for their family and become part of the larger community. In fact, 199 Members, including 114 Republicans, are cosponsors of H. Res. 25, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the mortgage interest tax deduction should not be restricted in any way.

I will submit for the RECORD a list of the cosponsors of H. Res. 25.

As we head home for the August work period, I urge every Member who votes against this amendment, especially those Members who are cosponsors of H. Res. 25, to return to their districts and tell their constituents, many of whom still struggle to pay their bills or to put a child through college, why they oppose protecting the mortgage interest tax deduction.

As Chairman CAMP recently suggested, it is critical that we do nothing to undermine the housing market as our economy marches toward recovery. Because the value of the mortgage interest deduction is capitalized into the price of housing, curtailing or eliminating it would reduce the value of housing across the United States, put more homeowners underwater, and take the wind out of recovery. Simply put, this Congress should not be throwing up obstacles to the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment also seeks to preserve the charitable contribution deduction that is essential to the economic viability of thousands of organizations, both large and small, national and local, to advance important causes or provide critically needed services to our most vulnerable constituents. From the neighborhood church to the local food pantry to international organizations like the Red Cross and the Salvation Army, these organizations play a crucial role in the lives of millions of Americans as well as the international community.

We've heard many times from our Republican colleagues how charitable organizations can and should relieve the Federal Government of some of its responsibilities, especially those responsibilities of assisting the most vulnerable Americans. With thousands of families slowly regaining their footing after the housing crisis, now is not the time for Congress to make it more difficult for charitable organizations to provide meals, clothing, job training, temporary shelter, and other vital aid to our struggling neighbors.

Repealing the charitable tax contribution could result in a loss of as much as \$150 billion, or 69 percent, of annual charitable giving. By one report, private giving must already multiply more than tenfold by 2016 just to keep up with the proposed House Republican budget cuts.

If a Member votes against my amendment, I would urge that Member to go home to his or her district and visit a local food pantry or place of worship and tell their volunteers why they will need to slash their programs and reduce their outreach to the community.

Our Republican colleagues have proposed deep cuts to SNAP, to childhood nutrition programs, affordable housing, and job training. Will they now vote to create another obstacle for organizations that, by their own reckoning, should fill the void of reduced Federal investment for social programs?

My Republican colleagues can't have it both ways. The Republican budget claims that it will lower everyone's taxes in a revenue-neutral fashion by closing loopholes and capping or eliminating deductions. However, when pressed for details about which deductions they plan to cap or eliminate, they refuse to give specifics. Now is the time for specifics.

The underlying bill establishes the parameters of the upcoming tax reform debate. Will my Republican colleagues protect homeowners and the Nation's most vulnerable, or will the richest Americans enjoy another tax cut at the expense of the middle class? There is one way to find out. A vote for my amendment is a vote for protecting the middle class.

I yield back the balance of my time.

BILL SUMMARY AND STATUS

H. RES. 25

Latest Title: Expressing the sense of the Congress that the current Federal income tax deduction for interest paid on debt secured by a first or second home should not be further restricted.

Sponsor: Rep Miller, Gary G. [R-CA-42] (introduced 1/6/2011)

Cosponsors: 199

Committees: House Ways and Means

Latest Major Action: 1/6/2011 Referred to House committee. Status: Referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Cosponsors, By Party [* = original cosponsor]:

Cosponsor Statistics: 199 current (includes 5 original)

Rep Andrews, Robert E. [D-NJ-1]—4/6/2011; Rep Baca, Joe [D-CA-4-3]—1/6/2011*; Rep Barrow, John [D-GA-12]—6/23/2011; Rep Bishop,

Sanford D., Jr. [D-GA-2]—1/18/2011; Rep Bordallo, Madeleine Z. [D-GU]—4/4/2011; Rep Boswell, Leonard L. [D-IA-3]—7/6/2011; Rep Braley, Bruce L. [D-IA-1]—3/31/2011; Rep Brown, Corrine [D-FL-3]—2/10/2011; Rep Capps, Lois [D-CA-23]—4/1/2011; Rep Cardoza, Dennis A. [D-CA-18]—2/10/2011; Rep Carnahan, Russ [D-MO-3]—3/3/2011; Rep Chandler, Ben [D-KY-6]—5/12/2011; Rep Christensen, Donna M. [D-VI]—5/2/2011; Rep Cicilline, David N. [D-RI-1]—2/13/2012; Rep Clay, Wm. Lacy [D-MO-1]—7/18/2012; Rep Cleaver, Emanuel [D-MO-5]—5/3/2011; Rep Connolly, Gerald E. "Gerry" [D-VA-11]—3/29/2011; Rep Costa, Jim [D-CA-20]—2/14/2011; Rep Courtney, Joe [D-CT-2]—5/23/2011.

Rep Cuellar, Henry [D-TX-28]—5/23/2011; Rep Cummings, Elijah E. [D-MD-7]—2/14/2011; Rep DeFazio, Peter A. [D-OR-4]—2/10/2011; Rep Donnelly, Joe [D-IN-2]—5/16/2012; Rep Engel, Eliot L. [D-NY-17]—5/25/2011; Rep Eshoo, Anna G. [D-CA-14]—3/31/2011; Rep Farr, Sam [D-CA-17]—2/10/2011; Rep Filner, Bob [D-CA-51]—2/10/2011; Rep Green, Al [D-TX-9]—1/12/2011; Rep Green, Gene [D-TX-29]—3/3/2011; Rep Hahn, Janice [D-CA-36]—2/28/2012; Rep Hanabusa, Colleen W. [D-HI-1]—4/6/2011; Rep Hastings, Alcee L. [D-FL-23]—5/23/2011; Rep Heinrich, Martin [D-NM-1]—5/10/2011; Rep Higgins, Brian [D-NY-27]—4/4/2011; Rep Hinchey, Maurice D. [D-NY-22]—5/12/2011; Rep Hinojosa, Rubén [D-TX-15]—1/6/2011*; Rep Hirono, Mazie K. [D-HI-2]—5/10/2011; Rep Hochul, Kathleen C. [D-NY-26]—6/20/2012; Rep Holden, Tim [D-PA-17]—6/14/2011.

Rep Holt, Rush D. [D-NJ-12]—5/2/2011; Rep Honda, Michael M. [D-CA-15]—3/29/2011; Rep Inslee, Jay [D-WA-1]—5/31/2011; Rep Israel, Steve [D-NY-2]—5/23/2011; Rep Jackson Lee, Sheila [D-TX-18]—2/10/2011; Rep Johnson, Eddie Bernice [D-TX-30]—5/23/2011; Rep Johnson, Henry C. "Hank," Jr. [D-GA-4]—3/3/2011; Rep Keating, William R. [D-MA-10]—5/23/2011; Rep Kildee, Dale E. [D-MI-5]—5/12/2011; Rep Langevin, James R. [D-RI-2]—1/24/2012; Rep Larsen, Rick [D-WA-2]—5/10/2011; Rep Lewis, John [D-GA-5]—3/29/2011; Rep Loebbeck, David [D-IA-2]—3/20/2012; Rep Lofgren, Zoe [D-CA-16]—5/12/2011; Rep Lujan, Ben Ray [D-NM-3]—2/2/2012; Rep Matheson, Jim [D-UT-2]—5/16/2012; Rep McCarthy, Carolyn [D-NY-4]—5/3/2011; Rep McGovern, James P. [D-MA-3]—6/14/2011; Rep McIntyre, Mike [D-NC-7]—3/3/2011; Rep McNerney, Jerry [D-CA-11]—2/18/2011.

Rep Meeks, Gregory W. [D-NY-6]—1/6/2011*; Rep Miller, Brad [D-NC-13]—5/23/2011; Rep Napolitano, Grace F. [D-CA-38]—2/14/2011; Rep Norton, Eleanor Holmes [D-DC]—5/2/2011; Rep Owens, William L. [D-NY-23]—12/6/2011; Rep Pallone, Frank, Jr., [D-NJ-6]—3/11/2011; Rep Pascrell, Bill, Jr., [D-NJ-8]—2/29/2012; Rep Payne, Donald M. [D-NJ-10]—5/2/2011; Rep Perlmutter, Ed [D-CO-7]—5/25/2011; Rep Rahall, Nick J., II [D-WV-3]—3/31/2011; Rep Reyes, Silvestre [D-TX-16]—5/23/2011; Rep Richardson, Laura [D-CA-37]—2/10/2011; Rep Ross, Mike [D-AR-4]—2/14/2011; Rep Roybal-Allard, Lucille [D-CA-34]—5/12/2011; Rep Rush, Bobby L. [D-IL-1]—5/23/2011; Rep Sanchez, Linda T. [D-CA-39]—3/7/2012; Rep Sanchez, Loretta [D-CA-47]—1/31/2012; Rep Schiff, Adam B. [D-CA-29]—5/10/2011; Rep Scott, David [D-GA-13]—2/10/2011; Rep Sherman, Brad [D-CA-27]—2/10/2011.

Rep Sires, Albio [D-NJ-13]—3/3/2011; Rep Slaughter, Louise McIntosh [D-NY-28]—5/23/2011; Rep Tonko, Paul [D-NY-21]—3/11/2011; Rep Towns, Edolphus [D-NY-10]—5/23/2011; Rep Waters, Maxine [D-CA-35]—3/3/2011; Rep Wu, David [D-OR-1]—4/8/2011; Rep Akin, W. Todd [R-MO-2]—5/2/2011; Rep Amodei, Mark E. [R-NV-2]—12/5/2011; Rep Austria, Steve [R-OH-7]—2/14/2011; Rep Barletta, Lou [R-PA-11]—3/3/2011; Rep Bartlett, Roscoe G. [R-MD-6]—2/10/2011; Rep Barton, Joe [R-TX-6]—4/8/2011; Rep Biggert, Judy [R-IL-13]—7/8/2011; Rep Bilbray, Brian P. [R-CA-50]—1/18/2011;

Rep Bilirakis, Gus M. [R-FL-9]—9/13/2011; Rep Bishop, Rob [R-UT-1]—5/3/2011; Rep Blackburn, Marsha [R-TN-7]—4/4/2011; Rep Brooks, Mo [R-AL-5]—5/3/2011; Rep Brown, Paul C. [R-GA-10]—11/4/2011; Rep Burgess, Michael C. [R-TX-26]—8/1/2011.

Rep Burton, Dan [R-IN-5]—3/16/2011; Rep Calvert, Ken [R-CA-44]—1/6/2011*; Rep Capito, Shelley Moore [R-WV-2]—5/23/2011; Rep Chabot, Steve [R-OH-1]—7/8/2011; Rep Chaffetz, Jason [R-UT-3]—2/10/2011; Rep Coble, Howard [R-NC-6]—4/8/2011; Rep Coffman, Mike [R-CO-6]—3/29/2011; Rep Conaway, K. Michael [R-TX-11]—2/18/2011; Rep Crawford, Eric A. "Rick" [R-AR-1]—6/14/2011; Rep Crenshaw, Ander [R-FL-4]—6/23/2011; Rep Culberson, John Abney [R-TX-7]—5/12/2011; Rep Denham, Jeff [R-CA-19]—3/31/2011; Rep Dent, Charles W. [R-PA-15]—3/31/2011; Rep Duncan, Jeff [R-SC-3]—11/2/2011; Rep Fincher, Stephen Lee [R-TN-8]—5/23/2011; Rep Fitzpatrick, Michael G. [R-PA-8]—3/16/2011; Rep Fleischmann, Charles J. "Chuck" [R-TN-3]—5/10/2011; Rep Frelinghuysen, Rodney P. [R-NJ-11]—7/6/2011; Rep Gallegly, Elton [R-CA-24]—1/12/2011; Rep Gardner, Cory [R-CO-4]—5/31/2011.

Rep Gerlach, Jim [R-PA-6]—5/23/2011; Rep Gibbs, Bob [R-OH-18]—7/28/2011; Rep Gibson, Christopher P. [R-NY-20]—5/23/2011; Rep Gingrey, Phil [R-GA-11]—3/3/2011; Rep Gohmert, Louie [R-TX-1]—6/22/2011; Rep Granger, Kay [R-TX-12]—4/6/2011; Rep Graves, Sam [R-MO-6]—5/10/2011; Rep Graves, Tom [R-GA-9]—9/8/2011; Rep Griffin Tim [R-AR-2]—2/14/2011; Rep Grimm, Michael G. [R-NY-13]—3/16/2011; Rep Guthrie, Brett [R-KY-2]—5/10/2011; Rep Hall, Ralph M. [R-TX-4]—5/23/2011; Rep Heck, Joseph J. [R-NV-3]—2/18/2011; Rep Herrera Beutler, Jaime [R-WA-3]—4/15/2011; Rep Huizenga, Bill [R-MI-2]—5/12/2011; Rep Hultgren, Randy [R-IL-14]—4/15/2011; Rep Hunter, Duncan D. [R-CA-52]—2/10/2011; Rep Johnson, Bill [R-OH-6]—5/23/2011; Rep Johnson, Timothy V. [R-IL-15]—11/14/2011; Rep King, Peter T. [R-NY-3]—4/25/2011.

Rep Kinzinger, Adam [R-IL-11]—5/23/2011; Rep Lance, Leonard [R-NJ-7]—5/23/2011; Rep Latham, Tom [R-IA-4]—8/9/2011; Rep LaTourette, Steven C. [R-OH-14]—3/3/2011; Rep LoBiondo, Frank A. [R-NJ-2]—2/10/2011; Rep Long, Billy [R-MO-7]—2/14/2011; Rep Luetkemeyer, Blaine [R-MO-9]—2/10/2011; Rep Manzullo, Donald A. [R-IL-16]—1/6/2011*; Rep Marino, Tom [R-PA-10]—5/12/2011; Rep McClintock, Tom [R-CA-4]—6/21/2011; Rep McKeon, Howard P. "Buck" [R-CA-25]—3/7/2012; Rep McKinley, David B. [R-WV-1]—1/12/2011; Rep McMorris Rodgers, Cathy [R-WA-5]—5/23/2011; Rep Meehan, Patrick [R-PA-7]—5/23/2011; Rep Miller, Jeff [R-FL-1]—1/20/2011; Rep Murphy, Tim [R-PA-18]—4/8/2011; Rep Myrick, Sue Wilkins [R-NC-9]—4/1/2011; Rep Noem, Kristi L. [R-SD]—3/31/2011; Rep Nugent, Richard [R-FL-5]—1/19/2011; Rep Nunnelee, Alan [R-MS-1]—5/23/2011.

Rep Palazzo, Steven M. [R-MS-4]—5/23/2011; Rep Paul, Ron [R-TX-14]—3/31/2011; Rep Pearce, Stevan [R-NM-2]—7/11/2011; Rep Petri, Thomas E. [R-WI-6]—5/31/2011; Rep Poe, Ted [R-TX-2]—5/10/2011; Rep Posey, Bill [R-FL-15]—1/18/2011; Rep Rehberg, Denny [R-MT]—5/12/2011; Rep Rivera, David [R-FL-25]—5/17/2012; Rep Roe, David P. [R-TN-1]—5/12/2011; Rep Rogers, Mike D. [R-AL-3J]—4/6/2011; Rep Rogers, Mike J. [R-MI-8]—3/7/2012; Rep Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana [R-FL-18]—5/23/2011; Rep Ross, Dennis [R-FL-12]—2/10/2011; Rep Royce, Edward R. [R-CA-40]—9/8/2011; Rep Runyan, Jon [R-NJ-3]—3/16/2011; Rep Scalise, Steve [R-LA-1]—5/10/2011; Rep Schilling, Robert T. [R-IL-17]—5/31/2011; Rep Schmidt, Jean [R-OH-2]—7/6/2011; Rep Scott, Austin [R-GA-8]—3/16/2011; Rep Scott, Tim [R-SC-1]—3/29/2011.

Rep Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr. [R-WI-5]—4/6/2011; Rep Sessions, Pete [R-TX-32]—5/23/2011; Rep Shuster, Bill [R-PA-9]—5/2/2011;

Rep Smith, Christopher H. [R-NJ-4]—3/29/2011; Rep Southerland, Steve [R-FL-2]—6/14/2011; Rep Stivers, Steve [R-OH-15]—3/3/2011; Rep Terry, Lee [R-NE-2]—2/14/2011; Rep Tipton, Scott [R-CO-3]—5/10/2011; Rep Turner, Michael R. [R-OH-3]—3/3/2011; Rep Upton, Fred [R-MI-6]—5/2/2011; Rep Walberg, Tim [R-MI-7]—6/2/2011; Rep Walden, Greg [R-OR-2]—5/2/2011; Rep Walsh, Joe [R-IL-8]—5/3/2011; Rep West, Allen B. [R-FL-22]—4/6/2011; Rep Westmoreland, Lynn A. [R-GA-3]—4/15/2011; Rep Whitfield, Ed [R-KY-1]—5/23/2011; Rep Wilson, Joe [R-SC-2]—1/25/2011; Rep Wittman, Robert J. R-VA-1]—5/31/2011; Rep Young, C.W. Bill [R-FL-10]—1/25/2011; Rep Young, Don [R-AK]—3/11/2011.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, nice try. Let's not be drawn in by this kind of gimmick. Vote "no" on the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. 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 188, noes 235, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 551]

AYES—188

Ackerman	Costa	Heinrich
Altmire	Costello	Higgins
Andrews	Courtney	Hinches
Baca	Critz	Hinojosa
Baldwin	Crowley	Hirono
Barber	Cuellar	Hochul
Barrow	Cummings	Holden
Bass (CA)	Davis (CA)	Holt
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Honda
Berkley	DeFazio	Hoyer
Berman	DeGette	Israel
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Deutch	Johnson, E. B.
Bonamici	Dicks	Jones
Boren	Dingell	Kaptur
Boswell	Doggett	Keating
Brady (PA)	Donnelly (IN)	Kildee
Braley (IA)	Doyle	Kind
Brown (FL)	Duncan (TN)	Kissell
Butterfield	Edwards	Kucinich
Capps	Ellison	Langevin
Capuano	Engel	Larsen (WA)
Carnahan	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
Carney	Farr	Lee (CA)
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Levin
Castor (FL)	Finer	Lewis (GA)
Chandler	Frank (MA)	Lipinski
Chu	Fudge	Loeback
Cicilline	Garamendi	Lofgren, Zoe
Clarke (MI)	Gonzalez	Lowe
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Luján
Clay	Green, Gene	Lynch
Cleaver	Grijalva	Maloney
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Markey
Connolly (VA)	Hahn	Matheson
Conyers	Hanabusa	Matsui
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)

McCollum	Quigley	Sires
McDermott	Rahall	Slaughter
McGovern	Rangel	Smith (WA)
McIntyre	Reyes	Speier
McNerney	Richardson	Stark
Meeks	Richmond	Sutton
Michaud	Ross (AR)	Thompson (CA)
Miller (NC)	Rothman (NJ)	Thompson (MS)
Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Moore	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Moran	Rush	Towns
Murphy (CT)	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda T.	Van Hollen
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Velázquez
Neal	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Olver	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)
Owens	Schiff	Wasserman
Pallone	Schmidt	Schultz
Pascrell	Schrader	Waters
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Watt
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Waxman
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Welch
Peters	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Peterson	Sewell	Woolsey
Pingree (ME)	Sherman	Yarmuth
Polis	Shuler	
Price (NC)		

NOES—235

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

Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)

Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Akin
Black
Cardoza

Cohen
Fleischmann
Jackson (IL)

Jackson Lee
(TX)

□ 1612

Messrs. BOREN and SHULER and Ms. HAHN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 232, noes 189, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

AYES—232

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodel
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishkek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buechson
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culbertson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold

Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eilmlers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa

Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee

Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher

Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers

Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—189

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge

Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver

Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Lowe
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Townes
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Akin
Black
Blumenauer
Campbell

Cardoza
Cohen
Fleischmann
Jackson (IL)

Jackson Lee
(TX)

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

□ 1620

Mr. BUTTERFIELD 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 for:
Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 552 for final passage of H.R. 6169, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 10 of House Resolution 747, H.R. 6169 is laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2012

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6233.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6233) to make supplemental agricultural disaster assistance available for fiscal year 2012 with the costs of such assistance offset by changes to certain conservation programs, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. COSTA. I am opposed to this legislation in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:
Mr. Costa moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6233 to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 1, beginning line 3, strike section 1 and insert the following new section:
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, FINDINGS, AND SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Agricultural Disaster Assistance Act of 2012”.

