



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2012

No. 123

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 13, 2012.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. First, I join the American people and the Members of Congress in extending my deepest sympathy to the families of the four Americans killed yesterday in Libya. It was such a tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, there's another tragedy. It's called Afghanistan. Like most of my colleagues, last month, I was home. I've been here in Washington 3 days. Back home, as well as the last 3 days

here, more and more people are coming in concerned about budget cuts, worried about sequestration. We all are hearing it. Yet there's no debate about Afghanistan. It just keeps going on and on and on.

I'm pleased to say that next Thursday, a group of Democrats and Republicans have joined me for a press conference. The author of this book, called "Funding the Enemy," subtitled, "How U.S. Taxpayers Bankroll the Taliban," Douglas Wissing, is coming to Washington next Thursday, and we will hold a news conference at 10 o'clock. The reason for this is to continue to remind Congress the American people have been speaking out about pulling our troops out of Afghanistan sooner rather than later. I hope that this news conference with Mr. Wissing will continue to beat the drum of bringing our troops home in 2013, not 2014. That's the President's plan. That's the plan that most Republicans in leadership have agreed to. But that's the end of 2014. How many more young men and women have to give their life, their legs, their arms for a failed policy?

In this book, "Funding the Enemy," and also at the news conference, we will have the former Inspector General of Afghanistan, who is a marine general. General Fields will join Douglas Wissing and a group of Republicans and Democrats to talk about the failed policy and how many times we send millions and millions and millions of dollars to Afghanistan and it never gets to the villages it's supposed to help; how many times we send millions and millions of dollars to Afghanistan and it's not accounted for. Somebody has taken the money. It's America's money. It's the money that we could be using here to save programs and to save jobs. But, again, Congress is not talking about Afghanistan.

I will continue to come to the floor, Mr. Speaker, and talk about the waste of life, the waste of money, and how

it's unfair to the American taxpayer. And more importantly, it's unfair to the military families. Many of the marines in my district—and I'm sure in the United States Army—have been to Afghanistan three and four times. Truthfully, nothing has changed. If I could have been an adviser to the President, I would have said: Mr. Obama, you got bin Laden. You have dispersed al Qaeda. Let's bring our troops home. That has not happened—and it will not happen until 2014. I think 2014 will slip into 2015.

So it's my hope that after this election that those of us who I hope will come back here and let's take a new approach and look at Afghanistan. Whether it's Mr. Obama or Mr. Romney, let's try to prevail upon them as a Congress to start bringing the troops out in the spring of 2014. It's not fair to the families. It's not fair to broken bodies of those who return with lost legs.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, as I do many, many times, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, to please hold in His arms the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to bless my colleagues in the House and the Senate. And I will ask God three times, Mr. Speaker, please God, please God, please God, continue to bless America.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS IN THIS CONGRESS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I would like to join my colleague in asking for the blessings on this Nation and to remind America that we gathered on Tuesday, together, in commemoration and recognition of 9/11. But America also needs us to do better. And I speak

□ 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.

H5925

in the backdrop of a horrific tragedy that we are all reminded of in the loss of Americans in what continues to be an attack on our values. That's why it's important for us to shed all that partisanship leads to and the lack of bringing forth bills that would help all of America.

So I am here this morning to remind us of work yet undone, that we just had 61 bills that have been signed into law this year, the fewest in more than 60 years. In all of 2011, only 90 bills were signed into law. And so we know in the last session, the 111th Congress, 258 bills were signed into law. We have got to do better. And the most difficult thing that I rise and speak about is the lack of presenting on the floor of the House the President's jobs bill, the American Jobs Act, that would invest in small business, that would create an opportunity for those who have lost their unemployment to be extended, to create summer jobs and part-time jobs, to be able to ensure that there is job training, and to make sure that we say to America: we are your partner in job creation. Why haven't we been able to overcome those who would stand in the way on the other side of the aisle for putting forth the American Jobs Act? It is to help the American people.

We have not been able to tackle, if you will, postal reform. Those are jobs. Those are people who work to make America's commerce travel from place to place. I have spoken to small businesses, and they say the U.S. Postal Service is their lifeline for their small business. They can actually make a profit by using the U.S. Postal Service. Senior citizens who receive their Social Security checks, sometimes in the mail, many times we know online, but are connected to the post office. They're connected to the letter carriers. They're connected to the local post office in their neighborhood. How do I know? Because of the outpouring of concern for the closing of a post office on Mesa Road in the 18th Congressional District, my congressional district.

□ 1010

So I am interested in this Congress not being known by the do-nothing Congress, do-nothing Republican Congress. I want us to work together and be able to say that these items need to be put forward for the American people. What do we have to say, now looking toward sequestration? We realize that you cannot cut discretionary funding. We realize that 50 million Americans are suffering from food insecurity, and we have a \$13 to \$16 billion cut in the supplemental nutritional program. That simply cannot be. That cannot be the record of this Congress. No jobs, no postal reform, cutting food that people need, and, of course, starving down at our men and women in the United States military where resources that they need may be cut.

So I am asking that we may be reminded that there are those who have

written, Norm Ornstein and Thomas Mann, that in studying Washington politics in Congress for more than 4 years, this is their quote, they have never seen such a dysfunctional place. We can do better. We must do better.

Democrats are ready to work to pass the American jobs bill, to pass postal reform, to pass bills dealing with helping to improve the lives of Americans, to ensuring that no American goes to bed hungry, and that we welcome our troops home and provide for their families. That's the Congress that we should be known for. That's what America is all about.

I ask that God blesses this Nation, but this Congress recognize that we have to be busy until He comes. Let's get busy for the American people. Democrats are busy and want to work to succeed to do what is right for America.

VOICE OF TEXAS, JEFFREY FROM LEAGUE CITY, TEXAS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Texans have been sharing with me their stories and lives about their businesses that they have built without the help of an out-of-control government. The responses were a testament to the tenacity of the American people.

Jeffrey, from League City, Texas, wrote me this:

I am the son of a single mother. I grew up watching my mom work two and sometimes three jobs to support us. She never took one penny of government assistance.

When I was 8 years old, I lied about my age and took three paper routes that had morning/evening and Sunday delivery.

At the age of 11, I took a job as a short-order cook at a 24-hour diner working from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m., went to school, played sports, went home, grabbed a quick dinner, slept for a few hours, and went back to work.

I did my homework while standing over a grill in the kitchen.

In the summer months, I would squeeze in a second job working in a service station.

I went into the Marine Corps upon high school graduation at the age of 17. I spent 6½ years in the military.

Upon being honorably discharged, I entered the Houston Police Academy. I have been an officer in Houston, Texas, for the past 27½ years. I worked 17 years undercover in the narcotics division, the rest has been in patrol.

My wife is an educator. We have two sons, a 19-year-old Lance Corporal in the Marine Corps on his way to Afghanistan and a 7-year-old. We live day to day, paycheck to paycheck, and are on the verge of losing everything if our taxes go up along with the cost of living.

Meanwhile, I see folks on government (giveaway programs) with Smart phones, flat screen TVs and newer cars than I can afford, cable TV, and Internet, and living in nicer apartments than I could afford while I was trying to save 17 years for my first house.

Sir, my family and I have built this life. Don't tell me that government built this life for me. That is a lie.

Mr. Speaker, Jeffrey is not alone. Contrary to the misinformed views of

some, the American people are the backbone of this Nation, not government. Government is not the solution. It's the problem. Government encourages some Americans to live off the hard work of others. Government promotes a social philosophy that it will give away more free stuff to some while it takes and punishes people who work.

People, not government, take business risks. People work and make sacrifices in an effort to pursue the American Dream, and people, not government, suffer the loss if the business is not a success. But Big Government wants to take credit for what American workers have done.

Government doesn't make America, Mr. Speaker. People make America.

And that's just the way it is.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the Speaker.

About 27 miles away from here, secret negotiations are ongoing. A number of us have asked to be allowed to observe the negotiations because it will have a dramatic impact on the future of the United States of America and our economy, but no Member of Congress has been allowed into these negotiations. This is over something called the Trans-Pacific Partnership. It's essentially NAFTA for the whole Pacific Rim.

Now, imagine how well that's going to work. NAFTA, of course, has cost the U.S. hundreds of thousands of jobs in many industries.

Now, this is a new agreement, a new forum, the President has put his stamp on it, it is called a living agreement, meaning it's being negotiated among a small number of relatively small countries, but the U.S. is running the show. But later on, other countries, like Japan and China, can plug in.

We know very little about what's being negotiated because, again, the documents are all kept secret from Members of Congress. They have been shared, however, with 600 corporations who, at the click of a mouse, can access them through a secure site online. But yet no Member of Congress is allowed to see these documents, no one representing the American people.

Now, the problem is that we have had some leaks, and the analysis is if Japan is allowed to join, and the U.S. is trying to get Japan to join, we'll lose 90,000 automotive jobs immediately. This is yet another example of failed trade policy of the United States of America.

It is also rumored—again remember, no elected representative of the American people is allowed to view these documents which 600 U.S. corporations are allowed to review and annotate and make suggestions on—that it would have intellectual property restrictions that would far exceed those that were

already rejected by the elected representatives of the American people, the House and the Senate, so-called SOPA and PIPA.

These intellectual property restrictions in this agreement, it is rumored, will far exceed those already rejected, yet they would be binding on the United States of America, again going around our elected representatives.

It is also rumored that the U.S. pharmaceutical industry is seeking to roll back previous reforms that even George Bush negotiated in the U.S.-Peru FTA that enhanced access to affordable medicines. The pharmaceutical industry doesn't like inexpensive, affordable, life-saving medicines. That would be rolled back.

Further, it would allow drug companies to challenge the price formularies in Canada. Remember, U.S. citizens can buy drugs made by U.S. companies in the U.S. much more cheaply in Canada than here because the Canadian government negotiates on their behalf. It's rumored that this agreement would force Canada to raise their drug prices.

It is also rumored that it might actually prohibit the United States Government from negotiating or allowing under part D Medicare—pharmaceutical companies and insurance companies are involved but the insurance companies can negotiate under authority of law lower drug prices. It may also prohibit the drug formulary for Medicaid which saves hundreds of millions and billions of dollars a year, and the VA, which provides our veterans with low-cost pharmaceuticals.

All of those things may be preempted by this Trans-Pacific Partnership.

□ 1020

Now, this is really an extraordinary thing that this is being done in secret and no Member of Congress is allowed to review it.

It has one chapter we know about, which is so egregious that Australia has said they have to have a total exemption. And the U.S. has said, sure, okay. We understand you want to protect your people. We'll let you do that, but we don't want to protect ours.

This is a little provision, similar to NAFTA, which gives corporations the power to challenge in foreign tribunals—not U.S. courts—our domestic laws that protect consumers and the environment. We would now give this authority to corporations, if China accesses to this, that are run by the Communist Government of China because they own many of the corporations in their country. The People's Liberation Army owns those corporations.

This is extraordinary. Six hundred corporations have access to this document, but no Member of Congress has access to this document, and yet this is the trade future. This is the 21st century trade agreement, we're told by this administration.

Further, the chief negotiator for the United States has said it's his greater desire that China become part of this

because then China would be bound by these rules. Oh, yeah, I heard that before. We used to vote annually on China's trade performance and we had a stick called "most-favored-nation status." When we gave up that stick—I voted against it—we gave them permanent most-favored-nation status, then they could join the World Trade Organization. But they said, don't worry, now they'll have to follow the rules. Guess what? They don't. And if they get in this agreement, they won't follow the rules either.

Kiss our economy good-bye if this secret agreement goes through.

FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of this week, we come even closer to the date on which our farm bill will expire, which is on September 30, in just a short period of time.

Yesterday, we had a rally here on the Capitol grounds that hundreds of farmers from across the Nation came together and talked about the importance of doing a farm bill now. That was the driving theme because we recognize the responsibility that farmers across this Nation have to feed our families and to make sure that they have food that they can put on the tables across this world.

Recently, I received a letter from some producers in South Dakota. Myron and Mary are real people, and they live near Wall, South Dakota. I wanted to read this letter for you today. They have a farming and ranching operation that they have had since 1969 near the Badlands of South Dakota. They farm around 750 acres of corn and wheat in South Dakota, and like many producers, they're struggling through this drought that has afflicted our country. I want to read a portion of that letter to you:

Our area was designated extreme drought early July. The corn usually yields 60 bushels per acre; wheat, 50 bushels per acre; safflower, 1,200 pounds per acre; alfalfa, 1 ton per acre. This year, the corn was cut for hay and silage, the safflower yielded half, and the alfalfa was next to nothing. We usually raise enough hay to meet our needs. To date, we have spent \$120,000 to buy hay, and we still need more.

The farm bill is important to our operation in two areas in particular: Number one, crop insurance that is all inclusive (hail, fire, drought); and, number two, disaster assistance as provided in the last farm bill but expired last year. Disaster assistance is desperately needed now due to the drought.

It is the time of year to plant wheat and to wean calves, which we will do. We don't know if it will rain, but if we knew that a farm bill was in place, we could make the decisions whether to maintain our cowherd numbers and if we plant crop. Please pass a farm bill before the end of the year.

I want you to take a look at this picture that's next to me that is a corn-

field in South Dakota. It was taken a while ago. If you would look at this field, traditionally, when this picture was taken, that corn should be lush and green; it would be setting ears, it would be building test weight, and it would be ready for harvest. Instead, these stalks are falling over due to the drought. They weren't able to provide much in growth and are struggling. This corn, more than likely, will be cut for silage—for feed for cattle—instead of returning on the investment for the producers that planted it hoping to get a crop.

We need to give Myron and Mary and producers such as those that own this corn and their families that depend on the food grown in this country the certainty of a farm bill. We cannot wait for the next disaster. We need to do our job. We need to continue to provide for our families across this country that need affordable food policies and depend upon this country and the security that a strong food program can bring them through doing a farm bill now.

POVERTY

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, as cofounder of the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus, I rise today to call for an immediate response to the ongoing crisis of poverty in our Nation.

The census numbers released yesterday underscore the urgent need to act boldly and to create jobs in this country, to protect our safety net, and to target resources where they are needed—basically, to communities of color, low-income communities, those communities, rural areas, who were hit hardest by the economic downturn.

It's really beyond shameful that over 45 million Americans, including over 16 million children, are living in poverty in the wealthiest nation in the world. The data also shows a wide racial disparity, with the poverty rates for whites standing at 9.8 percent, while the rates for African Americans and Hispanics remain unacceptably high at 27.6 percent and 25.3 percent, respectively.

In 2005, I founded the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus because of the rising tide of poverty. Some of us saw this unfortunate day coming. That was beginning under the failed policies of the previous administration.

Of course, we also know the terrible economic impact of the massive financial crisis that they left us on their way out of office. With the swift efforts of President Obama and congressional Democrats, we are finally beginning to dig ourselves out of the hole that was left by the Bush administration and slowly moving the poverty rate in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, we must do more and we can do more.

One of the most critical responsibilities we have as a government is to

promote and enact policies that keep our middle class strong and provide opportunities and a safety net for those striving and fighting to become middle class and to get into the ranks of the middle class, to enhance their quality of life. But far too many Americans are continuing to suffer joblessness and have dropped out of the middle class and into poverty because of this Republican do-nothing Congress.

Republicans in Congress have continually blocked efforts to extend and expand vital safety net programs which safeguard millions of American families and children who face stark realities of unemployment, hunger, and homelessness. Further, their continued blocking of critical Federal support to our States and localities has caused widespread layoffs of dedicated public servants like teachers, police officers, and firefighters in communities all across the country.

This attack on our country's public servants has had a particularly hard impact on communities of color and on women across the country. I just have to tell you, African Americans and women have long found job opportunities in the public sector, in public employment. African Americans, in particular, often found work with the city or the State because of racial bias and barriers and obstacles in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, the American people know that you can't have it both ways. Government spending cannot kill jobs on one hand, when spent on hiring teachers and police officers, and create jobs on the other hand. And those services are desperately needed throughout our country. We need more police officers on the street.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle must begin to accept the reality of history. Federal investments in our Nation's infrastructure, in our schools, and in programs that help struggling families are critical to boosting our economy and spurring our economic recovery.

Tax cuts for millionaires don't pay for themselves; they create massive deficits and weaken our country.

Markets don't regulate themselves. Deregulation allows rampant fraud and creates massive bubbles that inevitably burst and threaten our entire economy.

We need a balanced approach that ensures that every American pays their fair share and is invested in a united and prosperous future for all Americans of every background. We need a balanced approach that ensures that millionaires and billionaires pay their fair share so that we can reignite the American Dream for all.

How this Nation treats the least of these is not just a measure of our Nation's moral priorities, but it will directly impact whether the American Dream survives and thrives for all. Let us not forget that our greatest strength is the freedom and opportunity that our democracy created to allow us to work together to build the

largest and most prosperous middle class the world has ever known.

□ 1030

But this means that we must reduce and we must eliminate poverty. And I hope in the few days that we're left that this Congress will come together and figure out a way to pass the President's American Jobs Act, because in that legislation we have critical investment to rehire our police officers, teachers and firefighters who desperately need their jobs, but also the services are desperately needed in our communities.

COMMEMORATING NEIL ARMSTRONG

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I represent Alabama's Fifth Congressional District, home to NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center, home to the Saturn V rocket that carried American astronauts to the Moon.

Today, the Fifth District's talented scientists, engineers, and others work tirelessly to develop the Space Launch System for manned space flight both to and beyond low Earth orbit.

In the early 1960s, President John F. Kennedy challenged America to do the impossible, send an astronaut to the Moon and safely return him. As a young boy in the 1960s, I vividly remember the Earth tremble, dishes rattle, and windows pulsate as America tested our Saturn V rocket on nearby Redstone Arsenal. In 1969, America's hard work paid off.

I will never forget watching the grainy, black-and-white footage on TV as American astronaut Neil Armstrong stepped on to the lunar dust. The thrill of that moment, our pride in America, our awe of what Americans could do have belonged to all Americans ever since. Armstrong's walk on the Moon helped define America and changed world history as we left Earth behind and ventured into the mysteries of space.

Neil Armstrong was an accomplished aerospace engineer, Navy pilot, astronaut, and the first man to walk on the Moon. Neil Armstrong will be forever immortalized as a brave and great explorer.

Toward the end of his life, Neil Armstrong spoke frequently and passionately about the future of manned space flight. Neil Armstrong understood that American exceptionalism is in jeopardy and may be lost to future generations.

As a member of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I recently had the privilege to meet Neil Armstrong during a public hearing on NASA's Space Launch System, the Orion Multipurpose Crew Vehicle, and America's role in space. During that hearing, Neil Armstrong expressed concerns about the direction of America's space program.

Neil Armstrong testified, and I quote:

The past year has been frustrating to NASA observers as they tried to understand NASA's plans and progress. NASA leadership enthusiastically assured the American people that the agency was embarking on an exciting new age of discovery in the cosmos. But the realities of the termination of the shuttle program, the cancellation of existing rocket launcher and spacecraft programs, the layoffs of thousands of aerospace workers, and the outlook for American space activity throughout the next decade were difficult to reconcile with the agency assertions.

Neil Armstrong continued, and again I quote:

So, much has been accomplished. But NASA, hobbled by cumbersome limitations, has been unable to articulate a master plan that excites the imagination and provides a semblance of predictability to the aerospace industry.

Neil Armstrong concluded by testifying, and again I quote:

Predicting the future is inherently risky, but the proposed Space Launch System includes many proven and reliable components which suggest that its development could be relatively trouble free. If that proves to be so, it would bode well for exploration.

In the midst of America's current economic malaise and deficit-ridden Federal spending on programs that do nothing or little to advance technology or humanity's condition, I share Neil Armstrong's concern for the future of NASA and whether Washington has the inspirational leadership exhibited by President Kennedy in the 1960s, or "the right stuff" that is essential for space exploration.

Today, American astronauts hitch a ride from Russia. Oh, how far we have fallen. Quite frankly, America and the human condition beg for the White House leadership once shown by President Kennedy, but which now is sorely lacking.

Mr. Speaker, there is a whole universe out there waiting for us to explore. Just as America did in the 1960s, today's Americans can accomplish what is seemingly impossible. All America lacks is the vision needed to help us understand where we should go and the leadership needed to get us there.

Mr. Speaker, America will best honor the memory of Neil Armstrong and his achievements by striving for the American exceptionalism exemplified by Neil Armstrong in continuing his dream of manned space flight and exploration.

TAKE POLITICS OUT OF THE POST OFFICE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues in this do-nothing Congress to take politics out of the post office.

The post office was explicitly authorized in article I, section 8, clause 7 of the United States Constitution. It

began its operations on July 26, 1775, and Ben Franklin was appointed the first Postmaster General. That's a long time ago.

It has a legal obligation to serve everyone, regardless of geography, and at a uniform cost with uniform services. And it has exclusive access to boxes that are marked "U.S. Postal" or "U.S. Post Office." And it also competes with private package delivery services.

In 2006, Congress forced the United States Postal Service to pre-fund 100 percent of retiree insurance premiums. No other company, public or private, is forced to comply with such an unnecessary and destructive policy.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans cited declining mail volumes and a growing labor force as the primary reasons why the 2006 legislation was necessary. Yet 2005, 2006, and 2007 were the highest volume years in U.S. Postal Service history. In fact, 2006 was the highest volume year ever.

Mr. Speaker, the real motivation behind the 2006 legislation was to break the back of a public sector union and privatize the mailing industry. Why else would Congress alter an entity that hasn't taken a dime of United States taxpayers' money in 30 years?

According to the Congressional Research Service, the U.S. Postal Service was self-supporting since 1971, using postage sales to fund operations. The Postal Service was so profitable that it returned money to the Treasury every single year, while providing free services to the visually impaired and persons overseas.

If the Postal Service was a private corporation, or if it had been a private corporation at that time, my colleagues across the aisle would have hailed it as the model of economic success and sung its praises from sea to shining sea.

Since the pre-funding mandate of 2006, however, the Postal Service has nearly crumbled under the weight of its pension costs. How does an organization that had robust profits for 30 years, leading up to the 2006 legislation, suddenly start running deficits and lose \$25 billion between 2007 and 2011?

How did the U.S. Postal Service go from no debt in 2006 to over \$13 billion in debt today?

Many of my colleagues on the other side have well-connected friends who advocate for Postal Service privatization. I'm here to connect the dots for the American people.

Instead of wasting time today, this do-nothing Congress should vote to stop the damage inflicted upon the United States Postal Service by passing H.R. 1351. This bipartisan postal reform bill protects the hardworking employees of the Postal Service.

The U.S. Postal Service was not in danger of becoming insolvent until Congress decided to meddle in its affairs. It's hypocritically inconsistent for my friends on the other side of the aisle to talk about government being

the problem, while they don't acknowledge that they created a big problem for the post office. It is hypocritical.

Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service already missed a \$5.5 billion payment in August. Congress must act before the post office defaults on another payment later this month. Instead of scheduling political votes that highlight our differences, let's stop the madness and do what is in the best interest of the American people, the economy, and communities across the Nation.

The Postal Service employs 700,000 of our fellow citizens, over 17,000 of whom are from my State of Georgia.

□ 1040

One-third are military veterans who deliver 212 billion pieces of mail to over 144 million locations. This is the middle class that's doing this. If privatization advocates like the Koch brothers get their wish, the Postal Service will slowly be destroyed, causing good jobs to be lost and allowing companies to raise prices of delivery. Taking action to strengthen the Postal Service's finances is not just good for the letter carriers and postmasters; it's also good for business. There is \$1.3 trillion in mailing industry proceeds out there that support 7 million private sector jobs. The time to act, ladies and gentlemen, is now.

HUNGER STRIKE UNDERWAY BY PRO-DEMOCRACY ACTIVISTS IN CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, just 90 miles away from the coast of the United States there exists a murderous, terrorist regime on the island of Cuba. It is a regime that harbors terrorists, that funds terrorism, that has even held an American hostage since the summer of '09, and that denies all basic human rights to its people.

Currently, 26 pro-democracy activists, it has been reported, have initiated a hunger strike. It started with Jorge Luis Garcia Perez Antunez on September 7 of 2012 in order to protest the brutal oppression by the Castro thugs against the Cuban people and against the political prisoners, and it has now been joined, as I said, by another 25.

You're not going to see that on the front pages of the newspapers. These are individuals who, for some reason, the press will not cover. The only thing you'll see about the Castro regime is, frankly, the beauty of the beaches and the island and the fact that they have old cars—such a quaint thing. It's not quaint when your human rights are violated and when you are forced to drive 50-year-old automobiles—if you're lucky to even get one of those.

Since these individuals, these heroes, are for some reason being denied the

coverage that they deserve, I come to the floor to mention who they are—these heroes that we have to support, that we have to defend, and that we can never forget. So I am going to read their names.

I mentioned Jorge Luis Garcia Perez Antunez. Jorge Vazquez Chaviano, Arturo Conde Zamora, Yerandi Martinez Rodriguez, Orlando Almenares Reyes, Luis Enrique Ponce Sanchez, Roberley Villalobos Torres, Israel Robert Isaac, Yuniel Alvarez Garcia, Luis Enrique Santos Caballero, Yosmel Martinez Corcho, Alberto Reyes Morales, Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello—by the way, who is a very well-known pro-democracy leader of Cuba and whose health is, frankly, in poor shape—Omar Pedrosa Suarez, Yadira Rodriguez Bombino, Ibis Maria Rodriguez Gonzalez, Fermin Zamora Vazquez, Yasmani Nicle Abad, Leonardo Cancio Santana, Pedro Fernandez Vega Cortes, Arcelio Lopez Rojas, Misahel Valdes Diaz, and Jorge Luis Recio Arias.

These heroes, these pro-democracy activists and heroes, have stood up and are standing up to the Castro dictatorship with whatever they have, including their health and their bodies. They need our prayers. They need our support. They need our solidarity at this pivotal time in their struggle for Cuba's freedom.

Mr. Speaker, may God protect these brave heroes. May the international community demonstrate the solidarity that they deserve—and yes, we here in the United States Congress and in this country must continue to work to do what we can to help them and others achieve their final day of freedom.

THE FUTURE LEADERSHIP OF CONGRESS AND THE COUNTRY

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the American people are going to make a decision on November 6 about the future leadership of this Congress and this country, and they face, as they do every 4 years, two fundamental questions. The first: Who can be in charge of the cash register? Who will best manage the economy? The second: Who will be a firm hand in protecting America's foreign policy interests? If we look at the past 2 years with this Republican-led Congress, which has accomplished nothing and, in fact, has done damage, the question on who is best in charge of the cash register is quite clear.

The Ryan budget that was passed by this House and that stalled in the Senate would actually increase the debt. The whole point, supposedly, of the Republican agenda coming into Congress was to lower the debt. The budget they passed would increase it by \$6 trillion. Why is that? Well, first of all, many of the proponents of this budget are the folks who voted for policies that actually exploded the debt: the war in Iraq

on the credit card; nation-building in Afghanistan on the credit card; the prescription drug program unpaid for on the credit card. Those policies played a very big role in getting us into the debt that we have.

Then the Ryan budget, which is supposedly the blueprint to reduce the debt, increases it by \$6 trillion in 10 years. Why? Because it increases those Bush tax cuts that were never paid for and would lower their Republican Presidential candidate's effective tax rate to 1 percent. Secondly, it vastly increases Pentagon spending beyond what even the Pentagon is asking for. Even though it then imposes savage cuts on domestic discretionary spending—making it really difficult to do scientific research, to help our kids go to college—the net result is a \$6 trillion increase in the debt.

On foreign policy, no responsibility is so vested in one person—the President of the United States—when guiding American foreign policy. It needs a firm hand, a calm voice, a person who thinks before he speaks, who aims before he fires. The recent tragedy of losing our ambassador and three other brave civil servants from the State Department is an indication that the Republican Presidential candidate lacks the temperament to do that job.

Why is it that in the first statement that he made after the loss of four American lives he descended into what essentially was tactical politics—arguing about the wording of a communique from the American Embassy in Egypt? Is it really the case that we in America cannot defend the right of free speech and promote religious tolerance?

We need a President—and have a President—who is thoughtful, who is firm, who can act with conviction and clarity, and does it in a sober way that is going to defend and promote American political and foreign policy interests.

NO MORE SOLYNDRAS ACT

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, later today, we will begin debate on the rule for H.R. 6213, the No More Solyndras Act, which, along with my chairman, FRED UPTON of Michigan, I am proud to sponsor. This legislation is a culmination of an intensive and thorough 18-month investigation by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which I chair, and will fix the problems we have uncovered.

Specifically, the No More Solyndras Act will phase out the Department of Energy's grossly mismanaged loan guarantee program by prohibiting DOE from issuing any loan guarantees for applications submitted after December 31, 2011, and it will provide taxpayers strong, new protection for any pending participants in this program.

□ 1050

The bill provides greater loan guarantee transparency by requiring the DOE to report to Congress on the decisionmaking process, and, of course, the details of the loan. The bill also prohibits DOE from restructuring the terms of any guarantee and forbids the subordination of United States taxpayers' dollars at any time to private investors and holds the Department of Energy officials accountable for their actions by imposing penalties by failing to follow this law.

As many of you know, Solyndra was the first recipient of a DOE loan guarantee from title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and, frankly, was the poster child for President Obama's stimulus-driven green economy. It was also the first stimulus-backed recipient of a DOE loan guarantee to file for bankruptcy just 2 years after the loan closed, and 6 months after DOE restructured the loan and subordinated taxpayers' interest to two wealthy and well-connected investors, all but ensuring taxpayers won't see a dime.

Other DOE loan recipients have also struggled. Three of the first five companies which received loan guarantees issued by the DOE Loan Guarantee program—Solyndra, Beacon, and Abound Solar—have all filed for bankruptcy, losing hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money that will never, ever be recovered. The other two companies are struggling, also. Nevada Geothermal has substantial debts and no positive cash flow, and First Wind had to withdraw their planned IPO and also has substantial debt to boot.

On behalf of the American taxpayers, we had a duty to figure out what went wrong with Solyndra, the loan guarantee, and whether the loan guarantee program was properly managed. The Solyndra investigation has been thorough and methodical. The Energy and Commerce Committee requested and received and reviewed documents from every executive branch agency connected to Solyndra, and interviewed more than a dozen administration officials who played key roles in the loan guarantee program. The committee has also reviewed documents produced by the Solyndra investors, as well as DOE's independent consultant and their legal advisers.

As the committee's investigation revealed, the Obama administration put Solyndra's loan on the fast track for political reasons, despite repeated red flags and warnings in 2009 from the Office of Management and Budget and DOE officials about the company's financial condition in the market for Solyndra's product. Were they viable? It is clear that DOE failed to adequately monitor the loan guarantee, blindly writing checks to Solyndra as the company hemorrhaged cash throughout the year 2010.

When the warnings came to fruition and Solyndra was out of cash in the autumn of 2010, the Obama administration doubled down on its bad debt and

bad bet, restructuring Solyndra's loan in early 2011 and putting wealthy investors at the front of the line in front of taxpayers, which is a clear violation of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Right up to the bankruptcy filing, the administration was willing to take extraordinary measures to keep Solyndra afloat for political reasons and ensure that the first loan guarantee was not going to be a failure.

The investigation also showed that the DOE failed to consult with the Treasury Department as simply required by the Energy Policy Act prior to issuing a conditional commitment to Solyndra and that Treasury didn't even play a role in simply reviewing the restructuring. The No More Solyndras Act will correct this by ensuring that Treasury is actively involved in the loan process to protect our taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, the Solyndra investigation and the No More Solyndras Act are a great example of how congressional oversight should work. We asked the tough questions, collected all the facts, identified the problem, and now we're offering good legislation.

I encourage all my colleagues to support H.R. 6213, the No More Solyndras Act, to ensure that the mistakes and misguided decisions that occurred never, ever happen again.

IN CELEBRATION OF BILL KLING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of a beloved member of our south Florida veterans community, William "Bill" Kling, who passed away on August 6 at the age of 84.

Bill was a devoted husband and father; and he is survived by his two children, Marsha Mittentag and Steven Kling. My thoughts and prayers go out to them, to Bill's extended family, and to all of his friends and colleagues who share in mourning this loss.

Bill was a member of our Greatest Generation of Americans who served our Nation as a radar technician for the Navy during World War II. But Bill's service to our Nation was far from over when he returned from war. In fact, it was just beginning.

Bill Kling became a national leader and one of the strongest advocates for our Nation's veterans. He was dedicated to helping generations of veterans as they returned to civilian life. He worked tirelessly to make sure our veterans were getting the benefits they deserved—from education under the GI Bill to quality health care through our VA system.

I'm sure my Florida colleagues will agree that Bill was a force to be reckoned with, ever brightening our congressional doorways, pushing the urgency of the issue at hand. I know we are grateful for the remarkable legacy

he leaves behind, and he will be sorely missed.

I had the distinct pleasure of working with Bill for the last 23 years and have witnessed firsthand the many ways he helped thousands of veterans in Florida. I'm also proud to have called Bill my friend. For the past 7 years, Bill served as the chairman of my Military Academy Nominations Board where he helped the next generation of military leaders realize the dream of serving the country they love.

For 8 years, he served on the Florida Commission on Veterans' Affairs, and for the past 27 years he was the president of the Broward County Veterans Council. He also led the Jewish War Veterans and was a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans.

The list of superlatives for Bill shows him as the great American that he was. Bill was inducted into the Broward Senior Hall of Fame, received the Humanitarian of the Year award from the Dolphin Democrats, and changed the shape of veterans services in south Florida. In particular, he helped bring the Alexander "Sandy" Ninger Veterans' Nursing Home to Pembroke Pines in 2001 and worked with other veterans to create the South Florida National Cemetery in Palm Beach in 2007.

One of Bill's greatest accomplishments and lasting legacies was ensuring that veterans would have easy access to quality medical care. Bill noticed that too often veterans in Broward County had to travel too far to go to a VA facility to get the care that they needed. With that in mind, he helped open the Oakland Park VA Outpatient Clinic more than two decades ago.

When the building the clinic occupied began deteriorating, Bill worked to open a brand-new facility. Even though this effort took years, Bill kept a smile on his face and kept working to overcome every obstacle, because that's just how Bill operated.

So in 2008, a new 98,000-square-foot clinic opened in Sunrise, and fittingly on Bill's birthday. I think it's fair to say that without Bill Kling, this wonderful center that serves thousands of our veterans each year might not ever exist.

With that in mind, I'm honored to announce that next week my good friend, Congressman TED DEUTCH, also of Florida, and I will file legislation, along with many other members of the Florida delegation, that will rename the Broward Outpatient Clinic as the William "Bill" Kling VA Clinic.

This is such a fitting way to memorialize and thank Bill Kling. With passage of this bill, every veteran who walks through the doors of the Broward VA Clinic will know the name of the man who did so much for so many.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the passage of this legislation so we may

pay fitting tribute to a great American, William "Bill" Kling.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A 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. 6336. An act 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 United States Capitol.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 59 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Kris Holzmeyer, Second Baptist Church, Clinton, Tennessee, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we come to You this day with praise upon our lips. You are worthy of all glory and honor. You are faithful, and You hear us when we call.

We come to You this day to say thank you. You have given to us a free and prosperous Nation in which to live. We know that You and You alone are the provider of that freedom and prosperity.

We also come before You acknowledging our great sins as a Nation. We ask Your forgiveness as we seek Your will for the future of our country.

As our leaders gather in this room to discuss the business of this day, bless them with wisdom and knowledge to make the best possible decisions for our citizens. And may their actions, their words, and their motives bring You honor and glory.

We ask these things in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHILLING) come for-

ward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SCHILLING led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND KRIS HOLZMEYER

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. It is my pleasure to welcome Kris Holzmeyer in joining me here on the House floor to give the opening prayer.

Pastor Holzmeyer recently served as an associate pastor at the Second Baptist Church in Clinton, Tennessee, a town in my district. With a desire to serve the Lord in both word and deed, Kris has authored two devotionals: "The First Responder Field Manual" and "Lessons from the Locker Room." A passionate advocate for international adoption, Kris advocated for adoption awareness and established the Kyle Reagan Foundation, which raises money to help adopt children from abroad.

In Tennessee, Kris has been active as well in coordinating the 2012 Anderson County National Day of Prayer, in running the Summer Skills Basketball Camp at Second Baptist Church, and in ministering to local officials.

In addition to his strong ties to Tennessee, Kris also has a Washington connection. He served as assistant communications director for the D. James Kennedy Center for Christian Statesmanship on Capitol Hill from 2004 to 2006. While on Capitol Hill, he performed outreach to Members and staff.

A native of Indiana, Kris received his BA from the University of Southern Indiana and his master's degree from Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary. Along with his wife, Missy, and his children, Kyle and Sammi, I would like to thank Kris, and I am pleased that he could join us in prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WE NEED A FARM BILL NOW

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. During the month of August, I traveled throughout my Arkansas district, listening to the challenges family farmers are facing with record drought conditions. Even though the House did pass an important drought relief package, we need to

pass a farm bill. We must acknowledge the role that farm families play in our Nation's economy.

The success story of Arkansas and American agriculture can continue if Congress acts to pass sound policies. The message from my constituents and rural America is clear: We need a farm bill now. The farm bill needs to be a priority of the House, as it is critically important not only to my home State of Arkansas but to all of rural America.

At a time when many Americans have lost faith in the ability of Congress to accomplish great things, a comprehensive farm bill has the potential to be an example of what can be done when we put aside partisan politics and pass sound policy. We need a farm bill now.

FARM BILL

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

Ms. HOCHUL. Imagine if our farmers did their jobs the way Congress has been doing its job. I know what you're thinking. We'd all starve, wouldn't we? We've got a job to do, folks, and you just heard it from my colleague on the other side of the aisle.

There is no reason that our pleas for help on behalf of our farmers should go unheeded. We've been asking since early this summer to give the farmers the certainty they need to be able to do their jobs on our behalf in order to protect our food security, which is linked to our national security. It expires in a couple of weeks.

I don't want to go home and my colleagues don't want to go home—we don't want to leave this body—until we do our jobs on behalf of the farmers. If anyone thinks that a 6-month extension—kicking the can down the road—is sufficient, well, I encourage you to go visit my farmers, particularly my dairy farmers—the McCormacks, the Berwangers, the Nobles, the Zittels, the Kerners—who are the people I've met over our 5-week break who thought for sure we'd be able to pull together in a bipartisan way and do it.

There is still time, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to go home. Let's not go home until we take care of our farmers and get the job done right.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GLENN "SKIDS" SMITH

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

Mr. SCHILLING. Mr. Speaker, on September 1 of 2012, a tragedy occurred at the Quad City Air Show when a 30-year-old L-39 fighter jet fell from the sky, claiming the life of a veteran pilot.

Glenn Smith, or "Skids," as he is remembered by his fellow Hoppers of Frisco, Texas, never shied away from adventure. He lived life to the fullest

as a certified scuba diver, as a licensed sailor, and as a self-proclaimed "struggling" golfer. Nearly three decades ago, he took one of the greatest risks and started what would eventually become a successful business. In 2006, Skids retired to pursue his true passion—flying. Restoring and flying fighter jets wasn't just a hobby to him; it was a way to share a piece of our Nation's history with people across the country.

Skids will always be remembered by those he motivated through his mission to educate the general public and to inspire kids to work hard in school, aim high in life, and have fun. Skids' enthusiasm for life will truly be missed. My thoughts and prayers are with the family and friends and teammates he leaves behind.

WE WILL STAND AGAINST TERRORISM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join in asking for calm, along with Secretary Clinton, in this violent and tumultuous world, and particularly with regard to the actions that are going on in Yemen, Cairo, and certainly Libya. I offer my deepest sympathy to those who lost their lives.

I stand again to say, as the Secretary indicated this morning, that the American people and the American Government had absolutely nothing to do with this heinous film, but we reject the horrible and horrific violence.

I am also saddened to hear that resources probably prevented some of the reinforcing of some of our Embassies. We cannot shortchange the securing of the homeland, and as we go forward in dealing with sequestration, I beg that we understand that we must protect those who serve us overseas, including the United States military.

But I call for peace. I know the American people realize that no religion should be denigrated, but we cannot accept and will not accept and will stand against any violence against the American people or those who serve us in a civilian manner with honor and dignity.

To their families, I offer my deepest sympathy and a commitment that we will stand against terrorism.

A LONG-TERM DEBT SOLUTION TO THE COUNTRY'S FISCAL CLIFF

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

Ms. JENKINS. This week, Moody's threatened to downgrade the U.S.' credit rating if Washington fails yet again to deal with the long-term debt problem. This is not news. We were downgraded last year, but instead of acting to fix the problem, this administration racked up a \$1 trillion deficit

for the fourth year in a row, and now we face a fiscal cliff that could cause another recession.

Enough with the short-term fixes, patches, gimmicks, and tricks. They only make the problem worse. This country needs a comprehensive budget and tax reform. This means a simpler Tax Code that is more fair and efficient, and it means fundamental spending reform that will save Medicare.

We have a rare opportunity to put this country back on the right track to ensure a more prosperous future for our children. Let's take it. It's time to put the American people first.

□ 1210

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF MOUNT CARMEL SCHOOL

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in celebrating the 60th anniversary of Mount Carmel School and its proud record serving students in the Northern Mariana Islands from their elementary through high school years.

Since opening its doors, the school has constantly expanded, adding new facilities, state-of-the-art information technology, and the standards-based curriculum, with accreditation from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

Mount Carmel School has cultivated some of our islands' most notable business, government, and community leaders. As elected officials, doctors, attorneys, car mechanics, cooks, carpenters, teachers, and business executives, the school's alumni stand as inspiring pillars in our community. From humble beginnings in 1952, the school has evolved into an institution whose name is synonymous with educational excellence in our community.

I offer my congratulations to all of those who have been affiliated with Mount Carmel School over these past 60 years: teachers, staff, students, alumni, and parents. I have every confidence that the next 60 years will be marked by the same level of accomplishment.

Go, Knights.

NO MORE SOLYNDRAS ACT

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the No More Solyndras Act. It ensures that taxpayers are never left on the hook for hundreds of millions of dollars for any future President's risky bets. This legislation phases out the Department of Energy's flawed loan guarantee program. It seeks to stop future debacles like the recent \$535 million loan guarantee for the California solar panel manufacturer called Solyndra.

This administration refuses to promote legitimate and safe domestic energy resources by issuing moratoriums in the Gulf of Mexico and needlessly delaying very important projects like the Keystone pipeline. Instead, it chooses to roll the dice on unproven technologies that result in bankruptcies with hundreds of millions of wasted taxpayer dollars. That's not a way to move forward.

In south Louisiana, we know when it comes to energy production, domestic resources are waiting to be tapped safely, environmentally sound. Whether it's oil or natural gas or any other source, we must harness the resources of our land to create jobs here at home and to make sure that hardworking families aren't forced to feel the pain at the pump.

LET'S GET BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the responsibility that this institution has to the American people to finish the work they sent us here to do.

Partisan gridlock may make 2012 one of the Congress' least productive years in decades. That's why this institution has seen some of the lowest public approval ratings in history.

The American people expect better from their elected officials. They know that Members of Congress should be acting like adults and working with Members on the other side of the aisle to get things done. Each of us should remember the people we serve: the seniors who worked for years to secure a successful retirement, the students who took out loans to help pay for college, the middle class families who are concerned about their long-term economic security.

Rather than meeting for only 8 days this month, as Republicans propose, let's remain here, pass the American Jobs Act that the President proposed over a year ago, put aside partisanship, roll up our sleeves, and get back to work for the people we serve.

IN TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR CHRIS STEVENS

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that all Americans reflect upon the tragic loss of life in the American consulate in Benghazi. When one of our own pays the ultimate sacrifice in the service of our Nation, we're all touched by the loss. All four of these brave Americans will forever be remembered in the annals of American history as heroes.

In particular, I would like to take the time to pay tribute to Ambassador

Chris Stevens, a native of northern California. Although I did not know the Ambassador personally, his father, Senior Assistant Attorney General Jan Stevens, ably served our State in the California Department of Justice while I served as attorney general of my home State.

This tragedy hits close to home with all of the employees of the California Department of Justice who work with Jan Stevens. I wish to join with them, with friends and family members of the Stevens, and with all Americans in offering our thoughts and prayers as we mourn the loss of Ambassador Chris Stevens.

COACH JIM CALHOUN

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in a few short hours, a giant in the State of Connecticut, Coach Jim Calhoun, is going to announce his retirement after 26 years of leading the men's basketball program.

When he arrived 26 years ago, it was an also-ran program. Today, he has secured three national championships, he was inducted into the Hall of Fame, and the NBA is populated with graduates like Ray Allen, Emeka Okafor, and Kemba Walker, who are all-stars and really make the State of Connecticut so proud.

He also has performed hundreds of acts of personal kindness, small and large, Coaches vs. Cancer, the Yukon Cardiology Health Center program, and his latest passion, which is to help families with the scourge of autism.

Coach Calhoun is not just a great coach, he's a really good person. To him and his wife, Pat, on behalf of the people of the Second Congressional District, I want to extend my congratulations for his great leadership and career, and wish them all the success in the world as they begin a new chapter in their wonderful lives.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD OBESITY AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of America's 12½ million obese youth. I stand on behalf of America's 3.7 million low-income children between the ages of 2 and 4 who are either overweight or obese. Millions of our children depend on school meals and the generosity of food pantries for most of their nutrients. These are the children I've come to speak to you about today.

September is National Childhood Obesity Awareness Month, the month when Americans are reminded of the plight facing our children if we don't ensure they receive better meals and

build an environment that promotes physical activity.

It is time to get involved in the well-being of every child in America. So join me. Make a difference in a child's life during National Childhood Obesity Awareness Month and all year long.

MEDICARE CLASS WARFARE

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to participate in what I call "Medicare class warfare." I refuse to pit those who are 55 and above against those who are under 55.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that those of us who are above 55 ought to want the same health care for those who are under 55 that we're going to receive.

I refuse to participate in Medicare class warfare. I believe that those who are at the dawn of life should know that they will have the same health care benefits that we will have at the twilight of life.

Again, I refuse to participate in Medicare class warfare.

WATERBURY, VERMONT, THE BEST BEER TOWN IN NEW ENGLAND

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to bring attention to the town of Waterbury, Vermont.

There was an article in The Boston Globe identifying it as the best beer town in New England. In this small town, beer pilgrims from across the country flock to appreciate and enjoy the finest beer in America. It's the quality of the beer that's brewed that's really revered. Let me just tell you about a few.

It's the home to the Alchemist cannery, which makes an IPA called Heady Topper. I can tell you personally that it's really good. The Beer Advocate, the bible of the beer community, rates it as the third best in the world. The beer is sold in cans, but it sells out early, so get there early.

It's not hard to see why it's so popular when it's the third best in the world, but there are others there. Waterbury is the home to a number of restaurants: the Prohibition Pig, the Blackback Pub, and Arvad's, to name a few with great beers.

Vermont is coming back from Hurricane Irene. In Waterbury, it's one beer at a time.

□ 1220

CONGRESS IS DYSFUNCTIONAL

(Mr. MILLER of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, many of my Democratic colleagues today have criticized Republicans in Congress as do-nothings, but my own view is a little different.

It is certainly true that the Nation has real needs. Economists tell us that legislation held hostage here would create millions of jobs and put many Americans back to work. Instead of addressing those needs, Congress is just dysfunctional.

But considering what Republicans in Congress want to do, it is a great blessing that Congress has done next to nothing. They have repeatedly voted to repeal health care reform—33 times according to one count—as if denying health insurance for preexisting conditions would put Americans back to work.

They have voted to gut or eliminate the funding for Wall Street reform—putting us right back where we were 5 years ago with the Bush administration policies that created the painful downturn that we are now in—and at least 55 times voted to restrict women's reproductive rights and access to affordable health care, which included repeated attempts to eliminate funding for Planned Parenthood. It is hard to see that as a job creation agenda.

Mr. Speaker, better to do nothing than what they want to do.

CUT TAXES FOR AVERAGE AMERICANS AND REBUILD OUR INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am ready to cut taxes for Americans, average Americans, the middle class and rebuild our infrastructure.

Unfortunately, after wasting the last 2 years and after spending the entire month of August at home without making even the slightest effort to fix the Nation's economy, the Tea Party Republicans plan to adjourn next week for another 6 weeks after being here for 8 days. Instead of going on vacation, why don't we fix the Nation's business? Why don't we handle the business that we have to take care of?

We act like petulant children around here. These Tea Party Republicans stick to their obstinate demand to cut taxes for millionaires and turn Medicare into a voucher program. We can't afford to continue to handle our business like this.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's time for Congress to get to work. I think we should stay here and not leave for another 6 weeks, leaving the Nation's business hanging.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6213, NO MORE SOLYNDRAS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 779 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 779

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6213) to limit further taxpayer exposure from the loan guarantee program established under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-31. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 20, 2012, or September 21, 2012, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman, my friend from Massachusetts (Mr.

McGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 779 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 6213. This rule provides for the discussion and opportunities for Members of the minority and the majority to participate in this debate.

I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. The underlying legislation ensures that all American taxpayers will never again be forced to pay hundreds of millions of dollars because of this administration's politically motivated risky bets.

H.R. 6213 draws on the lessons learned from the failed Department of Energy Loan Guarantee Program, which invested \$535 million into a solar energy company named Solyndra. Unfortunately, Solyndra went bankrupt, leaving hardworking Americans with a check for over half a billion dollars.

Solyndra has become synonymous with the Obama administration's reckless spending programs that have done nothing to create the jobs our country so desperately needs, nor those that had been promised by the President of the United States and the Democratic Party. Despite warnings that the company was unsustainable and would surely fail, the administration was blinded by their political agenda and committed over half a billion dollars in taxpayer dollars to a privately held company.

In fact, during a 2011 restructuring of the loan, the administration placed private investors ahead of taxpayers when it came to reimbursement in the event of bankruptcy. Given these practices, it's no wonder that our current President has created budget deficits in excess of \$1 trillion each year he has served as President.

In addition to ensuring that the Federal Government does not throw taxpayer dollars after the investments, H.R. 6213 also highlights the need of the Federal Government to stop propping up failed companies which cannot support themselves in the open market. The Federal Government should not guarantee hundreds of millions of dollars in taxpayer-backed loans to companies that do not have a business model that supports sufficient private investment. The administration should not pretend to be a venture capitalist with taxpayers' money.

In testimony before the Rules Committee yesterday, Congressman ED WHITFIELD, chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy

and Power, testified that the DOE loan guarantee programs spent \$15 billion, but only created 1,175 jobs.

□ 1230

That means that each job created cost taxpayers \$12.8 million. These statistics demonstrate what House Republicans have been saying for years—this country cannot tax and spend its way to prosperity. Instead, we must encourage the free enterprise system by preventing over-regulation and promoting pro-growth policies, including tax policies that do not push jobs overseas, that create a better free enterprise system, that create not just jobs but also careers for Americans. And they should be designed to incentivize private investment, which is known, Mr. Speaker, as the free enterprise system.

Ultimately, the No More Solyndras Act puts an end to an ineffective government program, protects taxpayers from financing the administration's wish list of projects, and establishes necessary oversight to hold executive branch officials accountable for their actions.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, my friend Mr. SESSIONS, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this structured rule. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have brought up yet another closed process in what was supposed to be a more open and democratic House. After 2 years of broken promises, we shouldn't be surprised by this action. And we shouldn't be surprised that the Republicans are bringing up this overtly political bill just 55 days before election. H.R. 6213, the No More Solyndras Act, is just political theater. It's a bill that's going nowhere. We know the Senate won't consider it. The only thing it does is give the Republicans another talking point to use on the campaign trail.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are trying to make it seem like there was a big conspiracy to inappropriately give money to Solyndra, a company that was trying to manufacture solar panels here in the United States. They claim that there was a political effort to award Solyndra funds in an improper, and possibly illegal, way. And in doing so, they are attacking a Department of Energy loan guarantee program that allows private investors to invest billions of dollars in order to create thousands of jobs here in America.

The Republican response to a company that went bankrupt after receiving Federal loans—a company that was manufacturing alternative-energy

products here in the United States—was to begin investigations that turned into political witch hunts. And those investigations appear to have led us to this point by consideration of this bill that purports to end the loan guarantee program altogether. Of course, the reality is that those investigations have really been used as ammunition on the campaign trail.

But what the Republicans claim they're doing today and what they're really doing are two different things. They say that they're eliminating the loan guarantee program, getting rid of it completely. But what this bill really does is bar the Department of Energy from considering new applications submitted after December 31, 2011. That leaves \$34 billion in the pipeline for applications for the Department of Energy loan guarantee program that were submitted before December 31, 2011. And there's no deadline on when these applications must be approved.

Not only that, but most of the available loan guarantee funding is for fossil fuel and nuclear projects. That's right, Republicans are claiming to end this loan guarantee program but are still allowing it to spend tens of billions of dollars. And they are still picking and choosing the winners and losers by putting an artificial end date on the application submissions. The result will be billions more in loan guarantees for projects dealing with nuclear and fossil fuels like coal and oil and much less for hydro, solar, and hydro projects.

America should be about innovation, about creating new things. We're the country that put a man on the Moon. We're the country that created the car, airplane, and iPad. We should be fostering, not stifling, innovation, especially in energy like wind, solar, and hydro. Yet the Republican leadership is showing, once again, that political victory is more important than American success; that winning this election is more important than fostering American manufacturing and leadership in areas like alternative energy.

Mr. Speaker, this is just another example of how this Republican leadership likes to talk the talk but not walk the walk. In this case, they say they don't like the loan guarantee program, but they want their own pet industries to be able to use it. It's another example of how their rhetoric doesn't match up with their actions.

But we've seen this hypocrisy for years now. This is the same Republican Party that opposed the stimulus plan, but requested and touted funding from that same stimulus plan. In fact, Republican Members in this House have requested loan guarantees for businesses they support, including those in the nuclear industry; but they oppose this program for alternative-energy businesses that want to manufacture in America. And this is the flip-flopping that kind of makes my head spin.

It's clear that my Republican friends don't let the facts get in the way of their political argument. It's a fact

that this loan guarantee program is a success. For example, this loan program has ultimately supported 40 projects that help keep 60,000 people employed during this economic downturn alone. It's also a fact that the Solyndra bankruptcy represented a fraction of the entire loan guarantee program. In fact, loans and loan guarantee programs only cost taxpayers 94 cents for every \$100 invested. That's a pretty good return on investment.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Republicans that Congress needs a robust oversight program that examines the executive branch and ensures that they are not overstepping their bounds. It's ironic that these Republicans are conducting a vigorous oversight plan of President Obama, but simply looked the other way when it came to the oversight of the Bush administration.

But there's oversight and then there's overreach. Republicans looked into this issue, they held hearings, and conducted an investigation. And despite their claims of political manipulation, there is simply no evidence of such manipulation. Don't take my word for it. Bloomberg Business Week reported that there was "no evidence of wrongdoing." And The Washington Post reported: "The records do not establish that anyone pressured the Energy Department to approve the Solyndra loan to benefit political contractors."

Mr. Speaker, we all know what this is. This is an election year stunt, political theater that is more appropriate for the campaign trail rather than the House of Representatives. It's a bill that supporters claim will do something that it simply will not do. And this closed process is, once again, breaking Speaker BOEHNER's promise of a more open House.

This is a bad bill, it's a bad rule, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the bill and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to close with one observation. We have just returned from a recess. If the rumor mill is true, we will only be in session for 8 days before the election. I'm hearing that we're going to probably give away the first week in October. And given the fact that we're here such a short time, one would think that this would be an opportunity to come together and to pass legislation that both sides can agree on—legislation that might, in fact, help stimulate economic growth; might, in fact, help put people back to work; might address some of the real challenges that the American people are facing. We don't have to agree on everything to agree on something. And that something we agree on, we ought to be able to come together and pass it.

Yet what we're doing during these 8 days is debating hot-button issues and bills that are going nowhere. This is a hot-button issue. They will be debating another hot-button issue later. Hot button, hot button, hot button. Never any legislation that has any real meaning in the lives of the American people.

Bring the President's jobs bill to the floor. Let us have that debate. Let us be able to have a vote on whether or not we ought to invest in our economy and invest in our people. My Republican friends are squandering this opportunity. I think one thing is clear, and I think it's evident by the low esteem that the Congress is now held in by the American people: the American people want us to work on their behalf. And I understand the lust in this place for political power and winning elections and winning elections. I used to think that good government was good politics.

But what we are doing here for these 8 days, with the exception of passing a continuing resolution, which is kicking the can down the road on a whole bunch of other budgetary issues, what we're doing these 8 days is nothing meaningful, nothing that matters to anybody. And I just think that that's a sad commentary on the leadership of this House.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1240

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

I know that our Democrat friends think it's absolutely nothing to lose half a billion dollars that a government made a decision on. But what they really don't like is when we bring that up, when we say part of the job of being a Member of Congress as a policy body is to look at the mistakes that were made. We certainly have looked at mistakes that Republicans and Democrats, administrations and others, have made. But to ignore an issue would be a mistake.

This is not just Solyndra. It was the process of a political agenda that did not, could not pass the smell test and even make it out in the real world. It was a political agenda that was so wanted by an administration that they gave lots of money, not just half a billion here, but to other companies.

You know, today's legislation certainly highlights Solyndra as a failure in the DOE, Department of Energy's loan program, but it should be mentioned that there were other companies, not just Solyndra.

It's really a political process that said, Let's go do this thing whether it makes sense or not, whether it makes money. The companies went bankrupt.

Part of this comes from you've got a lot of people in the administration that wouldn't even recognize a business plan if they saw one. They do recognize taxpayer dollars, plenty of those that were made available by this excessive spending. But accountability is now what Democrats don't like when we're saying let's look at what happened, what materialized.

So Solyndra is not just a one-time or one-company failure of an otherwise what would be called a successful program. It's not. This simply became the poster child, and we believe that we

shouldn't repeat this failure. We believe we should effectively talk about it on the floor of the House of Representatives. We should take some bit of time. We're not here beating anybody up. You never even heard me mention names behind the administration or who made these decisions or who pushed it. We're not trying to do that.

We're simply trying to say that we believe half a billion dollars, and a review of that, should become available in the light of day, to not just Members of Congress; but we should vote on it and say we drew a conclusion with some issues.

So we believe any objective evaluation of the facts reveals some issues of Federal dollars of a plan that should be stopped, has stopped, but that we should at least tell what the results were. That's what we're doing here today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, you know what, one of the things that Speaker BOEHNER promised was a more open House and this would be a place where we could actually deliberate and various points of view would be heard.

I want to now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment and Economy whose amendment was not made in order, so he will not have an opportunity to debate it here on the floor.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Thank you for the time.

Mr. Speaker, Members, the original law that this bill amends today was actually created, the loan program, was in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, passed by a Republican Congress and signed by a Republican President. The law does need to have minor reforms, but this bill goes way too far.

The majority had the opportunity in our committee of Energy and Commerce to work in a bipartisan fashion to actually fix the problems with the loan guarantee program. I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee that had been supported by Republicans in our committee, but not a majority of the Republicans, to fix the problems with the program and find middle ground that would be suitable to both Democrats and Republicans alike.

But the majority chose a different path. They decided to forge ahead with a partisan messaging bill that stands no chance of becoming law even when it passes the House today. So despite the name, this bill will not prevent another Solyndra. It's the worst of election-year politics.

We had a chance to work together, something the American people want to see; and one of the things we were sent here to do was fix a broken program. Instead, we're playing more politics one more time.

The bill is bad policy. It doesn't do what conservatives want to do, so the

Heritage Foundation opposes it. It doesn't do what the liberals want to do. It eliminates a well-balanced, bipartisan agreement struck years ago, so it isn't what moderates want to do. It's legislating without accountability.

The majority doesn't care that it's bad policy because it will never become law.

Instead, I urge my colleagues to find the bipartisanship. Let's take this opportunity to fix the problem that we see and craft a bipartisan bill. This is a chance to show our country that Congress can do things.

One of the reasons Congress has a 10 percent approval rating is we're not legislating. We're messaging. This is probably the worst example of it. We're talking past each other. This is a chance to show our country that Congress can do things. Instead, this partisan circus helps confirm the belief that Congress is broken, and it's working against the interest of the American people.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and support a bipartisan effort to really make sure there are no more Solyndras.

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

I would like to go to the report. Let's see what the report out of the Energy and Commerce Committee said. I am quoting what would be on page 5:

However, the Bush administration did not approve any loan guarantees under the program. This was due partly to the fact that the DOE office implementing the program was slow in being set up, and that program funding only became available in 2007. But even after the Bush DOE had the program up and running, it ran into difficulties finding applicants whose energy projects are meritorious.