(b) FINDINGS.—The House of Representatives makes the following findings:

(1) Family farms and livestock producers are suffering from the worst drought facing the United States since the 1950s, and this drought affects almost every State.

(2) This Act does not help pork or poultry producers and provides only limited assistance for dairy producers.

(3) Many producers of fruits and vegetables may not have crop insurance available to

them as a risk management tool, and they too need some type of help, which this Act does not provide.

(4) Most of the disaster-related provisions of the widely popular Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (the current farm bill, Public Law 110-246) have expired.

(c) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—In light of the findings expressed in subsection (b), it is the sense of the House of Representatives that a five-year farm-safety net will provide greater certainty and stability for America's farm families than legislation extending farm policy for only one year or authorizing short-term disaster assistance.

Page 20, after line 12, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—Section 1001C of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-3) or any successor provisions shall apply with respect to assistance provided under this section.

Page 21, after line 19, insert the following new subsection:

(j) NO DUPLICATIVE PAYMENTS.—In implementing any other program which makes disaster assistance payments (except for indemnities made under subtitle A of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) and section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333)), the Secretary shall prevent duplicative payments with respect to the same loss for which a person receives a payment under subsections (b), (c), (d), or (e).

Mr. COSTA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I object at the present time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. COSTA. This is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. I repeat—it will not kill the bill nor will it send it back to committee. If adopted, however, the bill will immediately be amended and proceed under final passage.

In the Republicans' rush to legislate, they have missed some important pieces that the motion to recommit would address.

First, the bill, H.R. 6233, the Agricultural Disaster Assistance Act of 2012, allows disaster payments to go to corporations incorporated under State law, but there is nothing in the bill to prevent these corporations from being wholly-owned subsidiaries of foreign corporations.

Under current law, for much of the farm safety net, foreign corporations—defined under current law as to where more than 10 percent of the beneficial ownership is held by a non-U.S. citizen—cannot receive farm payments. This bill fails to do that.

The farm bill we passed in committee addressed the current law. It passed by a bipartisan vote of 35–11. It includes the same provisions that are in this disaster package. It also ensures that payments do not go to foreign corporations.

This motion to recommit fixes that.

Additionally, under current law, there is a provision to prevent duplicative payments from being made to producers under disaster programs, in other words, double-dipping. This provision was included to prevent producers from collecting payments from multiple programs for the same disaster. We want to treat those people fairly under this disaster, but we don't want people receiving double-dipping payments.

Again, in the Republicans' rush to legislate, the provision that ensures against duplicative payments and double-dipping somehow missed the boat.

This motion to recommit fixes that oversight as well.

Finally and more importantly, the motion to recommit also gives every Member here an opportunity to take a position on what ironically, I think, could be called the elephant in the room, and that is whether or not the House is going to consider a 5-year farm bill to provide certainty and security to rural America and its agriculture economy.

The motion to recommit expresses the sense of the House that a 5-year farm safety net is far better for certainty and security for farmers and farm families than this bill or even a short-term extension is. After all, the farm bill is traditionally one of the most bipartisan things we do around here.

In a statement regarding the underlying bill, a broad-based coalition of farm organizations said that they would:

support finding a path forward to reaching an agreement on a new 5-year farm bill before current program authorities expire on September 30.

They go on to say:

We are disappointed that the House Republican leadership has decided to not move forward with the House Agriculture Committee's bill before adjourning for the August recess. The bill would provide the disaster relief for our farm and ranch families needed at this time.

Those organizations among them are the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Corn Growers Association, the National Farmers Union, the National Milk Producers Federation, the United Fresh Produce Association, and Western Growers, to mention but a few.

□ 1630

Members, we have a chance to take a stand. Are you for regular order, or for political messaging? Are you for doing our work, or kicking the can down the road? Should we take up a comprehensive farm bill before September 30, or add this to the growing list of unfin-

ished business to be considered in a lame duck session? I hope not.

All in all, the motion to recommit makes important fixes in the underlying bill, making it consistent with current law regarding the treatment of foreign corporations and protections against duplicative payments, otherwise known as double-dipping. It puts the House on record that we need to consider a 5-year farm bill before the current one expires on September 30. I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

Traditionally, the farm bill is one of the most bipartisan pieces of legislation that we act on. The bipartisan support was in the Senate and the bipartisan support was in the House Agriculture Committee by a vote of 35–11. We have a crisis, and we ought to properly respond.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation, and rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I think everyone in this room knows that I and my colleague, the ranking member, Mr. PETERSON, and all members of the Agriculture Committee, have worked very aggressively to try to move the process forward to craft a comprehensive 5-year farm bill, a farm bill that addresses all commodity groups, addresses all regions, meets the needs of all of our producers so we can, as farmers and ranchers, meet the needs of the great American consumer.

One of the key points in the motion to recommit before us addresses the question of doing a 5-year farm bill. That's a sense of Congress. I happen to think that that already is the sense of Congress. I would suggest to all of you that if you want, as badly as I want, a comprehensive 5-year farm bill, then the process here is to take these points—they may be valid—but to take these points and bear them in mind. Go home and see your constituents for the next 5 weeks. Go home and discuss the drought in that 65 percent of the United States that's suffering. Go home and explain to them why, from the livestock producers' perspective, there's no assistance in a bill that was promised when it was put together in '08, or they thought they would have access to.

Go home and explain that, and build the momentum to come back here and do the farm bill. Then in regular order, on the floor—I know it's kind of a strange concept—we'll debate these and many more amendments, and we'll make refinements to what the committee has done. But right now, let's reject this motion, and let's go home and prepare for a farm bill debate when we come back. Most importantly, let's just go home.

With that, 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

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules with regard to House Concurrent Resolution 127.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 232, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—189

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

NOES—232

- Adams Gowdy Palazzo
Aderholt Granger Paul
Alexander Graves (GA) Paulsen
Amash Graves (MO) Pearce
Amodei Griffin (AR) Pence
Austria Griffith (VA) Petri
Bachmann Grimm Pitts
Bachus Guinta Platts
Barletta Guthrie Poe (TX)
Bartlett Hall Pompeo
Barton (TX) Hanna Posey
Bass (NH) Harper Price (GA)
Benishek Harris Quayle
Berg Hartzler Reed
Biggart Hastings (WA) Rehberg
Bilbray Hayworth Reichert
Bilirakis Heck Renacci
Bishop (UT) Hensarling Ribble
Blackburn Herger Rigell
Bonner Herrera Beutler Rivera
Bono Mack Huelskamp Roby
Boustany Huizenga (MI) Roe (TN)
Brady (TX) Hultgren Rogers (AL)
Brooks Hunter Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA) Hurt Rogers (MI)
Buchanan Issa Rohrabacher
Bucshon Jenkins Rokita
Buerkle Johnson (IL) Rooney
Burgess Johnson (OH) Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert Johnson, Sam Roskam
Camp Jordan Ross (FL)
Canseco Kelly Royce
Cantor King (IA) Runyan
Capito King (NY) Ryan (WI)
Carter Kingdon Scalise
Cassidy Kinzinger (IL) Schilling
Chabot Kline Schmidt
Chaffetz Labrador Schock
Coble Lamborn Schweikert
Coffman (CO) Lance Scott (SC)
Cole Landry Scott, Austin
Conaway Lankford Sensenbrenner
Cravaack LaTourette Sessions
Crawford Latta Shimkus
Crenshaw Lewis (CA) Shuster
Culberson LoBiondo Simpson
Denham Long Smith (NE)
Dent Lucas Smith (NJ)
DesJarlais Luetkemeyer Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart Lummis Southerland
Dold Lungren, Daniel Stearns
Dreier E. Stivers
Duffy Mack Stutzman
Duncan (SC) Manullo Sullivan
Duncan (TN) Marchant Terry
Ellmers Marino Thompson (PA)
Emerson McCarthy (CA) Thornberry
Farenthold McCaul Tiberi
Fincher McClintock Tipton
Fitzpatrick McHenry Turner (NY)
Flake McKeon Turner (OH)
Fleming McKinley Upton
Flores McMorris Walberg
Forbes Rodgers Walden
Fortenberry Meehan Walsh (IL)
Foxy Mica Webster
Franks (AZ) Miller (FL) West
Frelinghuysen Miller (MI) Westmoreland
Gallegly Miller, Gary Whitfield
Gardner Mulvaney Wilson (SC)
Garrett Murphy (PA) Wittman
Gerlach Myrick Wolf
Gibbs Neugebauer Womack
Gibson Noem Woodall
Gingrey (GA) Nugent Yoder
Gohmert Nunes Young (AK)
Goodlatte Nunnelee Young (FL)
Gosar Olson Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

- Akin Cardoza Jackson Lee
Black Cohen (TX)
Burton (IN) Fleischmann
Campbell Jackson (IL)

□ 1649

Mr. PENCE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. 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 223, noes 197, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

AYES—223

- Adams Gallegly Neugebauer
Aderholt Gardner Noem
Alexander Gerlach Nugent
Altmire Nunes
Amodei Gingrey (GA) Nunnelee
Austria Goodlatte Olson
Bachus Gowdy Palazzo
Barletta Granger Paulsen
Barrow Griffin (AR) Pearce
Barton (TX) Griffith (VA) Pence
Berg Grimm Peterson
Berkley Guthrie Petri
Biggart Hall Platts
Bilbray Hanna Poe (TX)
Bilirakis Harper Schock
Bishop (GA) Hartzler Price (GA)
Bishop (UT) Hastings (WA) Rahall
Blackburn Hayworth Reed
Bonner Heck Rehberg
Bono Mack Hensarling Reichert
Boren Herger Renacci
Boswell Herrera Beutler Ribble
Boustany Hirono Richmond
Brady (TX) Holden Rivera
Braley (IA) Huelskamp Roby
Brown (FL) Hultgren Roe (TN)
Buchanan Hunter Rogers (AL)
Bucshon Hurt Rogers (KY)
Buerkle Issa Rogers (MI)
Burgess Jenkins Rohrabacher
Burton (IN) Johnson (IL) Rokita
Camp Johnson (OH) Rooney
Canseco Johnson, Sam Ros-Lehtinen
Cantor Kelly Roskam
Capito Kildee Ross (AR)
Carson (IN) King (IA) Ross (FL)
Castor (FL) King (NY) Ryan (WI)
Chandler Kingston Schilling
Cassidy Kinzinger (IL) Schock
Chaffetz Kissell Scott (SC)
Chandler Kline Scott, Austin
Clarke (NY) Labrador Scott, David
Clay Lamborn Sessions
Cleaver Landry Sewell
Clyburn Lankford Shimkus
Coble Latham Shuler
Coffman (CO) LaTourette Shuster
Cole Latta Simpson
Conaway Lewis (CA) Smith (NE)
Costello Loeb sack Smith (TX)
Cravaack Long Southerland
Crawford Lucas Stivers
Crenshaw Luetkemeyer Stutzman
Critz Lummis Sullivan
Cuellar Lungren, Daniel Terry
Culberson E. Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL) Mack Thompson (PA)
Denham Manullo Thornberry
Dent Marchant Tiberi
DesJarlais Marino Tipton
Diaz-Balart McCarthy (CA) Turner (NY)
Donnelly (IN) McCaul Turner (OH)
Dreier McHenry Upton
Duffy McIntyre Walden
Duncan (SC) McKeon Walsh (IL)
Duncan (TN) McKinley Webster
Ellmers McMorris West
Emerson Rodgers Westmoreland
Farenthold Mc Nerney Whitfield
Fincher Meehan Wilson (SC)
Fitzpatrick Mica Womack
Flores Miller (MI) Woodall
Forbes Mulvaney Young (AK)
Fortenberry Murphy (PA) Young (FL)
Fudge Myrick Young (IN)

NOES—197

Ackerman	Green, Gene	Perlmutter
Amash	Grijalva	Peters
Andrews	Guinta	Pingree (ME)
Baca	Gutierrez	Pitts
Bachmann	Hahn	Polis
Baldwin	Hanabusa	Posey
Barber	Harris	Price (NC)
Bartlett	Hastings (FL)	Quayle
Bass (CA)	Heinrich	Quigley
Bass (NH)	Higgins	Rangel
Becerra	Himes	Reyes
Benishek	Hinchev	Richardson
Berman	Hinojosa	Rigell
Bishop (NY)	Hochul	Rothman (NJ)
Blumenauer	Holt	Roybal-Allard
Bonamici	Honda	Royce
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Runyan
Brooks	Huizenga (MI)	Ruppersberger
Broun (GA)	Israel	Rush
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Capps	Jones	Sánchez, Linda
Capuano	Jordan	T.
Carnahan	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Carnahan	Keating	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Kind	Scalise
Chabot	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Chu	Lance	Schiff
Ciilline	Langevin	Schmidt
Clarke (MI)	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Schweikert
Cooper	Levin	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Sensenbrenner
Courtney	Lipinski	Serrano
Crowley	LoBiondo	Sherman
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lujan	Smith (NJ)
DeGette	Lynch	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Maloney	Speier
Deutch	Markey	Stark
Dicks	Matheson	Stearns
Dingell	Matsui	Sutton
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Dold	McClintock	Tierney
Doyle	McCollum	Tonko
Edwards	McDermott	Towns
Ellison	McGovern	Tsongas
Engel	Meeks	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Michaud	Velázquez
Farr	Miller (FL)	Visclosky
Fattah	Miller (NC)	Walberg
Filner	Miller, Gary	Walz (MN)
Flake	Miller, George	Wasserman
Fleming	Moore	Schultz
Foxx	Moran	Waters
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Watt
Franks (AZ)	Nadler	Waxman
Frelinghuysen	Napolitano	Welch
Garamendi	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Garrett	Olver	Wittman
Gibson	Owens	Wolf
Gohmert	Pallone	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Pascrell	Yarmuth
Gosar	Pastor (AZ)	Yoder
Graves (GA)	Paul	
Green, Al	Pelosi	

NOT VOTING—10

Akin	Cohen	Jackson Lee
Black	Fleischmann	(TX)
Campbell	Graves (MO)	Johnson (GA)
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	

□ 1657

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts 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 for:

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today, August 2, I missed a rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on No. 554.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 6233.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?
There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5986. An act to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to extend the third-country fabric program and to add South Sudan to the list of countries eligible for designation under that Act, to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States relating to the textile and apparel rules of origin for the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

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

S. 3510. An act to prevent harm to the national security or endangering the military officers and civilian employees to whom internet publication of certain information applies, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution providing for conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the adjournment resolution has arrived from the Senate, and I just want to advise not only my Members but all Members that there will be a vote following the next vote, which was scheduled to be the last vote, but because the adjournment resolution is now here, I want to advise my Members and obviously other Members as well. I've talked to Mr. CANTOR, the leader, who has been helpful on this effort as well, that there will be another vote following this vote.

□ 1700

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS ON GOVERNANCE OF THE INTERNET

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 127) expressing the sense of Congress regarding actions to preserve and advance the multistakeholder governance model under which the Internet has thrived, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 555]

YEAS—414

Ackerman	Costa	Hanna
Adams	Costello	Harper
Aderholt	Courtney	Harris
Alexander	Cravaack	Hartzler
Altmire	Crawford	Hastings (FL)
Amash	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Amodei	Critz	Hayworth
Andrews	Crowley	Heck
Austria	Cuellar	Heinrich
Baca	Culberson	Hensarling
Bachmann	Cummings	Herger
Bachus	Davis (CA)	Herrera Beutler
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Higgins
Barber	DeFazio	Himes
Barletta	DeGette	Hinchev
Barrow	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Bartlett	Denham	Hirono
Bass (CA)	Dent	Hochul
Bass (NH)	DesJarlais	Holden
Becerra	Deutch	Holt
Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Honda
Berg	Dicks	Hoyer
Berkley	Dingell	Huelskamp
Berman	Doggett	Huizenga (MI)
Biggert	Dold	Hultgren
Bilbray	Donnelly (IN)	Hunter
Bilirakis	Doyle	Hurt
Bishop (GA)	Dreier	Israel
Bishop (NY)	Duncan (SC)	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins
Blackburn	Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Blumenauer	Ellison	Johnson (IL)
Bonamici	Ellmers	Johnson (OH)
Bonner	Emerson	Johnson, E. B.
Bono Mack	Engel	Johnson, Sam
Boren	Eshoo	Jones
Boswell	Farenthold	Jordan
Boustany	Farr	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Keating
Brady (TX)	Filner	Kelly
Braley (IA)	Fitzpatrick	Kildee
Brooks	Flake	Kind
Broun (GA)	Fleming	King (IA)
Brown (FL)	Flores	King (NY)
Buchanan	Forbes	Kingston
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Kinzinger (IL)
Buerkle	Foxx	Kissell
Burgess	Frank (MA)	Kline
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Kucinich
Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	Labrador
Calvert	Fudge	Lamborn
Camp	Gallely	Lance
Canseco	Garamendi	Landry
Cantor	Gardner	Langevin
Capito	Garrett	Lankford
Capps	Gerlach	Larsen (WA)
Capuano	Gibbs	Larson (CT)
Carnahan	Gibson	Latham
Carney	Gingrey (GA)	LaTourette
Carson (IN)	Gohmert	Latta
Carter	Gonzalez	Lee (CA)
Cassidy	Goodlatte	Levin
Castor (FL)	Gosar	Lewis (CA)
Chabot	Gowdy	Lewis (GA)
Chaffetz	Granger	Lipinski
Chandler	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Chu	Graves (MO)	Loebsack
Ciilline	Green, Al	Lofgren, Zoe
Clarke (MI)	Green, Gene	Long
Clarke (NY)	Griffin (AR)	Lowe
Clay	Griffith (VA)	Lucas
Clyburn	Grijalva	Luetkemeyer
Coble	Grimm	Lujan
Coffman (CO)	Guinta	Lummis
Cole	Guthrie	Lungren, Daniel
Conaway	Gutierrez	E.
Connolly (VA)	Hahn	Lynch
Conyers	Hall	Mack
Cooper	Hanabusa	Maloney

Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rogers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts

NOT VOTING—16

Akin
Barton (TX)
Black
Campbell
Cardoza
Cleaver

□ 1706

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 555, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged concurrent resolution:

S. CON. RES. 56

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, August 2, 2012, through Monday, August 6, 2012, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, September 10, 2012, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any recess or adjourn, or until the time of any recess or adjourn pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, August 2, 2012, through Monday, August 6, 2012, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 10, 2012, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 150, noes 265, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 556]

AYES—150

Alexander
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishke
Biggett
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Ellmers
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Canseco
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Jordan
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr

NOES—265

Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kissell
Kucinich
Labrador
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks

Turner (NY)
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (MI)
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Walberg	Watt	Westmoreland
Walz (MN)	Waxman	Wilson (FL)
Wasserman	Webster	Wittman
Schultz	Welch	Woolsey
Waters	West	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Akin	Cardoza	Jackson Lee
Barton (TX)	Cohen	(TX)
Black	Duffy	Pitts
Buchanan	Fincher	Sullivan
Burton (IN)	Fleischmann	
Campbell	Jackson (IL)	

□ 1724

Messrs. CANSECO, TURNER, and GOSAR changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the concurrent resolution was not concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOCK ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3510) to prevent harm to the national security or endangering the military officers and civilian employees to whom internet publication of certain information applies, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3510

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

SECTION 1. EFFECTIVE DATE DELAY.

The STOCK Act (Public Law 112-105) is amended—

(1) in section 8(a)(1), by striking “August 31, 2012” and inserting “September 30, 2012”; and

(2) in section 11(a)(1), by striking “August 31, 2012” and inserting “September 30, 2012”.

SEC. 2. IMPLEMENTATION OF PTR REQUIREMENTS UNDER STOCK ACT.

Effective September 30, 2012, for purposes of implementing subsection (1) of section 103 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (as added by section 6 of the STOCK Act, Public Law 112-105) for reporting individuals whose reports under section 101 of such Act (5 U.S.C. App. 101) are required to be filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, section 102(e) of such Act (5 U.S.C. App. 102(e)) shall apply as if the report under such subsection (1) were a report under such section 101 but only with respect to the transaction information required under such subsection (1).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, this Republican majority is prepared to adjourn the House of Representatives to leave for the August district work period without accomplishing what the American people have sent us here to do. They want us to create jobs. They want us to reduce the deficit, and they want us to give a middle-income tax cut, which the President has suggested and the American people overwhelmingly support.

Instead, we have no jobs agenda, no tax cuts for the middle class, no farm bill, no Violence Against Women Act, no cybersecurity strategy, no balanced, bipartisan plan to prevent the sequester.

The only thing the Republicans have done is to increase the uncertainty that threatens another debt crisis and undermines our economic growth. Now they want to head out of town to campaign, when Congress should stay in session to address the most pressing challenges facing our Nation: job creation, growth in our economy, and strengthening the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats want us to get our job done. When we go home to meet with our constituents, we want to say what we have accomplished and what results we can bring that have been worked out in a fair, bipartisan, balanced way.

In spite of this, the Republican obstruction at every turn is preventing that.

Let's get to work. Let's do the job our constituents elected us to do: to create jobs with them and to relieve the uncertainty in their lives.

□ 1730

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

JULY IN REVIEW

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we are now at some point in time going to conclude 4 weeks in session with little to show for it.

Over the past month, the Republican do-nothing Congress has continued its relentless pursuit of message over substance. Not only have they failed to address job creation or deficit reduction in any serious way, they have also refused to work with us to pass bills that the Senate approved with bipartisan support: Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act—critically important to women and to families; postal

reform—absolutely essential; a farm bill.

Their approach has been confrontation, unfortunately, not compromise. As a result, House Republicans have been unable to govern.

This week, in the most brazen abandonment of responsibility we've seen yet, Republicans chose to adjourn for the summer, which we prevented, without a middle class tax cut extension signed into law.

We ought not to adjourn, ladies and gentlemen of this House, until we pass a middle class tax cut.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will state his inquiry.

Mr. GOHMERT. Isn't this the point at which Speaker PELOSI 4 years ago turned off the lights and microphones and wouldn't let us make speeches? I'm just curious.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

SECURING ONLINE PRIVACY

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I've got a cell phone somewhere around here. Here it is. I'm going to ask:

Is this a tracking device or is there somebody in this device who is taking my photographs? my videos? my treasured personal stuff like that—my address book?

What is this?

It is something that we need to be smart about. Smart government policies should ensure our data isn't improperly collected, sold, and exploited; but what we've learned from SOPA is that we tried to shove legislation down the public's throat, and we failed. We learned we'd better consult the folks who use the Internet before we regulate it.

That's why, last week, I launched AppRights.us. Using the Web and social media, we are asking what smart policy looks like before we write a bill. We are using the Internet to make sure we don't break the Internet.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues and the public to visit AppRights.us and to send their thoughts and concerns. Tell Congress how we can do a better job of securing your privacy.

TAXMAN GRABS A PIECE OF THE GOLD MEDAL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Team USA's Fierce Five became the

second American women's gymnastics team ever to win the gold medal. These teenagers will also be awarded \$25,000 each for being the best in the Olympic world—but what they've earned they're not going to be able to keep because part of the medal and the prize will be confiscated by our government, so sayeth Uncle Sam.

That's right, Mr. Speaker. Each one of the Fierce Five has to pay a medal tax of up to \$236. Then they also have to pay a prize tax on their cash award that could be up to \$8,750. So that brings the total up to about \$9,000 that they could owe the taxman. Leave it to our government to punish Team USA for their success on behalf of all Americans.

Yesterday, Senator RUBIO introduced a bill to exempt Olympic medalists from paying taxes on their medals and their prizes. I am a cosponsor of a similar bill in this House. The long arm of the internal taxman reaches far across the seas to grab a piece of the gold from kids that it neither earned nor deserves.

And that's just the way it is.

ON THE ATTEMPT TO ADJOURN

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to this body's attempt to adjourn until September 10.

The people of southern Arizona sent me here to work on their behalf, and while it is essential that all of us go back home from time to time to hear from our constituents, we attempt to leave here today with many critical issues unresolved.

We have done nothing about sequestration. We are facing \$1.2 trillion in across-the-board cuts in defense and domestic programs. These arbitrary cuts will harm the people of my district.

Yet we took a vote to leave Washington.

We have done nothing about the postal service, which is bleeding billions of dollars because of congressional mandates; and it is wrongfully planning to shut down a crucial processing facility in my district.

Yet we took a vote to leave Washington.

We have done nothing to approve budgets to maintain vital programs that assist veterans, seniors, and children.

Yet we took a vote to leave Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stay here and work.

ERIN CAFARO, WINNING THE GOLD

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

Mr. DENHAM. I rise today to honor Modesto native, two-time Olympian,

and five-time U.S. National Team member Erin Cafaro, who this morning successfully defended, along with her teammates of the United States women's eight rowing team, the gold medal they won at the 2008 Beijing Olympics.

Erin's victory today is the culmination of years of training, and it is an example of how personal dedication to a goal is the cornerstone of success.

The London games are Erin's second Olympics, having first represented the team in the 2008 Beijing Olympics. In 2008, Erin and the women's eight rowing team were the first to bring home a gold medal to the United States in this event. In this morning's race, faced with strong competition from Canada and the Netherlands, Team USA won in a time of 6 minutes, 10.59 seconds.

Erin Cafaro, you and your teammates have made Modesto, the State of California, and the Nation proud. Please accept my sincere congratulations on a gold medal today.

RESTORING CONFIDENCE IN OUR DEMOCRACY ACT

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

Mr. DINGELL. Citizens United v. FEC is one of the most destructive Supreme Court decisions in the history of this country.

It unleashed the floodgates for unlimited expenditures on elections; ignored factual records; disregarded congressional intent; and opened up the floodgates of crime, misbehavior, and scandal. In addition to that, people are going to be spending money without knowing who is having it spent, why, or for how much or by whom.

That is why, today, I, along with a number of my colleagues, will be introducing the Restoring Confidence in Our Democracy Act. This legislation makes findings of fact about the negative effects of unlimited spending which the Court cannot ignore. It reinstates the law that was in place on the day before Citizens United was adopted by the Court. It prohibits corporate spending in elections, and it subjects super PACs to \$5,000 contribution limits.

Don't wait for a constitutional amendment to undo Citizens United. Support the Restoring Confidence in Our Democracy Act, and let us do it by an enactment of Congress preceded by the necessary findings pointing out the evils of this scandal. We will be back in less than 30 days, and we are going to find out after the primary elections and after the general election what an outrage this is.

□ 1740

ROSALIND FRANKLIN UNIVERSITY OF MEDICINE AND SCIENCE

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science for 100 years of educating and training physicians and health care providers.

Since they opened their doors in 1912, Rosalind Franklin has had a non-discrimination policy in place and has embraced a diverse student body. These students have gone on to treat patients throughout the world and contribute to vital research.

At Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science, their focus is on interprofessional education, where students are encouraged to learn and share experiences with members of the health care team outside of their chosen profession. This provides a strong foundation for graduates of the program and enriches their clinical practice. The president, Dr. Michael Welch, has received numerous accolades for his leadership, including winning the 10th District Congressional Leadership Award for education this year.

I want to congratulate Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science for an impressive 100 years of educating some of our best and brightest health care providers, and for giving back to the community and working to better the world around them.

REPUBLICAN HOUSE FIDDLES WHILE AMERICA BURNS

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican do-nothing congress. With all the problems we're having in our Nation's transportation and infrastructure, we had a full committee meeting today on Amtrak food and beverage service. We could have been talking about critical rail issues that we left out of the surface transportation bill, like positive train control, the railroad rehabilitation improvement financing program, or the freight congestion plans. Or we could have been talking about real debt restructuring of Amtrak. We could even have gotten crazy and talked about how we were going to finance future transportation bills or hold a markup on a Water Resource Development Act. And if we really want to talk about food, we could have had a hearing on the repeated instances of needles being placed in airplane sandwiches. Most importantly, we could have had a hearing on the near fatal plane collision that happened just 2 days ago at Washington National Airport.

Once again, the Republican House fiddles while America is burning.

HOUSE STANDS READY TO WORK

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that the Democrat controlled Senate voted today to adjourn for over a month, and they haven't even voted on a budget for 1,191 days.

Mr. Speaker, this is a \$3.5 trillion enterprise, and the Democrat-controlled Senate, led by Majority Leader REID, voted to adjourn for over a month so that when they come back it will be 1,240 days since they haven't voted on a budget.

Mr. Speaker, the House did what it had to do. It voted on a budget. It voted to extend the current tax rates to all citizens, and we are here ready to work. We ask the Senate to reconsider the decision, Mr. Speaker. That's what we ought to do. We ask them to come back in and work with us to finally pass a budget.

A CALL FOR BIPARTISANSHIP

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my Republican colleague in disbelief because the fact of the matter is that the Republican House has now adjourned, or at least is trying to adjourn, and go home for 5 weeks, as far as I can tell.

The fact of the matter is that when you go home and you talk to your constituents, they talk about jobs, they talk about the economy. When the gentleman says, Oh, we already passed a bill and why doesn't the Senate take it up, he knows very well that in order to accomplish anything here in terms of tax cuts and extending tax cuts for the middle class, that we have to get together on a bipartisan basis with the Democrats. That's simply not happening here.

The Senate has passed bills that seek to create jobs, larger infrastructure bills, bills that would actually send money back to the States so that we can rehire some of our public employees, our police, our firemen, and our teachers.

The fact of the matter is that the House Republicans really do not want to do anything to create jobs, whether it's in the public sector or it's in the private sector. We see no action here on the House side under the Republican leadership that would do anything to stimulate the economy or create jobs.

ARMY PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JULIAN L. COLVIN

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

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to the life and service of Alabama's own fallen soldier, Army Private First Class Julian L. Colvin, a courageous soldier, loving son, an American hero.

Pfc Colvin was a dedicated soldier assigned to the 508th Special Troops Battalion, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 82nd Airborne Division from Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Pfc Colvin lost his life at the age of 21 on July 22 while supporting Operation Enduring Freedom in Kandahar, Afghanistan.

Pfc Colvin, a Birmingham native, proudly joined the United States Army on March 9, 2011 as a combat engineer. As a remarkable paratrooper and outstanding engineer, he was considered a shining example of excellence in our military service.

Born on March 2, 1991 in Birmingham, Alabama, Pfc Colvin was the loving son of Carla and Alfred Colvin. As a young man, Pfc Colvin dutifully answered the highest call to duty for this country. Pfc Colvin was a selfless servant leader who bravely sacrificed for the love of his country. During his brief military career, Pfc Colvin earned numerous honors, including the distinguished Bronze Star Medal, the Purple Heart, and the Army Commendation Medal.

The Seventh Congressional District in the State of Alabama and this Nation have suffered a tremendous loss. Our Nation is eternally grateful for Pfc Julius Colvin and his dedicated service and patriotism. I ask those present today to join me in honoring the life and legacy of this heroic soldier, Pfc Colvin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my 1-minute speech.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing the U.S. House to honor Army Private First Class Julian Colvin of Birmingham, who lost his life in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan on July 22, 2012, in the defense of his country.

Pfc. Colvin was a dedicated paratrooper and combat engineer assigned to the 82nd Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Although just 21 years of age and on his first deployment, Pfc. Colvin was highly decorated for his service, with awards including the Bronze Star Medal, the Purple Heart, the Army Commendation Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Ribbon, the Combat Action Badge, and the Basic Parachutist Badge.

But perhaps the highest honors have come from the innumerable testimonials to his high character.

Pfc. Colvin was, according to Lt. Col. Peter Levola, commander of the 508th Brigade Special Troops Battalion, "a shining example of the inspiration and promise of our young, remarkable Paratroopers—a selfless hero who willingly took on one of the most difficult jobs in the Brigade by leading patrols with a mine detector."

Services for Pfc. Colvin will be held at the 6th Avenue Baptist Church in Birmingham on Saturday, August 4. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family and loved ones during this difficult time.

We will always remember Pfc. Colvin as a young patriot and hero to us all and it is appropriate for our nation to remember his service today.

As the senior member of the Alabama delegation, we join with Congresswoman Terri Sewell in her tribute to our Alabama hero, Army Private First Class Julian Colvin.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JON TIBBETTS

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Jon Tibbetts, who died last week in a car accident. This tragic accident cut short the life of a man who had devoted his career to helping others as a first responder.

Jon Tibbetts served as fire chief of the Sandoval County Fire Department for the past 8 years. Earlier in his career, he was a paramedic in San Juan County. I had the pleasure of working with Chief Tibbetts during my time on the Public Regulatory Commission, and I saw first hand his commitment to the firefighters he commanded, as well as to the people of New Mexico that he helped protect.

Thanks to his hard work and determination, Chief Tibbetts improved the way that emergency medical services and firefighters responded to better serve the community. Because of his dedication, there is no doubt that more people in New Mexico are safer.

My thoughts and prayers are with the Tibbetts' family during this difficult time, especially his wife Connie and his daughters Natasha and Amy.

We'll miss you Chief Tibbetts.

END THE POLITICAL GAMESMANSHIP

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, the American people expect Congress to work to get our economy back on track, to promote economic growth, and to provide families and small businesses with some certainty when it comes to their taxes.

The Senate passed legislation to ensure that middle class families do not see a tax increase at the end of the year. Yesterday, House Democrats offered the identical bill, one that the President would sign, yet our Republican friends passed a plan that will raise taxes on 25 million middle class families by preserving tax breaks for the wealthiest among us.

We need to end this kind of political gamesmanship that has held our economy back. Against this backdrop, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle

have decided to leave town for almost 40 days with a long list of unfinished business: postal reform, the Violence Against Women reauthorization, the farm bill, comprehensive jobs legislation, the Make It in America agenda, a balanced and big plan to solve our deficit, and tax cuts for the middle class.

We should remain here and do the work the American people sent us to do.

□ 1750

JOBS.GOP.GOV

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. I have come down to the floor just to remind my colleagues and you, Mr. Speaker, that if you go to jobs.gop.gov you will see a list of 25 bills that have been passed in this Chamber to do a couple of things: to boost competitiveness in the manufacturing sector; encouraging entrepreneurship in government; to help pay down our debt; and my favorite is maximizing American energy production. Yes, using American energy and our resources to create jobs, like the Keystone XL pipeline. We passed numerous bills to move the Keystone XL pipeline, 20,000 immediate jobs.

Mr. Speaker, you can go to jobs.gop.gov to check the 25 different bills that we have passed in this Chamber. We have done our work. We will continue to do our work. Obviously, we need the other Chamber to be somewhat functional and at least consider these bills and then move to conference, which is how a bill becomes a law.

NO TAX CUT FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, you have controlled the House for 19 months. The Republican majority has simply failed to lead. And more importantly, you are incapable of governing for the middle class—the middle class, the people who help build this great Nation. This week we had the opportunity to provide a tax cut for 100 percent of these Americans, those individuals earning less than \$200,000 and less than \$250,000 for a family. But once again, the Republican majority wanted it their way.

And what was your way? You wanted to pass tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires, your friends. And what does that do? It adds \$1 trillion to our deficit and debt over the next 10 years. How many times has the majority said time and time again about the deficit and debt. And what do you do? You pass the tax cuts that are going to add \$1 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, it's about time that we step back and we realize that we are

here to serve and the fact that we must take care of the majority, the wonderful middle class.

NEVADA'S SALES TAX

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Congress must do right by Nevada's middle class families and make permanent the sales tax deduction, a measure that benefits so many middle class families in Nevada. Over 300,000 Nevadans claimed \$456 million in deductions for State and local sales tax in 2009 alone. Nevada is one of only nine States that has no State income tax and, instead, revenue is raised through a sales tax.

Nevadans should be able to deduct their sales tax from their Federal income tax, just as citizens from income tax States do now. The sales tax deduction helps families across Nevada by leaving more money in their pockets. This creates jobs, stimulates economic growth, and keeps money in their pockets.

It's a matter of priority, Mr. Speaker. We must make the sales tax deduction permanent in order to give middle tax families the certainty of knowing they will have extra money in their pockets to put food on their table, gas in their cars, and be able to pay the mortgage on their family home.

RAISING TAXES ON MILITARY FAMILIES

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House unfortunately passed a tax bill that will raise taxes on 25 million families, including many military families. And that is, in a word, outrageous. We see strenuous objections from the majority to fairly tax the superwealthy; but we don't hear a peep about placing an extra tax burden on our middle class families, including members of our military whose families are actually struggling in this economy.

Under the majority's tax bill, an E-1 sailor in the Navy with 2 years' service with a spouse and three young children at home would see a tax increase of \$1,096. A private in the U.S. Army in her first year of service who is married with an infant child would see a \$273 tax increase.

As the ranking member of the House Military Personnel Subcommittee, I want to know why we are asking those who have given so much for our country to give even more while we ask the wealthiest Americans to sacrifice nothing. Our military families deserve much better than that, and so do the American people.

THE DO-NOTHING REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, can you believe it—Republicans are on their planes, trains, and automobiles headed out of Washington for a month when they haven't provided tax cuts for middle class Americans and for small businesses. That's right, Mr. Speaker: absent without cause, AWOL, while the American people wait.

And here they are, we had a chance to provide tax cuts for middle-income families. We had a chance to make sure that middle-income families aren't stretched in this economy; but, instead, they've added nearly \$1 trillion to our deficit and debt over the next 10 years because they are interested in protecting millionaires and billionaires. And now they're high-tailing it out of Washington.

Well, I can't believe it. Republicans are leaving with the postal service in default; the Violence Against Women Act not reauthorized, leaving domestic violence victims in limbo; jobs legislation undone, leaving Americans who want to work out of work.

Well, Jiminy Cricket, Mr. Speaker, what is going on with this do-nothing Congress, with this do-nothing Republican Congress? The American people deserve more, and it's time to get back to work.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF AMERICAN FOLKLIFE CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 2103(b), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, of the following individual from private life to the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress on the part of the House for a term of 6 years:

Mr. C. Kurt Dewhurst, Michigan

IT'S A SPENDING PROBLEM, NOT A REVENUE PROBLEM

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my good friend from Virginia.

REMEMBERING THE FALLEN OF THE CHINOOK HELICOPTER CRASH

Mr. RIGELL. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute, to honor, and to remember and celebrate the lives of American heroes. We're approaching a most sobering anniversary, August 6. This is the day 1 year ago when a Chinook helicopter crashed in Afghanistan, taking with it the lives of

so many, including five soldiers, three airmen, and 24 SEALs. It marks the most serious and heaviest loss of life for our SEAL community in their illustrious service to our country. Families across our Nation are hurting and will hurt not only on the anniversary but just as they remember their loved one.

So it is with great humility and just deep appreciation to the families of the fallen, our Gold Star families, to pause for a moment to rise and to honor their loved one.

Our colleague from Iowa, STEVE KING, entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a poem that was written specifically for this occasion. And I appreciate my colleague yielding just for the few minutes it will take to read the poem.

□ 1800

It is with a grateful heart that I read this poem, and I thank my colleague, Mr. KING, for entering it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is written from the vantage point of the following:

WE STOOD!

We!
WE STOOD!
WE STOOD, so you can sleep!
While, out across our Nation our Mothers now so weep!
WE FOUGHT, so you can live!
All in such blessed peace—that which our most selfless sacrifice so gives!
As all in such pain and headache our families must now so live!
WE STOOD, so you could sleep!
Upon that Bed of Freedom so very sweet!
As to all of you, our promises WE Did So Keep!
As it was all for you, our bodies Now So Sleep!
So Sleep, all in such cold dark quiet graves so very deep!
WE GAVE!
All of Our Most Precious Lives!
While, all of our Brothers In Arms did so weep . . . and not ask why!
As WE so raised our hands so way up high!
And so swore to pledge our most precious lives!
To Make A Stand!
To Make A Difference With It All!
As WE so gave That Last Full Measure While Standing Tall!
As WE died and bled!
To so keep all of our most solemn vows of honor, said!
As why out across our Nation Our FAMILIES Now So Weep!
All But For The Greater Good, WE so gave all we could!
AS WE STOOD!
As WE pray now to our Lord their fine souls to so keep!
For THEY So Stood For What Was Right!
All with their most brilliant souls so burning bright!
As THEY died, all for that Old Red White and Blue this sight!
As into that face of evil, THEY so marched off casting their most heroic lights!
To so go forth, all in such a most brilliant force to fight!
For THEY'D, MUCH RATHER HAVE DIED FOR SOMETHING!
THAN TO HAVE LIVED FOR NOTHING AT ALL!
FOR STRENGTH IN HONOR!
Was but THEIR most sacred battle cry . . . call!