In other words, they could not find somebody who is asking for the loan who could present a good business plan of not just profit and loss, but where it would fit in the marketplace to even be considered successful. This is the reason why the Bush administration and Republicans did not do that because they could see failure in the marketplace written all over it even as early as 2007.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me again repeat for my colleagues what Bloomberg Business Week reported, and I quote again: "There was no evidence of any wrongdoing." The Washington Post reported: "The records do not establish that anyone pressured the Energy Department to approve the Solyndra loan to benefit political contributors.

I mean, you know, it's clear what's going on here.

Again, bringing this bill, a bill that's going nowhere—we heard about the bridges to nowhere; this is the legislation to nowhere—I think is bad enough, but then bringing it up under a closed process.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Natural Resources,

had three amendments. All three of them were denied by the Rules Committee, including a Buy America provision. What a radical idea that we should make it in America and we should buy it in America. That radical amendment was denied by the Rules Committee. It's hard to believe.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, in the history of this whole program, it was started for the nuclear industry. Pete Domenici, 2005. Why? Because there hadn't been a new nuclear power plant built in 30 years out in the free market so they needed the Federal Government to come in and prop it up on crutches. That's the only way it would work.

So when President Obama took over, he said, Well, maybe we should do something for solar as well. Of course, the coal industry, the oil industry, the nuclear industry, they recoiled in fear that there would actually be competition in the marketplace. When one solar company got in trouble, the Republicans pounced on solar. They pounced on wind. They pounced. That's why, by the way, the Republicans are going to allow the wind tax breaks to expire this year, but they're going to keep all of the oil tax breaks on the books.

So here we are today and they have something called the No More Solyndras Act. Ah. Except for the \$88 billion that they're going to grandfather in in terms of the application date that they have selected.

□ 1250

So, who qualifies for that? Well, \$76.5 billion would be the nuclear industry, \$11.9 billion would be the coal industry. Ah, I get it now. It's not the No More Solyndras Act; it's the "Only \$88.4 Billion More for Nuclear and Coal No More Solyndras Act of 2012." It's just the same kind of tilted playing field that the Republicans have always had. Nuclear, oil, coal, great. Wind and solar finally getting going—12,000 new megawatts of wind installed in the United States this year; 3,200 megawatts of solar installed in the United States this year—that puts the fear of the marketplace in the coal and the nuclear and the oil industry brain. So that's why we're out here with this "kill solar and save nuclear and coal" with this incredible amount of money.

Now, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said, I had an amendment that I requested the Rules Committee put in place, and that is that if your company last year lost \$540 million or more, you could not qualify for a loan guarantee. Remember, Solyndra lost \$538 million, so I picked \$540 million. And if your company is on the verge of being delisted by the New York Stock Exchange and has already reached junk bond status with S&P's and Moody's, come on, you cannot qualify. I mean, come on. We're not having Federal tax-

payer money go to companies on the verge of being delisted and that have already reached junk bond status.

They all voted "no" in the committee. When I had my amendment put up before the Rules Committee, they rejected it. Now, why did they reject it? Because the United States Enrichment Corporation lost \$540 million last year; it's on the verge of being delisted on the stock exchange; it's reached junk bond status; but yet nuclear will qualify. So I said, well, we can't invest in that kind of a company.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts said, the same thing is true for buying American. If we're going to have these loan guarantees, let's at least make sure that they are American jobs. They wouldn't put that amendment in order as well.

This whole issue here is basically one of this favored oil-above-all agenda, not all of the above—not when you say tax breaks for oil companies continue and wind companies die; not when you have loan guarantees that continue on for nuclear and coal, but not for wind, not for solar. It's just so transparent. It's just arithmetic, ladies and gentlemen. Solyndra loses 538, the Enrichment Corporation—nuclear—loses 540. The arithmetic is pretty simple: They both should not qualify. But not these guys, no, no.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MARKEY. Not these guys, oh, no—no, no, no, because it's not marketplace. There's no rhyme or reason to it until you start to think about what has always been their agenda. That has always been the fossil fuel industry agenda.

I would abolish the entire program. You want to abolish this program? Abolish it. Put the vote out here, I'll vote for it. Get rid of the loan guarantee program, then let solar and wind and nuclear and coal and oil all compete in the free marketplace for private capital investment. You want to know what that would do? It would put the fear of Adam Smith in the heart of the nuclear industry because they would receive no private investment, none. It takes the Federal Government providing a crutch. So it then requires the Republican Party to take away the loan guarantees for the competition. Well, they're giving the loan guarantees, Federal taxpayer loan guarantees, to industries that otherwise could not get any money in the private sector. The United States Enrichment Corporation can't get any private sector investment. Nuclear power industry, this loan guarantee program—two for \$8 billion for a program that is already \$1 billion over the two Vogtle plants in Georgia. The whole thing is bad arithmetic for the American taxpayer.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we're now well into the political extremism that we see many times that exhibits itself not just here on the floor of the

House of Representatives but really all across this country—those people that want gasoline to rise substantially because they really don't like gasoline. They really don't like the underpinning of how this country uses the energy that we have. Whether it's natural gas, they attack natural gas. If it's nuclear—which is a non-emitting source of pollution—they attack that. This crowd that really doesn't like free enterprise and what I believe is the heartland of this country, manufacturing, which has really taken off as a result of effective use of natural resources in this country through natural gas and the availability of nuclear power and the availability of oil, which fuels our cars to where we can use the resources that were given us effectively.

What they want to do is they want to tax these industries higher so that prices go up, so that consumers have to pay a lot more money. What they forget is that the cars that we fuel, the electricity that we need is the cleanest and the best here in America. The way these are produced are American jobs. The way they're consumed is about American jobs. The way that consumers pay for them and pay for these advantages is American jobs. And here we're looking at how half a billion dollars worth of taxpayer money was put into an effort that not only not ever got off the ground, it quickly went into bankruptcy because it did not meet the marketplace challenges.

I'm not opposed to competition; I think we stand for competition. But don't push a narrow environmentalist policy, go to the White House, go to the Department of Energy and try and fund these on taxpayer dollars only to see that, whoops, we made a mistake, and then act like, whoops, we don't want anybody to know.

All we're trying to suggest today is that Republicans do believe in American jobs. We do believe in American industry. We do believe in the energy industry. We believe in effective use of resources because we're trying to keep jobs here. Their narrow, political, environmentalist policy is what will diminish American jobs, it will diminish our ability to effectively use the resources that we have in this country, and it will put us in a circumstance—for instance, with the Keystone pipeline—where we could use energy from a friendly neighbor to fuel American needs at a good price and avoid what may happen if we get into a circumstance overseas in the Middle East where we would be held hostage, held hostage by those that have the energy that we need, when we could be having it not only close to home, but in our own home, energy made in America.

So, Republicans, look, all we're trying to say is a half a billion dollars that was wasted, somebody ought to recognize that we shouldn't be doing that. That's what Republicans are doing here today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just respond by saying when the Republicans talk about jobs, I don't know whether to laugh or cry. Let me go back to what we were talking about earlier with Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY had an amendment—let me read it. It would prevent guarantees from being granted unless the applicant certifies that at least 75 percent of materials and components required for construction, manufacturing, or operations are produced in the United States of America. Any facility at which construction, manufacturing, or operations are to be carried out must also be located in the United States of America. This amendment is not even allowed to be debated on this House floor. The Republicans in the Rules Committee said: Absolutely not. Absolutely not.

So, if we're going to be talking about jobs, I mean, maybe we're here about different jobs. I'm talking about jobs in America; maybe my friends are talking about creating more jobs overseas. We need more jobs here. And if you're serious about that, why wouldn't you allow that amendment to be brought up and debated on the House floor?

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. This bill ought to be renamed the "No More Solyndras, But More Money for Nuclear White Elephants Loan Program."

My friends on the other side of the aisle like to talk about the free enterprise system, but I'm sure that you're aware that Wall Street won't invest in nuclear power. The nukes can't get money from the free enterprise system, so they want government to bail them out.

This bill claims to reduce wasteful spending on energy projects, but it's actually an attack on renewable energy. The real effect is laid bare by the effective date of the bill, which grandfathers the worst of the worst of the worst energy boondoggles.

□ 1300

Specifically, it allows nuclear power loan guarantee projects to proceed, even though some create exposure for the Federal Government of about 15 times the exposure created by Solyndra—and these programs, these nuclear loan programs, are more likely to fail.

One of the biggest loan guarantees for nuclear, not even necessary. This is not my assessment. It's the assessment of Kevin Marsh, the President of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, which is attempting to build a new nuclear power plant. He said, on a call to analysts and investors:

We're confident in our ability to finance this project without a loan guarantee. It could be in the \$8 to \$10 billion range.

So the conflict here is, generally, Wall Street isn't investing. But you get a group of investors that think they

can, but are they leveraging against the hope of government involvement? I don't know.

Truth is nuclear power plants are simply not viable without massive government subsidies, which eclipse subsidies for renewable energies by orders of magnitude.

The Congressional Budget Office has had this to say about nuclear loan guarantees:

The CBO considers the risk of default on such loan guarantees to be very high—well above 50 percent.

Dale Klein, former Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, cautioned that nuclear plants will not move off the blackboard and into construction, not as long as natural gas remains as cheap and plentiful as it is today.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KUCINICH. An article opposing the bill, by Autumn Hanna and Henry Sokolski in the National Review Online, states:

The total number of projects this bill grandfathers isn't publicly available. Par for the course with this highly secretive program. We know it's a lot. Our research points to nearly 100 projects that claim to have applied.

If this was really about being fiscally responsible with taxpayers' money, we'd be targeting the projects that have the highest probability of failing and carry the highest price tag and preclude them. But the bill does the opposite.

What we should be doing is continuing our efforts to invest in renewables, understanding some of them may not work, but that's the future. It's cleaner. It's safety. It protects the globe. That's where the jobs of tomorrow are.

We have to stop China from eating our lunch on these alternative energy projects. We have to reclaim this for America. Bring the jobs here. Create the jobs here.

The money's there. Don't go giving it to nuclear. Nuclear is dead in the water unless government tries to resurrect it by giving away billions of dollars in taxpayers' money that will never be recovered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I think it's very obvious that what Republicans are trying to do is to keep American jobs. We're trying to utilize the free enterprise system, the natural resources that we have in America—clean natural gas, the abundance of other power that we have, including coal, including nuclear—opportunities to keep America strong and keep jobs here, and that's why we're really opposed to the loan guarantees and the things which might take on additional debt and risk by the government. But, more importantly, if it can't be funded within the free enterprise system, then it can't stand on its own.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from

California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), one of my colleagues.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill ends the title XVII loan guarantees that produced Solyndra and so many other alternate energy scams that cost Americans hundreds of millions of dollars while the politically connected perpetrators of these scams walked away wealthy men and women. But this measure does still put taxpayers on the hook to loan out billions of dollars more to at least 50 additional shady, alternate energy schemes that had been submitted under the same title prior to January 1. So there will be more Solyndras under this bill.

I'd offered an amendment to pull the plug on the applications, but I was told, Don't bother; the Rules Committee won't allow the amendment to be brought to the floor.

So I support the bill, but I do agree with my friend from Ohio that the title, "No More Solyndras Act," is a bit misleading. I would suggest an alternative, the "50 More Solyndras and Then We'll Stop Wasting Your Money, Really, We Promise, Act."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman who just spoke for pointing out how bad this rule is. He's on the other side of the aisle, and even though I disagree with the amendment he had, he ought to have been able to offer it to the floor. I hope that he will join with us in opposing this rule because I don't think his leadership will get the message if he rewards bad behavior by giving them a vote.

At this point, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman. I'm opposed to the rule, I'm opposed to the bill, but I'm really opposed to the thinking behind this.

This is like a Back to the Future or the Flat Earth Society or something. I don't know how we would have a space program if one failure stopped the whole show. I don't know how—we would never. I mean, Michael Jordan was kicked off his high school basketball team, but he eventually learned how to put the ball in the basket.

The notion that, as the greatest Nation on Earth, we're going to cede to others alternative energy programs, that somehow we're unwilling to go through what is necessary to be successful in this field, doesn't make any sense.

Now, President Bush signed this into law. It's a great program. In fact, James Rogers, who's the CEO of Duke Energy, said just a few days ago that, in terms of energy, America is so much better off because of this administration's all-of-the-above strategy. For the first time in 30 years, we've got nuclear plants that have been licensed. We have natural gas. We've got oil. We have renewables.

I've supported these loan guarantee programs. And like any loan program,

you might have some loans that perform and some loans that don't perform. The vast majority of these loans perform very, very well, and America is better off for it.

I was at the Israeli Embassy last night speaking to a group of scientists. They've been so far ahead of us on renewable energy it's a shame. We have seen what Germany's done on wind.

This party that is in the majority here, that wants to do away with the wind energy credit, I don't know what the notion here is that somehow we, as a country, are not prepared to pay the price for progress. We have not won every battle in wars that we've been in, but we've won the war.

And so this a company in which things, the numbers didn't add up for us. It's like one of our rockets or satellites not performing properly. But the head of NASA says that we're not in a business in which we cannot take risks. We have to take risks. And when it comes to energy, our country has to be prepared to take risks.

Now, it was Albert Einstein who said we cannot use the same level of thinking to solve problems that we used to create these problems.

This country and our status as the leading Nation in the world requires us to take risks. And if this majority is so unimpressed with the ability of Americans and Americans to innovate and to compete in the renewable sector like others around the world who are also getting help from their governments, that is unfortunate. But, for me, I believe that America has to take risks. We're going to lose, we're going to win, but at the end of the day, as we learn and go forward, it will allow us to continue to be number one.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I have no additional speakers and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We ought to have a debate in this Chamber on energy, on an energy policy, whether or not we should invest in innovation, whether or not we should invest in renewable, green, clean energy. I believe we should.

My friends on the other side believe not just in the status quo, they believe in going backwards. They believe in investing, not in new technologies, but in the old technologies.

□ 1310

But we should have that debate here.

This bill really is not that debate, because this bill is a political stunt. It is not anything real. It is not anything that is going anywhere. This is just politics as usual, and that's what makes this so frustrating.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to end where I began in my opening, which is to say we're only here for a few days. I mean, I've never been part of a Congress that has worked less than this Congress and that has produced less than this Congress. Today's Roll Call has a great piece: "Congress on Pace to be the

Least Productive." Is that what my friends on the other side of the aisle are aspiring to—to be known as the least productive Congress?

We're back for these few days. We ought to do something meaningful for the American people. We ought to be debating a jobs bill. We ought to bring the President's jobs bill to the floor. If you don't want to vote for it, vote against it, but at least we'd be doing something of substance. We ought to be extending tax breaks for middle-income Americans. Why would you leave town without making sure that middle-income Americans continue to get their tax breaks?

We ought to have a responsible farm bill passed and signed into law. As we're running out of time, we're told that's probably not going to happen at all. We ought to be talking about legislation that will actually strengthen this country, that will help improve the quality of education and give more access to education for our young people.

We are doing none of those things. We are squandering this opportunity. With the exception of passing a continuing resolution, which is tantamount to kicking the can down the road, these 8 days that we have been back in session have been useless. They have just been about politics. That is why the American people are so sick and tired of this Congress. That is why the approval rating is so low. They want us to come to Washington to legislate and deliberate on issues that will make a positive difference in their lives. Instead, what we have is the same old, same old—politics as usual. There has to be some common ground between Republicans and Democrats on energy. Let's find that common ground and move forward. Enough with the political stunts. It is time to start doing the people's business, and this is not it.

So I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to vote against this, again, restrictive rule that denies a multitude of amendments, including an amendment that would make sure the jobs that we are talking about are in America. Buy American. What is so wrong with even debating that? We're not even given that opportunity. So vote against this restrictive rule, and vote against the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, obviously, we can see that today's legislation answers the question. It ends the debate about Solyndra. Taxpayers know the committee did its work. It held a Rules Committee hearing. Half a billion dollars was lost by Solyndra. We're not down here jumping up and down. We haven't even raised our voices. We simply said that we think that a better process could have taken place, and they're arguing we never should have even had this on the floor—that we don't need any feedback, that everybody already knows. Here is what they know.

We lost half a billion dollars by one company. At least two others had the same outcome where they did not produce anything. They went belly up—bankrupt. We just think that the administration—government—is really not in the business and shouldn't be in the business—despite what we've heard—of pushing the envelope. Let's go out and invest whether it makes sense or not.

Losing money is still a bad proposition. Republicans think it's a bad proposition. There have been lots of arguments today that the government did the right thing, that this administration did the right thing. I think that the facts of the case say that half a billion dollars in a process that didn't work—we need to hear the feedback, and we need to close the books on it. The rule is here to do exactly that—to place on the floor the opportunity for us to debate now the facts of the case, which is exactly what will happen.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 117, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6365, NATIONAL SECURITY AND JOB PROTECTION ACT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 778 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 778

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 117) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6365) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to replace the sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011. 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 the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommitt.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. House Resolution 778 is a closed rule for the consideration of two bills, H.R. 6365, which is the National Security and Job Protection Act, and H.J. Res. 117, which is the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for FY13.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a freshman on the Rules Committee. It's a good committee to be on. I enjoy it. I get to work with learned Members like my friend from Florida, who is across the aisle, but it falls to me to handle continuing resolution bills. As you'll remember, when we showed up at the beginning of 2011, there was a lot of unfinished business from 2010, and we went right into continuing resolution act to continuing resolution act to continuing resolution act—sometimes 2 and 3 weeks at a time. That's no way to run a government. It's no way to have a Congress.

My friend from Florida and I disagree on a great deal of policy, but we believe that a deliberative process yields better results than the "right here, right now, hurry up and wait" kind of mentality that this body so often adopts. So what we've done here today with this bill, with this H.J. Res. 117, is to say we understand that the appropriations responsibilities of this Congress have not yet been completed. The Constitution gives this Congress—not just this body, but this Congress—the responsibility of providing appropriations for this Nation.

Now, as the Speaker knows full well, this House has set about getting its business done. We divided those appropriations bills up across a number of bills. The Commerce-Justice-Science bill passed this House with a bipartisan majority. It went to the Senate, and the Senate had no floor action whatsoever. Mr. Speaker, you know that the Energy and Water bill passed this

House with a bipartisan majority. It went to the Senate, and the Senate did nothing with it whatsoever. You know that the Homeland Security bill passed this body—again, with a bipartisan majority. It went to the Senate, and the Senate took no action. I can go on and on and on. There is the leg branch bill, the military construction bill, the defense bill, on and on and on.

So here we are. We don't have control over the Senate. We only have control over what goes on here in this body, and I've got to tell you that I'm proud as a freshman that we've set about getting our business done. With one deliberative bill at a time and one open rule on appropriations bills at a time, we allowed every Member of this body to come to the floor to offer their amendments and to have their voices heard in order to produce the very best work product that we could produce. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we did that at a funding level even lower than what the American taxpayer asked of us in the Budget Control Act. I'm very proud of that work.

□ 1320

But in the absence of the Senate taking action, Mr. Speaker, we have to move on. The American people are going to have a referendum in this country. They're going to have a referendum on what fiscal responsibility means.

We're going to have an election in November, and new House Members are going to come and new Senate Members are going to come. The administration may change. We're going to have that opportunity for all of us as citizens to speak out in November and choose a path for 2013. But our business today, Mr. Speaker, is making sure the doors stay open moving into 2013.

As my colleagues know, in the absence of action, Mr. Speaker, government offices begin to close on October 1 of this year, one by one—national parks, veterans services, Social Security services, Medicare services. That's not the kind of governing responsibility that we all swore an oath to uphold.

So I'm pleased to be here today, Mr. Speaker, to bring this rule to the floor to say, yes, we have gotten our work done in this House, but we've been stymied by the leadership in the Senate that has not scheduled votes on these bills, but we will not allow the American taxpayer and American citizens to pay the price of inaction by the United States Senate. We will make sure that government services continue with this great referendum that this great Republic will have in November. It's a 6-month continuing resolution, Mr. Speaker, and it will solve that need.

This rule also, Mr. Speaker, provides for consideration of H.R. 6365. It's called the National Security and Job Protection Act, but what it is is a sequester replacement bill. Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I've ever been more disgusted in my 18 months in this body.

We came together here in this House in a bipartisan fashion. We passed the Budget Control Act, which gave six House Members and six Senate Members—six Republicans, six Democrats—12 Members of this Congress, esteemed Members of this Congress, talented, bright, conscientious, American-loving Members of this Congress, an opportunity to look at our entire budget. They didn't just look at the \$3.8 trillion that we'd spend this year, Mr. Speaker, not just that \$3.8 trillion, but next year, and the year after that, and the year after that, well into the three-generational window. It was hundreds of trillions of dollars these 12 men and women had an opportunity to look at to find bipartisan agreement.

About 4 months they worked on that project, Mr. Speaker, and you know how that story turns out. After 4 months of labor by 12 of the brightest, most conscientious Members of this body—six Republicans, six Democrats, six House Members, six Senate Members—looking at hundreds of trillions of dollars in tax expenditures in social programs, in taxes and tax cuts, they agreed on absolutely nothing. Not one dollar out of hundreds of trillions did they come together on. That was a tremendous disappointment.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, in order to try to bring agreement to that body, we passed legislation that implemented what they called the sequester, to say, if against all odds this joint select committee were to fail—candidly, it was not on my radar screen that they would. This was a solemn responsibility. These were talented Members who were assigned to it. But if they were to fail, we would implement automatic spending cuts that would achieve the kind of budget reductions that every American knows that we need. The problem in this town is spending, and the sequester said we will not fail on this opportunity to address it.

Well, that sequester goes into effect in January of next year, and hardest hit will be the United States military. Again, this was a device that was put into place not because folks thought it was the best policy in the room, but to be there as the hammer to say surely this 12-member committee, this joint select committee will come to the agreement that will bring us back from this fiscal cliff. They didn't. Now this sequester hangs over the head of not just the United States military, but over Medicare, over social programs.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I'm just so proud to be a freshman Member of this House. This House said back in the spring that is an unacceptable outcome. It was never intended to be the outcome. No one ever desired that it be the outcome, and we can change that outcome.

So we passed a sequester replacement right here in this House that went into mandatory spending programs, which is where the real problem is in the budget, as we all know, and said let's replace the sequester that may harm

defense—cuts that are going to deal with our military, that are going to put our national security at risk, and let's replace those with spending reductions that make sense.

Again, we passed that in the House. The Senate has taken no action whatsoever.

I don't mean to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they've taken no action on our bill. They most certainly have not. They're under no obligation to. It's the right thing to do, but they're under no obligation. They are under an obligation to do something about it. They are under an obligation to stand up and listen to the same constituents that my colleague from Florida and I listen to to say there must be action. We must prevent this tremendous threat to our readiness, to our troops, and to our troops' families.

This bill, introduced in this body by Colonel ALLEN WEST of Florida, gives us an opportunity to do just that in the bipartisan, open-minded way that I think has characterized the 18 months that I've served in this House because of the leadership of folks like you, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't say you have to use the House-passed bill already.

Was it a good bill? Absolutely. Was it the right answer? I believe that it is.

But what it says is use the House-passed bill or use something like it. If you can find a better plan, if the Senate, in its wisdom, can find a better plan, that's going to work, too. It's not our way or the highway. It's that we know that there's a right way and a wrong way to deal with our budget challenges, and we want to do it the right way.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. I rise in strong support of the two underlying provisions, as well. I look forward to the debate on that this afternoon. We're going to be able to debate these individually, which I believe is the right way to handle questions of this magnitude and this importance.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from my neighboring State of Georgia, whom I consider to be one of the most conscientious, hardworking individuals in the Congress, and I appreciate the fact that he's 18 months here in the Congress. He and I know that he understands this institution considerably, having worked here for a number of years, and I'm grateful the process allows and he has allowed that I receive the traditional 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides, as has been said, for consideration of two bills. To identify them again, H.J. Res. 117 is the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, and H. Res. 6365 is the National Security and Job Protection Act.

When my colleague began his remarks, he said the magic words, "This

is a closed rule." When I was, as he, 18 months in the House in 1992 and I would be on radio, people were talking about how awful it was that the Democrats had so many closed rules. The Democrats lost the election that following year in 1994, and one of the leading reasons was closed rules. Yet we find ourselves on something as important as the financial circumstances of this country coming to the floor at the 11th hour with a closed rule, and, in fact, not having many more days that we are scheduled to be here, but having absolutely no reason why we could not be here at any point in time between now and the time that our financial circumstances would begin to be, as they are, much worse. Maybe the Republicans should have added a third entitled resolution. I would call it the "No More Getting Anything Done in This Congress Act," because that is the message of this particular package.

This continuing resolution is merely a reminder that my friends in the majority were unable to complete work on the regular appropriations bills.

□ 1330

Instead of devoting congressional time to tackling the needs of essential government programs, Republicans have spent the summer trying to repeal the health care law, giving away benefits to the oil and gas industry, and chipping away repeatedly at women's rights.

Now, my colleague is correct in many respects to point out that the other body presents us with challenges, but it is not as if the other body has not done something. Let me tell you one of the measures that I have a continuing interest in because of my constituency, and that is that the Senate has passed a farm bill for a 5-year extension.

What my colleagues or leadership on the Republican side will not do is put that farm bill here on the floor even though we are faced in this country with a residual from one of the worst droughts that America has ever experienced. Even though food prices for all of the people in this country are continuously rising, here we are with this time that the chair of the Agriculture Committee and the ranking member begging the leadership, cannot find time for it to be on this floor. Instead of devoting our time to tackling the needs of essential government programs, we decide that we're going to attack women's rights.

Now, suddenly, you seem to have awakened to the looming, described, fiscal cliff. It's kind of good that you've noticed; but rather than address this challenge head on, the Republicans are pushing a bill that doesn't do anything. The sequester replacement does not actually prevent the sequester with a prudent mix, and every panel that has looked at this says that we have to have a prudent mix of spending cuts and revenue increases. What the Republicans simply do is kick the can down the road, which is no surprise.

I said in an earlier Rules meeting, and it was during the Olympics, that if kicking the can down the road were an Olympic sport, then Congress and the Republican majority would win gold, bronze, silver, and tin. This poor can doesn't have much more space to be kicked on, and I can tell you it places the burden on someone else to deal with this in the future. And this is what my Republican colleagues would call fiscal responsibility?

We got into this mess because of the massive deficits the Republicans piled on this country. Two wars in the Middle East not paid for, huge tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans—for those among us that are in a high-paying position—and huge, unpaid prescription drug benefits are all things that Republican Members in this House voted for despite the huge costs that would be imposed.

In fact, just 61 bills have been signed into law this year, the fewest in more than 60 years. In all of 2011, only 90 bills were signed into law. When Democrats controlled both Chambers in 2010, 258 bills were signed into law.

Now, I don't want to sound like I'm the only person who is making this observation that is being made. Let me cite two people, especially here inside the Beltway, that have made this observation, and that are generally respected as nonpartisan and accepted as experts by Republicans and Democrats.

We on this side are not the only ones who have noticed the lack of productivity that I just identified with the 61 bills. Norman Ornstein and Thomas Mann wrote in a Washington Post column, the two gentlemen, and I am quoting them:

We have been studying Washington politics and Congress for more than 40 years, and never have we seen them this dysfunctional. In our past writings, we have criticized both parties when we believed it was warranted. Today, however, we have no choice but to acknowledge that the core of the problem lies with the Republican Party.

That's from two particularly nonpartisan observers that everybody around here recognizes as experts. Now we are asked to support the Romney-Ryan vision of America, which ignores any responsibility for today's economic difficulties and instead demands that those who have the least in this great country should sacrifice the most. While Republicans last year were fighting tooth and nail to default on our debt obligations and crash the economy, millions of Americans were fighting to keep their jobs and millions lost them.

Millions of Americans were fighting to pay off their mortgages, and millions could not pay them. Millions of Americans were seeking access to quality health care, and they could not afford it. Millions of children of parents who wanted them to go to college are finding themselves without the capacity to get a decent education largely for the reasons that I have suggested.

But under the Romney-Ryan vision those priorities should take a back seat

to increase defense spending, and yet give more tax cuts for the wealthiest among us in our society. When it comes to Medicare and Medicaid, student loans and public safety, the Republicans are quick to dismiss billions of dollars in essential funding with a wave of their hand and the crocodile tears of deficit reduction. But when the defense contractors stand to lose just \$1, Republicans suddenly find their fighting spirit and cry about a weakening America.

It's a shame, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans can't shake off their do-nothing indolence to fight as hard for all Americans as they do for the richest.

We have a long list of programs, tax cuts, and activities set to expire at the end of this year; but rather than confront those challenges head on, Republicans are wasting our time with do-nothing bills. I suppose that when you have absolutely no ideas to offer besides tax cuts for those that are better off among our society, you may as well campaign on a platform of "we have no ideas or even a plan to offer." But the American people need and deserve much more.

Mr. Speaker, I reject the Republican notion that a do-nothing Congress can help grow our economy, create more jobs, and address the many challenges facing this Nation from crumbling infrastructure to the impossibly high cost of education; and I also reject the Romney-Ryan vision that the only solution, at least that they have offered to these challenges, is tax cuts that help the rich and increase military spending.

My Republican colleagues paint a very pessimistic vision, Mr. Speaker, of a country where it appears to them that we have given up on trying to better everyone's lives and instead use the public's resources to enrich those who have already made it.

But I believe differently. We can afford to invest in our future. We can afford to create jobs. We can afford to make the choices now that will reap benefits for future generations—right now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1340

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, before I yield to my freshman colleague from Pennsylvania, to say to my friend from Florida, I don't think you heard the word "Democrat" come out of my mouth during my presentation except to talk about those things on which we cooperated together. There are absolutely challenges in this Chamber, but the challenges I'm talking about are challenges with the United States Senate.

Democrats and Republicans in this body came together to pass 7 of the 12 appropriations bills this cycle. We began back in April. Far from being an 11th-hour solution, we began, as the Constitution requires us to begin, one piece of legislation at a time in the

most open process this body can implement, Mr. Speaker, where every Member of this body gets to offer any amendment that they desire. Seven appropriations bills we've moved through this body, Mr. Speaker. And then it became apparent, as the Senate has moved not one of 12 bills, that that process was going to be fruitless—fruitless.