Because, moments . . . are all that WE so have!

To Make A Difference!
To Hear That Call!
To Change The World!
To go off so boldly with flags unfurled!
Troops mount up, as Heaven calls!
Move on! Move out!
As there are 30 more new Angels, In The Army of Our Lord . . .

To fight that battle, who shall not pause!
To so watch over us all!
And then there comes a gentle rain, their tears will wash down upon us so to remain!
To ease our pain, so we won't have to cry anymore!

As forever in our hearts YOUR most sacred names,

WE will carry ALL!
Because, YOU died so WE can sleep!
Upon, That Bed of Freedom . . . YOUR Gift of Peace!

As now WE LAY YOUR FINE BODIES down to rest, to sleep!
BECAUSE YOU STOOD!
Amen!

Mr. Speaker, this very special poem is entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it was written by Albert Carey Caswell. I have the privilege of representing a wonderful district, Mr. Speaker, home of a lot of heroes. These are good men, and you'd never know how they serve and what they do. We are deeply grateful for their service and for all servicemembers across this great land.

We stand with the families of the fallen, our Gold Star families, and we ask God to give them a special measure of comfort and peace on this anniversary.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you being with us this afternoon and giving me the opportunity to come down here and talk about where we have been this week on Capitol Hill trying to find a pathway forward.

Now, as with every decision we make, Mr. Speaker, as you know, you and I have been here for 18 months with a voting card in hand, trying to make those decisions for our constituents back home, trying to bring their voice to be heard on Capitol Hill, and we're facing one of those choices right here today.

Which lane will we choose, Mr. Speaker?

We proposed, passed today here in the House in a bipartisan way a proposal that will create 1 million new jobs. Now, I'm going to go on and bring out some other studies and where those jobs are coming from. But one of the folks we're going to hear from that's going to confirm the job-creation opportunities that exist in this proposal is going to be President Barack Obama because he will have stood about 10 feet behind me in a State of the Union address just 18 short months ago and advocated in favor of this job-creation proposal.

I don't know what has changed in 18 months, Mr. Speaker, but what we saw here on the floor of the House today is our Democratic colleagues advocating

for a different choice. A choice that Ernst & Young in an independent analysis of legislative proposals said will destroy 710,000 jobs. It will lose the opportunity to employ 710,000 Americans. As we are hearing what is unquestionably the worst recession in my lifetime, and when presented with a choice between creating a million new jobs or losing 710,000 others, we are faced with a choice.

The House made the right choice today, Mr. Speaker. The House chose to create 1 million new jobs. But just in the last 7 days, the Senate made the wrong choice. The Senate chose a path that study after study after study shows us results in failure. Why is that, Mr. Speaker? Why is that?

What I have here, Mr. Speaker, is a chart you'll remember from our budget debate. I'm just so proud, I serve on the Budget Committee here in the House, Mr. Speaker. And, you know, we've brought two budgets to the floor. In the short 18 months that I've served here in Congress, we've brought two budgets to the floor that made tough decisions. Tough decisions.

When you're running \$1.4 trillion deficits, Mr. Speaker, and when you're trying to create jobs for a Nation that's hurting, when you're trying to prevent job-killing tax hikes from being imposed on American job creators, there're no easy decisions. They're tough decisions, and they have consequences.

But this is what I learned in our budget debate. What I have here is a chart that shows tax revenue from 1947, just after World War II, all of the way out to 2077, about 130 years of tax revenue. And what we'll see, Mr. Speaker, is tax revenue that's actually come in represented by this green line, and then the tax revenue that's projected to come in. You'll see that's a flat line. It's taxes as a percent of GDP, and what we see is whether we operated America with some of the highest tax rates in history, and we've had 90 percent income tax rates in this country—90 percent income tax rates—or whether we operate America with the lowest income tax rates in this Nation's history, we bring in about the same amount of money either way.

I know that's not intuitive. I could bring up chart after chart after chart that shows how it's true. I can show what happened in the Kennedy years when he cut those top marginal rates and more revenue came in. We can look at what happened in the Reagan years when we cut those top marginal rates and more revenue came in. And we can look at what happened in the Bush years when we cut those marginal rates and more revenue came in, over and over and over again.

But rather than dwell on those charts, Mr. Speaker, I just want you to see that over time, revenue is relatively constant. Americans are willing to give the Federal Government about 18 percent of the size of the economy. And if the government asks for

more than that, Americans change their behavior so they don't have to give it.

But the red line, Mr. Speaker, represents spending in this country, spending going back to just after World War II, going out to where we are here today and a projection forward based on current law. Based on current law, Mr. Speaker. Folks look at this chart and they see this giant red line, government spending as a percent of GDP as it threatens to consume all of American GDP, and they think: Golly, what in the world. Who are the crazy people proposing that we do that? Who are they?

□ 1810

Mr. Speaker, that's what happens if we do nothing. If we fail to proactively offer a solution, if we fail to confront the challenges that are facing this country with respect to spending, if we do not act, this is what we get. No President need sign a law to create this dangerous circumstance; the laws have already been signed.

The question is: What are we going to do about it, Mr. Speaker? We don't have a taxation problem in this country in terms of needing to tax Americans more; we have a spending problem in this country in terms of the Federal Government needing to spend less.

And just to put that in sharp relief, Mr. Speaker, I've reflected here in this green the path to prosperity. This is debt as a share of the economy. This is America's debt as a share of the economy.

You remember when we had all hands on deck in World War II, when we were literally fighting for the future of the world, debt crested 100 percent of GDP. We borrowed an amount equal to the entire size of the United States economy. Well, we're right back there today, Mr. Speaker, we will be over the next decade. And if we do nothing again, that spending will create a debt pattern that will completely consume not just all of the revenue, it will consume all of the wealth of this country.

If we took everything from everybody, Mr. Speaker, if we confiscated every stock and every bond, if we confiscated every small business and every large business, if we took everybody's bank account and took everything out from under their mattress, if we sold everyone's car, everyone's home, we still wouldn't have enough money to pay for the promises that previous Congresses have made to America.

It's a spending problem; it's not a revenue problem. But this green line, Mr. Speaker, represents the budget that you and I and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle came together to pass. It's not about blaming folks. Did all of this red line come from previous Congresses before I got here? You better believe it. But it's not about finding out who was to blame in those previous 5 years, 10 years, 15 years, 20 years; it's about finding out who's going to offer the solution to get

us out of this mess. And you know who it is, Mr. Speaker? It's this freshman class that you and I have the great fortune of being a part of. It's the conservatives who have served in this Congress, calling out in the wilderness time and time again, the senior leaders of this conference, and this Congress who are going to come together and provide solutions.

This green line represents not just a proposal that one man wrote, not just an idea that maybe 10 or 15 people agree on. This green line, this solution represents the budget that passed this United States House of Representatives in a bipartisan fashion.

Don't let folks tell you it's hopeless, Mr. Speaker. Is it dire? Yes, it is. But we have proffered solutions, we have debated solutions, and we have passed, on the floor of this House, solutions. The problem is not that taxes are too low in this country; the problem is that spending is too high in this country, and we have offered solutions to that. That's been the debate on the floor of the House this week.

Before I get into the debate that we've actually had this week, Mr. Speaker, I've brought a chart of who benefits from tax loopholes. Who benefits from tax loopholes? We talk a lot about tax loopholes.

I'm a cosponsor of the Fair Tax, Mr. Speaker. I'm a big believer in the Fair Tax, the fundamental tax reform proposal. It has more sponsors than any other fundamental tax proposal in the House or in the Senate. It's H.R. 25 here in the House. It proposes that we turn our tax system on its head, to stop punishing people for what they've earned and begin to tax people based on what they spend.

If you're going out and you're buying a brand new Mercedes, I don't care what kind of job you have, you can afford to pay the tax. If you're driving a used Ford Festiva, I don't care how much money you earn, you're plowing that money back into the economy instead of taking it out.

This is what we see. Who benefits from tax loopholes? The bottom 20 percent, Mr. Speaker, get next to nothing from tax loopholes. The bottom 40 percent, Mr. Speaker, you see, get nothing from tax loopholes. The bottom 60 percent, the bottom 80 percent get next to nothing in terms of tax loopholes. The top 20 percent, Mr. Speaker, that finally starts to show up on the chart. But it's the top 1 percent of all income earners who benefit the most from all the tax loopholes. In this case, it's just over \$250,000 each.

Now, why is that? I'm not picking on our top 1 percent. The top 1 percent pays about 40 percent of all the income taxes in this country. The top 1 percent pays 40 percent of all the income taxes. The bottom 50 percent pays zero. If the bottom 50 percent is paying zero, that means the top 50 percent has to pick up the whole tab. We pay more on the top 1 percent. So it only makes sense that if you have a complicated Tax Code

that allows for lots of loopholes, exemptions, deductions, and carve-outs, those loopholes, exemptions, deductions, and carve-outs are going to benefit the people who are paying all the tax—top 1 percent paying all the tax, and so top 1 percent benefiting from all the loopholes.

Why am I talking about those folks in the top 1 percent? Because I'm not picking on them. I admire them. I just want to make that clear. I admire them. I'm not one of them, but I aspire to be. I hope I come up with that next great idea like Bill Gates, like Steve Jobs. I hope that I do something that makes a difference for America. I hope that I'm one of those folks who owns a business back home that provides jobs for families, jobs for my neighbors, income that supports people's families. I want to be one of those guys. I don't demonize the 1 percent. I admire folks who have gone from nothing but the power of their ideas and the sweat of their brow and created something. Golly, that's what America is to me. That's what it is.

But there are some in this Congress, there are some down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Mr. Speaker, who are intent on demonizing that 1 percent. And what they have now today, this week on the floor of the House, has been a proposal to raise taxes on all of those job creators there in that category. Fully 50 percent of all of the income generated by small businesses is what my colleagues in the Senate, my colleagues here on the Democratic side of the House have proposed to raise taxes on. Those 50 percent of small business owners who are providing all the jobs, that's where my colleagues believe a major tax increase should be levied.

Mr. Speaker, we have put forth a proposal—I'm just so proud—that says, rather than raising taxes on job creators, killing jobs—I showed my choice of two futures—why not introduce fundamental tax reform that eliminates those deductions and loopholes, those carve-outs and exemptions that all of America knows are in the Tax Code, that all of America would like to see eliminated. And if we know that eliminating those has the greatest impact on the highest of our income earners, why do we need a class warfare that's going on down here on the floor of the House?

I say to my colleagues who want to demonize the top 1 percent, join me in eliminating deductions and carve-outs and loopholes and exemptions and you will raise taxes on that community, because those are the folks who benefit because those are the folks who pay the taxes.

There's a better way. Mr. Speaker, that's not just some hardcore freshman Republican who is the sponsor of a fundamental tax reform bill talking.

□ 1820

The President of the United States, this President of the United States, stood not 10 feet behind me at this podium at that microphone right behind

me, and he said these words in January of 2011:

Over the years, a parade of lobbyists has rigged the Tax Code to benefit particular companies and industries. Those with accountants and lawyers to work the system can end up paying no taxes at all, but the rest are hit with one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world.

President Obama said that, and he followed it with this:

It makes no sense, and it has to change.

Hitting job creators in America with the highest tax rate in the world “makes no sense, and it has to change.”

This was January of 2011, 1 month after December, 2010, when the President signed the tax package for 2 years that the House passed today. I ask the Speaker, where is the contention today? This is the same proposal that was passed 2 years ago when the President acknowledged the challenges facing our job creators and said “it has to change.”

We have a bigger plan for fundamental reform that changes the debate in Washington forever, but right now, we are about the business of stopping the largest tax increase in American history from destroying jobs in this country beginning in January of next year. The President acknowledges it and said it had to change.

Right here behind me in January, 2011, he says this:

So tonight, I’m asking Democrats and Republicans to simplify the system, get rid of the loopholes, level the playing field, and use the savings to lower the corporate tax rate for the first time in 25 years without adding to our deficit. It can be done.

It can be done, says President Obama—and he’s right. Our Ways and Means Committee has held more hearings on fundamental tax reform than any other Ways and Means Committee in my lifetime. We are talking about those fundamental reforms that the President has asked to talk about. And this week, this week, Mr. Speaker, we passed a framework that gives expedited procedures.

We all know how things get slowed down in Washington, D.C. We all know how easy it is for somebody to latch on to something and stop it from passing because they want to stand in the way of progress. We passed expedited procedures to do exactly what the President has asked us to do. This is not Republican politics. This is not partisan politics. This is folks coming together to try to save what is a fragile economy today. Is it the strongest economy in the world? You’d better believe it. Is tomorrow going to be brighter than today in America? You’d better believe it. But not by holding our tongues, not by sitting on our hands, and not by fighting amongst ourselves about who gets the credit.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t care. I’ve got a fundamental tax reform bill that I believe solves this problem. You can call it anything you want to. Call it the Democratic plan to save America. It

doesn’t matter to me. We don’t care who gets the credit. We care about solving the problem. And that’s what our President charged us to do.

He goes on, January, 2011, 10 feet behind me:

We measure progress by the success of our people, by the jobs they can find and the quality of those jobs, by the prospects of a small businessowner who dreams of turning a good idea into a thriving enterprise.

My colleagues here are trying to raise taxes on 50 percent of all the income those small businessowners make. The job creators in this country are faced with the largest tax increase in American history. Our President has asked us not to do that. He goes on to say this:

By the opportunities for a better life that we pass on to our children, that’s the project the American people want us to get to work on together.

And we did. We passed our plan for fundamental tax reform together in a bipartisan way this week.

Talking about the agreement that the President passed and signed in December of 2010, the very same agreement that we’re trying to pass today, he said this:

We did that in December. Thanks to the tax cuts we passed, Americans’ paychecks are bigger, and these steps taken by Republicans and Democrats will grow the economy and add to more than 1 million private sector jobs this year.

Did you remember my saying the President was going to back up, that this proposal was going to create 1 million private sector jobs? He said it in January, add to more than 1 million private sector jobs created last year.

I’ll close with this, Mr. Speaker. That was 10 feet behind me January 20, 2012, the President said this:

We have a huge opportunity at this moment to bring manufacturing back to America, but we have to seize it. We have to seize it.

I bolded this so everybody could see it, Mr. Speaker. We should start with our Tax Code. Right now, companies get tax breaks for moving jobs and profits overseas, meanwhile companies that choose to stay in America get hit with one of the highest tax rates in the world. It makes no sense. Everyone knows it. So let’s change it.

Mr. Speaker, that’s the bill the House passed this week. The bill the Senate passed this week continues to punish those small businessowners and continues to reward those companies that do their businesses overseas.

Don’t let an election year get in the way of doing what’s right. The President called for it, the Ways and Means Committee delivered it, the House has passed it, and we can do it. I call on my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to believe as I believe, that tomorrow can be better than today.

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

IRAN’S NUCLEAR AMBITIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 32 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the previous gentleman here. His comments were very compelling to me.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin my comments tonight, let me just sincerely say that I hold in my heart this privilege of being a Member of the American family and this United States Congress to be a priceless gift of God. And I would ask that my comments tonight would be heard in that context, and I would even dare to hope, Mr. Speaker, that you and the Members of this body might grant me a modicum of understanding befitting the conviction and the gravity that give impulse to the statements that I make tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the very first responsibility of human government is to protect its people. Many times during the nearly 4 years of the Obama administration, I have stood on this floor and have called upon this administration to address the grave threat posed by Iran’s nuclear program.

When I first began calling for Iran to be referred to the Security Council, they possessed only 157 centrifuges, Mr. Speaker. But tonight, Iran possesses more than 9,000. And tonight I stand here with such a sense of urgency that I find it difficult to articulate, Mr. Speaker. I believe we may be facing the very last window this world will ever have before it becomes too late to prevent jihad from becoming armed with nuclear weapons and shattering the peace and security of human freedom as we have known it.

Because this administration has delayed and sent ambiguous messages to Iran and the world, as of approximately 3 months ago, Iran reached the point where it now possesses all the components necessary to become a nuclear-armed nation.

Mr. Speaker, Iran has the knowledge, the technical expertise, the equipment, everything necessary to build a nuclear warhead. They need no new technology, no new personnel, no new parts or resources of any kind from anyone. All they need now is time and lack of intervention.

Mr. Speaker, if Iran is allowed to gain nuclear weapons, it will unequivocally transform the landscape of human freedom as we have known it throughout the world. The world’s primary financier of terrorism will be armed with nuclear warheads. A desperate arms race will rage across the entire Middle East. Israel will be in range of nuclear missiles in the hands of a jihadist enemy who despises them, is dedicated to their complete annihilation and capable of obliterating their entire nation in 15 minutes.

□ 1830

America and our allies will then face an enemy with the ultimate asymmetric capability of a nuclear-generated high-altitude electromagnetic pulse potentially capable of devastating our electric grid and the civilizational architecture it sustains.

Jihadists the world over will have access to nuclear weapons, and the world's children, Mr. Speaker, will have forever etched in their memory that moment in history when this government allowed the hellish shadow of nuclear jihad to fall across their future.

For almost 4 years, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the same weakness, naivete, vacillation, ambiguity, and delusional policy toward radical jihadists in Iran that once allowed them to hold 56 American hostages for 444 days during the Carter administration. That failed approach, that failed understanding now saturates nearly every policy corner of the Obama administration as Iran seeks to gain a nuclear grip on America's throat.

As always, any credible threat should be evaluated by whether an enemy possesses both the intention and the capacity to inflict harm. The despotic regime now governing Iran has been explicitly clear in its intention toward the United States. Official military parades in Iran have, for years, routinely featured a litany of slogans calling for death to Israel, death to America.

President Ahmadinejad was speaking to the whole world when he said:

And you, for your part, if you would like to have good relations with the Iranian nation in the future, recognize the Iranian nation's greatness and bow down before the greatness of the Iranian nation and surrender. If you don't accept to do this, the Iranian nation will later force you to surrender and bow down.

Does that sound like someone who thinks he knows something that we don't?

Ahmadinejad also said:

Israel is about to die and will soon be erased from the geographical season.

Then he added:

The time for the fall of the satanic power of the United States has come, and the countdown to the annihilation of the emperor of power and wealth has started.

Iranian Basij Commander Naqdi said:

As long as America exists, we will not rest. We must create the environment for the destruction of America.

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has consistently denied the existence of the Holocaust, Mr. Speaker, calling it a myth or a fabrication. And in the same breath, he threatens to make it happen again by repeatedly calling for the destruction of the Jewish State, for Israel to be "wiped off the map." He has said, point blank:

The wave of the Islamist revolution will soon reach the entire world. Anybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nation's fury.

And just today, Mr. Speaker, just today, Ahmadinejad called for the annihilation of Israel again.

Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon estimates that hundreds of U.S. soldiers have died, as many as three and four of our casualties, as a result of Iran supplying terrorists in Iraq with weapons such as highly sophisticated explosive form penetrators designed to destroy American armor and vehicles. What possesses us to believe that they would not do the same with nuclear weapons?

Former Joint Chief of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen said:

My worst nightmare is terrorists with nuclear weapons. Not only do I know that they are trying to get them, but I know they will use them.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu called Iran:

the major terrorist-sponsoring state of our time. Tehran could give those nuclear weapons to terrorists, or give them a nuclear umbrella that would bring terrorism beyond our wildest dreams.

Mr. Speaker, can we allow a man like Ahmadinejad, leading the world's most dangerous regime, to be able to disseminate nuclear weapons to terrorists and to have his finger on the button that could launch nuclear missiles targeting our families and our children?

And how do we negotiate with a nuclear Iran, as Senator Obama suggested, when their jihadist ideology considers Armageddon a good thing?

Mr. Speaker, even without nuclear weapons, the Iranian regime has remained relentless and undeterred in its efforts to harm America, Israel, and Western interests. In October of last year, our intelligence interdicted an Iranian plot to assassinate the Saudi Arabian Ambassador and to detonate bombs at both the Saudi Arabian and the Israeli Embassies right here in Washington, D.C. Tapes in American possession show that the Iranians were unconcerned with "collateral damage." Now, Mr. Speaker, translated, that means dead Americans. It also means that Iran has no fear whatsoever of the Obama administration.