Again, is that what the American people want from us? Absolutely not. Are we doing what the American people deserve in this body? Absolutely we are. In my 18 months, I have not found it to be a Republican-Democratic problem. I've found it to be a problem of ideas.

I said to my friend from Florida, I know that he believes in his heart every single word that he has just enunciated. He speaks for inspiration, Mr. Speaker. I have the great pleasure of sitting behind him on the dais in the Rules Committee, so it's always his words that inspire me before it's my turn to take the microphone.

My constituents back home, they say, ROB, what have you learned in 18 months with a voting card? I said, What I have learned is it's not theater on the other side of the aisle. Folks aren't taking to the microphone for their 15 seconds of fame on television. They're taking to the microphone with heartfelt beliefs that they know in their heart to be a reflection of their constituents back home.

And so as we hear two different presentations about what it is we're doing today—a presentation that suggests it's an 11th-hour, last-minute process versus that presentation that says we've done it all right in the openness of day, and here, 4 weeks before the deadline approaches us, we are going to take action to make sure that uncertainty does not further slow this economy.

I'm told, Mr. Speaker, that the fewer days Congress is in session, the higher the stock market goes because at least nothing bad happens here. We're the problem, Mr. Speaker. Government is not the solution. Government is too often the problem.

The last Congress that passed as few bills as this Congress has passed, it was the 104th Congress, when Republicans took control of this House for the first time in over 60 years, because they were elected then not to expand the size and scope of government but to improve the size and scope of government, to reform those processes.

What my friend from Florida says about 2005, 2006, unfunded priority after unfunded priority, I'd love to tell him he's wrong, but he's absolutely right. He's absolutely right. The American taxpayer knew it, and Republicans in this Chamber paid the price for it in the very next election. That's the ace in the hole for America, Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer. They're paying attention to what happens here.

My colleague may believe that we're on the wrong track. I'll tell you, in 18

months, I've never been more proud for what this institution has done. We're going to find out when the American taxpayer speaks out in that referendum November 6.

With that, Mr. Speaker, there are 87 new freshmen in this freshman class and two more added. I yield 2 minutes to a freshman colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding the Continuing Appropriations Resolution.

This week's violent ambush at the United States Embassy in Cairo and the brutal attacks against U.S. diplomats in Benghazi serve as a blunt reminder that countries in the Middle East have been increasingly unstable and anti-American. The brutal attacks also emphasize the fact that the United States cannot continue to use taxpayer dollars to bankroll countries, with no conditions. We should immediately suspend all funding for those countries that refuse to meet strict conditions and fail to take adequate measures to prevent the loss of American lives.

Egypt has been one of the five top countries receiving the most U.S. aid over the past decade, and President Obama said he doesn't think we would consider Egypt an ally. Certain countries continue to serve as a safe haven for those who wish to cause harm to Americans and tear down our fundamental principles of freedom and liberty. Such actions merit repercussions, not a continued free flow of American tax dollars.

When our Nation has a debt of more than \$16 trillion and people in my district in Pennsylvania are struggling to find jobs to support their families, it is past time that we reconsider funding to people that wish harm on the United States. It is time to end the practice of appeasement and take a staunch position regarding Libya, Egypt, and others in order to ensure a more calculated, tactful approach.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to my good friend and colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, I would just urge my colleague from Pennsylvania to know that all of us are mindful, and rightfully should be concerned, about what's transpired in the Middle East. But he cites to one set of finances, and I would urge that he look at how and why the United States is involved in a compact with the Egypt military for the moneys that are distributed there, and not base it on what is happening today but look at what has happened throughout the years to assist in stabilizing that area. It didn't just happen overnight. It happened as a result of a serious compact in peace negotiations.

I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank my colleague for the time, and I rise in very strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if I could create a rule that would best sum up the Republican

leadership of this House over the past 2 years, this would be it, because this rule represents everything we have seen over the length of this Congress. It's a closed rule that stifles debate, and it's a rule that makes in order partisan, meaningless legislation that will do nothing—absolutely nothing—to address the real issues facing the American people.

I voted against the sequester because it was a lousy idea and a terrible way to run a government.

But let's be clear: This bill does not stop the sequester. It simply kicks the can down the road once again and prohibits any effort to address our fiscal situation that raises a single dime of revenue. The Republican approach is not fair, it is not balanced, and it stands no chance of becoming law.

Meanwhile, back in the real world, the American people are wondering why Congress isn't focused on their concerns. Where is the comprehensive jobs legislation, like the Make it In America plan? Nowhere to be found. Where is the middle class tax cut bill that passed the Senate? Not on this House floor. Where is the bipartisan farm bill and drought relief bill that passed the Senate, or the Violence Against Women Act or postal reform? Not here on this floor. Where is the big, bipartisan, balanced plan to reduce the deficit? Not here. And where—and this one really bugs me, Mr. Speaker—where in the world is a full and fair debate on the war in Afghanistan?

It's absolutely stunning to me that Governor Romney accepted the nomination of his party and asked the American people for their votes to be Commander in Chief without even mentioning the longest war in U.S. history, a war that continues to do this and continues to claim the lives of American servicemen and -women, a war for which we are borrowing tens of billions of dollars every month.

Apparently, the Republican leadership of this House would like to ignore these big issues and instead focus on meaningless sound bites for their 30-second political commercials. It is no wonder that the public has the lowest regard for Congress in history. I guess the Republican plan is to do next to nothing and to get out of town as quickly as possible—even though we just got back from a 5-week recess—and hope that the American people don't notice we were even here.

It's a sad day for the people's House, Mr. Speaker. And let me remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, this is the people's House. It is not the House of Big Oil, it is not the House of Big Banks, Big Business, or special interest super PACs. This is the people's House, and I hope the people take it back.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule.

□ 1350

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

I'd just like to remind my colleague from Massachusetts how we ended up

here; and, again, we ended up in a way I think that we can all be proud of.

Take ourselves back to April of this year. Again, this is the 2013 funding bill we're talking about. We sit here in September of 2012, we're talking about funding 2013 spending. We began this process back in April on the floor of this House, bill after bill after bill passing in a bipartisan way.

The Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs bill, Mr. Speaker. What could be more important and what could be more bipartisan? Passed this House 407-12. We went through that bill, Mr. Speaker. We went to every single Member of this Chamber. Not just 435, Mr. Speaker. We went to every delegate as well and said do you have a voice that needs to be heard on this floor on this issue and gave every Member that opportunity.

At the end of that, Mr. Speaker, which was just a free-for-all of democracy right here—it was our Republic at its best—this House came together, 407-12, to pass that bill. Mr. Speaker, 226 Republicans, most of our number, 181 Democrats, most of their number, passed that bill—407-12 for our military and our veterans. That bill didn't see the light of day on the Senate side, Mr. Speaker.

Our failure to pass this continuing resolution today sees those dollars go to zero. Far from being an abdication of responsibility, this is the height of taking responsibility. Abdication of responsibility has already happened. I can't fix it. I can't change it. We did our business here in this House. But we are being held hostage. And by "we," I mean we, the citizens of this country. I mean "we," the voters of this country. Those with the priorities of this land, we are being held hostage by a Senate that is finding other priorities, priorities other than military construction and our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't end there with Military Construction. It goes on. It goes through Leg Branch appropriations, Homeland Security appropriations, Energy and Water appropriations, Transportation and Housing and Urban Development appropriations.

How about Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Speaker? I mean, when you listen to some of the voices on this floor, there's a reason, there's a benefit to being a Southerner and talking slow. It gives your blood pressure time to come down just a little bit before the words begin to come out of your mouth, because Transportation, including mass transit, Housing and Urban Development, those programs for the neediest among us, passed this House 261-163 in a huge bipartisan majority; 182 Republicans, 79 Democrats came together to say let's focus on the priorities of our constituents back home.

Transportation and Housing and Urban Development. Let's move that bill through this body. Again, Mr. Speaker, in the most open process this institution can imagine where every

single Member has a chance to be heard, where every single Member can offer their amendments right here in the well.

There are no voices that are being quieted here. We all represent American citizens back home. It's their voices that get shut out.

Do we have a closed rule today on this continuing resolution? We do.

I think back, Mr. Speaker, I know you do, too, to H.R. 1, back in the spring of 2011. It's the only continuing resolution I've ever known of that came under an open rule, and boy did we have a show of democracy here.

It began on a Tuesday, Mr. Speaker. Congress was supposed to adjourn by Thursday afternoon; but by early in the morning on Thursday, it was clear we were nowhere near done. As a freshman, I was a little cynical about this process. I had a suspicion the leadership was going to close that process down because Members had planes to catch and events to go to, and after all, all it was was a continuing appropriations bill.

You know what this leadership said, Mr. Speaker? They said not on our watch. We're going to go into Thursday night. And I don't mean Thursday night at 9. I mean Thursday night past midnight. We're going to go all night long. We're going to go all night long into Friday. We're going to go Friday to noon and Friday through dinner and all night long on Friday night. We finished at 5 a.m. on Saturday morning.

Mr. Speaker, I jumped on the first flight out of National. Flew home. Did a town hall meeting no later than 3 hours after we adjourned that Saturday morning. I was on fire because this House gave every single Member a chance to offer every single amendment that their constituents would have them do. That was extraordinary. We can't do that every day. We can't go marathon sessions 5 days, day and night. I'm young and vigorous, Mr. Speaker, but I've got to tell you, some folks may not be able to handle it. I'm with you, Mr. HASTINGS, if you're ready to go those days and nights. I'll do them with you.

But we did that, those 12 appropriations bills. We did that in this body. Not all in one package, but one at the time, at the time, and the Senate said no.

Our choice here today is do we close the doors at these agencies? Do we close the doors on these social services? Do we go through another one of those government shutdown scenarios that benefit absolutely no one, or do we do the right thing which is observe our budget caps, continue to reduce spending? That's right, Mr. Speaker, you know as well as I do on these appropriations bills, on this discretionary spending we spent less in 2011 than they spent in 2010. We spent less in 2012 than we spent in 2011. And if we pass this bill, we'll spend less in 2013 than we spent in 2012.

It hasn't happened since before World War II. Three years in a row, Mr.

Speaker, of this body coming together and telling the American people we can do better with less. That's what this bill is about today, Mr. Speaker.

Again, strong supporter of this rule. Strong supporter of the two underlying measures.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My good friend from Georgia speaks out of both sides of his mouth. On the one hand, you're saying that we began this process open and this democracy flourished, and you were so passionate about it until when we left at 5 a.m. in the morning you rushed home and you were on fire.

I'm curious to know when we finish up here, ostensibly tomorrow afternoon, what is it that would cause us not to be able to be here and allow, as you put it, every Member to have his or her say for their constituents on this measure?

But, no, we're here on a closed rule.

I understand that the government has to continue and that's why we are doing a continuing resolution, but I also know we could have done an omnibus bill, and I also know that my colleague and others were the ones that caused this country to come to the brink and our credit rating to be assaulted; and you are going to tell me that we can't stay here tomorrow, that we can't come back here after the holidays or tomorrow and stay here if need be to get this done?

But, no, we're doing it now before April so that when we come back, we will be faced with the same crisis, and the only thing that's going to change is the faces and the places that the people come from, and all I'm saying is let's do it now. Let's do those things that you were talking about. And if it requires 5 a.m. in the morning, let's do it at 5 a.m. in the morning. I'm 76 and I'm still staying up. I don't know about you.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I'm grateful to my friend for yielding.

I'd say to the gentleman, I think we would be here until 5 a.m. yet again. But our experience, as was our experience on H.R. 1, is time and time again we do the people's work here and the Senate says, no. I have had no indication from the Senate that they will accept anything in that body except this continuing resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, first I ask my colleague. You know and I know you have farm interests in Georgia the same as I do, not necessarily the same, but we have farm interests in Georgia and farm interests in Florida. The Senate did pass the farm bill.

Can my colleague tell me why we don't have the farm bill on the floor during all of this period of time? We

could at least do that in light of the disaster relief that took place.

Mr. WOODALL. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to my friend.

Mr. WOODALL. I'd say that I regret I'm not high enough up the chain to know all the strategic decisions, but I will tell you that the bill that came out of the Senate is a sad 2-year bill that provides absolutely no certainty to any of the farmers in my district. It spends more and provides less certainty.

□ 1400

The farmers in my district say, ROB, we need a farm bill, but why can't you do it right? And I know my colleague would agree with me.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Where did you get the number 2-year rather than 5-year bill from? Because the 5-year proposal is what the chair of the Agriculture Committee, your and my colleague, Mr. LUCAS, is seeking to offer. But I don't want to get us caught in the weeds.

Let me go ahead and yield 2 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Could I inquire of the Chair how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are 10 minutes remaining for the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank Mr. HASTINGS for the opportunity to rise in opposition to the rule for the CR.

The continuing resolution contains \$99.9 billion in the Overseas Contingency Operation funds to continue the war in Afghanistan and to fund other operations in the so-called "war on terror." This is on top of over \$1.3 trillion we've already spent in waging war abroad.

This is a war that costs U.S. taxpayers \$2 billion a week. It's a war that, according to the Congressional Research Service, has cost the lives of nearly 2,000 U.S. servicemembers and has resulted in another 17,519 being injured, yet the war seems to have fallen from headlines and our national conscience, and this is wrong.

We cannot afford another \$100 billion on a war that will never result in stability in Afghanistan or the region. This war against Afghanistan boomeranged against the Soviet Union; it's boomeranging against our country.

When you look at the amount of money that is being spent—not just for the war, but for the United States Pentagon, we're looking at a fiscal '13 budget of \$613 billion, spending more money than every other country in the world almost combined for so-called "defense."

Now, we have an obligation to defend our country, but we also have an obligation for housing, for health care, for education, for retirement security. If you're concerned about Congress regaining authority under article I, section 8, then we should be voting to end

this war right now by striking the money for it. If you're concerned about the debt, then we should be voting to end this war by taking money away from funding and then you could contribute that to resolving the debt. If you're concerned about emboldening radicals in other countries who are following in on the wake of our invasions, then we should be taking the money out of this for more war. If you're concerned about the budget, that it doesn't have enough for jobs and housing and health care and education and energy and the environment, then end the war now, vote against it. If you're concerned about America taking steps to create peace, then we should get this money out of this budget which creates more war.

This is time for us to reclaim our country, which we're losing not just to war, but to a national security state like yesterday when we voted as a House—I voted against it—to empower security agencies to be able to intercept the phone calls of anybody in the United States who makes calls internationally.

We have got to reclaim our Nation. This CR doesn't do it. This is the same old, same old, same old war, national security state, forget the real needs of the American people. I'm going to vote against this rule and I'm going to vote against the underlying bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I'd say to my friend from Florida that I have no further speakers remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I also have no further speakers and I'm prepared to close, and I thank the distinguished gentleman.

I also would like to offer an apology to my colleague. I committed a parliamentary faux pas when I said you speak out of both sides of your mouth. In the heat of the moment, I guess what I was trying to say is you said one thing one way than you said at another point in time, so I offer you my deepest my apologies.

Mr. Speaker, we will soon start another long district work period even though we haven't given the middle class an extension of tax cuts for the next year. If we defeat the previous question, I'm going to offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that the House won't leave town until middle class tax cuts are signed into law. The first step is to give this House a vote on the middle class tax cut, introduced by Mr. LEVIN, which is the same proposal the Senate has already passed and the President is eager to sign.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is an upside to the Republicans' "do-nothing" Congress.

First, it creates a clear contrast between the Republicans and Democrats.

Democrats want to press forward with meaningful ideas to create jobs, improve access to affordable health and education, and invest in the kinds of programs that bring about progress and prosperity for all Americans. I believe that my friends in the majority want to push legislation that either cuts taxes for the wealthiest among us, or increases spending on the military, or does nothing more than pay the bills today—play politics while accomplishing nothing.

This is not about the deficit. The United States doesn't lack the money to prioritize our future. What we do lack is the political willpower and leadership necessary to set gainful priorities.

The Romney-Ryan vision for America is nothing more than a reckless sellout to the ideological extremes of the Republican Party, a party that is utterly dominated at this point in our history by a Tea Party dogma which cares more to preserve tax cuts for the rich than to be about the business of ensuring the well-being of our entire society.

The so-called "sacrifices" continually demanded by the Republican majority in order to provide ever more money for foreign wars and tax cuts for the wealthy are shortchanging the future of this Nation. Continuing to move further to the right—or to the left—does not constitute progress. Furthermore, the closed-door negotiations and closed process is truly disheartening and does not reflect the democracy that is supposed to be the hallmark of this institution.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, and I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate my colleague for his words. A lot of folks, Mr. Speaker, have the burden of working with folks whose motives they question. I have the great benefit of working on the Rules Committee with a team of folks whose motives I absolutely never question because I know folks are operating from their heart and from their constituents' best interest.

Let me say, because we talk so much about productivity down here on this floor, Mr. Speaker, The Washington Times did an article earlier this year on productivity in the House and the Senate. They called it "the futility index"—the futility of all the efforts in the body. They said the Senate ranked number one of all the years that they've been keeping records; less activity going on in the Senate by a large margin than ever before. Then they came to the House and they said, you know what, it's true the House hasn't passed a lot of bills. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we outlawed all of those silly commemorative bills that were not about the people's business but were

about folks and their campaigns. Those no longer come to the floor. We eliminated a whole portion of that that was not about the people's business. What The Washington Times said was this: that we had more time in this House in session than all but 10 Congresses since they began keeping records and that we had more debate in this House, Mr. Speaker, than all but two Congresses on record; more debate, more discussion about those ideas and those priorities that are important to the American people.

Now, I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, there's not a man or woman in my district that defines success by how many bills the President of the United States will sign; or if they do, they find those things to be inversely proportional. They don't want us to take over any new industries; they don't want us to regulate any new industries; they don't want us to pick any more winners and losers. They want us to stop. And even better than stopping, they want us to roll those things back.

We're having that debate in America, Mr. Speaker: Who are we? Who are we as Americans? Who are we as a people? And what is so wonderful about this country, despite all of our differences there has always been more that unites Americans than that divides us, always. You can't pick up a newspaper today, Mr. Speaker, without them talking about the ideological divide in this country being as stark as it has ever been, but there is still more that unites us than divides us.

I believe, when we come into this election in November, Mr. Speaker, we're going to have the largest voter turnout in American history. I have no idea what they're going to conclude. But I believe in this country, and I believe that if more of us are at the ballot box participating in this Republic—as we are required, duty bound to do—we're going to end up with a better result.

□ 1410

I look at the young faces in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. I like to think of myself as young, but I'm in my forties. The gentleman from Florida expressed his age, despite his youthful vigor. It's about the young people, Mr. Speaker.

And when the gentleman says America is strong enough that we can handle all of these growing debt challenges, I say to the gentleman, I admire his optimism but I disagree with his conclusion. The numbers I look at tell me, if I take everything from everybody, if I take everyone's house, everyone's car, everyone's bank account, if I nationalize every single company in this country, if I take it at all and put it in a bank account today, I still can't pay the hundreds of trillions of dollars in promises that this Federal Government has made to generations to come.

We don't have a problem in this country, Mr. Speaker, that we're not

taxing people enough. Our problem is that we're spending too much.

I serve on the Budget Committee as well as the Rules Committee, and we took that challenge on head-on, head-on, Mr. Speaker. They call some things the third rail of politics. We said, in this House, in a bipartisan way, the third rail of politics is failing to deal with these challenges. Failing to deal with these challenges is the problem; dealing with them is the solution.

This wasn't a solution that everyone agreed with. It was a solution that got the only bipartisan majority in this entire town. And we did it not once, but twice, Mr. Speaker.

This is not a happy day. I usually come to the floor; I talk about how excited I am to be here because we're going to do an open rule and we're going to have the Republic at its best. That's not today.

That day was May 10 on the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill, where we had every voice heard. That day was July 19 on the Defense Department bill, where we had every voice heard passing those bills in huge bipartisan fashion. That day was June 6, when we did it with the Energy and Water bill, huge bipartisan majority; and again on June 7 with the Homeland Security bill, and the Legislative Branch bill on June 8; May 31 on Military Construction, on and on and on, Transportation, HUD, June 29.

We've done those things, and the silence on the Senate side is deafening. We could do all those bills again, but this House has already spoken. The people have already spoken. And this continuing resolution gives this body and the American people 6 months for that referendum in November, for every voting-age man and woman in this country to come out and have their voice heard.

We've done all we can do in this body, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I just want to ask, 6 months from now, when we come back, if you and I are here, will you commit that we would have that debate 6 months from now under an open rule?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I have had no prouder moment than our debate on H.R. 1—no prouder moment.

Though I will say to the gentleman, as the gentleman knows quite well, it is frustrating that we can't do the business today. We tried.

As the gentleman from Florida knows, we tried all of these appropriation bills. They weren't 6-month bills. They weren't 2-week bills. They were entire FY13 bills, and we did them right. We did them the way they were supposed to be done. Some people won, some people lost, but, in the end, a bipartisan majority came together and passed every single one. That's what

we should be doing here, Mr. Speaker, and we have.

The American people are going to decide in November: Is the problem the House? Is the problem the Senate? Is the problem the executive branch? I have my own suspicions, but I trust the American people more than I trust any other vote that we make in this House, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I rise in strong support of this rule. I rise in strong support of the two underlying bills, the continuing resolution bill and our opportunity job protection sequester replacement bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule. I urge my colleagues to support the two underlying bills.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 778, the Rule providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 117, making further continuing appropriations for the beginning of the 2013 Fiscal Year. This measure will continue to assure funding for all federal government agencies and allow the government to continue its day to day operations through March of 2013.

I am quick to note Mr. Speaker the attempt by the Rules Committee Ranking Member, Ms. SLAUGHTER to amend the rule for H.R. 6365 to make in order and provide the appropriate waivers for amendment #1 offered by the Budget Committee Ranking Member Mr. VAN HOLLEN, which would have replaced the entire sequester for 2013 with savings from specific policies that reflect a much-needed balanced approach to deficit reduction. The entire House should have been allowed to debate Mr. VAN HOLLEN's measure even though I had serious concerns about the substance. Nevertheless, the debate is one that we should have.

I rise in support of making further continuing appropriations for the beginning of the 2013 Fiscal Year. This measure will continue to assure funding for all federal government agencies and allow the government to continue its day to day operations through March 27 of 2013.

I am also rising in support of helping families in Houston cope.

I am rising in support of Texans who need critical Federal Government goods and services.

I rise in support of people who are clinging to their jobs—the working poor.

I rise in support of those on Medicaid who are beholden to the governor of Texas who is in the business of rejecting federal funds and then using them to prop up his budget numbers.

I rise in support of the elderly.

I rise in support of military veterans.

I rise in support of children.

Today, the House will consider H.J. Res. 117, Six-Month Continuing Resolution. This Continuing Resolution will fund the government through March 27, 2013. The Senate is expected to consider the House-passed Continuing Resolution next week.

The Continuing Resolution reflects a bipartisan agreement between Congressional Republicans, Congressional Democrats, and the White House—and will prevent a government shutdown and maintain the programs and services critical to the American people.

The Continuing Resolution (“CR”) ensures a total rate of operations for FY 2013 at \$1.047

trillion—the level for FY 2013 discretionary spending that was agreed to as part of the Budget Control Act of 2011 (PL 112–25).

As a starting point, the CR continues funding at the current rate of operations for federal agencies, programs and services. To meet the agreement to ensure the rate of operations at \$1.047 trillion, a government-wide, across-the-board increase of 0.6 percent over the base rate is also included.

The CR caps funding for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) for FY 2013 at the President's FY 2013 request of \$88.5 billion—which is \$26.6 billion below the FY 2012 OCO funding level. OCO is not included under the \$1.047 trillion cap.

The CR continues funding for the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund at last year's level, with this disaster relief funding also not included under the \$1.047 trillion cap.

The CR includes a clean, six-month extension of TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families). Without this extension, cash assistance and work support for working families would stop in FY 2013.

The CR extends the current pay freeze for federal employees, which includes Members of the House of Representatives and Senators, as requested by the President.

The CR also includes various provisions, often needed in a longterm CR, to ensure adequate funding of certain key government operations and services through the six-month period, including provisions allowing additional funding for such things as:

The Veterans Administration to meet an increase in the disability claims workload.

The Interior Department and the Forest Service for wildfire suppression efforts.

The FCC to conduct spectrum auctions.

Nuclear weapons modernization efforts, to ensure the security of our nuclear stockpile.

Sustaining Homeland Security cybersecurity efforts.

I urge my colleagues to pass this Rule and the underlying Continuing Resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 778 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 3. Upon completion of consideration of House Resolution 746 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 15) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief to middle-class families. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. 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 recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legisla-

tive day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 3 of this resolution.

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House 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.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 778 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 778, if ordered; adoption of House Resolution 779, by the yeas and nays; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1775.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 178, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 572]

YEAS—235

Adams	Chabot	Gibbs
Aderholt	Chaffetz	Gibson
Alexander	Coble	Gingrey (GA)
Amash	Coffman (CO)	Goodlatte
Amodei	Cole	Gosar
Austria	Conaway	Gowdy
Bachmann	Costa	Granger
Bachus	Cravaack	Graves (GA)
Barletta	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Bartlett	Crenshaw	Griffin (AR)
Barton (TX)	Culberson	Griffith (VA)
Bass (NH)	Denham	Grimm
Benishek	Dent	Guinta
Biggert	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Bilbray	Dold	Hall
Billirakis	Donnelly (IN)	Hanna
Bishop (UT)	Dreier	Harper
Black	Duffy	Harris
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Bonner	Duncan (TN)	Hastings (WA)
Bono Mack	Ellmers	Hayworth
Boren	Emerson	Heck
Boustany	Farenthold	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Herrera Beutler
Brooks	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp
Buchanan	Flake	Huizenga (MI)
Buehson	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Buerkle	Fleming	Hunter
Burgess	Flores	Hurt
Burton (IN)	Forbes	Issa
Calvert	Fortenberry	Jenkins
Camp	Fox	Johnson (IL)
Campbell	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (OH)
Canseco	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Gallely	Jordan
Capito	Gardner	Kelly
Carter	Garrett	King (IA)
Cassidy	Gerlach	Kingston

Kinzinger (IL)	Noem
Kline	Nugent
Labrador	Nunes
Lamborn	Nunnelee
Lance	Olson
Landry	Palazzo
Lankford	Paul
Latham	Paulsen
LaTourette	Pearce
Latta	Pence
Lewis (CA)	Petri
LoBiondo	Pitts
Long	Platts
Lucas	Poe (TX)
Luetkemeyer	Pompeo
Lummis	Posey
Lungren, Daniel E.	Price (GA)
Mack	Quayle
Manzullo	Reed
Marchant	Rehberg
Marino	Reichert
Matheson	Renacci
McCarthy (CA)	Ribble
McCaul	Rigell
McClintock	Rivera
McHenry	Roby
McIntyre	Roe (TN)
McKeon	Rogers (AL)
McKinley	Rogers (KY)
McMorris	Rogers (MI)
Rodgers	Rohrabacher
Meehan	Rokita
Mica	Rooney
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Miller (MI)	Roskam
Miller, Gary	Ross (FL)
Mulvaney	Royce
Murphy (PA)	Runyan
Myrick	Scalise
Neugebauer	Schilling
	Schmidt

NAYS—178

Ackerman	Eshoo
Altmire	Farr
Andrews	Fattah
Baca	Filner
Baldwin	Frank (MA)
Barber	Fudge
Barrow	Garamendi
Bass (CA)	Gohmert
Becerra	Gonzalez
Berkley	Green, Al
Berman	Green, Gene
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva
Bishop (NY)	Gutierrez
Blumenauer	Hahn
Bonamici	Hanabusa
Boswell	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Heinrich
Braley (IA)	Higgins
Brown (FL)	Himes
Butterfield	Hinche
Capps	Hinojosa
Capuano	Hirono
Carman	Hochul
Carney	Holden
Carson (IN)	Holt
Castor (FL)	Honda
Chandler	Hoyer
Chu	Israel
Cicilline	Jackson Lee
Clarke (MI)	(TX)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.
Clyburn	Jones
Cohen	Kaptur
Connolly (VA)	Keating
Conyers	Kildee
Cooper	Kind
Costello	Kissell
Courtney	Kucinich
Critz	Langevin
Crowley	Larsen (WA)
Cuellar	Larsen (CT)
Cummings	Lee (CA)
Davis (CA)	Levin
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)
DeFazio	Lipinski
DeGette	Loeb
DeLauro	Lofgren, Zoe
Deutch	Lowe
Dicks	Lujan
Dingell	Lynch
Doggett	Maloney
Doyle	Markey
Edwards	Matsui
Ellison	McCarthy (NY)
Engel	McCollum

Schock	Van Hollen
Scott (SC)	Velázquez
Scott, Austin	Visclosky
Sensenbrenner	Walz (MN)
Sessions	
Shimkus	
Shuler	
Shuster	Akin
Simpson	Berg
Smith (NE)	Broun (GA)
Smith (NJ)	Cleaver
Smith (TX)	Diaz-Balart
Southerland	Herger
Stearns	
Stivers	
Stutzman	
Price (GA)	
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)	

Wasserman	Welch
Schultz	Wilson (FL)
Waters	Woolsey
Watt	Yarmuth
Waxman	

NOT VOTING—16

Jackson (IL)	Schweikert
King (NY)	Sires
Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Nadler	Towns
Ross (AR)	
Ryan (WI)	

□ 1436

Messrs. CAPUANO, FARR, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. WELCH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. HARTZLER changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 182, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

AYES—232

Adams	Dreier	Issa
Aderholt	Duffy	Jenkins
Alexander	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (IL)
Amash	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)
Amodei	Ellmers	Johnson, Sam
Austria	Emerson	Jordan
Bachmann	Farenthold	Kelly
Bachus	Fincher	King (IA)
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Kingston
Bartlett	Flake	Kinzinger (IL)
Barton (TX)	Fleischmann	Kissell
Bass (NH)	Fleming	Kline
Benishek	Flores	Labrador
Biggert	Forbes	Lamborn
Bilbray	Fortenberry	Lance
Billirakis	Fox	Landry
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Lankford
Black	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Blackburn	Gallely	LaTourette
Bonner	Gardner	Latta
Bono Mack	Garrett	Lewis (CA)
Boustany	Gerlach	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	Long
Brooks	Gibson	Lucas
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Buehson	Goodlatte	Lummis
Buerkle	Gosar	Lungren, Daniel E.
Burgess	Gowdy	Mack
Burton (IN)	Granger	Manzullo
Calvert	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Camp	Graves (MO)	Marino
Campbell	Griffin (AR)	McCarthy (CA)
Canseco	Griffith (VA)	McCaul
Cantor	Grimm	McClintock
Capito	Guinta	McHenry
Carter	Guthrie	McKeon
Cassidy	Hall	McKinley
Chabot	Hanna	McMorris
Chaffetz	Harper	Rodgers
Coble	Harris	Meehan
Coffman (CO)	Hartzler	Mica
Cole	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Conaway	Hayworth	Miller (MI)
Cravaack	Heck	Miller, Gary
Crawford	Hensarling	Mulvaney
Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler	Huelskamp
Culberson	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)
Denham	Huizenga (MI)	Myrick
Dent	Hultgren	Neugebauer
DesJarlais	Hunter	Noem
Dold	Hurt	Nugent

Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
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)

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

□ 1443

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6213, NO MORE SOLYNDRAS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 779) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6213) to limit further taxpayer exposure from the loan guarantee program established under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 182, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]
YEAS—232

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
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
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah

NOES—182

Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchesy
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)

Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishke
Biggett
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson

McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
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
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
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 (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—182

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
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
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner

Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchesy
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal

Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Holt
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15
Akin
Berg
Broun (GA)
Cleaver
Diaz-Balart

Herger
Jackson (IL)
King (NY)
Michaud
Miller, George

Nadler
Ross (AR)
Ryan (WI)
Townsend
Welch

Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
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
McIntyre
McKeon

Akin
Berg

Broun (GA)
Buchanan

Cleaver
Emerson

NOT VOTING—15

Heger
Jackson (IL)
King (NY)

Michaud
Nadler
Ross (AR)

Ryan (WI)
Towns
Young (AK)

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch

Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Oliver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)

Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Posey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
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)

Neal
Pelosi
Ross (AR)
Ryan (WI)
Smith (NE)
Towns

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

□ 1451

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.