And now, in recent days, we have learned that Iran was behind another barbaric attack, a terrorist attack on innocent civilians, when its terrorist proxy, Hezbollah, bombed a Bulgarian bus, killing five innocent Israeli citizens and killing a pregnant woman and including dozens more. Imagine how emboldened Iran will become if they are allowed to come into possession of nuclear weapons.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, imagine for a moment the scenario of Hezbollah, one of Iran's terrorist proxies, gaining possession of just two nuclear warheads and bringing them across the border into the United States concealed, say, in bales of marijuana—this shows you that they can get them in—when transporting them into the heart of two different crowded unnamed cities and then calling and telling the White House exactly when and where the first one will be detonated, and then following through 60 seconds later.

Then imagine them, Mr. Speaker, calling the White House back and mak-

ing demands, which, if they're not met, would mean that the second warhead would also be detonated in a different unnamed American city. The entire United States would be held hostage by terrorist monsters, Mr. Speaker.

Or imagine if those same terrorists acquired two small cargo ships carrying mobile launchers with SCUD missiles from Iran's existing arsenal and used them to launch those two warheads in a coordinated and devastating high-altitude electromagnetic pulse attack over the homeland of the United States.

Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that Iran is pursuing the means whereby they could assist groups like Hezbollah to do exactly these kinds of horrifying things. The only components they lack to proceed are the nuclear warheads.

Mr. Speaker, there is no longer a single rational defense for the argument that Iran is not pursuing nuclear weapons capability.

So let me say this, and pray that the Members of this body and pray that the President and this Nation understand. If Iran gains nuclear weapons, they will give them to terrorists the world over. And still, as the centrifuges in Iran are spinning, the Obama administration is fiddling, and many of the Members of this body stand by and contemplate.

Have we lost our minds?

Mr. Speaker, President Obama has allowed Iran to rope-a-dope this administration in so-called peace talks that have burned the clock for nearly 4 years of his Presidency. The President has made stern warnings and then backed down every time. We've endured five rounds of peace talks, five different proposals, six different United Nations resolutions, and more than a dozen sets of economic sanctions.

The House just voted yesterday on another Iran sanctions bill that was so weakened and watered down by Mr. Obama and his supporters in the Senate that it is now barely worth the paper it's written upon. The administration's focus has been on sanctions, and weak sanctions at that, Mr. Speaker. And even then, Mr. Obama has granted waivers to further weaken the sanctions already in place.

Now, I wonder if this administration has considered the fact that we have had economic sanctions against North Korea for over 60 years, and in recent decades we have sanctioned them nearly into starvation. And yet during that time, they have tested nuclear warheads twice. And it's a genie that we cannot put back in the bottle, Mr. Speaker.

President Ahmadinejad has said of economic sanctions:

If they want to continue with that path of sanctions, we will not be harmed. They can issue resolutions for 100 years.

Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei said Iran's nuclear policies would not change, no matter the pressure. He said:

With God's help, and without paying attention to propaganda, Iran's nuclear course

should continually remain firmly and seriously. Pressures, sanctions, and assassinations will bear no fruit. No obstacles can stop Iran's nuclear work.

□ 1840

Mr. Obama's own Director of National Intelligence was asked by the Senate Intelligence Committee whether sanctions had any effect on the course of Iran's nuclear program. The answer was simple, Mr. Speaker, "No, none whatsoever."

I've said many times, starting long ago, that we should have pursued truly effective sanctions, dissident support, regime change, and political pressures to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear-armed state. But without the conviction in the minds of the Iranian leadership that military intervention will occur if they continue to develop nuclear weapons, none of these other approaches will change their minds. Our greatest hope to prevent military action against Iran was to make sure their leaders understood that the free world would respond militarily before we allowed them to threaten it with nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, Iran's radical leaders concluded that Barack Obama simply lacked the understanding or the resolve to use military action to prevent their nuclear weapons development. And why would they conclude anything else, Mr. Speaker? Even now, the stated goal of the Obama sanctions policy is simply to get Iran back to the negotiating table where they can waste even more time and gain even more valuable advances. And if we do get them back to the negotiating table, Mr. Speaker, what compromise can we seek—maybe that Iran keeps only a small number of nuclear weapons? No, Mr. Speaker. If Iran is hell-bent on getting nuclear weapons, there is no diplomatic solution.

In the popular revolt in Iran in 2009, the President could have assisted the dissidents and the peace-loving, decent people of Iran, of which there are so many, to overthrow their oppressors in the Iranian regime—or at least he could have spoken up on their behalf when they were out dying in the streets to try to bring about regime change, which, if they had been successful, could have changed all of this equation. But the President left them twisting in the wind.

To call Mr. Obama a bystander in all of this is to be charitable. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, he has been nowhere to be found. Many congressional Republicans have written and pleaded with this President numerous times on this vital issue to absolutely no avail.

The truth is that this President has waited too long. He has waited so long that the equation now before us has no good answer. His policies have only helped Iran accelerate their nuclear program. Iran is now tripling its uranium output, moving enrichment facilities deep under a mountain near Qom and restraining the IAEA from even inspecting weaponization facilities.

Maybe now it is becoming clear why Israel is so very concerned, because for them, a nuclear Iran is not just an academic question—it calls into question their very survival—and the Obama administration has now placed Israel into an almost impossible circumstance. Israel has watched this President resist an Israeli strike on nuclear facilities in Iran more than he has resisted a nuclear Iran. Israel has listened to Mr. Obama openly criticize Israel more for building homes in their capital city than he has openly criticized Mahmoud Ahmadinejad for building nuclear weapons with which to threaten the entire free world. In fact, they have watched this administration systematically scrub references that Jerusalem is even the capital of Israel.

Consequently, I believe Israel has known for some time that they can no longer trust the Obama administration to act in their best interest.

They know that Mr. Obama has waited so long that if Israel acts now to defend their own nation—and all of us incidentally—that they will suffer a far more damaging response from the radical regimes that surround them than they otherwise would have. Israel knows that, if they wait much longer to attack, the Iranian nuclear facilities may well be beyond their conventional military capability. Israel desperately needs America and her greater ability to attack heavily fortified targets. They need us, Mr. Speaker, but they will act without us if they must.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said simply and clearly, "One thing I'll never compromise on, and that is Israel's security . . . When it comes to Israel's survival, we must always remain the masters of our fate."

So what is this administration's present strategy? "We're trying to make the decision to attack as hard as possible for Israel." The most disgraceful part of it is President Obama's threat to withhold resupply from Israel to pressure them into his brand of inaction.

So let me just see if I have this straight, Mr. Speaker. The President says, according to his own State Department, that the world's greatest supporter of terrorism, a self-avowed enemy of America, with an advancing nuclear weapons program, has committed to destroy us and Israel and that the President's goal is to prevent Israel—our best and most committed friend and national ally on this Earth—from defending themselves. Did I get that right?

Mr. Speaker, that's why Israel will never trust this President with their national survival.

You see, Israel knows the very inconvenient truth that, when it comes to a nuclear Iran, if we are to prevent, we must preempt. They know that the choice with Iran is no longer a choice between the way the world is now and the way the world might be after a military strike to prevent them from

gaining nuclear weapons. Rather, the choice now is between what the world will be like after a preventative military strike on Iran or what the world will be like after Iran gains nuclear weapons.

So, Mr. Speaker, we should not deceive ourselves. When the head of Israeli intelligence tells the prime minister that Iran is entering into that "zone of immunity" where Israel will no longer have the conventional capacity to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons, Israel will act.

They will act knowing that many in the world will condemn them. They will act knowing that they will be blamed for any radiation releases from Iran's nuclear facilities that might result. They will act knowing that thousands of Iranian, Hamas, and Hezbollah rockets and missiles will fall upon the cities of their tiny nation in retaliation. They will act knowing that it is now extremely difficult for them to succeed.

But, Mr. Speaker, Israel will act because they are students of history, and they will not be made to walk silently into the gas chambers again.

They will act because they know that whatever the consequences for their actions will be that they will pale in significance compared to what the consequences would be for them and for the whole world if the jihadist Government of Iran were to gain nuclear weapons.

And, if and when they do act, the Obama administration will owe an apology to the whole world for ignoring this grave reality for so long, but Israel will especially deserve an apology—an apology from this administration for leaving them with no choice but to act on behalf of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, now, with all of the things I've said tonight, there seems to be a profound new irony upon us. This administration finally seems to recognize that they have, indeed, waited too long. This administration is finally realizing that Israel can no longer stand around and wait. It is also beginning to understand if Israel is forced to strike Iran's nuclear facilities alone or if Iran tests a nuclear weapon before the November 6 election, that the American people and the world will damn the Obama administration for their breath-taking vacillation. Under such scenarios, the administration very likely sees the chances for Mr. Obama to be reelected as virtually zero.

So it has occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Obama administration may have at last found sufficient rationale to move decisively against Iran's nuclear weapons program. The President knows that, in times of military action, the American people often rally around their President. Consequently, in spite of the fact that it has blatantly ignored the national security implications of Iran's nuclear program, it will now not surprise me at all if this administration launches an attack on

Iran's nuclear facilities before the November elections to protect itself politically, even if it is done in concert with Israel to make it appear less politically motivated.

While I believe the American people will see such an action for what it is, if a Presidential campaign will finally motivate this administration to get serious about our national security and Iran's nuclear program, then so be it, Mr. Speaker. It would still be far better for the administration to do that than to stand idly by and force the tiny state of Israel, our closest friend and ally on this Earth, to undertake such a monumental task alone, with all the odds against them and facing such crushing consequences whether they succeed or fail.

But it didn't have to be this way. There was a time when Iran's nuclear weapons ambitions could have been arrested with far less cost.

□ 1850

The President has waited too long.

Mr. Speaker, President Ronald Reagan gave an address in 1983 when the world faced a similar threat in the growing strength and nuclear ambition of the Soviet Union. Mr. Reagan said:

I urge you to beware the temptation to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong, good and evil.

Mr. Speaker, there were those in 1938 who deemed the ambitions of Adolf Hitler and the Third Reich a giant misunderstanding. The free nations of the world once had opportunity to address the insidious rise of the Nazi ideology in its formative years when it could have been dispatched without great cost, but they delayed, and the result was atomic bombs falling on cities, 50 million people dead worldwide, and the swastika shadow nearly plunging the planet into Cimmerian night.

Mr. Speaker, let the world's free people resolve once and for all, for the sake of our children and for future generations, that we of this generation will not stand by and watch a similar dark chapter of history be repeated on our watch.

God help this administration to wake up, and God help us all as Americans to be awake in this destiny year for our beloved country.

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

THE FISCAL PATH FORWARD

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, every Member of Congress has heard from a broad range of interests: education leaders, State and local officials, defense con-

tractors, small businesses, people concerned about the devastating impact of the looming sequestration spending cuts. Each of these groups, indeed, all of our constituents, deserve an honest accounting. How did we get in this predicament, and how can we get out of it in a way that accelerates our economic recovery and restores our fiscal health?

Our situation results from the failure of the so-called "supercommittee" established in the wake of the debt ceiling crisis manufactured by Republicans last summer to come up with a deficit reduction plan. Instead, we're faced with across-the-board cuts that would indiscriminately slash more than 8 percent from every national security and domestic account. Cutting with a meat axe instead of a scalpel is the most dangerous way imaginable to set fiscal policy. These cuts would come on top of the more targeted, but nonetheless significant, \$917 billion in cuts and spending caps that the administration and Congress have already locked in.

In the case of defense spending, these earlier cuts were a result of a careful, strategic review by the administration, and they'll save nearly half a trillion dollars over the next 10 years. As for domestic investments in education, infrastructure, research, and innovation, these cuts have already gone too far, slowing the recovery, and putting at risk our ability to compete in the global marketplace.

The House Republicans' first order of business in the 112th Congress was to precipitate an unnecessary, confidence-shaking, government shutdown crisis to extract domestic spending cuts. From there, they moved to the needless months-long debt ceiling crisis, during much of which consumer confidence plummeted, and the economy posted 2011's four slowest months of job growth.

By undermining confidence in the economy and withholding countercyclical investments that would boost the recovery and prompt future growth, Republicans have provided a case study in how not to make macroeconomic policy. Yet they want to do more of the same. According to the Economic Policy Institute, House Republicans approved a 2013 budget that would put 4.1 million people out of work by cutting investments in our future.

At root, Republicans are proposing a brand of European-style austerity, the same policy that has tipped many economies back into recession. Interestingly, with sequestration now looming and pressure from defense contractors mounting, a substantial portion of the Republican caucus on both sides of the Capitol has belatedly become aware of the concept of macroeconomics. All of the sudden, they're talking macroeconomics. You might call it "defense Keynesianism," the belief that only defense spending creates jobs, and that cutting it would result in job losses. In fact, the same argument applies equally to domestic in-

vestments in education and research and infrastructure, a truth Republicans have found it convenient to ignore.

The Republicans, by the way, can only thank themselves for the deep defense cuts in sequestration. One can easily imagine an alternative sequestration approach, triggering a tax surcharge, in addition to less severe cuts to defense and domestic spending. But as was the case during these repeated unnecessary crises, Republican dogmatism kept revenue off the table.

It's clear sequestration would devastate our defense, education, infrastructure, and research sectors, undermining our economy over the near and long term. It would also hobble critical functions from air traffic control to meat inspection and Social Security claims processing. It can't be resolved in isolation or through half measures. Yet Republicans are now proposing staving off the impact of sequestration on defense alone, and they pay for it by again targeting health care for low-income women and children, food and nutrition assistance, and other safety net programs for the poorest Americans, in addition to locking in a 2 percent Medicare cut. Their plan would victimize the most vulnerable, it would hinder job creation, and jeopardize our ability to compete.

Mr. Speaker, there's a better way. The impending fiscal cliff, which includes both sequestration and the expiration of the Bush tax cuts, offers an opportunity for all Members of Congress to set the talking points aside and act in our country's best interest. I know we can chart a course to fiscal balance because we've done it before. In the budget agreements of 1990 and 1993, which set the stage for 4 years of budget surpluses, the formula was fiscal discipline on all fronts.

No area of spending can be sacrosanct. We should focus our limited dollars on boosting the recovery and making critical investments in our future because the most effective means of deficit reduction is a growing economy. As in the 1990s, revenue must be part of the solution. The President has already proposed a sensible plan allowing the Bush-era tax breaks to expire on income over \$250,000 a year. Extravagant tax breaks for various special interests must be ended. The revenue raised could be used to pay down the deficit and to help fund the investments in education, research, infrastructure, and innovation that are critical to economic growth.

Most Americans agree with this comprehensive approach, but most Republicans still hide behind their anti-tax pledges. Their insistence that no additional revenue ever be raised, for example, by ending tax loopholes for oil companies or asking millionaires to return to their Clinton-era tax rates, is still the largest obstacle to a sensible budget compromise in Washington. As we approach the fiscal cliff, that fever has got to break. We must find our way

to the comprehensive balanced approach that will enable our country and all of our people to prosper.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1900

UNITED STATES-AFRICA TRADE RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend my fellow colleagues in the House for their leadership, for their vision, and for their votes today to strengthen the U.S.-Africa economic and trade relations. Passage of H.R. 5986 will also solidify the U.S. long-term investment in Africa.

I want to commend my colleagues for voting to extend AGOA, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. And I would also like to applaud all of those advocates who worked tirelessly to pass H.R. 5986, the long overdue extension of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, AGOA, including the third-country fabric provision as a part of AGOA.

This third-country fabric provision will enable eligible countries in sub-Saharan Africa to ship thousands of goods to the United States without paying import duties. This provision, which has been set to expire this September, on September 30, waives the duties on clothing from most AGOA countries, even if the yarn or fabric is made in a "third country," such as China, South Korea, or Vietnam. With passage of this important legislation, sewing jobs for hundreds of thousands of African workers will be protected and also created.

The first beneficiaries for this bill will be the women of Africa, because about 70 to 80 percent of the workers in these burgeoning apparel and textile industries are women. Mr. Speaker, when women are working, families are fed and stability is a result.

I am so pleased, Mr. Speaker, that once again AGOA will become the law and that the President will sign this law in the near future.

THE DEATH OF GHANAIAAN PRESIDENT JOHN ATTA MILLS

Next, Mr. Speaker, I stand in the House well today to send my deepest sympathies, the sympathies of the people of the First Congressional District of Illinois, and to send our prayers to the Ghanaian people and to the family of the recently departed President John Atta Mills, the late president of Ghana. His death is a terrible loss not only for Ghana and its people, but for the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, President Atta Mills was a tremendous leader. He solidified the foundation for peace and prosperity in the nation of Ghana, creating confidence in the Ghanaian political, so-

cioeconomic system that led to massive foreign direct investments in Ghana, which resulted in the creation of millions of jobs for the Ghanaian people. He will be greatly missed.

I also want to congratulate His Excellency, Mr. John Dramani Mahama, the new leader of Ghana.

Mr. Speaker, the peaceful transition of power in Ghana clearly demonstrates that Ghana has embarked into an unwavering path and process for democracy and the democratic principles we all hold near and dear. Within hours of the passing away of the President, late President John Atta Mills, the Vice President was sworn in as the new President.

The political violence that we witnessed after the passing of President Umaru Yar'Adua of Nigeria and President Bingu wa Mutharika of Malawi simply did not occur. This, Mr. Speaker, is evidence, sheer evidence that Ghana's democratic institutions are viable and are getting much stronger day by day.

This just did not happen. It took strong leadership from previous Presidents of Ghana in order to lay the right foundation for this smooth transition of power in Ghana over the last week. People like former President Jerry Rawlings, who was elected in 1996. And lest we not forget Mr. Rawlings' party lost with a narrow margin, but he didn't try to fight and hold back the willful decision of the Ghanaian people. He conceded the election without any controversy.

I also commend former President John Kufuor for his strong stance in support of the Ghanaian democratic march, the principles, and the democratic values that we cherish here in the United States.

It is for these reasons that I stand here today to commend the Ghanaian people, the Ghanaian leadership, and the Ghanaian institutions for their stable, forward-thinking, and mature leadership. I commend them all this evening.

NIGER DELTA CRISIS

Mr. Speaker, on my final note before this body, I rise today to also urge this Congress to pass H. Con. Res. 121, a resolution to save the Niger Delta region, which is located in Nigeria. Over the last few years and months, a lot has been said and a lot has been written about the Niger Delta crisis that is occurring right now in Nigeria as we speak.

□ 1910

Just about a year ago, the United Nations Environment Program released a report, a startling report, a report calling for an urgent response to reverse the environmental destruction and devastation in the Ogoniland region of the Niger Delta wetlands. That report again was startling, intense, and accurate. It also called for the establishment of a \$1 billion cleanup fund to finance the restoration and the cleanup of the Niger Delta region.

Mr. Speaker, to give you some perspective on the scope of the destruction and on the devastation, it is estimated that the cleanup of the Niger Delta could take as many as 30 years to complete. Of course, Mr. Speaker, strong voices have begun to emerge and strong actions have taken place to do more to publicize these environmental atrocities.

Just recently, I watched a movie directed by a brilliant Nigerian-born filmmaker whose name is Jeta Amata. It was a movie titled "Black November: Struggle for the Niger Delta." This movie raises the awareness of the tragedy of the Niger Delta and the Niger region. "Black November," the movie, is based upon the true story of the people of the Niger Delta, the communities in the Niger Delta that suffer extreme environmental degradation and extreme poverty in this oil-rich Niger Delta region.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation, we cannot, the American people cannot remain indifferent to the struggle of the people of the Niger region, the Niger Delta, as they struggle to clean up the pollution created by mostly American and other Western oil and petroleum companies. Most of the Niger Delta's 31 million people live on less than \$1 a day, although this region is the very backbone of Nigeria's economy, with oil and gas extraction accounting for over 97 percent of Nigeria's foreign exchange revenues.

The Niger Delta region, which consists of nine states, makes up about 12 percent of Nigeria's total land mass, and it is one of the world's 10 most important wetlands and coastal marine ecosystems.

Mr. Speaker, the social unrest, the criminality, illegal oil trade, the bunkering, and the general corruption have hindered oil and gas investment and production, as well as the Niger Delta region's development.