STOLEN VALOR ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1775) to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a criminal offense relating to fraudulent claims about military service, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 3, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 575]
YEAS—410

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodi
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brady (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert

Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch

Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch

Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Oliver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)

Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Posey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
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)

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

□ 1459

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military decorations or medals.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on September 13, 2012, I inadvertently voted “nay” on Roll No. 575. I ask that the record reflect that I intended to vote “yea,” to approve H.R. 1775.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 177

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of House Resolution 177.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule adopted earlier today, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 117) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 778, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 117

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2012 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2012, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

NAYS—3

NOT VOTING—16

Miller, George
Heger
Jackson (IL)
King (NY)
Michaud

Paul
Moore
Myrick

(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (division A of Public Law 112-55), except for the appropriations designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief in section 735 of such Act.

(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-55), except for the appropriation designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief in the second paragraph under the heading “Department of Commerce—Economic Development Administration—Economic Development Assistance Programs” in such Act.

(3) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012 (division A of Public Law 112-74).

(4) The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-74).

(5) The Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2012 (division C of Public Law 112-74).

(6) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2012 (division D of Public Law 112-74).

(7) The Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (division E of Public Law 112-74).

(8) The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (division F of Public Law 112-74).

(9) The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2012 (division G of Public Law 112-74).

(10) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (division H of Public Law 112-74).

(11) The Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2012 (division I of Public Law 112-74).

(12) The Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (division C of Public Law 112-55), except for the appropriations designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief under the heading “Department of Transportation—Federal Highway Administration—Emergency Relief” and in the last proviso of section 239 of such Act.

(13) The Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-77), except for appropriations under the heading “Corps of Engineers—Civil”.

(b) Whenever an amount designated for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (in this section referred to as an “OCO/GWOT amount”) in an Act described in paragraph (3) or (10) of subsection (a) that would be made available for a project or activity is different from the amount requested in the President’s fiscal year 2013 budget request, the project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations that would be permitted by, and such designation shall be applied to, the amount in the President’s fiscal year 2013 budget request.

(c) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) is hereby increased by 0.612 percent. Such increase shall not apply to OCO/GWOT amounts or to amounts incorporated in this joint resolution by reference to the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-77).

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2012 or prior years; (2) the increase in

production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2012 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2012.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2012.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) March 27, 2013.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2013 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget author-

ity was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2012, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2012 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Section 147 of Public Law 111-242, as added by Public Law 111-322, shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “December 31, 2012” each place it appears.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any statutory pay adjustment (as defined in section 147(b)(2) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 111-242)) otherwise scheduled to take effect during fiscal year 2013 but prior to the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution may take effect on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning after the date specified in section 106(3).

SEC. 115. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) Of the amount made available by section 101 for “Social Security Administration—Limitation on Administrative Expenses”, \$483,484,000 is additional new budget authority specified for purposes of subsection 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) Section 5 of Public Law 112-74 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 116. (a) Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, each department and agency in subsection (c) shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, for the period through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution, a spending, expenditure, or operating plan—

(1) at the program, project, or activity level (or, for national intelligence programs funded in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, at the expenditure center and project level); or

(2) as applicable, at any greater level of detail required for funds covered by such a plan in an appropriations Act referred to in section 101, in the joint explanatory statement accompanying such Act, or in committee report language incorporated by reference in such joint explanatory statement.

(b) Not later than 30 days after the date on which any sequestration is ordered by the President under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, each department and agency in subsection (c) shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate the spending, expenditure, or operating plan required under subsection (a), updated to reflect any adjustments to funding as a result of the sequestration and any extension of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

(c) The departments and agencies to which this section applies are as follows:

- (1) The Department of Agriculture.
- (2) The Department of Commerce.
- (3) The Department of Defense.
- (4) The Department of Education.
- (5) The Department of Energy.
- (6) The Department of Health and Human Services.
- (7) The Department of Homeland Security.
- (8) The Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- (9) The Department of the Interior.
- (10) The Department of Justice.
- (11) The Department of Labor.
- (12) The Department of State and United States Agency for International Development.
- (13) The Department of Transportation.
- (14) The Department of the Treasury.
- (15) The Department of Veterans Affairs.
- (16) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
- (17) The National Science Foundation.
- (18) The Judiciary.
- (19) With respect to amounts made available under the heading "Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President", agencies funded under such heading.
- (20) The Federal Communications Commission.
- (21) The General Services Administration.
- (22) The Office of Personnel Management.
- (23) The National Archives and Records Administration.
- (24) The Securities and Exchange Commission.
- (25) The Small Business Administration.
- (26) The Environmental Protection Agency.
- (27) The Indian Health Service.
- (28) The Smithsonian Institution.
- (29) The Social Security Administration.
- (30) The Corporation for National and Community Service.
- (31) The Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
- (32) The Food and Drug Administration.
- (33) The Commodity Futures Trading Commission.
- (34) The Central Intelligence Agency.
- (35) The National Security Agency.
- (36) The National Reconnaissance Office.
- (37) The Defense Intelligence Agency.
- (38) The National Geospatial Intelligence Agency.
- (39) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

SEC. 117. Not later than November 1, 2012, and each month thereafter through the month following the period covered by this joint resolution, the Director of the Office of

Management and Budget shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on all obligations incurred by each department and agency in the period covered by this joint resolution. Such report shall—

- (1) set forth obligations by account;
- (2) compare the obligations incurred in the period covered by the report to the obligations incurred in the same period in fiscal year 2012; and
- (3) specify each executive branch account for which funds made available by this joint resolution are apportioned at a different rate for operations than the rate otherwise provided in section 101, with an estimate of the different rate otherwise provided in such section and the total obligations estimated to be incurred under this joint resolution for such account.

SEC. 118. Section 726(15) of division A of Public Law 112-55 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution without regard to the first proviso of such section.

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for "Department of Agriculture—Domestic Food Programs—Food and Nutrition Service—Commodity Assistance Program", at a rate for operations of \$253,952,000, of which \$186,935,000 shall be for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program.

SEC. 120. (a) Amounts made available under section 101 for "Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction" may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.

(b) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a plan to maintain the launch schedules and life cycle cost estimates established in fiscal year 2012 for the satellite systems described in subsection (a) and options for reducing costs, including management costs.

SEC. 121. Through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to—

- (1) retire, divest, realign, or transfer aircraft of the Air Force;
- (2) disestablish or convert any unit associated with aircraft described in paragraph (1) or any unit of the Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve; or
- (3) retire C-23 Sherpa aircraft.

SEC. 122. The authority provided by section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2399) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding subsection (f) of such section, through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 123. The authority provided by section 572(b)(4) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (20 U.S.C. 7703b(b)(4)) shall continue in effect through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 124. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense may transfer an amount designated for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 made available by this joint resolution for the Department of Defense between such appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred. The Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees not fewer than 15 days prior to any transfer made pursuant to this section.

SEC. 125. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for "Department of Energy—National Nuclear Security Administration—Weapons Activities" at a rate for operations of \$7,577,341,000.

(b) Section 301(c) of title III of division B of Public Law 112-74 shall not apply to amounts made available by this section.

SEC. 126. In addition to the amounts otherwise made available by section 101 for "Department of Energy—National Nuclear Security Administration—Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation", an additional amount is made available for domestic uranium enrichment research, development, and demonstration at a rate for operations of \$100,000,000.

SEC. 127. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for "October 1, 2012".

SEC. 128. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading "District of Columbia Funds" for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 6020 (112th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under "District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses" as included in the Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Request Act of 2012 (D.C. Act 19-381), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 129. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for "District of Columbia—Federal Funds—Federal Payment for Emergency Planning and Security Costs in the District of Columbia" at a rate for operations of \$24,700,000, of which not less than \$9,800,000 shall be used for costs associated with the Presidential Inauguration.

SEC. 130. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for "General Services Administration—Expenses, Presidential Transition" for necessary expenses to carry out the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note), at a rate for operations of \$8,947,000, of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 is for activities authorized by sections 3(a)(8) and (9) of such Act.

SEC. 131. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for "Executive Office of the President—Office of Administration—Presidential Transition Administrative Support" to carry out the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) at a rate for operations of \$8,000,000.

(b) Such funds may be transferred to other accounts in this joint resolution or any other Act that provide funding for offices within the Executive Office of the President and the Office of the Vice President to carry out the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note).

SEC. 132. Notwithstanding section 101, the fifth proviso under the heading "Federal Communications Commission—Salaries and Expenses" in division C of Public Law 112-74

shall be applied by substituting “\$98,739,000” for “\$85,000,000”.

SEC. 133. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, amounts made available by section 101 for “Department of the Treasury—Departmental Offices—Salaries and Expenses” and “Department of the Treasury—Office of Inspector General—Salaries and Expenses” may be used for activities in connection with section 1602(e) of the Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act of 2012 (subtitle F of title I of division A of Public Law 112-141).

SEC. 134. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Office of Government Ethics—Salaries and Expenses” at a rate for operations of \$18,664,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall be for development and deployment of the centralized, publicly accessible database required in section 11(b) of the STOCK Act (Public Law 112-105).

SEC. 135. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Small Business Administration—Business Loans Program Account” for the cost of guaranteed loans as authorized by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act and section 503 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 at a rate for operations of \$333,600,000.

SEC. 136. (a) Amounts made available by this joint resolution for “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses” shall be obligated at the rate for operations necessary to maintain the staffing levels (including by backfilling vacant positions) of Border Patrol agents, Customs and Border Protection officers, and Air and Marine interdiction agents in effect at the end of the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2012, or, with respect to Border Patrol agents, at such greater levels as may otherwise be required in the second proviso under the heading “U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 112-74. Any increase of the rate for operations for such purpose under this subsection shall be derived by adjusting amounts otherwise made available within such account by this joint resolution, without regard to the restrictions on reprogramming in section 503 of division D of Public Law 112-74.

(b) Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed expenditure plan for “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses” at the program, project, and activity level that specifies how the Commissioner will maintain staffing levels as required under subsection (a) through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 137. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Homeland Security—National Protection and Programs Directorate—Infrastructure Protection and Information Security” at a rate for operations of \$1,170,243,000, of which \$328,000,000 is for Network Security Deployment, and \$218,000,000 is for Federal Network Security that may be obligated at a rate for operations necessary to establish and sustain essential cybersecurity activities, including procurement and operations of continuous monitoring and diagnostics systems and intrusion detection systems for civilian Federal computer networks.

(b) Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate

an expenditure plan for essential cybersecurity activities described in subsection (a) of this section for the period through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 138. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109-295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 139. Section 550(b) of Public Law 109-295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “October 4, 2012”.

SEC. 140. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of the Interior—Department-wide Programs—Wildland Fire Management” at a rate for operations of \$726,473,000.

(b) In addition to the amounts provided under subsection (a), there is appropriated \$23,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2013 for “Department of the Interior—Department-wide Programs—Wildland Fire Management”, to remain available until expended, for repayment to other appropriations accounts from which funds were transferred in fiscal year 2012 for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 141. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management” at a rate for operations of \$1,971,390,000.

(b) In addition to the amounts provided under subsection (a), there is appropriated \$400,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2013 for “Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management”, to remain available until expended, for repayment to other appropriations accounts from which funds were transferred in fiscal year 2012 for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 142. Section 411(h)(4)(A) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1240a(h)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The annual amount allocated under subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 402(g)(1) to any State or Indian tribe that makes a certification under subsection (a) of this section in which the Secretary concurs shall be reallocated and available for grants under section 402(g)(5).”

SEC. 143. The authority provided by section 331 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (enacted by reference in section 1000(a)(3) of Public Law 106-113; 16 U.S.C. 497 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 144. (a) The following sections of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution:

(1) Subparagraphs (C) through (E) of section 4(i)(5) (7 U.S.C. 136a-1(i)(5)(C)-(E));

(2) Section 4(k)(3) (7 U.S.C. 136a-1(k)(3)); and

(3) Section 33(c)(3)(B) (7 U.S.C. 136w-8(c)(3)(B)).

(b)(1) Section 4(i)(5)(H) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a-1(i)(5)(H)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “September 30, 2012”.

(2) Notwithstanding section 33(m)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w-8(m)(2)), section 33(m)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 136w-8(m)(1)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “September 30, 2012”.

(c) Section 408(m)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 346a(m)(3)) shall be applied by substituting the date

specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “September 30, 2012”.

SEC. 145. Section 163 of Public Law 111-242, as amended by Public Law 111-322, is further amended—

(a) in subsection (b), by striking “2012-2013” and inserting “2013-2014”; and

(b) by inserting at the end the following:

“(c) Not later than December 31, 2013, the Secretary of Education shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, using data required under existing law (section 1111(h)(6)(A) of Public Law 107-110) by State and each local educational agency, regarding the extent to which students in the following categories are taught by teachers who are deemed highly qualified pursuant to 34 C.F.R. 200.56(a)(2)(ii) as published in the Federal Register on December 2, 2002:

“(1) Students with disabilities.

“(2) English Learners.

“(3) Students in rural areas.

“(4) Students from low-income families.”.

SEC. 146. The first proviso under the heading “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Low Income Home Energy Assistance” in division F of Public Law 112-74 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting “2013” for “2012”.

SEC. 147. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance” at a rate for operations of \$900,000,000. Amounts made available by this section may be obligated up to a rate for operations necessary to maintain program operations at the level provided in fiscal year 2012, as necessary to accommodate increased demand.

SEC. 148. Activities authorized by part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act shall continue through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2012, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose. Grants and payments may be made pursuant to this authority on a quarterly basis through the second quarter of fiscal year 2013 at the level provided for such activities for the corresponding quarter of fiscal year 2012.

SEC. 149. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, there is appropriated for payment to the heirs at law of Donald M. Payne, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey, \$174,000.

SEC. 150. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration” at a rate for operations of \$2,164,074,000.

SEC. 151. The authority provided by section 315(b) of title 38, United States Code, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 152. (a) Section 120 of division C of Public Law 112-55 shall not apply to amounts made available by this joint resolution.

(b) During the period covered by this joint resolution, section 1102 of Public Law 112-141 shall be applied—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by substituting “\$39,143,582,670” for “\$39,699,000,000”;

(2) in subsection (b)(10), as if the limitation applicable through fiscal year 2011 applied through fiscal year 2012; and

(3) in subsection (c)(5), by treating the reference to section 204 of title 23, United

States Code, as a reference to sections 202 and 204 of such title.

SEC. 153. The matter under the heading "Department of Transportation—National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—Highway Traffic Safety Grants" in division C of Public Law 112-55 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by treating each reference to section 2001(a)(11) of Public Law 109-59 under such heading as a reference to section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141.

SEC. 154. The matter under the heading "Department of Transportation—Federal Transit Administration—Formula and Bus Grants" in division C of Public Law 112-55 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting "49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340" for "49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5308, 5309, 5310, 5311, 5316, 5317, 5320, 5335, 5339, and 5340 and section 3038 of Public Law 105-178, as amended" each place it appears.

SEC. 155. Section 601(e)(1)(B) of division B of Public Law 110-432 shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for "4 years after such date".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. 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.J. Res. 117.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This 6-month continuing resolution, Mr. Speaker, will keep the government's doors open and its wheels turning until March 27, 2013. It's a necessary bill that ensures that the Congress is doing its job, even if this is not our preferred way of going about doing it.

Funding for the government in short increments is not the right way to govern and not something that should be common practice.

It's essential to our Nation's financial future that the Congress complete these important appropriations bills in regular order.

However, the Senate failed to act on any of the 12 appropriations bills this year, instead choosing to default on their most basic fiscal duty in the name of election-year politics.

Over the past few months, the House did its very best to support the core functions of the government and provide responsible levels for critical programs and services. In fact, the Appropriations Committee considered all 12 bills, fulfilling our duty as shepherds of

Federal tax dollars and our responsibility as representatives of the people in this country.

I'm deeply disappointed that this work is now on hold and that Congress will not complete this work before the end of the fiscal year this September 30.

Though we have found ourselves in this undesirable position, it does not mean we can't yet act responsibly.

This CR is a good-faith effort to provide limited, but fair, funding for government programs. It sticks with the agreement the House leadership made with the Senate and the White House to continue government operations at the Budget Control Act-approved level of \$1.047 trillion, thereby avoiding the perils of a threatened government shutdown.

This legislation is very limited in scope. Funding levels have been held at rates essentially consistent with the current fiscal year. It makes minor changes to prevent detrimental or catastrophic or irreversible changes to Federal programs and to ensure good government.

This includes provisions to allow additional funding for things like nuclear weapons modernization efforts, wildfire suppression, maintaining current border security staffing levels, more help to process veterans' disability claims, and things of that sort. Essential.

We've also made sure that we will take care of these individuals, businesses, and communities affected by the recent natural disasters like Hurricane Isaac. We provide \$6.4 billion in additional disaster funding. This funding will prevent any lapse in critical assistance to those already working to recover from these catastrophes, as well as adequate financial resources, should any need arise in the future.

□ 1510

The bill also protects critical funding for our national defense, maintaining last year's levels for Department of Defense programs which the Senate and the White House have sought to significantly cut.

Mr. Speaker, my committee will stand ready and will stand at the ready to continue the appropriations process. We intend to use the lame-duck session to the fullest extent. Just because this CR will last until March 27 of next year, we will not rest on our laurels until that time. We will do as much as we can to allow ample time to complete that essential work.

Mr. Speaker, we have to pass this important bill to maintain the continuity of our government and to prevent its shutdown and to continue the vital programs and services for our people, for our Nation, and for the stability of our economy.

I ask for support, Mr. Speaker, of this critical legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

While I would prefer to be doing our regular appropriation bills, I support

this continuing resolution. H.J. Res. 117 avoids a government shutdown by continuing the full range of Federal activities at last year's rate of operations, plus six-tenths of 1 percent. The CR also preserves the agreement on spending levels and the reforms in budgeting for disaster relief as set out in the Budget Control Act.

On defense, the CR caps overseas contingency operations at the President's request for FY 2013 at \$88.5 billion instead of continuing last year's level of \$115.1 billion, a reduction of \$26.6 billion.

The CR grants some flexibility for transferring funds within OCO since last year's priorities do not meet this year's defense needs in the region. Beyond that, however, the CR is stringent on defense. DOD requested limited authority for new starts and changes in production and procurement rates. Those requests were all denied.

The CR includes only a handful of spending anomalies, providing additional funding only where absolutely necessary.

Wildland fire suppression receives more funds than last year's level. The Interior Department and the Forest Service have already spent all of their FY12 fire suppression funding, in addition to \$400 million that was reprogrammed to respond to a harsh fire season.

VA operating expenses are also increased because disability claims are expected to increase significantly in FY 2013 as more vets return.

Without an increase above last year's level, the launch schedule for the weather satellites would be delayed, causing significant gaps in data collection essential for severe weather forecasting.

Increases are provided for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, child nutrition, and Commodity Supplemental Food program, which all need additional funds to meet current caseloads.

There are even fewer extensions of expiring authorizations. Only those affecting spending are addressed.

The CR includes a 6-month clean extension of TANF. Without the extension, cash assistance and work support for working families would stop at the start of FY 2013.

The CR also specifies the LIHEAP State allocation formula to ensure that States receive adequate funding for the winter heating season.

I must mention two concerns.

First, I am very disappointed that we have yet to enact a single FY13 bill in the Congress even though we passed seven bills in the House of Representatives. I know Chairman ROGERS shares my disappointment. A CR is not a replacement for the appropriations process. Federal agencies need much more direction than what is provided in a CR, and I believe this measure serves to underscore the need for timely, regular appropriation bills.

Lastly, I am deeply concerned that the threat of a sequester inhibits current economic growth and slows job

creation. The sooner we deal with all the fiscal cliff issues, the sooner our economic recovery will be strengthened. Just yesterday, Moody's threatened a potential downgrade of the U.S. Government's credit rating in 2013 unless Congress averts the fiscal cliff. I wish we could turn off sequestration in this CR and enact a balanced package of deficit reduction to replace it. Unfortunately, any serious discussion seems impossible until after the election.

As Chairman ROGERS said, this is a streamlined CR, free of any new riders and negotiated in a bipartisan fashion. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I want to commend the chairman for working so hard and being so diligent in his efforts to restore regular order in the appropriation process, and I concur in his judgment that we should try to put together an omnibus between now and the holidays in order to get our work done this year. That would be the best course of action, rather than waiting until March.

Again, let's vote for this CR and do our work and get it done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman I will introduce next has served on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for over 30 years, as has the previous speaker, Mr. DICKS, served over 30 years as well. These two gentlemen, the previous speaker and the upcoming speaker, are the House's experts, in my judgment, on military matters. So I yield such time as he may consume to the former chairman of the full committee, and also now the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I use this time to rise to present the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2013, and that's what I had planned to do. But then, all of a sudden, I realized I already did that 2 months ago; and the House, in a strong, bipartisan vote of more than 330 votes passed this good bill that Mr. DICKS and I had worked so long and hard to prepare and to present. We were really excited about getting to the Senate and having the Senate make their mark and then go to conference and get this bill on the law books.

It's important that our national defense and the members of our military have some certainty in what they're going to be able to do in the next fiscal year. But that was not to be. We were rolling along with that bill, and we had passed seven other appropriations bills, thanks to Mr. ROGERS getting us back to regular order. His committee had already voted out all but one of the appropriations bills. We had passed seven in the House before we got the message. The Senate leader said the Senate will pass no appropriations bills this year. There's something wrong with that.

I'd like to read the Constitution, and I recommend it. It's good reading.

Article I, section 9, says, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." That's what it means to pass these appropriations bills.

The end of the fiscal year is only a few weeks away. This Constitution would come into play. The government would have no money to function. Portions of the government would have to be closed down. You've heard it referred to, a government shutdown. We're going to have to pass this CR because we don't want a government shutdown.

The Defense appropriations bill was a very good bill. It was a bipartisan bill. There were some great initiatives that we had included and the House supported in that bill. We got to keep two of those initiatives as anomalies, and that's all.

So it's important that as soon as the Congress reconvenes, when it does, we get back to this Defense appropriations bill and pass it for sure.

One of the anomalies had to do with prohibiting the Air Force from undertaking any of the new aircraft retirements or relocations of aircraft and associated missions that were identified in their fiscal year 2013 budget request. That needs to be in here. This affects all of our States. All of our Governors, all of our adjutant generals weighed in on this issue. We did get that, as an anomaly, in the bill.

But we need to get to work on this Defense appropriations bill as soon as we possibly can and get it into law so that our military, the members of our military, the men and women who wear the uniform, those at the Pentagon who do the management, who do the planning, they have to know what it is they're going to be able to do, what money will they have available. And then they're facing sequestration, which also has to be avoided somehow, one way or another.

But when the Constitution is ignored—which is happening with our brothers and sisters in the other body—things don't work right, and we've got to get them right. In the lame-duck session, we have got to take care of these problems and get to work on this Defense appropriations bill. We've got to find some way to persuade those who serve in the other body. If their leadership doesn't want to do it, there are ways to apply pressure to the leadership to get the job done that the Constitution requires.

□ 1520

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROGERS for the good job he's done, and I thank him for the time that he has given to me today.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member DICKS for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, reluctantly, to support this 6-month fiscal 2013 con-

tinuing resolution. It is unfortunate we have before us a continuing resolution that only kicks the can down the road a bit, again, but does not represent the regular order to which our institution must return for sound governance of our Republic.

House Republicans have left the House with no choice but to support this measure or we will face another government shutdown. I'm sure we will hear from our Republican colleagues that the Senate didn't pass any appropriation bills, and that's why we're here considering a temporary bill.

The reality is that the unwillingness of the House Republicans to keep their word is why we have a short-term continuing resolution before us toward. The bipartisan agreement in the Budget Control Act provided for \$2.2 trillion in balanced deficit reduction and included strict spending caps for future appropriations.

But rather than keeping to the bipartisan agreement, the Republican leadership rammed through the House a radical Ryan budgetary agenda that seeks to burden the middle class and seniors with the entire burden of reducing our debt while giving millionaires and billionaires more tax cuts. That is totally irresponsible.

House leadership wasted precious floor time with fiscal 13 appropriation bills that everyone knew were destined to languish. We should have spent our time debating comprehensive jobs legislation, a farm bill, and legislation to save the U.S. Postal Service.

Nevertheless, under the circumstances of hyperpartisanship, I commend Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member DICKS for crafting a clean continuing resolution that also addresses other important issues such as wildlife management, veterans benefits, Small Business Administration loan guarantees, and nutrition assistance.

In particular, I want to commend the chairman and ranking member for providing sufficient funding for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program so food assistance is not taken away from low-income senior citizens across our country, whose calls at food banks have gone up 20 percent.

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program is a vital weapon in our fight against the real hunger that millions of our fellow citizens confront daily. Ninety-seven percent of these individuals are low-income seniors.

The program needed a slight increase to keep up with real food inflation, and rather than provide the resources to keep up with inflation, the House Republican FY 13 appropriation bill proposed to slash funding.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman.

The appropriation bill would have resulted in 55,000 participants, predominantly seniors, being cut off vital nutrition assistance per month. So I'm

pleased that this CR provides their necessary support.

And while I regret that House Republicans leaders favor kicking the can down the road instead of addressing the important budgetary issues America faces, I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution so we can prevent the Republicans from forcing another potential government shutdown.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to express my great appreciation for the tireless efforts Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member DICKS have expended in this Congress and this fiscal year. They, the other committee Members, and the committee staff have applied their expertise and a tremendous amount of energy and effort in their attempt to return the appropriations process to the regular order. To their credit, Chairman ROGERS and Mr. DICKS have allowed this body to pass more than a majority of our bills.

While I support the continuing resolution, I am abjectly disappointed that the Congress is, once again, going to fail at one of its most fundamental responsibilities. We are all elected to make discrete decisions about Federal programs. By being unable or unwilling to pass individually negotiated appropriation bills, we are doing a great disservice to our constituents and to our country by not providing the guidance necessary for Federal programs to operate effectively.

As the ranking member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, I would like to highlight the National Nuclear Security Administration as an example of where this CR does not provide the necessary oversight for good government. The agency is plagued by dramatic cost increases on nearly every major task under its jurisdiction. The poster child of this inability to accurately estimate cost is the Life Extension Program for the B-61 bomb, the pricetag of which has gone from \$4 to \$10 billion.

And I would also be remiss if I did not mention my disappointment that an anomaly for the United States Enrichment Cooperation is included in the CR. The government has subsidized this company for far too long, and we shouldn't continue to throw good money after bad. I believe that the national security arguments for this program are inconsistent and unpersuasive, and while USEC may have a pressing need for a bailout, there is no immediate defense requirement.

In closing, I do support the CR because it is timely and bipartisan, but we need to break the habit of perpetually kicking every hard decision and deadline down the road.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the continuing resolution. Two of Congress' primary responsibilities are setting Federal spending levels and being a good steward of taxpayer dollars. We should all agree that is best accomplished when we comb through the budget, line by line, to enact responsible spending bills.

That became impossible when the majority walked away from the agreement in last year's Budget Control Act. As a result, the House engaged in a futile attempt to adopt bills that simply don't add up to the spending levels already agreed upon.

A temporary blanket extension of funding doesn't allow us to prioritize increased investments in STEM education, biomedical research, clean energy, infrastructure, advanced manufacturing, and job training initiatives that will grow our economy and create jobs. And a CR also inhibits our efforts to root out wasteful spending.

I will support this bill. We must keep the government operating. However, next year, we must work across the aisle to ensure adequate investments in activities that will facilitate economic growth and best serve our national interest.

I would also like to take a moment to thank my good friend, NORM DICKS. It has been a privilege to serve on the committee with you, and your expertise, steady hand, and leadership will be greatly missed.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), who's the ranking member on the Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, a continuing resolution is a sign that a budget has failed. And this appropriations process was destined to fail from the start as Republicans unilaterally abandoned the Budget Control Act statutory spending caps in favor of the unworkable caps of the Ryan budget.

This 6-month stopgap spending bill proves that the Ryan budget is a lemon. A lemon's a car that won't start, and the Ryan budget is still a nonstarter because it's out of step with the Budget Control Act, with our priorities, and with our values.

While the CR avoids the worst of the Ryan budget's cuts to education, infrastructure, and research, this isn't the way Congress should be budgeting. We should be considering final appropriations bills for Homeland Security and other agencies, or an omnibus bill, that would provide certainty about funding levels for fiscal 2013.

The whole notion of a 6-month CR begs the question: If we can pass a 6-month bill, why not return to the regular order and pass a 12-month bill?