Mr. Speaker, these numbers are alarming. The World Conservation Union and the representatives from the Nigerian federal government and the Nigerian Conservation Foundation calculated in 2006 that up to 1.5 million tons of oil had been spilled in the Niger Delta over the last 50 years—1.5 million tons. That is 50 times, that's right, 50 times, Mr. Speaker, the pollution released in the Exxon Valdez tanker disaster in Alaska a few years ago.

This pollution, this oil spill, this devastation has severely limited the local inhabitants' access to clean water and has largely destroyed the fishing stock that the majority of the delta inhabitants depended on to make their daily living. A result also has been that illegal oil and gas refineries have become a source of income for these poor people who have unfortunately diverted their activities from fisheries destroyed by the oil spills. Illicit oil trade and illegal refineries are booming, and they are consequently threatening the economy, the security, and the environment of this very vital region in the world.

Mr. Speaker, more importantly or just as importantly, in too many of the communities in the Niger region, people drink water from wells that are contaminated with benzene, which is a known carcinogen.

□ 1920

They drink this water, which has been estimated to be 900 times above the level that the World Health Organization uses as its guideline, 900 times above the standards set by the World Health Organization.

Since 2010, Nigeria has become one of our main strategic partners on the continent of Africa. This nation, Nigeria, is our Nation's second-leading trading partner behind Great Britain. Mr. Speaker, these and other facts mean that the struggle of the people of the Niger Delta—the struggle of the Nigerian people—is also the struggle of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the destiny of the two economies, the Nigerian economy and the American economy, are interconnected, interrelated, and intertwined. We cannot, and I emphasize, this Nation cannot afford to stay indifferent to the struggles of the people of the Niger Delta and the cleanup of the pollution that has been devastating this region for over the past 50 years. The struggle of the people of the Niger Delta is indeed our struggle, the struggle of the American people.

I have led, and with cosigners, have introduced H. Con. Res 121 to urge all the stakeholders in the Niger oil and gas industry to come together, to work together, to collaborate together, and to address collectively the environmental impact of the oil and gas production in the Niger Delta.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that we should commend this Congress—and I certainly commend President Goodluck Jonathan for presenting the new Petroleum Industry Bill, the PIB, to the Nigerian Parliament, which has the support of all the stakeholders and has the input of all of the stakeholders.

I also want to commend President Goodluck Jonathan for announcing the creation of the Hydro-Carbon Pollution Restoration Project, HYPREP, to look into the Ogoni land degradation, destruction, and devastation from the aforementioned oil spills. I applaud President Goodluck Jonathan for taking these initiatives. These are very important, critical first steps. It is my hope that all of the affected stakeholders will again come and meet again soon and collaborate strongly together to make the cleanup and rebuilding of the Niger region become a success story that the world will admire and that the world will celebrate.

The new energy regulatory framework that's being created must be fair, it must be transparent, and it must create an appropriate avenue for the economic empowerment for local Niger Delta communities affected by the industry, including the women and the youth.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot stand by. We must assist in this effort. The clock is ticking. We must support the people of the Niger Delta.

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

RECOGNIZING CHABAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the unique and essential work being done by Chabad. Chabad is known by many for its annual telethon. Where else on the TV dial can one go to see dancing rabbis once a year? Chabad is better known for meeting the spiritual needs of millions, for meeting the economic and counseling needs of thousands who are faced with destitution or faced with the scourge of substance abuse.

I would like to extend my regards to Rabbi Cunin and the entire Cunin family for their tireless efforts on behalf of Chabad and Yiddishkeit everywhere.

For decades, I've had a chance to work with Rabbi Mordy Einbinder and Rabbi Joshua Gordon, and all of the rabbis of Chabad in the San Fernando Valley, an organization that has grown from one storefront to now 25 centers of vibrant communities dedicated to worship and to study across the San Fernando Valley.

Chabad does hugely important work for the local community. They have taken a commercial-grade kitchen and turned it into a one-stop social service center to feed and care for thousands. And Chabad's drug prevention and treatment program, PRIDE, reaches thousands of at-risk youth in the San Fernando Valley and across the Los Angeles area.

For the last decade, I've worked with Chabad to achieve something very important to the Jewish people, the return from Russia of the Rebbe's papers. The Schneerson Library and Archives are of such important sacredness to Chabad and to many others, and yet they are still held in Moscow by the Russian regime.

This Congress passed Jackson-Vanik. There's discussion of us changing that important law to allow for Russian goods to be sold in the United States more freely, but Jackson-Vanik's purpose was to force Russia to let our people go. That process will not, in my mind, be complete until Russia lets the Rebbe's papers go as well.

So I look forward to Russia releasing those spiritually important documents. And I look forward to working with all the Chabad rabbis on issues from Moscow to the San Fernando Valley.

IMPORTANT ISSUES FACING AMERICA AND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time yielded to me to really cover a couple different issues and areas that have been pending either in the District or in our Nation—or even internationally—and using this opportunity to place into the RECORD and also speak to you—in essence, speaking to the Nation—on the importance of these issues.

□ 1930

First what I would like to do is really commend Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON for passing an ag bill out of their committee.

Now, what my producers are asking is to pass a full ag bill on the floor sooner rather than later. In fact, I've seen, and I'm sure you've seen, an ag bill now. But we were successful today in helping mitigate a flaw in the last ag bill in ensuring that the livestock provisions and the insurance portion of the ag bill of 5 years ago, it wasn't funded for this last year.

As everyone knows, this is a very challenging year for the agricultural sector. I was able to visit a dairy farm in my district last Friday, the Timmerman family, and there I was able to meet with my producers, both commodity, livestock and dairy, and in my part of the State, sometimes they are doing all of the above.

So I brought down—actually, they brought to me and I brought back to Washington to give an example of the challenges we're under. Here is a good ear of corn that has been irrigated and is what we would expect to see almost every year in southern Illinois. This was what came off of a stalk on the Timmerman dairy farm. And so this gives you, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity to understand the challenges that are faced.

Now, in a dairy operation, like a beef operation, they're growing the corn to feed their livestock. So if this is what's supposed to feed their livestock, they're used to getting this, you can understand why passing this disaster relief portion to fully fund the ag bill to help them out is very, very important.

Another producer brought this, which is the stalk and even a worse—well, it's not even an ear of corn. It's decayed, it hasn't formed, and that's what a lot of our producers are seeing in Illinois during this time.

Now, our agriculture producers are a healthy stock, and they understand that the world is changing and that there are spending and fiscal challenges and difficulties. They're asking for a simple premise. They just want to be able to have an ag insurance product that they can rely on, that they can choose to buy into or not. They don't want to be placed in a position of having no ag insurance and then depending upon if there's a drought on disaster

payments from the national government, as has happened in the past before we really had a safety net and an ag insurance program and plan.

They know that other provisions of the ag bill are going by the wayside. They know that direct payments are going to go by the wayside. So they are just very concerned, as they should be, that this is the end of the authorization of a current farm bill. The important thing is to get the next farm bill reauthorized so that, when they start buying the seed and planning which field they're going to plant what crop, they can then make a decision whether they want to insure that crop, and they will have some expectation that if they have another bad year they will at least be able to survive to the next year.

Giving a last story about my ag producers, I was up in another part of central Illinois. I was talking to one of the producers, and he projected—and I didn't know for sure that his loss of his crop was about \$400,000, which is a pretty big loss. With ag insurance, his loss is only going to be \$200,000.

Now, I know you, Mr. Speaker, come from a business background, but I think it's very important to let the American public know that these producers are still going to have a loss even with an ag insurance product out there. They're not going to make them whole. But what they will do is allow them to give it another go the next year and get back into the field. That's the importance of an ag bill.

Again, I really salute Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON, and I look forward to talking to my colleagues on the importance of having an ag bill, a long ag bill, a 5-year ag bill, so that our producers have some certainty when, as this year has shown, there could be uncertain times that they are powerless to control. If there were a private sector option, maybe we could have that debate of whether there should be ag insurance at all.

But the reality is the only insurance product available is that in which the Federal Government will help offset some of the cost, let the producers have some skin in the game, and then let's manage these risks so that we could still have the safest, least expensive food supply in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to turn my attention now to some problem statements coming out from the majority leader of the other body, Mr. REID, on a commissioner of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I pulled from the Web site the values statement and the principles of good regulation which is on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission site. And one of the first things on here, it says:

Independence: Nothing but the highest possible standards of ethical performance and professionalism should influence regulation.

Now, as we have learned from press reports on Monday, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID got angry, and for once, it wasn't directed at Republicans.

He directed his tirade at Bill Magwood, a commissioner at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Why did he focus such venom and energy at a little known public official at an independent agency? He thought he had successfully strong-armed an independent commissioner to vote the way he wanted to. In fact, the majority leader is acting—we all hate bullies, Mr. Speaker, and to have the majority leader of the Senate be a bully to a commissioner duly appointed being independent is egregious.

According to one article:

Reid said he was assured by Pete Rouse, a senior White House official, that Magwood would also oppose Yucca.

Now, Reid thinks Magwood worked against the effort to shut down Yucca. For that, Reid says Magwood is "one of the most unethical, prevaricating, incompetent people I've ever dealt with."

Now, this is the majority leader of the Senate besmirching a duly appointed commissioner confirmed by the Senate because the leader of the Senate has believed he had this person's vote versus the principles of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Nothing but the highest possible standards of ethical performance and professionalism should influence regulation.

Magwood unethical? I think the majority leader has got it backwards. Isn't it unethical for Members of Congress to pressure government officials to vote a certain way on adjudications? Now Senator REID is on a tirade because he thinks his intimidation wasn't successful in convincing Commissioner Magwood to ignore the law.

Senator REID wasn't embarrassed, though. He threw a party for his former employee, who is now the ex-commissioner. That's the kind of behavior that the public has had concerns with. This is publicly documented in the record. These are quotes by the majority leader of the Senate. It's not debatable that Commissioner Magwood is a duly appointed and confirmed commissioner of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission confirmed by the Senate and appointed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, now I will go to the other part.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the Senate or its Members.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I will just read the Senator's quote that's quoted in the story:

Reid said he was assured by Pete Rouse, a senior White House official, that Magwood would also oppose Yucca. "I met with him because Pete Rouse asked me to meet with him. I said, 'Is he okay on Yucca Mountain?'" Pete said, "Yeah."

□ 1940

The story continues:

Reid said that Magwood's behind-the-scenes maneuvering was unforgivable. "He's a first-class rat. He lied to Rouse, he lied to me, and he had a plan."

Mr. Speaker, I'm not making this up. This is quotes. I'm not assuming what the majority leader's intentions were. I'm just reading quotes in a recently published newspaper about the majority leader of the Senate's position to a duly appointed and confirmed member of an independent regulatory commission. I think the leader owes Commissioner Magwood an apology.

With that, Mr. Speaker, as I said in my opening comments, this gives me an opportunity to cover farm bill issues, national nuclear regulatory issues, some international issues.

I've been concerned about democracy in Eastern European countries for many years, so let me come to the floor to you to talk about Ukraine and the former Prime Minister. Ms. Tymoshenko continues to serve a 7-year sentence in Kharkiv, while being prosecuted in multiple criminal cases amid international outcry from the United States and the European Union.

The trial against Ms. Tymoshenko in the gas case was described as "selective justice" and "political persecution" in statements by the U.S. and the EU. The court found Ms. Tymoshenko guilty of abuse of her power, sentenced her to 7 years in prison, and ordered her to pay the state 188 million.

On October 24, 2011, Ms. Tymoshenko filed an appeal against the sentence, which was rejected on December 23, 2011. On December 30, 2011, Ms. Tymoshenko was transferred to a penal colony in Kharkiv, where her health has significantly deteriorated. The doctors who were allowed to examine her this past February stated that she was ill, in constant pain, and required significant care.

Ms. Tymoshenko went on a hunger strike from April 20 to May 9 in protest of what has happened to Ukrainian democracy and what is happening to her in prison.

I support my colleague, CHRIS SMITH's resolution, House Resolution 730, calling on Ukrainian authorities to release political opposition leaders and hold free and fair elections. The resolution calls for denying U.S. visas to Ukrainian officials involved in serious human rights abuses, anti-democratic actions, such as electoral fraud, or corruption, including officials involved in selective prosecution, persecution of political opponent.

I call on Ukrainian officials to immediately free Ms. Tymoshenko.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I spend time following, as I said, democracy issues in Eastern European areas, former captive nations, and I come to the floor also to talk about democracy in Belarus.

I continue to be gravely concerned about the condition of political prisoners in Belarus and serious violations by Belarus of its commitments to respect human rights, fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law.

Despite the release of two political prisoners, former presidential candidate Andrei Sannikov and his associate, Dmitry Bondarenko, the fundamentals of President Lukashenka's dictatorial rule have not changed. Thirteen political prisoners remain in prison, including Mikalai Statkevich, Ales Bialiatiski, Syarhei Kavalenka, Zmitser Dashkevich, Pavel Seviarynets, Mikalai Autukhovich, Eduard Lobov and Mikalai Dziadok.

While journalist Andrzej Poczobut has been released pending trial, we believe that his arrest for illegally defaming the president was politically motivated and that the conditions imposed on his release are designed to further limit his ability to exercise his human rights. Moreover, recent days have seen the surge of the offices of the Union of Poles and the confiscation of equipment supposedly related to Mr. Poczobut's case.

We also recently have seen the arrest and detention and the release of journalist Pavel Sverdlov of the European Radio for Belarus for "using foul language." Maybe we should consider that here sometimes. Such arrests and short-term detentions are becoming an ever-more common means to silence dissent in Belarus.

Increased restrictions on Alex Bialyatski and the court order issued July 4 for seizure of the offices of the Vyasna Human Rights Center are very disturbing.

Belarus, which already has applied travel restrictions on members of the opposition and human rights activists, recently has taken another step to restrict the fundamental freedom of movement, the right to leave one's country and return to it.

On July 12, the Belarusian authorities denied the right of Victor Kornienko, cochairman of the Initiative for Fair and Free Elections, to travel to Vienna to participate in the week's Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting. This restriction of Mr. Kornienko's freedom of movement calls into question Belarus' sincerity and commitment to change. The U.S. must protest this latest disregard of fundamental freedoms by Belarus.

The U.S. must call on Belarus to release all political prisoners immediately and unconditionally, to restore their full political and civil rights, and to stop the ongoing harassment of political activists, civil society representatives, human rights activists, and independent journalists.

Mr. Speaker, can I ask how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, last but not least, what I've done on a weekly basis is raise the issue of concern and address the high-level nuclear waste storage site in issue in this country. And so I really—since we're very close to the end of the session, very few working days here left in Washington before the elections, I'm not sure how

many more days I'll have available to come down to the floor—I'm finishing where I started over a year ago, going through the country and comparing nuclear waste sites to where they're at and where they should be. And why would I do this?

Well, I would do this to help educate you, Speaker, on the fact that we have high-level nuclear waste stored throughout this country. And a lot of people do not know that we tried to address this in 1982 with passage of a law called the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. And in 1987, and I wasn't here then, but this Chamber, this body, this country said, not only do we want to find a way to store our high-level nuclear waste, but we want it placed in a mountain, underneath a mountain in a desert. And that place is called Yucca Mountain.

Now, since that time we've spent about \$15 billion over 30 years investigating, doing the scientific studies to see if Yucca Mountain, again, a mountain in a desert, is a suitable place to put high-level nuclear waste. I believe it is, but I'm not a scientist.

So what this Chamber did a couple of week ago is, in our appropriation bill, we asked our colleagues should we, as a national government, commit the final dollars to do the final scientific study to come to a final conclusion of whether Yucca Mountain is safe. Over about 326 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, both Republicans and Democrats, from rural areas to urban areas, said let's keep going with the current public policy. Let's finish the study so we know if Yucca Mountain is indeed safe, and let's move to address our high-level nuclear waste and concerns throughout this country.

Why is that important?

Well, let's go to one site. Now, for you, Mr. Speaker, I've done this almost at least every month, probably every week we've been in session, going around the country at different locations from Tennessee to Illinois to Maryland, but where I started first is a very telling and educational location, and it's called Hanford.

□ 1950

Now, Hanford. I have a lot of colleagues and a lot of the new observers of our process here in Washington who sometimes think they should just shut down all government—stop spending, and don't have a Department of Energy. Sometimes you have to have a Department, and Hanford is a perfect example. Hanford is a legacy World War II nuclear waste site. We are still paying for winning World War II, and we are still paying for developing the nuclear weapons that stopped the war, especially in Asia. Obviously, the bombs dropped in Japan. And how are we paying for it? Well, we still have Hanford. I'll tell you that Hanford is right in the central, deep southern part of Washington State. This is the Columbia River.

So what do we have in Hanford?

At Hanford, we have 53 million gallons of nuclear waste on site. Now, this is not spent nuclear fuel. This is the chemical sludge—highly toxic and very nasty stuff—that was used to help, kind of refine uranium into the fuel needed to have nuclear weapons. There are 53 million gallons. If you've ever been by a refinery and if you've seen a tank farm with crude oil—you'll see these great big tanks where some might be 750,000 gallons and some might be a million gallons—that's what's at Hanford, but they're all buried underground. In these tanks are the 53 million gallons of this toxic sludge, and as I point to it here, some of it is leaking. Now, the waste is stored 10 feet underground because it's buried underground. It is 250 feet above the water table. Remember, some of this is leaking, and it's 1 mile from the Columbia River.

So I ask the question: Is there a better site?

I think the government, over the years, has said there is a better place to put this stuff. In fact, this stuff is being processed and placed into canisters to go to one location, and that location is Yucca Mountain.

Now, Yucca Mountain should have been opened years ago. What do we have at this site at Yucca Mountain?

Right now, there is no nuclear waste on site. The waste will be stored 1,000 feet underground versus 10 feet. The waste would be 1,000 feet above the water table versus 250 feet. The waste would be 100 miles from the Colorado River versus 1 mile from the Columbia River.

So I think the choice is fairly clear. Our promise to Washington State, like our promise to the nuclear utilities, was that, as they created this mess, we as a Nation—national government—would take it over and that we would safely store it in a single repository. That repository is here. However, we're not there yet.

The question is: Why aren't we there?

Because we have a Senate that is blocking the ability to have the final votes and to pay for the final scientific study to get this moving. And who is the majority leader of the Senate? Senator HARRY REID. But let's look at the Senators from the region. Where are they at on this issue? Who are the Senators who border the Columbia River? Well, it's pretty telling.

Senator MURRAY has voted "yes" for Yucca Mountain. Senator WYDEN from Oregon has voted "yes." Senator MERKLEY has a "no stated position." We don't know where he's at, although I think it would be a very important issue for that area. Senator CANTWELL voted "no" on moving the high-level nuclear waste from Hanford to Yucca Mountain.

Why is looking at individual Senators and where they're at on this position important?

Because there are 100 Senators. With the way the rules in the other Chamber work, they really have to have 60 to

really move a bill on the floor, so I've been trying to do a tally of where these Senators are. Either in public statements or in having cast votes either in their Chamber or as former Members of the House, 55 say, yes, Yucca Mountain should be our long-term geological repository and that we should be taking all our nuclear waste and putting it in a safe, secure cave in a mountain in a desert. For 22, we don't know their positions, and that's a lot of Senators. For 23, we have "nays." So, if Senator CANTWELL would move from a "nay" to a "yea," you're at 56. Then you really need only four more Senators, and there is a whole boatload. Some of them are up for reelection, and they haven't had a chance to make a public statement or to have a position on nuclear waste in 6 years.

What I find very confusing is that, in these 6 years, a lot of them come from States that have nuclear waste. Again, I like to talk about Hanford because this is Department of Defense waste that was created in developing the atomic bombs to win the Cold War—not the Cold War. Well, actually, they won the Cold War, too. They will say: a mutual assured destruction, an ability to have nuclear weapons to help protect Western Europe and to, really, protect the world. A lot of those weapons were created and developed right here at Hanford, but we still have the waste remaining. So we are looking for five more U.S. Senators to be able to move the bill on the floor and to pay for the final scientific study so as to keep our promise to the American people and to those who sacrificed land and location like Hanford.

The U.S. Government just kind of swooped in and said, We need this place. I think the story goes, We're going to do hydroelectric power. It's going to be cheap fuel because we're going to need a lot of energy. They displaced farmers. They took over the land, and we've left 53 million gallons of nuclear waste on site. We owe it to them to get it to a safe, secure location.