I'm pleased that the CR incorporates a number of "anomalies" which accom-

modate the Department of Homeland Security's need for flexibility in both cybersecurity and Customs and Border Protection personnel. By providing funds for both the EINSTEIN 3 system and for Federal network security, we're ensuring the Federal Government is prepared to tackle the next generation of cyberattacks before they disrupt the Federal network.

□ 1530

On the other hand, I remain concerned that, by not enacting the committee product, we are providing inadequate funding for FEMA first responder grants and for the science and technology directorate. These accounts were badly underfunded in 2012, and passing a CR rather than our 2013 bill continues the shortfall.

Now, the CR, some say, at least lets us keep the government open. Well, we're really in bad shape if the best we can say for ourselves is that we're keeping the government open! Any such claim of success simply underscores how low the bar was set earlier in the current Congress as House Republicans forced the country to lurch from one manufactured crisis to the other. We must do better.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage with the ranking member and clarify some apparent confusion on this CR's provision regarding cybersecurity, if the gentleman would engage.

The language in section 137 of the CR, regarding cybersecurity, is explicit and clear. The phrase that's apparently in question refers solely to the Federal Network Security program. The Federal Network Security is a limited program that provides security systems on government networks, not private. So no funds are for any new executive order. No funds or language expands any DHS authorities, and none of the funds or language in this section has anything to do with the regulation of private sector infrastructure, and we have confirmed that in writing with the Department of Homeland Security.

Without this anomaly, the program will be suspended due to the lack of available funding, and the monitoring of Federal civilian networks will be further delayed, leaving them vulnerable to infiltration and subsequent breach. That's all we are trying to prevent with this provision.

Let me also add that this provision is an abbreviated version of what is contained in both the House-passed and Senate-reported fiscal year 2013 appropriations bills—something our committees have been working on all year.

With all of that said, I now yield to the committee's distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), who I believe agrees with this clarification.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding on this vital matter, and I completely concur with his stated clarification on this CR's

funding and language regarding cyber-security.

I strongly supported the inclusion of this anomaly, and see it as essential but also limited in scope to only the securing of our vulnerable Federal civilian networks. This provision does not intrude upon the authorizers' jurisdiction or enable a new executive order in any way.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Before I yield back, Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to talk about the ranking member.

Mr. DICKS, as I said before, has served on this committee for 30-plus years. I'm not exactly sure how many. How many is it? It is 36 years. He has been a very, very dedicated member of the committee, including—and most especially—of the Defense Subcommittee on which he has served for, I think, 34 years. Before that, he was an aide to a Member of Congress, so he has wide, deep experience in this body.

Maybe just as importantly, perhaps even more so, is the dedication that he has given to the country through his service in the Congress. I, personally, have found him to be a close friend. He has also been a great partner in this appropriations process since I have become the chairman of the committee. He has been helpful in a thousand instances. His heart is in the right place. His mind is on the business of serving the public, especially the military part of that service.

We're going to miss NORM DICKS around here. He is going to leave a large hole in our hearts but also in the business of this body and this Congress, so we wish him well as he embarks upon a new career, perhaps, and a new way of life, perhaps. I've got an idea there are going to be a few fish involved in that future, but we are going to miss NORM DICKS for all that he has meant to us.

This may be the last bill that he has a part in. I hope, perhaps, there will be something in the lame duck; but in case there is not, I wanted to be sure that we said some words of deep, profound thanks to a patriot who has served his country as few others have. I wish NORM DICKS the very, very best as he embarks on the next phase of his life.

I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I want to thank the chairman for his very kind remarks. It has been a deep pleasure working with you and your very able staff. I think one of the reasons for the success of trying to restore regular order is that we've had good staff cooperation at all levels. I want to thank our staff, both the majority and minority, for their excellent work.

It has been a great pleasure working with you. Again, let's hope we can convince people that we should get our

work done so when we come back in the lame duck session we can finally put the omnibus bill together for 2013 and get this accomplished. I know that's what the chairman wants and that that's what I want, but I appreciate his kind remarks. I appreciate his courtesy and his leadership of our committee. Thank you.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention staff. As the ranking member has said, none of this would be here but for this wonderful staff that we are blessed with.

Bill Inglee on the majority side, the clerk; Will Smith, his deputy; and all of the staff on the subcommittees and the full committee have worked day and night—weekends included—on this bill. For that we are deeply appreciative. Then David Pomerantz on the minority side and all of the staff on the minority side, both full committee and subcommittees, have equally worked as hard and, most of the time, together on the same thing. So we want to thank them for the deep service that they've given to us.

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, we know that in too many states and districts across the country, students with the greatest needs are being taught by teachers with little or no training, including those enrolled in alternative route teacher preparation programs. That's why I am so glad this legislation requires the Department of Education to provide Congress—and the nation—with comprehensive information on the extent to which our highest-need students, including students with disabilities, English learners, students from rural communities, and low-income students, are being taught by teachers-in-training who are enrolled in alternative route programs, disaggregated by state and district, as well as by student subgroups. The data that will be included in this report should be made public and disseminated to parents and other interested parties so that is understandable and actionable. Specifically, the provision requires:

The Secretary of Education must submit a report to Congress by 12/31/13 that provides a comprehensive picture, with state-level and LEA data, on the extent to which the following categories of students are taught by alternative route teachers-in-training who are deemed "highly qualified" pursuant to 34 CFR 200.56(a)(2)(ii): students with disabilities, English learners, students in rural areas, and students from low-income families. 34 CFR 200.56(a)(2)(ii) is the regulation that allows individuals participating in alternative route programs but who have not yet completed their full state certification to be labeled "highly qualified." This regulation was struck down by the Ninth Circuit in the *Renee v. Duncan* lawsuit, but written into statute in the December 2010 CR.

To produce the report required by this amendment, states and LEAs will be required to compile the data that they are already required to have under Section 1111(h)(6)(A) of NCLB regarding the professional qualifications of all their teachers, including: "Whether the teacher has met State qualification and licensing criteria for the grade levels and subject areas in which the teacher provides instruc-

Whether the teacher is teaching under emergency or other provisional status through which State qualification or licensing criteria have been waived.

The baccalaureate degree major of the teacher and any other graduate certification or degree held by the teacher, and the field of discipline of the certification or degree.

This data will provide essential information to parents, to educators and to policy makers so that informed decisions can be made so that we can strengthen one of our nation's most valuable assets, our public schools. We will be in a much better position to look at our neediest students and our neediest rural and urban school districts and determine the extent to which well prepared teachers are or are not equitably distributed. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to receiving this important report from the Secretary on December 31, 2013.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of an important provision that is included in this Continuing Resolution. This provision will enable the collection of essential information that we have long sought to make determinations about whether teachers are equitably distributed among our high needs schools. It will also help us understand which teachers are working with underserved students.

In many places, teachers-in-training are serving as teachers of record. While we know this, we do not know exactly where they are concentrated around the country or which subgroups of students they are primarily teaching. Data points are available for some locales, but not nationally. This provision will require the Department of Education to gather information about the extent to which students with high needs are being taught by teachers with the least amount of preparation, including students with disabilities, English language learners, low-income students and students in rural areas and report this information to Congress by December 31, 2013.

It is my hope that this report will require States and LEAs to compile the data that districts are already required to have under the Parents' Right to Know Section of NCLB regarding the professional qualifications of all their teachers.

I look forward to receiving this important report. The information presented will assist Congress, the public, parents and educators in making informed decisions about policy and practice.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 778, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution 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 House Joint Resolution 117 is postponed.

□ 1540

NATIONAL SECURITY AND JOB PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 778, I call up

the bill (H.R. 6365) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to replace the sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 778, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6365

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 “National Security and Job Protection Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Current law requires that there be across-the-board cuts, known as a “sequester”, imposed on January 2, 2013. The sequester will result in a 10 percent reduction in non-military personnel programs of the Department of Defense and an 8 percent reduction in certain domestic programs, such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and border security.

(2) Intended as a mechanism to force action, there is bipartisan agreement that the sequester going into place would undercut key responsibilities of the Federal Government.

(3) As the Administration stated in its fiscal year 2013 budget request, “[Sequestration] would lead to significant cuts to critical domestic programs such as education and research and cuts to defense programs that could undermine our national security. . . . [C]uts of this magnitude done in an across-the-board fashion would be devastating both to defense and non-defense programs.” (The Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2013, p. 24, February 13, 2012).

(4) On March 29, 2012, The House of Representatives passed H. Con. Res. 112, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2013, which includes reconciliation instructions directing House Committees to craft legislation that would achieve the savings required to replace the sequestration called for in fiscal year 2013, as established by the Budget Control Act of 2011.

(5) On May 10, 2012, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 5652, the Sequestration Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012, which would replace the \$98 billion sequestration of discretionary spending called for in 2013, as established by the Budget Control Act of 2011, by making changes in law to reduce direct spending by \$310 billion through fiscal year 2022.

(6) An analysis of the impact of the sequestration prepared for the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee found that if left in place, sequestration would cut the military to its smallest size since before the Second World War, all while we are still a nation at war in Afghanistan, facing increased threats from Iran and North Korea, unrest in the Middle East, and a rising China.

(7) Major consequences identified by the House Armed Services Committee include the following:

(A) 200,000 soldiers and Marines separated from service, bringing our force well below our pre-9/11 levels.

(B) Ability to respond to contingencies in North Korea or Iran at jeopardy.

(C) The smallest ground force since 1940.

(D) A fleet of fewer than 230 ships, the smallest level since 1915.

(E) The smallest tactical fighter force in the history of the Air Force.

(F) Our nuclear triad that has kept the U.S. and 30 of our allies safe for decades will be in jeopardy.

(G) Reductions of 20 percent in defense civilian personnel.

(H) Two BRAC rounds of base closings. (House Armed Services Committee memo entitled “Assessment of Impacts of Budget Cuts”, September 22, 2011).

(8) Secretary Panetta and the professional military leadership have also looked at the impact of sequestration and reached similar conclusions.

(9) Secretary Panetta stated, “If the maximum sequestration is triggered, the total cut will rise to about \$1 trillion compared with the FY 2012 plan. The impacts of these cuts would be devastating for the Department. . . Facing such large reductions, we would have to reduce the size of the military sharply. Rough estimates suggest after ten years of these cuts, we would have the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest number of ships since 1915, and the smallest Air Force in its history.” (Secretary Panetta, Letter to Senator John McCain, November 14, 2011).

(10) General Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated, “[S]equestration leaves me three places to go to find the additional money: operations, maintenance, and training. That’s the definition of a hollow force.”

(11) The individual branch service chiefs echoed General Dempsey:

(A) “Cuts of this magnitude would be catastrophic to the military. . . My assessment is that the nation would incur an unacceptable level of strategic and operational risk.” –General Ray T. Odierno, Chief Of Staff, United States Army.

(B) “A severe and irreversible impact on the Navy’s future” –Admiral Jonathan W. Greenert, Chief of Naval Operations.

(C) “A Marine Corps below the end strength that’s necessary to support even one major contingency.” –General James F. Amos, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

(D) “Even the most thoroughly deliberated strategy may not be able to overcome dire consequences.” –General Norton A. Schwartz, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force (Testimony of Service Chief before House Armed Services Committee, November 2, 2011).

(12) According to an analysis by the House Appropriations Committee, the sequester will also have a significant impact on non-defense discretionary programs, including the following:

(A) Automatically reducing Head Start by \$650 million, resulting in 75,000 fewer slots for children in the program.

(B) Automatically reducing the National Institutes of Health (NIH) by \$2.4 billion, an amount equal to nearly half of total NIH spending on cancer this year.

(C) A reduction of approximately 1,870 Border Patrol Agents (a reduction of nearly 9 percent of the total number of agents).

(13) Beyond the negative impacts sequestration will have on defense readiness, it will also undermine the industrial base needed to equip our armed forces with the weapons and technology they need to complete their mission. A study released by the National Association of Manufacturers suggests that 1.1 million workers in the supply chain could be adversely affected, including 3.4 percent of workers in the aerospace industry, 3.3 percent of the workforce in the shipbuilding industry and 10 percent of the workers in the search and navigation equipment industry.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONAL REPLACEMENT FOR FY 2013 SEQUESTER.

(a) CONTINGENT EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by it shall take effect upon the enactment of—

(1) the Act contemplated in section 201 of H. Con. Res. 112 (112th Congress) that achieves at least the deficit reduction called for in such section for such periods; or

(2) similar legislation that achieves outlay reductions within five years after the date of enactment that equal or exceed the outlay reductions flowing from the budget authority reductions mandated by sections 251A(7)(A) and 251A(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as in force immediately before the date of enactment of this Act, as it applies to direct spending in the defense function for fiscal year 2013 combined with the outlay reductions flowing from the amendment to section 251A(7)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 made by subsection (c) of this section.

(b) REVISED 2013 DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMIT.—Paragraph (2) of section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

“(2) with respect to fiscal year 2013, for the discretionary category, \$1,047,000,000,000 in new budget authority;”.

(c) DISCRETIONARY SAVINGS.—Section 251A(7)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

“(A) FISCAL YEAR 2013.—

“(i) FISCAL YEAR 2013 ADJUSTMENT.—On January 2, 2013, the discretionary category set forth in section 251(c)(2) shall be decreased by \$19,104,000,000 in budget authority.

“(ii) ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.—OMB shall issue a supplemental report consistent with the requirements set forth in section 254(f)(2) for fiscal year 2013 using the procedures set forth in section 253(f) on April 15, 2013, to eliminate any discretionary spending breach of the spending limit set forth in section 251(c)(2) as adjusted by clause (i), and the President shall issue an order to eliminate the breach, if any, identified in such report.”.

(d) ELIMINATION AND CONDITIONAL REPLACEMENT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION FOR DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) ELIMINATION.—Any sequestration order issued by the President under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to carry out reductions to direct spending for the defense function (050) for fiscal year 2013 pursuant to section 251A of such Act shall have no force or effect.

(2) CONDITIONAL REPLACEMENT.—To the extent that legislation enacted pursuant to section 3(a)(2) achieves outlay reductions that exceed the outlay reductions flowing from the budget authority reductions required in section 251A(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as in force immediately before the date of enactment of this Act, the direct spending reductions for the nonsecurity category for fiscal year 2013 otherwise required to be ordered pursuant to such section shall be reduced by that amount, and Congress so designates for such purpose.

SEC. 4. PRESIDENTIAL SUBMISSION.

Not later than October 15, 2012, the President shall transmit to Congress a legislative proposal that meets the requirements of section 3(a)(2) of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6365.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to myself.

Mr. Speaker, under current law, there will be a \$110 billion across-the-board cut known as sequester. It will be imposed in this country on January 2, 2013, resulting in a 10 percent reduction in the Department of Defense programs and an 8 percent reduction in certain domestic programs as well.

In May of this year, the House passed a bill to deal with this. That was H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act. What this legislation would do is it would replace that sequester of 2013 with commonsense spending cuts and reforms. Unfortunately, we have seen a lack of leadership both over in the Senate and in the White House. The Senate has failed to act on this legislation—the Senate, where all good bills go to die, so too with this, or any sequester replacement bill. Today the House will once again try to responsibly fix the sequester.

The National Security and Job Protection Act would ensure our national security, but at the same time we do that, we'll cut spending. The National Security and Job Protection Act would do two things quickly. First, it would turn off the sequester of Congress, enacting the House-passed reconciliation bill or similar legislation that achieves equal levels of deficit reduction. Secondly, the National Security and Job Protection Act would require the President of the United States to submit to Congress a legislative proposal to replace the sequester with an alternative no later than October 15 of this year.

Up until this point, we have seen absolutely no leadership, we have seen no plan from the President to fix this sequester problem, but yet there is strong bipartisan agreement that the sequester, as it is right now, is bad policy and should be re-prioritized. Once again, the President has failed to lead in this area, failed to put forward a credible response, failed to put forward a legislative proposal, and the Senate has failed as well. The result is that in less than 100 days we will see reductions that our own Secretary Panetta says will hollow out our Armed Forces and make totally arbitrary reductions in other spending programs.

Not only has the President failed to lead in this area, he has failed to put forward a plan. The President has also failed—and this is important—to submit to Congress a report, as law requires him to do so, detailing specifically how this administration would implement the sequester.

Mr. Speaker, after months, literally months, of stonewalling Congress on how this administration would implement the sequester, Congress now comes to the floor because we are forced to pass legislation requiring the President to submit a detailed sequester implementation program. When that legislation became law, as we said, the President's response has been no response. Rather than him doing his homework, the President has simply taken a pass on this matter and instead has provided Congress with nothing, and he is not even meeting the requirements of the law. It is an example, I think, to use the President's own word, of an "incomplete" by this President on his report card.

That the President lacks leadership is simply stunning to this Member and to the American people as well. As I say, the Senate is no better for failing to respond in this matter. The Senate refuses to take up any bill or to replace the sequester whatsoever.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we again come here passing legislation to try to solve this problem, to fix the sequester, to make sure that these draconian cuts do not go in place now. We're not saying that it has to be the House-passed bill that passed. We're also asking the President to put forward his own legislative proposal, for the Senate to act before the legislation takes effect.

Americans are looking for leadership, and they're getting it from the House of Representatives today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is really quite a charade we're engaged in here today on the floor of the House of Representatives. Let's just flash back a year ago to how we got to this spot.

At that time, our Republican colleagues threatened that the United States would default on its full faith and credit, that we wouldn't pay the bills that we already incurred, that this Congress had already voted for, and threatened to tank the economy unless we passed their version of the budget, the Ryan budget, the budget that came out of the House Budget Committee. In order to prevent the United States from defaulting, everybody got together—the House, the Senate, and the President—and they passed the Budget Control Act. To hear our Republican colleagues today, you'd think they had nothing to do with the Budget Control Act. We heard the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, on television the other day not wanting to associate himself with that.

□ 1550

The reality is he voted for it. The Speaker of the House said he got 98 percent of what he wanted. Here's the Speaker of the House after we passed the Budget Control Act:

I got 98 percent of what I wanted. I'm pretty happy.

Now we are faced with the consequences of the Budget Control Act. What did it do? Two things: It cut spending, discretionary spending over 10 years by a trillion dollars by putting in spending caps, and it created a sequester process.

There's agreement in this House that allowing the meat-ax sequester agreements to take place would really be a stupid thing to do. There's agreement on that.

The issue is: How do we replace that? How do we achieve a similar amount of deficit reduction to replace that sequester?

We hear our Republican colleagues say there is no leadership from the President; they haven't heard any alternatives. That's just not true.

There are lots of alternatives that have been put on the table. They just don't like the alternatives. And do you know why? Because the Democratic alternatives to the sequester, and the one put forward by the President, takes the same balanced approach that's been recommended by bipartisan commissions.

They say that in order to tackle our deficit we should make additional cuts. But we should also eliminate a lot of special interest tax breaks for Big Oil companies. We should ask the very wealthy to go back to paying a little bit more in taxes, about what they were paying when President Clinton was President, the last time we balanced our budget.

The President has submitted that. In fact, a year ago the President sent down a plan right here on how we could take a balanced approach to deficit reduction.

Just yesterday in the Rules Committee, on behalf of my Democratic colleagues, we proposed a substitute that would totally have replaced the sequester, again through a mix of cuts, cutting some of the excessive agriculture subsidies, but also raising revenue by cutting some of the big breaks for Big Oil companies and asking the wealthiest to chip in a little bit more.

Our Republican colleagues who say they want a big open debate on the floor here, they denied us even a vote on that amendment. We're not going to get to vote today on that amendment. Instead, we're voting on this resolution that, even if we pass it and the Senate passes it and the President would sign it, it would do nothing about the sequester—nothing. That's why I said this is a charade.

We had an option to bring to the floor of this House a real substitute proposal that, if we passed it, it would have removed the sequester, made sure that there are no cuts to defense and nondefense under the sequester. We don't get to vote on that today. Instead, we're voting on something that is totally meaningless.

They say they're going to ask the President to submit a report to the

Congress. He's already done it. He did it a year ago. They just don't like it because it takes a balanced approach, because it does ask Big Oil companies to give up some of their big taxpayer subsidies.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's end the charade. The moment our Republican colleagues come to the conclusion that it's more important to protect defense spending than it is to protect special interest tax breaks for Big Oil companies, we can move on and deal with this in a balanced way, the same way bipartisan commissions have recommended.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members that it is inappropriate to traffic the well while a Member is speaking.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the sponsor of the legislation before us, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST), who recognizes that while the President may have presented a plan to this Congress, that bill went down 414-0, and to the Senate 97-0.

Mr. WEST. I want to thank my colleague for allowing me to come here.

This is not a charade. I served 22 years in the United States military, and I was part of a reduction in force coming out of Desert Shield/Desert Storm, and I know what these types of cuts will do to the military. Also, this is what these types of cuts will do to non-defense discretionary.

The sequestration will put at risk all that we have accomplished in education and weaken programs that help children, serve young families, send young people and adults to college and make the middle class American Dream possible.

Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan.

Secretary of Defense:

This mechanism of sequestration will force defense cuts that, in my view, would do catastrophic damage to our military and the ability to be able to protect our country.

I think right now, Mr. Speaker, it's very simple. George Santayana had a quote back in the 1920s and said:

Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

At the end of World War I, we cut our military, then came World War II. At the end of World War II, we cut our military, then came the Korean War. At the end of the Korean War, we, of course, did the exact same thing, and, of course, we had to chase communism all over the world, Vietnam.

As I spoke about earlier, I participated in the RIF after Desert Shield/Desert Storm. This sequestration does one simple thing: It takes the Army and Marine Corps down to 1940s levels.

It puts 200,000 of our men and women in uniform on the streets.

It makes our United States Navy go to 1915 levels. Currently, we have a naval force of 283 warships. It goes down to 230.

It takes our Air Force down to the smallest Air Force we have had in mod-

ern history, when we created the United States Air Force. It cuts non-tactical fighter squadrons.

If you talk to any of our service chiefs, if you listen to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs who talks about hollowing out this force, we should not be doing this at a time when we all see what is happening in the world right now, when the United States of America has had a sovereign piece of its territory attacked. We have had an Ambassador that has lost his life. The message that we are going to send is that we are going to do nothing?

This legislation says, very simply, we have passed a plan out of the House. The Senate, if you don't like our plan, come up with your own plan. Mr. President, you are the Commander in Chief. Come up with a plan.

One of the things that you learn as a young officer, that if you ever get into a firefight, you are ever in an ambush, to do nothing means that people lose their lives. I will not stand here and do nothing at this time because those are my friends still in uniform; those are my relatives that are still in uniform.

Now, I did not have the ability to be selected to be on the supercommittee—maybe because I have only been here as a freshman—but that does not mean that I will not be an adult and present a solution that says, very simply, if you don't like what we passed in the House, then do something. Come up with a plan.

We just heard the debate about the continuing resolution, a continuing resolution we have been forced into because we have a Senate that has not passed a budget in close to 3 years. We have a Senate that has not taken up any appropriations bills.

Well, I will tell you—and I will reach out to my colleagues from the other side—at least here in the House we have done something. But we have been forced into a position with this sequestration to say we have got to come up with a solution. The supercommittee did not meet its enacted mandate.

Does that mean we're going to stop? Does that mean that we're going to look at the men and women in uniform and say we will allow this to happen? Did that mean that we're going to look at other people that are affected by these non-defense discretionary cuts?

All I'm saying is, with this piece of legislation, those who have come up with a plan, tell us what you want so that we do not have this occur. Think about the second- and third-order effects that will come to this.

We are talking about the people that will be lost in uniform.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. No, I will not yield, so please—thank you.

We're talking about the Department of Defense civilian positions that would be lost. We're talking about the defense industrial base, the technology that is going to develop the next generation of weapons systems for our men and

women that will be lost. We're talking about a critical decision for the way ahead for the United States of America.

And I understand what has been said about this balanced approach that the President sent over in his fiscal year 2013 budget. They had \$1.9 trillion of new taxes, but yet it never balances at any time. If it was such a good plan, such a good budget, no one here took it up. That's my concern.

This is a last chance for us to be the adults, to do something, to stave off this sequestration. The House voted. The House sent a piece of legislation out in May. The House voted on the Sequestration Transparency Act. We still have not gotten anything.

The Director of the OMB, Mr. Jeffrey Zients, testified before the Armed Services Committee he has no plan. All he did was sit there and say that, if you guys would stop with these tax cuts not being brought up on the rich, then this would not happen.

What is a fair share when the top 1 percent pays close to 37 percent of taxes? That's not the debate, Mr. Speaker. The debate is what we're going to do about this sequestration.

□ 1600

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

We've heard before that there was this vote on the President's plan and that it got no votes. We had a vote on a fake President's plan. When we actually had to vote on the Democratic alternative, which the White House made clear was closer to their plan than the one that was put up for a fake vote, it got a huge vote from our Democratic colleagues.

I would just ask Mr. WEST to read his own amendment. Because if you read the bill, it's pretty clear if we were to pass it and the Senate was to pass it and the President would sign it, it doesn't make the sequester go away. No, it doesn't make the sequester go away. It calls for action. In fact, it says the President should submit a plan within a certain period of time. It's right here in your bill: Presidential submission not later than October 15, 2012. The President shall transmit to the Congress a legislative proposal.

Mr. WEST. If the gentleman will yield, it says that it would be replaced. If you come up with a plan, it will be replaced.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Exactly. And reclaiming my time, that's exactly right. That's exactly what it says. But you tell the President what his plan has to do. You tell the President that his plan cannot include one penny of revenue for the purpose of reducing the deficit. In other words, you say the President's plan has got to look like your plan.

So, Mr. Speaker, the issue here is not whether the President has a plan or not. He does have a plan. Our Republican colleagues don't like it because it says that it's more important to protect defense spending and protect domestic spending like NIH than it is to

protect special interest tax loopholes. And I see the chairman of the Armed Services Committee on the floor, and I respect him greatly. That's the position he took last October. Here's what he said when he was asked:

"If it came that I had only two choices, one was a tax increase and one was a cut in defense over and above where we already are, I would go to strengthen defense."

That is the President's position. That's the President's position, Mr. WEST. He said we need to take a balanced approach to reducing the deficit. We need to combine cuts. But we also should end special interest tax breaks for the big oil companies. George Bush himself said when you've got oil above \$50 a barrel, you don't need these ridiculous incentives to keep them drilling. And we should ask very wealthy individuals, frankly, to pay the same tax rate that the people who work for them do; the same effective tax rate. And we should eliminate some of these ag subsidies.

Now you asked about other proposals. I have a proposal in my hand. I took it to the House Rules Committee yesterday. It would have totally replaced the sequester. If we actually voted on this, it would replace the sequester for defense and nondefense. You know how we do it? We do it through cuts to big ag subsidies, we do it by eliminating subsidies for the big oil companies, and yes, we ask people making more than a million dollars a year to pay a little bit more because we think it's more important to do that than allow these cuts to defense to take place and all the consequences you talk about, and we think it's important to protect investments in places like NIH, people who are fighting to try and find cures for diseases.

So, Madam Speaker, the issue is not whether we replace the sequester. The President's got a proposal. I've got a proposal. It's how we do it. And, again, our Republican colleagues have doubled down on this idea that you're going to protect every tax break that's out there before you protect spending on our national defense.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Before we hear from our leader, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST).

Mr. WEST. We voted to cut defense spending by \$487 billion. We're talking about additional. And when you talk about raising these taxes, Ernst & Young had an independent report that talked about the adverse ramifications that will come from raising taxes.

Obviously, one thing we fail to understand, small business operators, subchapter S corps, LLCs, you're going to ruin this economy and more job losses by raising those taxes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just would ask the gentleman, and I would yield to him for an answer, whether he means Bain Capital is a small business.

Mr. WEST. I'm not talking about Bain Capital. You said raise taxes on individuals. I'm talking about personal income.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time. Mr. WEST, when Mr. Romney and Mr. RYAN and all our Republican colleagues cite those figures about passthroughs, that includes companies like Bain Capital. It also includes some Fortune 100 companies. The President has put forward a proposal that says let's act right now to extend tax relief to 98 percent of the American people and 97 percent of all passthrough businesses.

It's true we don't think that Bain Capital needs a big additional tax break when we've got a big deficit that we should deal with in what we think should be a balanced way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield 1 minute to our leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey and commend the gentleman from Florida on bringing this bill forward.

Madam Speaker, the bill before us is not about tax rates. Because I think that that issue will be resolved one way or another here shortly in this election. We know that there's a difference between the two sides. Unfortunately, our counterparts on the other side of the aisle think it's very important in this tough economy to raise taxes. We don't believe that, Madam Speaker. The bill before us simply asks the President to give us his plan for replacing the first year of cuts in the sequester.

It has been 126 days since we passed our plan to responsibly replace the sequester with cuts that maintain our fiscal discipline. Our plan controls unchecked government spending and reduces wasteful and duplicative programs. But still there has been no action and no proposal coming from the other side of the Capitol, coming from the other side of the aisle.

It has been 126 days since the President said he would veto our plan. But he has failed to put forward an alternative. And the letter that some of us Republican leaders wrote on July 14 asking the President to engage with us to come and find a bipartisan solution to the sequestration, that letter has gone unanswered.

Madam Speaker, inaction carries a very high risk. Instability and unprecedented political transformation throughout the Middle East, a civil war in Syria, Iran's dogged pursuit of nuclear weapons in support for terrorism, as well as challenges posed by a rising China and geostrategic shifts in the Asia Pacific make maintaining American military preeminence as important as ever. And the deadly and tragic

attacks on Ambassador Chris Stevens, Foreign Service Information Management Office Sean Smith, and two other Americans at our consulate in Benghazi, Libya, make clear that Islamic extremist terrorism remains a tremendous threat to the Middle East, the United States, and the international community.

If the cuts in the sequester go forward, they will fundamentally weaken our current and long-term security and our ability to meet challenges we're facing. Implementing these cuts will mean reductions in shipbuilding, aircraft and missiles, shrinking our current force to levels not seen since before World War II. And that means fewer defense-related jobs. According to a study conducted by the Aerospace Industries Association, the job losses will reach 2 million. Let me put that in perspective. The economy added less than 100,000 jobs last month. Worse, more people dropped out of the labor force than were added to it. Under the sequester, unemployment would soar from its current level up to 9 percent, setting back any progress the economy has made. According to the same study, the jobs of more than 200,000 Virginians, my own State, are on the line. A small business in my district called Produce Source Partners, which provides fresh food to military bases, says the sequester threatens the jobs of their 200 employees. Another small company in Virginia, HI-TEST Laboratories, could be forced to reduce their staff by as much as 30 percent. Removing these jobs from the community will shrink the local economy and set back an already underutilized business zone. That same predicament faces hundreds of hardworking men and women in towns from here to California.

Madam Speaker, we are here today asking the President simply to come forward with a plan. We are here today because the minority has failed to work with us to find a solution to prevent these cuts that would hollow out our military and result in massive layoffs.

Madam Speaker, the House has acted. Now we need leadership, Mr. President.

□ 1610

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

It's hard to know where to begin because—I hope everyone was listening very carefully. If we allow these spending cuts to take place, we will lose hundreds of thousands of jobs in Virginia alone. Thousands of jobs around the country.

You know, I've heard a lot of complaints from our Republican colleagues about the recovery bill and the fact that we had to do some emergency spending to prevent the loss of millions of jobs. You know what? That worked. And here our Republican colleagues here today are saying that we've got to make sure the spending cuts don't take

place because if we do, it will result in a lot of lost jobs.

Well, you know what? It takes jobs to build an aircraft carrier, absolutely. It also creates jobs when you invest in trying to repair and modernize our roads and our bridges, our infrastructure.

The President submitted a jobs bill more than a year ago to this House to do exactly that. Let's invest more in modernizing our infrastructure. We haven't had a single vote on the President's jobs bill.

So I'm really glad to hear our Republican colleagues say that if we make these kinds of cuts, it's going to result in lost jobs because you know what? You are right about that.

The debate today is not about whether we should prevent the sequester from taking place. As I said, we should. It's how we do that.

I heard again from the Republican leader the President doesn't have a plan. He has a plan. They just don't like his plan. They don't like his plan because it takes a balanced approach. It says, you know what? In addition to cuts, we should also ask people who make more than a million dollars a year to contribute a little more to reducing our national deficit and preventing the sequester. We should ask big oil companies to give up their taxpayer subsidies.

So, the question, Madam Speaker, is not whether we replace the sequester. There are lots of plans that I've already talked about. The one in my hand, I offered it yesterday. I can't get a vote on it today.

The issue is not whether; it's how. We should take a balanced approach.

I yield now 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to participate in this debate in some ways, although I do have to say that this is not really the kind of honest debate that we need to be having. We should be having a conversation. We should have been having a conversation well before now about how we would avoid sequester and do it in a bipartisan way and do it in a balanced way. That is not what is happening. Right now what we're seeing is a Republican plan without that kind of conversation, without that kind of willingness to find common ground or balanced approach.

The Federal budget is about choices. The choices we make matter. Do we choose to protect our seniors, to grow the middle class, to make smart investments in our economy, to be able to reach agreement on deficit reduction in a way that is fair to the American people or not?

Republicans have made their choices, their priorities, and their values very clear. Once again, they are wasting America's time playing politics instead of working to find that common ground.

Sequestration was put in place to push us, to force us in Congress to

work together on a bipartisan, balanced approach to deficit reduction. We knew it would be tough. We all knew we would not want to implement sequester, that that would be difficult. But we put on the table what needed to get done if we couldn't have that kind of conversation, and we have not yet seen the Republican leadership in the House be willing to engage in that kind of serious deficit reduction conversation that takes a balanced approach, respects our obligation to Americans and our future.

Today's legislation does not move us any closer to achieving the goal of deficit reduction done in a balanced way, in a fair way, in a real way. We know we must reduce the Nation's deficit in a balanced and fiscally responsible manner. We've seen every bipartisan independent commission tell us that.

It means, and they've told us and we know, that we have to take some hard hits in spending cuts, that we have to require greater efficiency and greater effectiveness from all sectors of government, that we must do this with a balance, with increased revenue. It cannot be done without it.

In order to build economic growth in our Nation, we need to do all of this. Deficit reduction means spending cuts, it means increased revenue, it means a balanced approach if we're going to grow the economy for now and the future.

The Republicans in Congress have rejected this balanced approach, and in doing so they have made it clear that they are not serious about deficit reduction. They are, in fact, willing to add \$800 billion to our deficit with tax breaks to the wealthiest. That's what this legislation does today. They are adding \$2 trillion more in defense spending, more than the Pentagon has said it needs to keep us safe and defend our Nation. They're willing to do this at the expense of our middle class, our seniors, and our economic recovery.

The Republican approach to replacing the sequester means that we will be less prepared to compete in the 21st century economy. Now is not the time to make drastic cuts in transportation and infrastructure, in innovation and clean energy, or in education and health care. And that's what this would do.

The Republican plan creates false and unfair choices for the American people.

Let's get serious. Let's have some real solutions. Let's move forward on deficit reduction and economic growth for the American people.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I would now like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) who recognizes that it is really not a balanced plan to say that we want to raise \$3 on every American in taxes and only \$1 in spending reductions, and it is not a balanced plan to say that we want to pick and choose winners and losers when it comes to the Tax Code reform.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the National Security and Jobs Protection Act offered by Mr. WEST from Florida. I have the privilege of serving on the Armed Services Committee with him, and I thank him for his leadership in bringing this important bill forward at this time.

It boggles my mind, Madam Speaker, that we are standing here ready to wipe out our national defense at a time when we turn on the TV in the morning and see the Middle East erupting, when we see Iran moving forward on their plans to achieve a nuclear weapon, when we see China increasing their defense spending while we're cutting ours.

People need to understand that we have cut \$487 billion starting October 1 over the next 10 years out of our defense. And on top of that, we have added this problem of sequestration, which adds another 500, \$600 billion over the next 10 years starting January 2.

The first \$487 billion, some thought was put into, and plans. Even though we had to adjust our strategy that we've had since World War II, we've had to cut back. We know that we won't be able to carry out the missions that we've been called on to do in the future, but we will be able to survive, according to our military leaders.

But the sequestration—we held five hearings last September with all of our former military leaders, our current military leaders, former chairmen and Secretaries of these committees, and to a man, every single one said that the sequestration would hollow out and wipe out our national defense.

We would take the Navy back to the size it was in World War I, the Armed Forces, the ground forces back to the size they were in 1940, and the Air Force back to the smallest it's been since it was created. How does anybody think that given these times that is not a stupid thing to be doing?

The way the sequestration would take effect is you just pull out the budget and take a percentage—the administration hasn't told us yet what percentage; it's probably going to be about 15, 20 percent—off of every single line item. So mowing the lawn at Fort Dix will have the same priority as ammunition for the troops in Afghanistan. How can anybody think that that is a smart idea?

You know, we have a Constitution of the United States, and it tells us how we should operate here in this Congress. It says one body passes a bill, the other body passes a bill, a conference is formed, you work out your differences, you take it back for final passage, and send it to the President to be signed into law.

The House has acted. We took tough votes. We accomplished our objective of paying for the first year of sequestration, not just the defense cuts, but all of the cuts across the board, to move it back, pay for the first year, move it back into a time where we're

less stressed with the election upon us, where we could do it in a less political environment, and the Senate hasn't acted. In 126 days, the Senate hasn't acted. Excuse me. The other body hasn't acted.

□ 1620

Madam Speaker, they don't like our bill; I understand that. All they have to do is pass another bill, get it to conference, and then we'll work out the differences. We accomplished ours through cuts, they can accomplish theirs through increasing taxes, and then we can work out a difference. All the gentleman on the other side says is, They've presented a plan and we don't like their plan.

Well, a plan is nothing. What they have to do is pass a bill. Show us. Get the votes, pass a bill, and then go to the conference. It's in the Constitution. That's how we operate. And it's important enough that we should all act like adults and follow the Constitution and get it done. Our Nation, our security depends on it, and we don't have much time left to do it.

Madam Speaker, I think it's very important that we pass this bill. I encourage my colleagues to vote for it. Let's act like adults. Let's earn our salaries here. Let's get this job done.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the National Security and Jobs Protection Act offered by Mr. WEST, whom I have the pleasure of serving with on the Armed Services Committee. We all know that in less than 4 months, the automatic across-the-board cuts known as sequestration will go into full effect, significantly reducing funding for our national defense and vital domestic programs.

Mr. WEST and members of our committee understand just how much these draconian cuts will undermine our constitutional obligation to provide for the common defense. They will result in the United States having the smallest Army since World War II, the smallest Navy since World War I and the smallest Air Force in U.S. history. That is why President Obama's own Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, has said the pending sequester is devastating and akin to shooting ourselves in the head.

So the natural question is—what is our government doing to stop sequestration? On May 10, 2012, the United States House of Representatives passed a measured and responsible proposal to deal with this impending threat, H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012. Yet, 126 days later the Senate has not acted. The President has not acted.

Madam Speaker, the House is prepared to work with the President and the Senate on alternatives to sequestration. We urge them to come to the table. That's what Mr. WEST's legislation does. Our colleagues in the Senate tell the press that they are negotiating a deal. Well they have been talking about that for a year now. It is time to put something down on paper and get it passed. We must not allow the well being of our troops and our national security to be used as a bargaining chip in this debate.

Just this week we were reminded at how unstable and dangerous our world is. The kill-

ing of Americans in Benghazi on the anniversary of Sep 11th is a reminder and a challenge to every member of this body that we must put our national security and our national interests first.

As one senior military official recently told me, America's inability to govern ourselves past sequestration plays directly into the hands of those who spread a narrative of American decline and will ultimately thrust us into a more dangerous world.

This legislation will require President Obama to live up to his obligation as Commander-in-Chief and submit his alternative plan to replace sequestration, while encouraging the United States Senate to do the same. Let us also not forget that it was the President who put defense "squarely on the table" last summer in the negotiations for the Budget Control Act.

Madam Speaker, we are running out of time before the draconian cuts in sequestration take effect. There are 111 days remaining. We need to work together to find a solution. I urge members to vote "yes" on this legislation.

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

I agree with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee; we should act like adults.

We agree that the sequester cuts are done in a stupid, meat-ax way. We also agree with what the chairman of the Armed Services Committee said last October when, if it came to choosing between allowing all of the terrible consequences that he rightly spoke about and taking a balanced approach to deficit reduction which included some additional revenue, he would accept the balanced approach.

Mr. MCKEON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I will yield for a very quick question.

Mr. MCKEON. You presented something that I said when I was asked after a speech what I would do, given two bad choices. But you don't have anything on the floor yet. You haven't passed a bill, so I don't even have the opportunity to vote for increased taxes because you haven't passed a bill yet.

Thank you.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We wanted to give you that opportunity yesterday, which is why I went to the House Rules Committee with this substitute—which is in my hand, Mr. Chairman—that said you can replace the sequester right away if you're willing to cut some big ag subsidies, which I thought we were all agreed that we could do, but also get rid of some of the subsidies for the Big Oil companies, not some of the smaller producers, the big five, and you ask folks over \$1 million to pay the same effective rate that people who work for them pay.

I agree with what you said last October, which is that it's more important to prevent the kind of cuts that we're talking about here today to defense and non-defense than it is to protect tax breaks for Big Oil companies.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to vote. We wanted to vote. If the Rules Committee will allow us a vote, you can do it right now. In fact, the thing I have in my hand, the substitute, if we passed it, would actually replace the sequester. The resolution on the floor doesn't replace the sequester, even if it goes to the White House.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. LEVIN.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Well, I have now been here 30 years, with 26 on the Ways and Means Committee. So why are we at this point of serious impasse? I think a major reason is that the radical right has taken over House Republicans. Balance is considered surrender; compromise is considered retreat.

Indeed, since the passage of the Budget Control Act in August of 2011, the Republicans have made sequestration even more likely. Before August of last year, the Republican position was no new revenues. The Bush tax cuts for the very wealthy were untouchable. But in their budget passed this March, the Republicans not only said that the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy must continue, but also they should be expanded. They are doubling down on a policy of tax cuts for the wealthiest while annual income stagnation continues for the middle class, and we have the worst income inequality in generations. So, in a word, they went from bad to worse, furthering the likelihood of sequestration.

Under the Ryan budget and the so-called tax reform fast-track bill they passed last month, a recent analysis concluded that the average millionaire would lock in an average tax cut of \$330,000, while the average person making less than \$200,000 would see their taxes rise by \$4,500.

I support tax reform, but so far Republicans have refused to say which policies they would eliminate to pay for it. It's been dodge and deception.

Half of the money in individual income tax expenditures is in the lower rates for capital gains and dividends, and they propose to cut those rates even further, Mr. RYAN down to zero on capital gains. Most of those benefits go to those making over \$1 million. Most of the other major tax expenditures—mortgage interest, health insurance, education benefits that would have to be decimated—are mainly middle class benefits.

This bill ignores the fact that the President put forward a balanced deficit reduction package over a year ago that would have cut the deficit by \$4 trillion over 10 years.

I close by emphasizing the word, "balanced." Essentially, the Republican Party that I've known over the years has become very deeply imbalanced in terms of the mainstream of America.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), who understands that we are in fact presenting a balanced approach inasmuch as we present the options to either pass this legislation that the House already did or an alternative.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I had made some notes I was going to say, but I'm now going to go off script as the gentleman from Maryland, who I genuinely like and respect, made some comments to which I feel I must respond.

The gentleman referred to, as the President does often, additional taxes on domestic energy, for which they use the pejorative "Big Oil," and taxes on job creators, for which they are creating a pejorative, "the rich," and that these two things will solve all ills.

Well, by my count, when we did the budget this year in the Budget Committee, the Democrats used those two taxes to pay for seven, by my count, different items of spending.

Now, let me explain what that's like. It's like this:

Here is a dollar. This is one dollar, a single dollar. If I go into a store and spend it and buy these breath mints, the dollar will be gone and I will have the breath mints. I cannot now take this dollar into six more stores and buy six more bits of breath mints because the dollar is gone. I spent it. So you cannot use the same tax increases to pay for everything that are multiple times what those tax increases will ever raise.

Now, I understand this is a political talking point. I get it. Look, we all do those. I get it. But this is not a game. We saw this week, with the reprehensible assassination of Ambassador Stevens, that our national defense is not a game—it is definitely not a game now—and our economy is not a game, as millions of people who are out of work can attest. This is a real proposal. We're asking the President for a real proposal and not a political talking point, and we need to solve this problem.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend from California for those comments, and I would just say this:

I have in my hand a proposal, a substitute amendment. If we passed it, it would prevent the sequester from taking place on defense and non-defense in a balanced way. You spend these things one time to get rid of the sequester.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee said he wished he had an opportunity to vote on something like this, and I say to him, I wish the Rules Committee had given him that opportunity.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, the distinguished Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I tell my friend from California whose dollar was at issue here, the gentleman from California, I will tell you with all due respect and affection, your party, over the last 10 years, took that dollar and they bought those mints; and they went to the six subsequent stores and they gave them a credit card for the next mints they bought. It's time to pay the bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I have a very short time, but I wanted to make that point that you kept buying mints; you just didn't keep paying.

Madam Speaker, this bill is another instance of this Republican caucus walking away from its responsibility. The budget sequester was never intended to be a solution in and of itself. It was meant to be the blunt instrument to force compromise. Unfortunately, "compromise" is a dirty word around here in some quarters.

To lay out conditions, as this bill does, requiring one side to concede before negotiations even begin—and while solving only part of the problem—disregards sequestration's fundamental purpose: to be equally unacceptable to both sides that it forces compromise.

□ 1630

This bill, which I strongly oppose, essentially says, let's pretend. Let's pretend we don't have a deficit challenge. It says, let's pretend that we can solve our problems by cutting domestic spending alone.

No rational human being believes that's the case. No cuts to Republicans' favored programs, no elimination of tax loopholes for oil companies or anybody else, no increases in revenue by asking the wealthiest to contribute a little more to setting our country on a sound path.

We're collecting the lowest amount of revenues we've collected in 70 years in this country, and we haven't cut spending, and we increased spending in the last administration very substantially. By the way, a greater percentage than this administration has increased the deficits: 86 percent versus 41 percent. Check the figures.

What we need, Madam Speaker, is pragmatism, principle, and serious governing. We need to be honest with the American people. Both bipartisan commissions that explored that issue concluded that the best solution is a balanced approach that addresses revenues, entitlements, and targeted cuts to domestic and defense spending. To achieve such a balanced solution, we need something that is sorely lacking in this House: courage, and a willingness to compromise, to come together, to reason together, and to make tough decisions together.

Sequester is the direct result of Republican policies and is a part of the Republican strategy to cut spending.

You keep saying, well, it's the Democrats. This is not a Democratic policy.

It's an irrational policy, but it's in your bills and in your rules.

Now, instead of working with Democrats to turn off the sequester, Republicans are trying to paint the sequester as a Democratic initiative. That is false, untrue.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. HOYER. The Republican cut, cap and balance bill enforces its cuts and its caps. How? Through sequestration. That's what you voted for.

After the agreement was reached on the Budget Control Act that put the sequester in place, Speaker BOEHNER said, "I got 98 percent of what I wanted." Now our Republican colleagues are attempting to undo the sequester in a way that let's them off the hook politically but puts America at risk financially.

Democrats have an alternative—Mr. VAN HOLLEN just spoke of it—that would repeal the sequester for a year by asking that the wealthiest in our country, why, because they can help a little more, not because they're bad. God bless them. And by the way, we're most of those as well, folks.

I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle, who I know are as deeply concerned about our deficits and debt as I am, will join Democrats in defeating this bill and sending a message that only by working together can we find the solutions we need. America expects that of us.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam Speaker, let's review. We have \$16 trillion in debt, and it's climbing every single day. We have no budget from the Senate for the last 3 years. The President's budget got exactly zero votes in the House and in the Senate. And the Federal Government has dramatically increased spending, which has led to this spending-driven crisis.

Let me show you what I mean by that. Five years ago, in 2007, the Federal Treasury received in \$2.5 trillion in revenue, the same amount that's estimated to come in this year in revenue, \$2.5 trillion 5 years ago, \$2.5 trillion now.

Five years ago, total spent by the Federal Government, \$2.7 trillion, now \$3.7 trillion. That almost looks like a \$1 trillion difference in spending, which equals the same amount as our deficit.

It's amazing to me. When we process through this, the problem is crystal clear. It's just the solution that seems to evade us in this process.

Now, some would say, tell you what we need to do. We've increased spending \$1 trillion, let's just increase taxes as well and that will solve the issue.

I would say, why are we spending money we don't have?

Last summer, we agreed that we would cut some spending and put a

group of people together in a room and let them work out a plan to find \$1 trillion in cuts. The back-up, the emergency back-up plan was that we would cut across the board if a solution wasn't found, 10 percent for security, 8 percent for everything else.

Now, no one wants across-the-board cuts that are that huge. A 1 percent cut in agencies would be no big deal. I can't imagine any agency couldn't handle 1 percent. Two percent, no big deal. Maybe even 3 percent. But you start to climb up, and it really begins to cut into some agencies that are actually very efficient. Other agencies, you could do a 50 percent cut and it would be fine.

The problem is an across-the-board cut becomes a very big issue for us. Treating every line item the same is a mistake. Every part is not the same in our budget.

Let me give you an example. At my house, on a Saturday afternoon, I'll open up a Dr. Pepper can at my house and my very cute, red-headed 12-year-old daughter will walk up and say, Daddy, can we split that? I will almost always smile at her and say, sure, I'll take the liquid, you take the can and we'll split it even. To which she says to me, that's not really fair.

But it again comes back to the same point: not all parts are the same. If we do across-the-board cuts in every area, that is not the best way to do it.

Now, I guarantee you, you allow this House to go item by item through this budget, we will find \$100 billion in cuts next year. I guarantee you. But doing across-the-board cuts into FBI, it cuts into our defense, it cuts into Border Patrol, it cuts into the basics and the heart of what we're doing; and we cannot do that.

The House passed a very specific plan for dealing with this last May. It is complete for us. Now it's time for the Senate to actually do their job, and it's time for the President to send that over to us.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support, obviously, of H.R. 6365, the National Security and Job Protection Act.

Do we need any more evidence than recent events in Egypt and Libya to oppose these devastating cuts and what it would do to our Nation security? I don't think so.

If sequestration occurs, it would cut the military to its smallest size since before World War II. All the while, we're still a Nation at war in Afghanistan, facing unrest and aggression in the Middle East, increased threats from Iran, China, and North Korea.

In addition to the 10 percent cut to defense, our domestic programs would have, such as health, science, research, education, border security, an additional 8 percent cut.

In May, this House passed the only plan that's been presented thus far to prevent and replace sequestration, last May, by providing and making commonsense reforms to our fast-growing government that's on auto pilot spending programs and to avert the spending-driven economic crisis that's before us.

Well, we've seen no signs of leadership from the White House or the Senate. But the House will act again today with H.R. 6365, the National Security and Job Protection Act. The House will lead, where others have not.

This legislation sends a clear statement that the House is ready to carry out our budgetary responsibilities. We just need willing partners. The President, the Senate, House Republicans and Democrats, we all agree on a common goal: replace the sequester to protect important domestic programs, our fragile economy, our national security and our troops.

This bill is a path to that solution. Make no mistake, if sequestration goes into effect, America will compromise a legacy of superiority on the land, on the sea, and in the air and potentially send our economy spiraling back into a recession.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill, and I would hope that we could pass this with a large number and get on with it.

□ 1640

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader, the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. As we come to the floor this afternoon to talk about this sequester issue, the clock is ticking. Every moment we delay in dealing with the budget issue is a moment of time that does not increase confidence in our economy, that does not bring more certainty to our economic situation, and that does not reduce the deficit.

I heard the previous speaker say that this legislation that is on the floor would end sequestration. It does not. That is one of the major differences between it and the Democratic proposal put forth by Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Unfortunately, afraid of debate on the floor, the Republicans on the Rules Committee did not allow Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal to come to the floor today so that we could have a vote on it; but even with that, we can have a debate on it.

The debate is about fairness. It's about balance. It's about living up to our responsibilities. It's about saying, yes, we all have to compromise—there will be cuts; we need revenue; we want growth. That's what Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal does. It does, indeed, replace the sequestration. It is a better plan. It actually does end sequestration, as I mentioned, through a mix of cuts and revenues.

The reason we have a problem here is that our Republican colleagues have

refused to have one red cent from the wealthiest people in our country contribute to resolving this fiscal crisis, this budget crisis—not one red cent. If they cared as much about defense as they say, 1 year ago they would have agreed to a plan with fairness and balance, where we would have had growth on the table, making decisions about revenue and about cuts to produce growth and not getting into a situation that called for across-the-board cuts in defense and in our domestic budget.

This is really silly. It's really silly. It's not serious. It's a charade, this bill that they have on the floor today. It just keeps making matters worse as the clock keeps ticking. So I urge my colleagues to reject this mirage of a bill that poses as a suggestion and to support, instead, ideas that are being advanced by Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I don't like everything about it. We've cut over \$1 trillion. That's how we got through last year—all cuts, no revenue.

You need only see how we differ by just looking at the Ryan-Romney Republican budget. Their blueprint says we're going to end Medicare; we're going to make seniors pay \$6,000 more as we end Medicare; and we're going to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country. That's not fair and that's not balanced, but that is what would happen if the Republican bill were to become law. It would enact the Ryan bill. So I urge my colleagues to think very seriously about this, because people sent us here to find solutions. We must resolve this.

When the Speaker of the House says, I'm not confident we can do this, we are confident we can do anything we set our minds to, and we certainly have to be confident that we can honor our responsibilities to the American people. We all have to go to the table and be willing to yield, willing to compromise. We had to do it with President Bush, Senior, and with President Bush on his recovery package for our country. Democrats cooperated with both of those Presidents when we were in the majority.

Why is it that the Republicans in the House see no reason to compromise even at the risk of the full faith and credit of the United States of America? even at the expense of the health of our economy? even at the expense of jobs for the American people?

Vote "no" on this mirage. Support what Mr. VAN HOLLEN is putting forth. Let's get moving because the clock is ticking.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

I saw the gentleman from Maryland this morning on television. It was the first time I had heard, Madam Speaker, of his proposal. So I had a chance to take a look at it today, and I also had a chance to look at the CBO report that was performed on it. I saw some interesting things that I don't know if we've discussed fully here today.

It raises taxes by \$85 billion over the 10-year window. According to the CBO, it raises spending by almost \$80 billion. This is a refrain that I used to hear a lot when I was younger—taxes and spending, taxes and spending, raise taxes and increase spending. I thought it was gone from today's party across the aisle, but evidently, here it is—alive and well—in Mr. VAN HOLLEN's substitute offering, raising taxes by \$85 billion and raising spending by \$80 billion, which is a net reduction of the deficit of \$5 billion over 10 years. According to the CBO, it actually increases the deficit by \$55 billion in the first year.

It does that, by the way, in part and parcel by offering what they call the Buffett rule. The last time I came to this well, I believe the gentleman from Maryland and I had a nice exchange about whether or not my amendment was a gimmick. It was the amendment regarding the President's budget. I seem to remember someone else calling the Buffett rule a gimmick. In my research in coming over here today, I found out that it was, in fact, the President of the United States who called the Buffett rule a gimmick. So I'm wondering now if the President believes that part of the gentleman from Maryland's offering is, in fact, a gimmick because it encompasses the Buffett rule in its entirety.

I compare all of this, Madam Speaker, to the offering that we have before you with our bill. That bill reduces the deficit by at least \$237 billion over the same 10 years. Theirs reduces it by \$5 billion—raising taxes. According to the CBO, ours reduces the deficit by at least \$237 billion. That's the smallest number the CBO gives us. It also gives us four times as much in deficit reduction in the first year as does the BCA that it seeks to replace. Again, theirs increases the deficit by \$55 billion in the first year. Ours decreases it by more than the BCA it seeks to replace. Our offering does that without asking anybody to pay more money to the government. People pay enough money to the government. We spend their money improperly. It's not that we don't take enough from them. We take enough money from our citizens. We spend it improperly.

So, when I finished looking at this, I thought to myself, I think it would be great to have this come up for a vote. I'm disappointed that the Rules Committee did not give Mr. VAN HOLLEN the chance to bring it to the floor. It has happened to me before, and for that, I am sympathetic. At the same time, I know that he has a chance to do that still. We are going to finish this debate here in a few minutes; and before we vote, there is going to be a motion to recommit. The gentleman from Maryland could easily offer his amendment as the motion to recommit. In fact, I would welcome the opportunity to see that debate. I would welcome the opportunity here, 60 days before an election, to have my colleagues across

the aisle come over and say, We want to raise your taxes. Would you please reelect us. I want that on the floor. I'm disappointed the Rules Committee did not bring it. I would love to see if that's really what our colleagues across the aisle stand for.

I heard it described by the gentlelady from California a few minutes ago as a better plan. I think we are doing a disservice by not allowing a vote on this particular bill, because it is not a better plan, and I think the vote here would bear that out, not just on our side of the aisle. I would be curious to see if that's what our colleagues stand for—more taxes, more spending here 60 days before an election.

I encourage folks to support our bill. Our bill cuts spending, lets people keep their money, and still allows us to end the sequester.

□ 1650

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I wish Mr. MULVANEY were more persuasive with his colleagues because we agree. I wish we had a vote on this. We're happy to have that debate. In fact, that's what we've been having on the floor today.

We heard a lot from our colleagues about the devastating impact of these cuts on defense and other things, and we agree, which is why we think it's appropriate to ask people who earn more than a \$1 million a year to help contribute a little bit more to our deficit so that we don't have to see these consequences.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, addressing our debt is a critical long-term goal, but it's not our immediate problem. Right now, our immediate problem is high unemployment, and our economy needs efforts to spur job growth. The expiration of the Bush-era tax cuts, particularly those targeted toward the middle class, and the start of unparalleled across-the-board \$1.2 trillion spending cuts mandated by the Budget Control Act sequestration provision, threatened further job growth.

Looking just at sequestration, there is rare agreement. Not the President, not the Congress, not anyone ever wanted or expected the sequestration measures to take effect. Why? Because we have a jobs problem, and the spending cuts demanded by sequestration are a huge jobs killer.

Republicans argue that this steep cut would risk defense-related jobs, and they're right. According to the Economic Policy Institute, these cuts would kill 1.3 million defense jobs in the first 3 years. But the Republicans completely ignore that the domestic spending cuts will also kill an estimated 1.3 million jobs in the same timeframe. Put another way, sequestration will kill 2.6 million American jobs in just 3 years. We simply must stop the sequestration-mandated spending cuts disaster, but this bill won't do that.

This bill mandates draining tens of billions of dollars of Federal spending next year, reducing the already draconian domestic spending caps, and doing all of this without adding a single dollar of additional revenue. The outcome is virtually the same. This Republican bill will still kill a couple of million American jobs. Talk about driving off a cliff.

Basic economics tells us that during good times, with low unemployment, government should reduce the national debt, but that to support job growth, government must not reduce spending during recessions. Now when we suffer from high unemployment, the proposed spending cuts, particularly those of the magnitude Republicans are proposing, would be disastrous. When we get to 5 percent unemployment, then we should start worrying about spending cuts. Right now, jobs are the issue.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 6365.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6365.

While there is wide bipartisan agreement that getting control of our debt is a critical long-term goal, there is also agreement that unemployment is unacceptably high and that our economy remains in need of major efforts to spur job growth.

As we grapple with these issues, there are two significant events approaching at the end of the year that many have argued could send our economy careening off the so-called fiscal cliff: (1) expiration of the Bush-era tax cuts, particularly those targeted toward the middle class, and (2) the start of unparalleled, across-the-board \$1.2 trillion spending cuts mandated by last summer's Budget Control Act sequestration provision.

On the tax question, we are where we've remained for years now—the President and Democrats agree that we can't afford to foot the bill for tax breaks for the wealthiest among us, while the Republicans continue to be beholden to the don't-tax-even-millionaires-and-billionaires plan.

But on sequestration, there is rare agreement. The simple truth is that no one—not the president, not the Congress, not anyone—ever wanted or expected the sequestration to take effect. Why? Because we have a jobs problem, and the spending cuts demanded by mandatory sequestration are a huge jobs killer.

In 2013 alone, sequestration would require that defense and discretionary domestic programs each incur an across-the-board \$54.7 billion cut. Republicans have been spending a lot of time talking about the effects this steep cut would have on defense-related jobs. And they are right. According to the Economic Policy Institute, these cuts would result in the loss of 1.3 million defense jobs in just the first three years.