The Federal Government realized that in 1982 by passing a law called the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The Federal Government then amended that law in 1987. In the years following, we moved diligently to finalize the preparations so that we could move forward. Then we hit a roadblock, and that roadblock was the election of President Obama, who made a promise to the majority leader of the Senate that we'll stop movement on Yucca Mountain—after 30 years, \$15 billion, and no solution in sight. Now there is talk about, well, maybe we can do something else. I can guarantee you, if we do something else, it's going to take—what?—30 more years, and it's going to take \$15 billion. At the end of that, we're going to come to the same conclusion where we're not going to have a solution.

So, when you hear people talk about interim storage, we have interim storage. Guess where it's at? It's around

our major metropolitan areas. It's around Chicago. It's around Boston, Massachusetts. It's around Los Angeles. We have interim storage, and that's our nuclear utilities. Now we have interim storage in Hanford, Washington.

It is time for us as a body to man up—to accept our responsibilities, to finish the scientific study, and to have a long-term geological repository underneath a mountain in a desert so that we keep our promises and so that we protect this land for future generations.

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

□ 2000

TROUBLING TIMES

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. Mr. Speaker, these are interesting times we live in, and it's nice to follow my friend, Mr. SHIMKUS, a graduate of the United States Military Academy, a servant of this country in the military, and still a servant in this country. It's good to call him friend. Hopefully he calls me friend, as well.

These are troubling times. When the name Justice Department depicts something other than justice, it's a very troubling time. Some of us are extremely familiar with the prosecution of what most would consider the most significant, largest prosecution of terrorism support and funding in the United States history, which occurred in Federal district court in Dallas, Texas. It was begun under the Bush Justice Department, all part of the aftermath of 9/11 because, as President Bush indicated, we can't just go after the people that actually plotted and carried out the events of 9/11, who plotted and carried out other terrorist attacks against the United States. It's not enough. We've got to go after those who have supported those efforts at terrorism, have supported the killing of innocent people around the world. And particularly, we have to protect Americans. And for those who have supported terrorism and continue to support terrorism, the United States must step forward in order to protect itself.

The Justice Department in November of 2008, I believe, got convictions of the individuals they had prosecuted in the Holy Land Foundation trial. Not only did they get convictions, they got over 100 different counts in which they got convictions. Through that, there were names of coconspirators who were named and set forward in the pleadings, and evidence was introduced, admitted into evidence at trial that showed there were groups and individuals in the United States that were

supporting terrorism, and there was significant evidence to support that.

In fact, two of those groups, CAIR and the Islamic Society of North America, ISNA, had moved that their names be stricken from the pleadings as named coconspirators in supporting terrorism. At that time, the acting U.S. Attorney did a very good job not only in the prosecution, but also in the pleading to the Federal district court there before Judge Solis, and he established plenty of evidence so that Judge Solis found there was plenty of evidence to support the coconspirators continuing to have their names in the pleading, and they were not satisfied with the ruling of the Federal district court. They appealed to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals ended up ruling that, yes, there was plenty of evidence to support the fact that CAIR, ISNA, and others were supporting terrorism, so their names would not be stricken from the pleadings, they would be kept in the pleadings as named coconspirators of terrorism.

After that very successful prosecution that was in conformity with President Bush's promise that if you're not with us, you're with them, and those who support terrorism would be made to account, that began the first stage of the prosecution of supporters of terrorism. Those were people and individual cases, those were organizations right here in America that were supporting terrorism, funding terrorism. Yes, they were supporting charities. Yes, they were giving money to good causes. That acted as a cover for them also funding terrorism, funding known terrorist organizations who had actually killed people and destroyed things, committing acts of war.

Then, the Attorney General became Eric Holder. The President, the Commander in Chief, became Barack Hussein Obama. We know it's okay to use the President's full name, because he proudly uses it when he goes to Muslim nations. In fact, the first nations the President went to and apologized for America's arrogance and divisiveness, dismissiveness were Muslim nations. In fact, going to Cairo, he snubbed America's ally, Israel's ally, Mubarak, who is not a fine, upstanding wonderful man but a man who had managed to keep some peace along the Israel border, a man who had agreements with this government just as this government had agreements with Qadhafi, despite the blood on his hands from terrorist involvement himself. In fact, I've read of reports of people even from our own Senate who have been over there, one who had tweeted that he had met with Colonel Qadhafi: "He was an interesting man. I met with him at his ranch." I understand that Senator now says that tweet didn't come from him.

But there were Americans from this government negotiating with Qadhafi, working out agreements, and then they turned their backs on people with whom they had worked agreements:

Mubarak, Qadhafi. I don't think we should have worked agreements with Qadhafi because of the blood on his hands, American blood on his hands. But it had been done, and yet this Nation turned its back on allies. It was no surprise to me to read that the King of Jordan—another person with whom we have a relatively good relationship—had sought an appointment with Ahmadinejad in Iran once he saw the way this administration not only turned its back on allies, but also would contribute to bombing to get them out of office. It's an amazing thing.

Then, being part of the Judiciary Committee here in Washington, some of us became very troubled that despite all of this substantive evidence—I've got a stack of it in my office from that Holy Land Foundation trial—substantiating allegations, at least to the satisfaction of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and the district court, that CAIR and ISNA and others should be named coconspirators, this Justice Department chose not to prosecute anyone else. Once again, using the old tactic, Well, the Bush administration didn't prosecute them. They did stage one, they got the initial prosecutions, and if those were successful, they intended to continue looking and pursuing all those who were implicated and could have cases proved, especially where there was substantial evidence, as there was with CAIR and ISNA.

Instead of prosecuting CAIR and ISNA, this administration—and there's no question about this—despite the fussing and nay-saying of some once proud journalists of some once proud journalistic television networks, once proud newspapers, despite their failure to do their homework, despite their taking the easy road and simply asking opinions, Well, what do you think about these terrible accusations, and getting opinions instead of simply digging and looking at the facts and presenting the fact, they sought opinions on things that people had not even read. They asked opinions about letters that people had not read. They asked opinions about general tenor without actually showing people the tenor of the letters.

□ 2010

And, unfortunately, some are always willing to respond without having read or reviewed the matter before them which they are being questioned about.

But the facts are the facts. On the White House's own Web site, last time I checked, there were references to ISNA. There are references to ISNA's president, Imam Magid, who, as I understand, has now written a letter wanting condemnation of me and others who simply set out factual recitations to five different departments and then asked the question, Would you please investigate to see the extent of Muslim Brotherhood influence in this administration in this department.

We know there's Muslim Brotherhood influence. The question is how much influence is there?

When the White House's own Web site was carrying compliments, such as those spoken by Denis McDonough, the number two person in our National Security Agency, complimenting Imam Magid for the wonderful prayers he had given inside the sanctity of the White House itself, for the White House's iftar celebration during Ramadan. Compliments to Imam Magid, the president of the main coconspirator, for the wonderful introduction he gave the number two person in the National Security Agency.

And within the FBI itself—it took until 2009 for the FBI to finally write a letter saying, Gee, because of all this evidence that came out about CAIR supporting terrorism in the Holy Land Foundation trial in 2008, we have suspended our relationship with them. At one place in the letter, they referred to it as a “partner” or a “partnership.”

So there's no question there is Muslim Brotherhood influence in this administration. Anybody that says otherwise will likely find that they will end up at the lowest level of Nielsen ratings in their history, or at least in 20 years or so, because they simply are not doing their homework. It's much easier to bash the messenger than it is to actually do homework. And in fairness, I know there have been lots of budget cuts. It's tough for some entities, some networks to do the research they once did when they were much more popular. But, nonetheless, the truth is the truth. Facts are facts.

The question remains: Just how extensive is the influence of the Muslim Brotherhood in this administration? We know that the ACLU and CAIR have been demanding documentation of what trainees have been taught in our Justice Department, in other departments, making FOIA, Freedom of Information Act, requests trying to get information on what we are training our undercover agents, if any we have.

Apparently, this administration has no problem outing people we have undercover in dangerous situations. At least somebody who has information about the very inner workings of this administration has leaked classified information. It remains to be found out who it is, but it is somebody that has access to some of the most important classified inner workings.

Yet you've got CAIR and the ACLU demanding information about the information that was used to train these people. And the facts are that if you ever disclose that—and as I understand, our Justice Department was preparing to provide all that information to CAIR and to ACLU—and if they provide all of the information on exactly how people who have been undercover in radical Islamic situations, it will be easy for those individuals to be outed and killed because they'll know what their training is and their approach to radical Islam. They'll know the meth-

ods and means of our undercover, of our intelligence. And yet this administration continues to cater to such requests to accommodate complaints about CAIR.

CAIR individuals can call the White House, as apparently was written up in material in the media after last August. They were complaining about people who were going to give a seminar to hundreds of law enforcement individuals. CAIR makes one call, as it was reported at least, makes a call to the White House. The seminar gets canceled. Hundreds of law enforcement individuals do not end up being taught about the inner workings of those who want to kill and destroy our way of life. And CAIR is happy.

Just how far does the influence of the Muslim Brotherhood go? We know from the evidence in the Holy Land Foundation trial that ISNA is the largest Muslim Brotherhood front organization in America. And President Obama has had President Imam Magid in the inner sanctum of the State Department to listen to the speech that he gave, trying to upstage Prime Minister Netanyahu when he was on his way over here in May of last year.

The report was that Imam Magid had actually given him advice on what he should say. Who knows, perhaps what Imam Magid said was, Oh, yes, Israel has agreed to go back to the 1967 boundary lines, so you can include that in your speech. Who knows.

We wanted an Inspector General investigation to find out in the State Department, Defense Department, intelligence department, in these five departments just how extensive is the Muslim Brotherhood influence. We know it's there. Most Americans know it's there. There are some that still drink the Kool-Aid and refuse to acknowledge the facts that have been proven in court.

There are facts that actually the prosecutor of the 1993 World Trade Center bombings has pointed out in his article—that's Andrew McCarthy—he has pointed out, We proved to New York jurors, wonderful New York jurors, beyond a reasonable doubt that there was this radical Islamic presence in America; and they did want to take over our country, that there is a civilization jihad. Some want to do it radically with violence. Some want to take over from inside our own governmental and civic organizations, and they're working toward that goal.

There's no question about so many of these things. The question is, How far does the influence go? That's what we need to know.

So we asked the question, and we had Attorney General Holder before our committee last year. And he was asked the question, Did you or did politics have any consideration in the refusal to prosecute any of the other named coconspirators about which the Fifth Circuit said there is plenty of evidence to support their involvement? Was there political involvement in that decision?

Well, we didn't know it at the time; but since then, more recently, in the last couple of months, we've had the Attorney General testify before our committee that there are political aspects to justice, from his standpoint, which fly in the face of everything that any good law school, any legitimate law school has ever taught its law students.

Justice is supposed to be blind. That's why the statue that depicts justice, holding the scales of justice, is blinded, is wearing a blindfold. Because justice is blind if it's real justice. And if justice is not blind, if we're looking to who it is and politically what the consequences will be, it's not justice. There are no political aspects to justice—or it's not true justice. And I'm afraid that's where we've gotten to in this so-called Justice Department.

So we had the Attorney General say, Oh, no, no, no. There is no political involvement. In fact, I said to my friend TRENT FRANKS, Gee, in fact, the U.S. Attorney handling that—I believe it was quoted in a newspaper—I believe it was the Dallas News—he said there was no politics involved in those dismissals because there was just no case there. There was no evidence to support it.

□ 2020

Well, I happened to have read that Dallas Morning News report, and I happen to have read the quotes from that acting U.S. Attorney. And yes, he did say it was local; politics weren't involved. But that is not what he said. He says no, the evidence wasn't there, which is entirely different since he was not under penalty of potential jail when he spoke to a reporter, but he was under potential penalty of jail. If you ever commit a fraud upon a court by not giving all of the information or misrepresenting to a judge or tricking a judge by not being truthful, you can be looking at jail time. Lawyers before me knew that. I didn't care about politics, but I cared about truth.

I cared about it in the Bush administration. So when we found out there were abuses of the National Security Letter, I was furious. And I grilled the Bush director of the FBI at that time. I was surprised there weren't more Democrats that were nearly as outraged as I was because that was so offensive. It was so improper. It was so unjust. I don't care who the President is; justice is justice. And for our Attorney General to act like oh, no, no, there wasn't anything. And then I know. I read the pleadings of that U.S. Attorney where he said there's plenty of evidence to support the name of CAIR and others being in here. And he convinced the Fifth Circuit of the same thing. So he was either lying to the courts or he was lying to the paper about the evidence.

And now, after having had the head of civil rights of this Justice Department, Mr. Perez, testify that gee, there was no political aspect in the decision not to pursue the New Black Panther

Party for what they did at a polling place in Pennsylvania, and now we have found out this week, Human Events has a great article, "Federal judge rules political appointees interfered with voter intimidation case." That's from August 2, posted at 2:12 p.m.

There's one from the American Spectator about the fact that Thomas Perez, assistant attorney general, is one of the most destructive forces against the rule of law in this Nation, including being the man responsible for the DOJ dropping charges against the New Black Panthers for voter intimidation in Philadelphia during the last Presidential election. It goes on to talk about he appeared before the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Constitution, which is a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and it goes on to say that he questioned Assistant Attorney General Perez over the administration's commitment to First Amendment rights. His questions were prompted by a Daily Caller article from late last year in which Perez was quoted as warmly embracing the proposals of Islamist advocates in a meeting at George Washington University, among them a request for a legal declaration that U.S. citizens' criticism of Islam constitutes racial discrimination.

Well, we know that one of the 10-year goals of the Muslim Brotherhood is to subvert the U.S. Constitution to sharia law. And once they convince enough people that it should be a crime to burn a Koran or to criticize Islam, then they can check that box.

I believe in the Bible. My eternity is based on belief of the Bible. But I also know under the U.S. Constitution, you can burn a Bible. I took a pledge and was willing to lay down my life, my 4 years in the Army, for our flag, but I also understand it's constitutional to burn a flag. And yet we have people in this injustice department saying they want to make it a crime to criticize Islam. No wonder they're purging their training materials, eliminating references to Islam.

As one intelligence officer of this government told me, we are blinding our ability to see our enemy, and that can and will have dangerous consequences if we don't turn it around.

Mr. Speaker, wrapping up here before we take this August recess that isn't a recess because we will be in pro forma session, we're willing, most of us, Republicans are willing to come back. All we have to know is that the Senate is finally doing something to pass some of the jobs bills we've sent their way. And in fairness, what we need is Republican leadership that will say okay, Senate, you want this bill, then you are going to have to pass some of the economic and jobs bills that will get this economy going, but we haven't used the leverage Republicans in the House have. And, unfortunately, with all of the talk about agreeing to another CR, it just means that we'll have finished out 2

years without cutting anything significant, as we promised 2 years ago after the biggest wave election in American history since the 1930s.

It's time for Americans to make clear you want Congress to do what was promised when the Congressmen got elected. And if we do that, it doesn't matter how obstructive the Senate is, it will make it even more clear if we use our leverage and say: Hey, people, the government is shut down on weekends, you seem to live okay. Let's get back to just essential needs of the government. Allow a shutdown of other things. Pass my bill that will make sure our military gets paid during a shutdown, we know Social Security recipients will still get their payments in the event of a shutdown, and keep the government shut down until everybody understands we're going to start living within our means as a Congress, like all Americans have to do, or declare bankruptcy. They have to do that. We can't afford to declare bankruptcy. We must get this government under control. I hope that constituents across the country during this month will make that clear, and we'll replace the Senators who are standing in the way of getting this economy going, that we'll replace the administration who is creating injustice and allowing radical Islamic jihadists to have any influence at all.

The Secretary of Homeland Security sat there and told me that it did absolutely not happen, that a member of a terrorist organization had been allowed in the White House; 6 days later, she not only admits to the Senate that it did happen after she told me absolutely not, but she said: Oh, but it's okay; we vetted him three times.

It's time for a government that is more considerate and concerned about providing for the common defense, of getting out of the way and letting the economy grow than they are about playing favorites, playing to their cronies, and playing against religious freedom.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending a memorial service for her first chief of staff in Houston, Texas.

SENATE BILL AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1409. An act to intensify efforts to identify, prevent, and recover payment error, waste, fraud, and abuse within Federal spending; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Barbara Barrett as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1369. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1021 Pennsylvania Avenue in Hartshorne, Oklahoma, as the "Warren Lindley Post Office".

H.R. 1560. An act to amend the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama and Coshatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act to allow the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo Tribe to determine blood quantum requirement for membership in that tribe.

H.R. 1627. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish hospital care and medical services to veterans who were stationed at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, while the water was contaminated at Camp Lejeune, to improve the provision of housing assistance to veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1905. An act to strengthen Iran sanctions laws for the purpose of compelling Iran to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons and other threatening activities and for other purposes.

H.R. 3276. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2810 East Hillsborough Avenue in Tampa, Florida, as the "Reverend Abe Brown Post Office Building".

H.R. 3412. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1421 Veterans Memorial Drive in Abbeville, Louisiana, as the "Sergeant Richard Franklin Abshire Post Office Building".

H.R. 3501. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 125 Kerr Avenue in Rome City, Indiana, as the "SPC Nicholas Scott Hartge Post Office".

H.R. 3772. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 150 South Union Street in Canton, Mississippi, as the "First Sergeant Landres Cheeks Post Office Building".

H.R. 5986. An act to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to extend the third-country fabric program and to add South Sudan to the list of countries eligible for designation under that Act, to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States relating to the textile and apparel rules of origin for the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 270. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Deschutes County, Oregon.

S. 271. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a property conveyance with the city of Wallowa, Oregon, and for other purposes.

S. 739. An act to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to establish battery recharging

stations for privately owned vehicles in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the Senate at no net cost to the Federal Government.

S. 3363. An act to provide for the use of National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center Commemorative Coin surcharges, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 3, 2012, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7167. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Export and Reexport Controls to Rwanda and United Nations Sanctions under the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 110725414-1480-01] (RIN: 0694-AF31) received July 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7168. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 03849; Amdt. No. 3485] received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7169. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Livingston, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0139; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANM-3] received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7170. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Pontiac, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1142; Airspace Docket No. 11-AGL-22] received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7171. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Memphis, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1211; Airspace Docket No. 11-ASO-40] received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7172. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class D Airspace; Andalusia, AL and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Fort Rucker, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1457; Airspace Docket No. 11-ASO-47] received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7173. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Lakehurst, NJ [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0456; Airspace Docket No. 12-AEA-9] received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7174. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Southwestern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0286; Airspace Docket No. 11-AWP-22] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7175. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Fairfield, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0196; Airspace Docket No. 12-AWP-2] received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7176. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Eureka, NV [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1333; Airspace Docket No. 11-AWP-19] received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7177. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Woodland, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0354; Airspace Docket No. 12-AWP-3] received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7178. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30851; Amdt. No. 3486] received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7179. A letter from the SLSDC Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Seaway Regulations and Rules: Periodic Update, Various Categories [Docket No.: SLSDC-2012-0001] (RIN: 2135-AA30) received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7180. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting recommended modifications of the project authorization to increase the authorized cost of the Little Calumet River, Indiana, Local Flood Control and Recreation Project; (H. Doc. No. 112-131); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

7181. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Corps Final Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement; (H. Doc. No. 112-130); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

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. 5949. a bill to extend the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 for five years; with an amendment (Rept. 112-645, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 5949. A bill to extend the FISA Amendments Act of

2008 for five years; with an amendment (Rept. 112-645, Pt. 2). 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. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 6272. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to expand the clinical trial registry data bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 6273. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. RAHALL:

H.R. 6274. A bill to amend the Indian Arts and Crafts Act to clarify the definition of Indian and Indian organization for the purposes of that Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey):

H.R. 6275. A bill to promote the domestic development and deployment of clean energy technologies required for the 21st century; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Science, Space, and Technology, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANDRY:

H.R. 6276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Commercial Fishing, Farm, and Ranch Risk Management Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 6277. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security from purchasing equipment or military aircraft containing electronic components that are not manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 6278. A bill to optimize Federal data center usage and efficiency; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 6279. A bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BARBER, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 6280. A bill to apply a Whole-of-Government Plan that integrates the full capabilities and authorities of each Federal department and agency, in coordination with the Government of Mexico, to combat Mexican-based transnational criminal organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, 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. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 6281. A bill to increase Federal Pell Grants for the children of fallen police officers, firefighters, and other public safety officers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 6282. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management, to convey to the City of Carlin, Nevada, in exchange for consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States, to any Federal land within that city that is under the jurisdiction of that agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H.R. 6283. A bill to enable States to establish reinsurance programs or high risk pools to ensure that high risk individuals are able to access health insurance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. RICHARDSON (for herself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 6284. A bill to establish a grant program for nebulizers in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 6285. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the former Mifflin County Army Reserve Center in Lewistown, Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FARR:

H.R. 6286. A bill to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 6287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BOREN, and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H.R. 6288. A bill to amend chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit provisional approval of fast track products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. KELLY, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 6289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand access to Coverdell education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 6290. A bill to prohibit the deployment of a unit or individual of the United States Armed Forces or element of the intelligence community in support of a North Atlantic Treaty Organization military operation absent express prior statutory authorization from Congress for such deployment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. GRUJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. CHU, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H.R. 6291. A bill to acknowledge donor contributions at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 6292. A bill to deny entry into the United States of officials of any foreign government, including their immediate family members, who commit or who fail to rectify fundamental due process and human rights violations of imprisoned United States citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 6293. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of civil relief to members of the uniformed services and to improve the enforcement of employment and reemployment rights of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 6294. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, and 37 of the United States Code to authorize the establishment of units of the National Guard in American Samoa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 6295. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the building of housing for moderate income seniors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 6296. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide the interest rate for certain disaster related loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 6297. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a presumption of service connection for certain veterans with tinnitus or hearing loss, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 6298. A bill to terminate the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide assistance under the Tenant Resource Network Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 6299. A bill to repeal the Federally subsidized loan program for non-profit health insurance, to provide for association health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 6300. A bill to provide adequate technical assistance and other support to States for long-term care partnership programs, and for other purposes; 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 Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 6301. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the United States Postal Service shall maintain the number of officers and employees necessary to meet its homeland security and natural disaster assistance responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 6302. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to prohibit funding under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance grant program and the Public Safety and Community Policing grant program to be provided to law enforcement agencies that use license plate readers unless certain conditions are met; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 6303. A bill to establish the Global Science Program for Security, Competitiveness, and Diplomacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 6304. A bill to designate the North American bison as the national mammal of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 6305. A bill to improve the efficiency of Federal Executive Boards to enhance the coordination, economy, and effectiveness of Federal agency activities, including emergency preparedness and continuity of operations, in geographic areas outside the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 6306. A bill to provide authorities for the appropriate conversion of temporary seasonal wildland firefighters and other temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies who perform regularly recurring seasonal work to permanent seasonal positions; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 6307. A bill to make certain luggage and travel articles eligible for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 6308. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, to submit to Congress, and make available to the public on the Internet, a report on the animals killed under the Wildlife Services program of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. REED, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 6309. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the special diabetes programs for Type I diabetes and Indians under that Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 6310. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reassert the authority of Congress to restrict spending by corporations and labor organizations on campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAROWSKY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. BASS of California, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 6311. A bill to prevent deaths occurring from drug overdoses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 6312. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to place certain synthetic drugs in Schedule I; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker,

in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 6313. A bill to promote peaceful and collaborative resolution of maritime territorial disputes in the South China Sea and its environs and other maritime areas adjacent to the East Asian mainland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 6314. A bill to enable the Department of Energy and a Commission on Energy Independence and Domestic Refining Capacity the ability to study, recommend, and implement Federal incentive packages that would sustain and increase domestic refining capacity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 6315. A bill to establish a commission to conduct a comprehensive review of Federal agencies and programs and to recommend the elimination or realignment of duplicative, wasteful, or outdated functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Appropriations, 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. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6316. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from income and employment taxes real property tax abatements for seniors and disabled individuals in exchange for services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 6317. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to repeal certain designation authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to repeal the Payment, Clearing, and Settlement Supervision Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 6318. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the "Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 6319. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for startup businesses to use a portion of the research and development credit to offset payroll taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HECK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H.R. 6320. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act so as to eliminate the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to limit the ability of medical providers to conduct lawful

business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 6321. A bill to terminate the Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 6322. A bill to require labor organizations to provide the notice to employees related to fees collection required pursuant to the Supreme Court cases *Teachers Local No. 1 v. Hudson* and *Knox v. Service Employees International Union*; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 6323. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit limitation for new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. BARROW):

H.R. 6324. A bill to reduce the number of nonessential vehicles purchased and leased by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 6325. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for higher education expenses in a program of study in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 6326. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit direct payment to pharmacies for certain compounded drugs that are prepared by the pharmacies for a specific beneficiary for use through an implanted infusion pump; 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. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 6327. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to improve eligibility requirements for uninsured individuals with a preexisting condition for coverage under the Preexisting Condition Insurance Program (PCIP); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HOCHUL:

H.R. 6328. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to transfer unclaimed clothing recovered at airport security checkpoints to local veterans organizations and other local charitable organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. HOCHUL:

H.R. 6329. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the research credit permanent, to increase the research credit for businesses manufacturing in the United States, and to make the research credit refundable for small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HOCHUL:

H.R. 6330. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for sentencing enhancements for certain identity theft offenses victimizing the elderly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary,

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. HONDA:

H.R. 6331. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition and the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 6332. A bill to establish a grant program to provide States with funds to detect fraud, waste, and abuse in the State Medicaid programs under title XIX of the Social Security Act and to recover improper payments resulting from such fraud, waste, and abuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 6333. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for Congressional oversight of agency rulemaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. BUERKLE, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 6334. A bill to provide that the individual mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act shall not be construed as a tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. FARR, Mr. STARK, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 6335. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act so as to exempt real property from civil forfeiture due to medical-marijuana-related conduct that is authorized by State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 6336. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a statue depicting Frederick Douglass from the District of Columbia and to provide for the permanent display of the statue in Emancipation Hall of the Capitol Visitor Center; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 6337. A bill to amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act to clarify how the Act applies to condominiums; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 6338. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by requiring a Federal emission permit for the sale or use of covered substances, reduce the deficit, and return funds to the American people; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 6339. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding access to stored communications and customer records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 6340. A bill to revoke a requirement of Executive Order 13618 with respect to the use of privately owned communications resources by the Secretary of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 6341. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a partial exclusion under section 911 for foreign earned income of employees of United States Government contractors who do not fulfill their foreign country residency requirements by reason of an Armed Forces troop reduction or similar cause beyond the employer's control; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 6342. A bill to allow the importation, distribution, and sale of investigational drugs and devices intended for use by terminally ill patients who execute an informed consent document; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 6343. A bill to transfer certain facilities, easements, and rights-of-way to Fort Sumner Irrigation District, New Mexico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 6344. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey lands of the former Fort Bayard Military Reservation in Grant County, New Mexico, to the village of Santa Clara, the city of Bayard, or the county of Grant in that State, in tracts of not less than 40 acres, and at market price at its present state of use as agricultural grazing lands as determined by the Secretary, for business and community development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. POMPEO (for himself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 6345. A bill to amend section 112(r) of the Clean Air Act (relating to prevention of accidental releases); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REHBERG (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BONNER):

H.R. 6346. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide a specific limited exemption from the overtime pay requirements of such Act for work related to insurance claims adjustment after a major disaster; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 6347. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require 20-year Congressional Budget Office cost estimates for bills or joint resolutions; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. BENISEK):

H.R. 6348. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to prevent the spread of Asian carp

in the Great Lakes and the tributaries of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROSS of Florida (for himself, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 6349. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to increase the maximum amount that may be paid to trustees for services rendered; to repeal provisions relating to the trustee administration of certain employee pension plans; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUNYAN (for himself, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. LOBONDO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. GUINTA):

H.R. 6350. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide additional flexibility for fishery managers, additional transparency for fishermen, a referendum for catch shares, and additional sources for fishery survey funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 6351. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9 of United States Code with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 6352. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 6353. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for patent box profit from the use of United States patents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 6354. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit P-31P; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TURNER of New York (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 6355. A bill to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 6356. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to change the membership of the Metropolitan Airports Authority Board of Directors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CHU, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Con. Res. 136. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the census surveys and the information derived from those surveys are crucial to the na-

tional welfare; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 755. A resolution in the matter of Representative Laura Richardson; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. HOLT):

H. Res. 756. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 10, 2012, as National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. AMODEI, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H. Res. 757. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Members of Congress should support and promote the respectful and dignified disposal of worn and tattered American flags; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. CHU, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FILNER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 758. A resolution designating a "National Month of Voter Registration"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H. Res. 759. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that supporting seniors and individuals with disabilities is an important responsibility of the United States, and that a comprehensive approach to expanding and supporting a strong home care workforce and making long-term services and supports affordable and accessible in communities is necessary to uphold the right of seniors and individuals with disabilities in the United States to a dignified quality of life; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. FUDGE):

H. Res. 760. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should reject the provisions of H.R. 6083, as ordered reported by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, that reduce the availability or amount of benefits provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program (SNAP) in effect under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H. Res. 761. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the practice of gassing stray cats and dogs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H. Res. 762. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding community-based civil defense and power generation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. SHULER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WEST):

H. Res. 763. A resolution condemning the targeted violence of vulnerable minority faith communities in Syria and calling on the United States Government to prioritize the safety and security of these communities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WEST, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. TOWNS):

H. Res. 764. A resolution recognizing and celebrating the 50th anniversary of Jamaica's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WEST, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. TOWNS):

H. Res. 765. A resolution recognizing the significance of the 50th anniversary of Trinidad and Tobago's independence to the people of Trinidad and Tobago and supporting the goals and ideals of Trinidad and Tobago's Independence Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H. Res. 766. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the restitution of or compensation for property seized during the Nazi and Communist eras; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

H. Res. 767. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives relating to increased transparency in the negotiations of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H. Res. 768. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to expand the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business to include nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 769. A resolution expressing support for Lunchtime Music on the Mall in Washington, DC, and honoring the public service of the performers and sponsors; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H. Res. 770. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that President Barack Obama should request authorization before sending the United States Armed Forces into Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey:

H. Res. 771. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 14th as National Solidarity Day for Compassionate Patient Care to promote national awareness of the importance of compassionate and respectful relationships between health care

professionals and their patients as reflected in attitudes that are sensitive to the values, autonomy, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds of patients and families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H. Res. 772. A resolution condemning the Kurdistan Workers' Party and supporting a peaceful dialogue with Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

262. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 136 requesting the Federal Energy Commission to immediately reject any requests for a rehearing regarding Cheniere Energy's Sabine Pass Liquefaction Project; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

263. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 149 urging the government to take all necessary steps to formally recognize the Louisiana Precinct of the Southern Bend of the Cherokee Nation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

264. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 46 approving the comprehensive master plan for integrated coastal protection; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

265. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31 supporting the comments of the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, calling for the USACE-NO District to implement changes to the Modified Charleston Method; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. MARKEY:

H.R. 6272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 6273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 6274.

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. FILNER:

H.R. 6275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 1, 2, and 18), which grant Congress the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States; to borrow money on the credit of the United States; and to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. LANDRY:

H.R. 6276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 6277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 6278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 6279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 6280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 6281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 6282.

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 make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, impost and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 6284.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6285.

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 14 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces."

By Mr. FARR:

H.R. 6286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 6287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 6288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8 Congress has the power 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. GARDNER:

H.R. 6289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Clause 18: 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. KUCINICH:

H.R. 6290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is Article I, Section 8, which enumerates the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. The bill will assert Congress' constitutionally granted authority to decide whether America enters into war, continues a war, or otherwise introduces armed forces or materiel into hostilities.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 6291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 6292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 6293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8:

The Congress shall have power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

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. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 6294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 14—to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 16—the Congress shall have Power To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 15—the Congress shall have Power To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions.

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2—the Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to

Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 6295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 6296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to “Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution Clause 18.”

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 6297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 14

“To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces”

And;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 6298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 6299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Bankruptcy Regulation

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

The Congress shall have Power *** To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

Business Regulation

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 6300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 6301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause 7. To establish Post offices and Post roads.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 6302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 6303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1. “All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.”

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 6304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 6305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 6306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 6307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, commonly referred to as the Commerce Clause. The Commerce Clause states that the Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes. This bill changes U.S. trade

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 6308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 6309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section IV.

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 6311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 6312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 6313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 6314.

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, which states the United States Congress shall have power “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes”.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 6315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution; clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution; section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 6317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 (“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"), 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"), and 18 ("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. GARRETT:

H.R. 6318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 (To establish Post Offices and post Roads) and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (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. GERLACH:

H.R. 6319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 6320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, as it is necessary and proper to protect patients and the doctor/patient relationship.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 6321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution provides Congress with the power to tax, and to spend those taxes to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States. Thus, Congress can choose to reallocate funds from one priority to another should it deem it appropriate.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 6322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 6323.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 6324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

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. HANNA:

H.R. 6325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 6326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 6327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. HOCHUL:

H.R. 6328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. HOCHUL:

H.R. 6329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. HOCHUL:

H.R. 6330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 6331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6 of the Constitution—"To coin Money . . ."

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 6332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 6333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' powers granted under article I of the United States Constitution, including the power granted to Congress under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the United States Constitution, and the power granted to each House of Congress under article I, section 5, clause 2, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 6334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 6335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 6336.

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 exercise exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever, over the District of Columbia as described in Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 6337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8 clause 3.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 6338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 6339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3, 9 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 6340.

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. PALAZZO:

H.R. 6341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The powers granted through Article 1 Section 8, and Amendment XVI to the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 6342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of The Constitution:

"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."

This includes the power to require federal the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to allow terminally-ill patients to use non-approved drugs when the patient's physician certifies they have no other options and the patient executes written informed consent that they are aware of any potential risks give small business a grace period to correct any violations of federal regulations before imposing job-destroying fines and other sanctions on the business.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 6343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 6344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 6345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 6346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 6347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 6348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. ROSS of Florida:

H.R. 6349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution. "Congress shall have the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States."

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 6350.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 6351.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 6352.

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 as stated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 6353.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 6354.

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.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. TURNER of New York:

H.R. 6355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 6356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause three, to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 59: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 111: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 139: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 178: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DENT, and Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 181: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 186: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 273: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 288: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 289: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 303: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. DENT, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 333: Mr. MEEHAN and Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 458: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 591: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 664: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 687: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 694: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 718: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 719: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 751: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 797: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 808: Ms. BASS of California, Ms. CHU, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE

JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 835: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 860: Mr. FALLONE.

H.R. 891: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 898: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 905: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 942: Mr. KIND and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 948: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 965: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 998: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 1005: Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 1063: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1085: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1086: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 1106: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STARK, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ELLISON, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1167: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 1206: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1219: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1244: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. REED, and Mr. TURNER of Ohio.

H.R. 1259: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 1265: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 1311: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1344: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1348: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1370: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1375: Mr. FARR and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE

JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1386: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1394: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1417: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1464: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 1489: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 1533: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1543: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1549: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1564: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1580: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1614: Mr. LANCE and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1621: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1639: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1648: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 1653: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1675: Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REYES, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1697: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1700: Mr. KELLY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MULVANEY, and Ms. BUERKLE.

H.R. 1703: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1711: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1757: Ms. HOCHUL.

H.R. 1775: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1781: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1802: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1842: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1897: Mr. BERG and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1936: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1946: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1947: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1971: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2009: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 2020: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2051: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2077: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. YODER, Mr. TURNER of New York, and Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 2085: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 2086: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 2110: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2159: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2194: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2198: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2256: Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2267: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2382: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2387: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2402: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 2448: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2466: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 2479: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2492: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2499: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 2507: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 2524: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 2547: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2554: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2557: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 2563: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 2569: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 2600: Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. BERG.

H.R. 2655: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2695: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 2697: Mrs. SCHMIDT and Mr. RIVERA.

H.R. 2705: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2721: Mr. BILBRAY and Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 2741: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2746: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2794: Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 2866: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 2925: Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2950: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2962: Mr. WALSH of Illinois and Mr. CRITZ.

H.R. 2985: Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 3007: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 3030: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3032: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 3053: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3067: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3144: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 3151: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 3179: Mr. KISSELL and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 3238: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. POLIS and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 3274: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 3307: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 3308: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 3337: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 3423: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 3435: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. QUIGLEY Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HOLDEN and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 3458: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 3481: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 3497: Mr. BACA, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3506: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 3510: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 3522: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 3553: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 3612: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. KISSELL.

- H.R. 3627: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 3634: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 3677: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3683: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 3713: Mr. CRAVAACK.
H.R. 3717: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3728: Mr. PAUL and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 3760: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3790: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3798: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 3825: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 3841: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 3861: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3895: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 4049: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 4062: Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 4066: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GRIFFITH of Arkansas, Mr. BERG, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 4087: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4091: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4100: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4111: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4120: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4122: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4123: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4153: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 4164: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4165: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 4173: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4180: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 4202: Mr. BACA and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 4212: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 4215: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 4235: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 4238: Mr. HOLT and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4252: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4280: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 4287: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 4336: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 4341: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 4342: Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 4350: Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 4369: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 4378: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BRALLEY of Iowa, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4385: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4405: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PALLONE and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 4467: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 4605: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 4818: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. LOEBsACK.
H.R. 4965: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Ms. HOCHUL.
H.R. 4978: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 5044: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 5194: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 5381: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 5542: Mr. FARR and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5684: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 5708: Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 5746: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 5749: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 5796: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 5817: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BACA, Mr. MILLER of Florida and Ms. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 5835: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 5840: Mr. FALeOMAVAEGA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. SHULER.
H.R. 5864: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. HOCHUL.
H.R. 5865: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5879: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 5894: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 5903: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 5910: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 5911: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 5914: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 5925: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 5932: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 5934: Ms. CHU and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 5942: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BERG, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 5943: Mr. FILNER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KIND, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 5959: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5969: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 5970: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 5977: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 5978: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5989: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 5996: Mr. CLAY, Mr. GRJALVA, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 6021: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 6025: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 6043: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 6048: Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 6050: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 6061: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 6077: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 6081: Mr. TONKO and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 6087: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRJALVA, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 6095: Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. WELCH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SULIVAN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. CUPELLAR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SHULER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 6097: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 6099: Mr. KIND and Mr. GRJALVA.
H.R. 6101: Ms. NORTON, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 6107: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 6113: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 6118: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 6121: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 6124: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 6135: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 6136: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 6138: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 6140: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LONG, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 6150: Mr. TONKO, Mr. BOSWELL, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 6159: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. HOCHUL, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 6160: Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 6164: Mr. LATTa.
H.R. 6165: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 6170: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 6172: Mr. LATTa and Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 6173: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 6174: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 6176: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 6187: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 6199: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 6200: Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 6207: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 6211: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BACA, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 6213: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 6216: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 6218: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 6220: Mr. RUSH and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 6246: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 6248: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. DREIER.
H.R. 6250: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 6251: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 6252: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 6255: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 6256: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 6261: Mr. LATTa, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 6262: Ms. HOCHUL.
H.R. 6267: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. YODER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BARROW, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JONES, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LOBONDO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.J. Res. 8: Mr. SARBANES.
H.J. Res. 47: Ms. SUTTON and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.J. Res. 88: Mr. SARBANES.
H.J. Res. 97: Mr. SARBANES.
H.J. Res. 100: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. STARK.
H.J. Res. 112: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mrs. ELLMERS.
H. Con. Res. 82: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. FLORES and Mr. TURNER of New York.
H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. BROOKS.
H. Con. Res. 129: Ms. HAYWORTH and Mr. MARINO.
H. Res. 134: Mr. MULVANEY and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 298: Mr. TONKO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. NUNNELEE, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. RAHALL.
H. Res. 341: Mrs. MALONEY.
H. Res. 609: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H. Res. 624: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 672: Ms. SPEIER.
H. Res. 676: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. LOBONDO.
H. Res. 682: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. WATT.
H. Res. 704: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. COOPER.
H. Res. 730: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. LEVIN.

August 2, 2012

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H5713

H. Res. 734: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SERRANO.

H. Res. 748: Mr. FARR, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsyl-

vania, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TONKO, and Mrs. MALONEY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

51. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ingham County, Michigan, relative to Resolution No. 12-196 expressing support for access to preventive health care services; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.