But, Madam Speaker, that is not the end of the story. The Republicans completely ignore the almost identical job loss from the mandated domestic spending cuts—also about 1.3 million jobs lost in three years, according to EPI.

Put another way, if we don't stop it, sequestration will be responsible for killing 2.6 million American jobs.

So we simply must stop the sequestration mandated spending cuts.

But this bill won't do that—at least, not really. H.R. 6365 still mandates (1) draining tens of billions of dollars of federal spending next year, (2) reducing the already draconian spending caps as outlined in the BCA, and (3) doing all this without adding one single dollar of additional revenue. So the outcome is the same—the Republicans would still kill a couple of million American jobs.

Talk about driving off a cliff.

But we won't hear about that from the Republicans, as they are too busy dancing as fast as they can to rewrite their role in setting up this self-made disaster in the first place.

During last summer's debt ceiling debate—another game of chicken where Republicans held our economy hostage—Republicans demanded a dollar-for-dollar spending cut in order to raise the debt limit so our nation wouldn't, for the first time ever, default on our debts. Sure, there was the charade of reaching compromise through the so-called super committee. But it should come as no surprise to anyone in this Chamber that we are where we are today. Republicans wanted deep cuts that would kill millions of jobs, and we now stand on the brink of implementing them.

Basic economics tells us that, if you want to support jobs and build the economy, government must not reduce spending during recessions. In good times, when unemployment is low, government should build surpluses to pay down the debt. In bad times, when unemployment is high, government should run deficits to make up for slowed private sector spending and to spur job growth. That is why what President Clinton did in the 90s—balancing the budget and beginning to pay down the national debt during a good economic time—was so good, and why what President Bush did—enacting huge tax cuts and running large deficits during a time of low unemployment, when he should have been paying down the national debt—was so devastating. Now, when we suffer from high unemployment, proposed spending cuts—particularly those of the magnitude Republicans are proposing—would be disastrous. When unemployment is down to five percent, then we can think about spending cuts. Now we must spur employment, and not enact these job-killing spending cuts.

Madam Speaker, it is imperative that we stop the misguided and self-made disaster that sequestration, or equivalent spending cuts, will bring. But H.R. 6365 won't do it. I urge a no vote.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I advise my colleague from Maryland that I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. May I ask how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished lady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you very much to the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Madam Speaker, we rise today to try to bring some logic and sense, because as Americans debate sequestration, they throw their hands up and say, What is that? What is that in the

minds of children and the elderly? What does that mean in a real rational way of coming together and saying there are some cuts and there are some revenue increases to be able to invest in the American public?

In order to create jobs, you expend dollars, you invest in research and development, you help to create opportunities for small businesses, you help to promote manufacturing. That's how you create jobs.

But let me tell you what the underlying bill says. This bill will only take effect one year later. It has no opportunity, no desire, and no rationale to raise revenue. Every thinking economist says that we must raise revenue in order to reduce the deficit and continue to spend dollars to invest in the American public.

Do you want your military families to be on food stamps? Do you want 50 million Americans to suffer food insecurity? Do you want these Americans to suffer? That would include seniors on Meals on Wheels, home care, adult protective services. Millions of children, one-third of them, depend on these social service block grants, child protective services, foster care and child care. This also includes 1 million disabled, respite care or transportation. Do you want to, as I said, continue the food insecurity for 60 million children?

All I can say is that this bill not only kicks the can down the road; it kicks the mountain down the road. Let's vote against this bill. Let's sit down at the table, boost revenue, and invest in the American people.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, we have a very serious debt problem in this country. We have a very serious jobs problem in this country. Both of those serious problems are solvable. The impediment is political.

This is exhibit A of a dysfunctional Congress. The supercommittee failed this Congress when the leadership on the Republican side implemented these sequester cuts. We all know they make no sense from an economic standpoint, but it puts the burden back on us to come up with the balanced approach that every American knows is the only way forward, a balance of revenues, a balance with entitlement reform, and the Pentagon making a contribution to solve our problems. That is what is going to create jobs, and that is what is going to create fiscal stability.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Madam Speaker, the issue all afternoon has not been whether we should replace the sequester. Yes, we should. The issue has been how we do that.

We've heard our Republican colleagues talk about the devastating impact of the sequester on defense and nondefense. We agree. That's why we put forward a plan to replace the se-

quester in the balanced way that has been recommended by bipartisan groups through a combination of cuts, but also revenues generated by things like closing the tax loopholes for big oil companies. Our Republican colleagues have just doubled down on the position that it's more important to protect tax breaks for big oil companies and very wealthy individuals than it is to protect our investment in spending in defense or other important national priorities. That's what this debate is all about.

I hope we will reject this proposal and adopt a more balanced one.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I began this day being interviewed by a group of southern college students, and the primary question that they asked was why can't Congress seem to work in a more bipartisan manner, work across the aisle, work with the other Chamber. I had to explain to them what was about to occur here on the floor; that one of the most seminal issues that we have to deal with in this country is fiscal matters and also our defense matters that this House, led by Republicans, have done everything we possibly could to make sure that this country stands strong fiscally and stands strong in a defense posture, as well. We've reached across the aisle, and we've reached across to the Senate in a bipartisan manner to effectuate that.

We have passed a budget out of this House only to find that bill go to the Senate where as they say "all good bills go to die," and not have anything come back. We've communicated to the President of the United States that we want to work with him on a budget, only to see his own budget come to the Senate and fail 97-0, and come to this House and fail 414-0, not getting any Democrat or Republican support for that bill, as well.

We have reached across the aisle. We have tried to work on the fiscal matters and the defense matters when it comes to the sequester. We recognize the devastating impact that this will have on our defense posture in this country. As other Members have already come to the floor, in light of all the past circumstances that have come across this country in the last decade, in light of the memorial services that we just held, all of us, in a bipartisan manner out on those steps just days ago on September 11, in light of what has just been in the newspaper in the last several days of our embassies being attacked and Americans killed on American soil, we realize the important significance of making sure that we have a strong defense at this point in time.

I ask anyone who considers this legislation to vote "yes" in favor of this legislation, and anyone who would stand and vote "no" against trying to make sure that we're strong fiscally

and trying to make sure that we are strong in the defense posture as well, anyone who would vote “no,” I would ask them how do they when they go through the airport leaving here or coming to Washington, look anyone in uniform in the eye and say that they voted against a bill to make sure that there would not be the defense cuts here.

□ 1700

The other side of the aisle has no answer for that. Their only answer today, and as it's been ever since I've been here in Congress, is to say the solution to all problems is what? Raising taxes. As I said before, they want to raise \$3 in taxes for every \$1 in spending cuts.

We do not have a revenue problem in this country; we have a spending problem in this country. You know, there is an old saying that goes, if there is a dime left on the table in Washington, someone, primarily from the other side of the aisle I would suggest, will find a dollar's worth of use for spending it, and I think that's the case here. If they raise the taxes 3 to 1, they will find \$30 worth of spending to increase.

As the gentleman from California pointed out, that was the example every single time in the Budget Committee. Every single time it was suggested for spending cuts, they were opposed. They would always use the same spending cuts to further increase spending elsewhere.

The gentleman from California makes the reference to spending a dollar every time for—what was it?—for breath mints, I think it was. Well, quite candidly, after listening to this debate, and after listening to the debate continuously in Budget Committee over years, I always leave there, as I will leave here tonight, with a sour taste in my mouth if the other side of the aisle does not agree to begin to work with us in a bipartisan manner to make sure that this country is strong fiscally, to make sure that this country is strong in a defense posture as well.

I would urge all of my colleagues from both sides of this aisle to vote “yea” on this legislation.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 778, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Van Hollen moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6365 to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike sections 3 and 4 and insert the following:

SEC. 3. BALANCED DEFICIT REDUCTION THAT PROTECTS MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUTS AND REQUIRES EVERYONE TO PAY THEIR FAIR SHARE.

(a) **CONDITIONAL ELIMINATION OF SEQUESTRATION.**—Sections 251A(7) through 251A(11) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall have no force or effect upon enactment of subsequent deficit reduction legislation containing savings over 10 years that meet or exceed the outlay changes that would have resulted from those provisions.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS OF DEFICIT REDUCTION LEGISLATION.**—Deficit reduction legislation enacted pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(1) require upper income taxpayers to pay their fair share by instituting a “Buffett rule”;

(2) extend middle class tax cuts while allowing components of the tax extensions that benefit upper income beneficiaries to expire as scheduled under current law; and

(3) include targeted spending cuts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, let's just flash back to a year ago when we were working on the Budget Control Act, and it's, I think, worth reminding everybody what the Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, said at that time:

I got 98 percent of what I wanted. I'm pretty happy.

That's what the Speaker of the House said about the Budget Control Act.

We now find ourselves here trying to find a way to prevent these across-the-board meat-ax cuts from taking place in the defense budget and the non-defense budget. There is agreement that that would be a stupid way to deal with our deficit, so there's no dispute there.

The issue is: What do we do to replace the sequester, to achieve deficit reduction, but do it in a reasonable and credible way?

That's where the rub is.

What Democrats have said is we need to do it in the way that bipartisan groups have proposed that we do it, through a combination of additional cuts in a targeted way, not in a meat-ax, across-the-board way.

But, yes, we also have to ask the very wealthiest Americans to contribute more to reducing the deficit, because the math is pretty simple. If you don't ask very wealthy people to contribute one more penny to reducing the deficit, then you have to hit everybody else much harder. You have to hit seniors on Medicare harder. You have to reduce dramatically our investment in our kids' education. You have to cut investments in infrastructure, our roads and bridges. Those are the consequences of not taking a balanced approach.

So we say, when it comes to the sequester, we should avoid all the ter-

rible things our colleagues have said and which we agree with. Let's take a balanced approach to do doing it.

You know what? The President submitted a plan to do just that, more than a year ago. It's not that he doesn't have a plan; it's our Republican colleagues don't like the plan. Why? Because he says we don't need to provide these big taxpayer giveaways to the Big Oil companies anymore. We don't need to cut dramatically into things like Medicaid and Medicare when we should be asking seniors to pay a little bit more. Let's ask them to pay what they were paying when President Clinton was President. That's the last time we balanced our budget.

The question is: How do we do it?

The President submitted a proposal. As I said earlier, I took a proposal yesterday to the Rules Committee that would have done this in a balanced approach. Our colleagues say they want an open, democratic process. We haven't had a vote on that.

Instead, we're going to have a vote on something that actually, even if it passes the House and the Senate and is signed by the President, doesn't do anything to eliminate the sequester, doesn't do a thing. It just says that the President has to come up with a plan. But they tell him what it has to do. They say it cannot be balanced. It cannot include any revenue. It has to be across the board in cuts.

Now let's talk a minute about taxes.

The President has called upon this Congress to immediately enact tax relief to 98 percent of the American people, let's do it now before they expire at the end of this year, and our Republican colleagues say, No, no. Nobody gets tax relief unless very wealthy people get a bonus tax break, because everybody on the President's proposal gets tax relief on the first \$250,000 of their income. Our Republican colleagues say, No; unless people like Mitt Romney get an extra tax break, nobody gets tax relief.

You know what? The President's proposal provides tax relief to 97 percent of all pass-through businesses. The Republican colleagues say, No; unless you're going to give businesses like Bain Capital a bonus tax break, we can't ask them to contribute one more penny to reducing the deficit.

Let's talk about jobs. It was really interesting to hear our Republican colleagues talk today about the fact that, if you allow these budget cuts to take place, it will have devastating impacts on the jobs in this country.

You know what? A year ago this month, the President submitted a proposal to this Congress, a jobs initiative. It called for investing more in our infrastructure, in our roads and in our bridges, to help put more persons back to work. We have 14 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

So here are our Republican colleagues saying, Well, we can't allow any of these cuts to take place because people who were building tanks will

lose their jobs. And we agree; spending that money on defense has consequences. But how is it that spending money on roads and bridges and infrastructure doesn't also put people back to work? That's what the President proposed a year ago. Not a single vote on the President's jobs bill. There were 37 votes to repeal ObamaCare, but not one vote on the President's jobs bill.

So, Madam Speaker, whether it's acting on the jobs bill, which has been sitting here for more than a year, or acting on the President's proposal to immediately extend tax relief to 97 percent of the American people, or whether it's taking a responsible balanced approach to replacing the sequester, let's do what bipartisan groups have recommended and take that balanced way to build our economy and reduce our deficit.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. GARRETT. The seminal question, I think, to those who are watching deliberations here on the floor tonight, they are asking themselves the question: Are you better off today than you were 4 years ago?

When you look at the economy, you have to answer that question with a resounding, "No." Poverty is continuously up year after year after year, at the highest levels in this country we have seen since back in 1995, when one out of seven people in this country now find themselves, unfortunately, on food stamps.

□ 1710

Forty-seven million of our friends and neighbors find themselves in that situation. One out of six Americans will be on Medicaid. Are you better off today than you were in the past? Absolutely not. And that's why it's astonishing as I stand here to listen to the other side of the aisle and the proposals that they presented so far and that they have over the years.

For the last hour of the debate, the gentleman from Maryland has been saying one or two basic things, but one primary thing is that he went to Rules last night, that he had a plan. He pulled out his plan and he said, This is what the solution is. This is how we solve the problem. But the problem was that that mean old Rules Committee just wouldn't allow him to have it come down to the floor tonight.

Well, my friend and colleague from South Carolina made the recommendation to him: Take that proposal. If that is truly the answer in your heart, it's the right answer, that is truly the way to go, and lay it out. If you really do believe that the solution to the problem is by raising taxes to the tune of \$85 billion and cutting spending to the extent that there's only a net reduction of \$5 billion; if you truly do believe, as you said for the last hour,

that the way to resolve the issue of sequester is by raising taxes by \$3 for every \$1 in cuts; if you truly believe, and for the last hour, as he has said, that is the solution to the problem, then he could have come here and presented an alternative in this format. But he has not done so.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

That's just not true. We asked the Parliamentarian, and they said we couldn't bring it in that format because of the rule.

Mr. GARRETT. Reclaiming my time, what we have here before us is a lack of direction, a lack of leadership that America is so looking for out of Washington. The American public is looking for leadership from Washington. They're not seeing it from the President, who has failed to present a budget that would get any single vote in either the House or the Senate—97-0, 414-0. They're looking for the Senate to demonstrate some degree of vision, some degree of leadership by taking any of the bills that we send over to them, whether it's the budget or the sequester legislation, and showing that they can pass that legislation. They're looking for some degree of vision from the other side of the aisle in the House as well on these matters to make sure that we can stand up fiscally and a strong defense, and they're seeing a lack of vision here by the other side of the House as well.

We know what writings tell us: A Nation without vision leads to a people that will perish. Well, Madam Speaker, I can tell you this: that the route these last 2 years, this Republican-controlled Congress has shown vision with our strong budget, with our sequester bill, and now with this bill as well to present the option to the other side, to the Senate, and to the President to make sure that we can defend this Nation strong militarily and fiscally as well.

I would encourage all my colleagues to vote "no" on this motion to recommit, and 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.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam 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 passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 170, nays 247, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 576]

YEAS—170

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

NAYS—247

Adams	Cantor	Foxx
Aderholt	Capito	Franks (AZ)
Alexander	Carter	Frelinghuysen
Altmire	Cassidy	Galleghy
Amash	Chabot	Gardner
Amodei	Chaffetz	Garrett
Austria	Chandler	Gerlach
Bachmann	Coble	Gibbs
Barletta	Coffman (CO)	Gibson
Barrow	Cole	Gringey (GA)
Bartlett	Conaway	Gohmert
Barton (TX)	Cravaack	Goodlatte
Bass (NH)	Crawford	Gosar
Benishek	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Berg	Culberson	Granger
Biggert	Denham	Graves (GA)
Bilbray	Dent	Graves (MO)
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Griffin (AR)
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Griffith (VA)
Black	Dold	Grimm
Blackburn	Donnelly (IN)	Guinta
Bonner	Dreier	Guthrie
Bono Mack	Duffy	Hall
Boren	Duncan (SC)	Hanna
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Harper
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Harris
Brooks	Emerson	Hartzler
Buchanan	Farenthold	Hastings (WA)
Buchson	Fincher	Hayworth
Buerkle	Fitzpatrick	Heck
Burgess	Flake	Hensarling
Burton (IN)	Fleischmann	Herrera Beutler
Calvert	Fleming	Huelskamp
Camp	Flores	Huizenga (MI)
Campbell	Forbes	Hultgren
Canseco	Fortenberry	Hunter

Hurt Miller (FL) Runyan Cassidy Hultgren Reed Kissell Nadler Schwartz
 Issa Miller (MI) Ryan (WI) Chabot Hunter Rehberg Kucinich Napolitano Scott (VA)
 Jenkins Miller, Gary Scalise Chaffetz Reichert Labrador Neal Scott, David
 Johnson (IL) Mulvaney Schilling Coble Renacci Langevin Olver Serrano
 Johnson (OH) Murphy (PA) Schmidt Coffman (CO) Ribble Larsen (WA) Owens Sherman
 Johnson, Sam Myrick Schock Cole Johnson (OH) Rigell Larson (CT) Pallone
 Jones Neugebauer Schweikert Johnson, Sam Rivera LaTourette Pascrell Shuler
 Jordan Noem Scott (SC) Cravaack Jordan Johnson, Sam Roby Lee (CA) Levin Paul Sires
 Kelly Nugent Scott, Austin Crawford Kelly King (IA) Rogers (AL) Rogers (GA) Paul Slaughter
 King (IA) Nunes Sensenbrenner King (IA) Rogers (KY) Lujan Price (NC) Smith (WA)
 Kingston Nunnelee Sessions Culberson King (IA) Rogers (MI) Loeb sack Perlmutter Speier
 Kinzinger (IL) Olson Shimkus Denham Kinzinger (IL) Rogers (MI) Lofgren, Zoe Peterson Stark
 Kissell Palazzo Shuler Dent Kline Rohrabacher Lowey Pingree (ME) Sutton
 Kline Paul Shuster DesJarlais Lamborn Lance Rooney Ros-Lehtinen Lynch Thompson (CA)
 Labrador Paulsen Simpson Diaz-Balart Lance Roskam Maloney Quigley Tierney
 Lamborn Pearce Smith (NE) Dold Landry Landford Latham Ross (FL) Markey Rahall Tonko
 Lance Pence Smith (NJ) Donnelly (IN) Dreier Latta Royce Matheson Rangel Tsongas
 Landry Peters Smith (TX) Dufer Latta Runyan Matsui McCarthy (NY) Richardson Van Hollen
 Lankford Peterson Southerland Latta Runyan Ryan (WI) Scalise McClintock Richmond Velázquez
 Latham Petri Stearns Ellmers Emerson Long Lucas Luetkemeyer Schmidt Rothman (NJ) Walz (MN)
 LaTourette Pingree (ME) Stivers Ellmers Emerson Long Lucas Luetkemeyer Schmidt Rothman (NJ) Wasserman
 Latta Pitts Stutzman Long Lucas Luetkemeyer Schmidt Rothman (NJ) Wasserman
 Lewis (CA) Platts Sullivan Terry Fincher Lummis Schock Schwikert McIntyre Rush Schultz
 Lipinski Poe (TX) Terry Fincher Lummis Schock Schwikert McIntyre Ryan (OH) Watt
 LoBiondo Pompeo Thompson (PA) Flake Lungren, Daniel E. Scott (SC) Meeks Sánchez, Linda
 Long Posey Thornberry Tiberi Mack Manzanillo Marchant Sessions Shimkus Shuster Simpson Smith (NE)
 Lucas Price (GA) Tipton Turner (NY) Turner (OH) Upton Walberg Fox Franks (AZ) Frelinghuysen Gallegly Gardner McKeon McKinley
 Luetkemeyer Reichert Upton Walberg Fox Franks (AZ) Frelinghuysen Gallegly Gardner McKeon McKinley
 Lummis Reed Turner (NY) Turner (OH) Upton Walberg Fox Franks (AZ) Frelinghuysen Gallegly Gardner McKeon McKinley
 Lungren, Daniel E. Renacci Ribble Rigell Rivera West Roby Westmoreland Garrett Gerlach Gibbons Meehan Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Miller, Gary Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Myrick Neugebauer Noem Nugent Nunnelee Olson Palazzo Paulsen Pearce Pence Petri Pitts Hartzler Hastings (WA) Hayworth Heck Hensarling Huelskamp Huizenga (MI) Ackerman Altmire Amash Andrews Baca Baldwin Barber Barrow Barton (TX) Bass (CA) Bass (NH) Becerra Berkley Berman Bishop (GA) Bishop (NY) Bonamici Boren Boswell Brady (PA) Braley (IA) Brown (FL) Butterfield Capps Capuano Carman Carney Carson (IN) Castor (FL) Chandler Chu Cicilline Clarke (MI) Clarke (NY) Clay Cleaver Clyburn Cohen Connolly (VA) Conyers Cooper Costa Costello Courtney Critz Crowley Cuellar Cummings Davis (CA) Davis (IL) DeFazio DeGette DeLauro Deutch Dicks Dingell Doggett Doyle Duncan (TN) Edwards Ellison Engel Eshoo Farr Fattah Filner Frank (MA) Fudge Gonzalez Green, Al Green, Gene Grijalva Gutierrez Hahn Hanabusa Hastings (FL) Heinrich Herrera Beutler Higgins Himes Hinchey Hinojosa Hirono Hochul Holden Holt Honda Hoyer Israel Jackson Lee (TX) Johnson (GA) Johnson (IL) Johnson, E. B. Jones Kaptur Keating Kildee Kind

McCarthy (CA) Roe (TN) Whitfield Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack Woodall Yoder Young (AK) Young (FL) Young (IN) Akin Critz Johnson (GA) Bachus Garamendi King (NY) Blumenauer Herger Ross (AR) Broun (GA) Jackson (IL) Towns

NOT VOTING—10
 Akin Garamendi Ross (AR)
 Blumenauer Herger Towns
 Broun (GA) Jackson (IL)
 Burton (IN) King (NY)

NOT VOTING—12
 Akin Critz Johnson (GA)
 Bachus Garamendi King (NY)
 Blumenauer Herger Ross (AR)
 Broun (GA) Jackson (IL) Towns

□ 1733
 Messrs. KISSELL, FORTENBERRY and LIPINSKI changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”
 Mr. BERMAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”
 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 noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Madam 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 196, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 577]

AYES—223

Adams Biggart Buchanan
 Aderholt Bilbray Bucshon
 Alexander Bilirakis Buerkle
 Amodei Bishop (UT) Burgess
 Austria Black Calvert
 Bachmann Blackburn Camp
 Bachus Bonner Campbell
 Barletta Bono Mack Canseco
 Bartlett Boustany Cantor
 Benishek Brady (TX) Capito
 Berg Brooks Carter

NOES—196
 Ackerman Clarke (NY) Frank (MA)
 Altmire Clay Fudge
 Amash Cleaver Gonzalez
 Andrews Clyburn Green, Al
 Baca Cohen Green, Gene
 Baldwin Connolly (VA) Grijalva
 Barber Conyers Gutierrez
 Barrow Cooper Hahn
 Barton (TX) Costa Hanabusa
 Bass (CA) Costello Hastings (FL)
 Bass (NH) Courtney Heinrich
 Becerra Critz Herrera Beutler
 Berkley Crowley Higgins
 Berman Cuellar Himes
 Bishop (GA) Cummings Hinchey
 Bishop (NY) Davis (CA) Hinojosa
 Bonamici Davis (IL) Hirono
 Boren DeFazio Hochul
 Boswell DeGette Holden
 Brady (PA) DeLauro Holt
 Braley (IA) Deutch Honda
 Brown (FL) Dicks Hoyer
 Butterfield Dingell Israel
 Capps Doggett Jackson Lee
 Capuano Doyle (TX)
 Carman Duncan (TN) Johnson (GA)
 Carney Edwards Johnson (IL)
 Carson (IN) Ellison Johnson, E. B.
 Castor (FL) Engel Jones
 Chandler Eshoo Kaptur
 Chu Farr Keating
 Cicilline Fattah Kildee
 Clarke (MI) Filner Kind

NOT VOTING—10
 Akin Garamendi Ross (AR)
 Blumenauer Herger Towns
 Broun (GA) Jackson (IL)
 Burton (IN) King (NY)

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 117) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. BARBER. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Barber moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 117 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the joint resolution (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 156. (a) FULL YEAR FUNDING FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL ACCOUNTS.—Notwithstanding section 106, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution (including section 101(c)) for the following accounts of the Department of Defense shall remain available until September 30, 2013:

- (1) "Military Personnel, Army".
- (2) "Military Personnel, Navy".
- (3) "Military Personnel, Marine Corps".
- (4) "Military Personnel, Air Force".
- (5) "Reserve Personnel, Army".
- (6) "Reserve Personnel, Navy".
- (7) "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps".
- (8) "Reserve Personnel, Air Force".
- (9) "National Guard Personnel, Army".
- (10) "National Guard Personnel, Air Force".

(b) PERFORMANCE OF MEDICAL DISABILITY EXAMINATIONS BY CONTRACT PHYSICIANS.—The authority provided by section 704 of the Veterans Benefits Act of 2003 (38 U.S.C. 5101 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

(c) TREATMENT OF HOMELESS AND SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL VETERANS.—The authority provided by section 2031 of title 38, United States Code, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

(d) ADDITIONAL SERVICES FOR HOMELESS AND SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL VETERANS.—The authority provided by section 2033 of title 38, United States Code, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

□ 1750

Mr. BARBER. Madam Speaker, I am offering this amendment to improve this legislation and truly show this Chamber's support for our veterans and men and women in uniform by preventing their pay and services from being impacted by a potential government shutdown next year. The underlying bill we are voting on today lacks key provisions that are needed to protect our veterans in Active Duty military. My amendment will add these provisions.

My amendment will ensure that our patriotic military men and women are not victims of partisan gridlock. My amendment ensures that basic military pay will not be interrupted in a potential shutdown. My amendment guarantees that our Armed Forces will be paid for the entire year, not just for the 6-month duration authorized by this continuing resolution.

Unfortunately, Congress has failed to do its job, and we cannot allow a government shutdown to impact the basic pay of our men and women in uniform. This is a guarantee and an assurance that they have a right to expect we will uphold no matter what.

My amendment also addresses the fact that three critical Veterans Administration authorizations are set to expire at the end of the year.

The first is for Contract Medical Disability Authority. Without this extension which my amendment provides,

the VA would not be able to pay for contract medical exams from discretionary funds. This could significantly delay veterans' receipt of benefits.

The second authorization which my amendment extends would give the VA the authority to establish sites to treat homeless veterans and those with mental illness. Without this extension, the VA would not be able to provide these essential services at these sites.

The third VA authorization set to expire helps the VA provide housing and treatment to homeless veterans with a serious mental illness. Again, without this extension, the VA would no longer be able to provide for therapeutic transitional housing assistance for veterans who are homeless or who have a serious mental illness.

Our veterans stepped forward when we asked them to serve this great Nation. In return, it is our undeniable responsibility to help them find employment when they are able to work and to care for them when they are not. Tonight, there are about 70,000 homeless veterans who will sleep on the streets of our country. This is a situation that is absolutely deplorable, and we must act to provide them with the assistance they deserve.

None of what I've proposed here should be a partisan issue. This is about keeping our sacred promise to those who have defended our freedoms. There are nearly 100,000 veterans in my southern Arizona district and two military installations—Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Tucson, where I grew up and where my father was deployed, and Fort Huachuca in Sierra Vista and the 162nd Fighter Wing of the Air National Guard just across the district line.

I am offering this amendment in thinking of the men and women who are stationed there and across this Nation and across the world. During our recent work period, I went to the airport in Tucson to honor the men and women of our Army National Guard as they left for deployment in Afghanistan. I told them and their families, on behalf of all of us, how grateful we are for their service. Today, I ask you to join with me in putting action behind those words. This is not a partisan issue. We can and must find common ground in this Chamber on this very issue.

This morning, my colleague Congressman PLATTS and I introduced a bipartisan bill, the Veterans Health Care Access Act. Our bill will make it easier for veterans to get access to the health care they need. What other issue we face is more important than this to both sides of the aisle than supporting our Armed Forces and our veterans?

At a time when we need to get services to our veterans who are newly returning home from Iraq and Afghanistan, we cannot be creating uncertainty and allowing a lapse of service or pay. This is about the Army sergeant I met on the flight going home who is now diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic

brain injury and who will soon be medically discharged. He deserves to know that we will stand up for him and others like him.

Let me say again that the passage of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. I urge my Republican and Democratic colleagues alike to vote "yes" on this final amendment and to support our military and to support our veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. As I understand it, Madam Speaker, there is foreign aid money in this bill, and I want to know if any of it is going to Libya or Egypt. Our Embassies have been attacked. An ambassador has been killed. The Muslim Brotherhood runs Egypt—and we're going to give them money? I would like to have an answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot respond to that inquiry. That is a matter for debate.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the motion to recommit. This procedural motion is nothing more than a dilatory tactic designed to score political points for the cameras.

We have worked fervently and in good faith to put together a CR that meets the Nation's critical needs for the next 6 months. We did take care of our veterans in this bill. We did take care of our troops. With the enactment of this CR, the funding for veterans will be \$2.1 billion more than last year. The CR provides all the funds necessary for our troops' pay raise.

The only problem is, in order for the checks to go out, the Senate has to pass an authorization bill, which they've been sitting on for months. It's time for the Senate to act on behalf of our troops and our veterans.

Now, we've got to pass this CR to keep the government open and to keep the doors from closing on their government, yet the Democrats want to put a roadblock to passing this one piece of legislation that keeps the government running. The last time I checked, Madam Speaker, if you closed down the government, the Nation's most deserving—our troops and veterans—would not get a single dollar of the benefits that they deserve. So this bill is necessary.

With the November elections on the horizon, we should not be surprised that the other side wants to put politics ahead of doing our work—as usual. The American people expect us to stop the partisan bickering and get our work done. The time for idle talk is over. Enough is enough. We've got bipartisan agreement on this bill. The

House, the Senate—both parties—and the White House have signed off on this bill. The motion is not needed, it is not helpful, and the money is in the bill. Stop the political posturing, and make our citizens proud. Vote “no.”

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. BARBER. Madam 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 House Joint Resolution 117 will be followed by 5-minute votes on passing House Joint Resolution 117, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing S. 3245.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

AYES—189

Ackerman Edwards Matsui
 Altmire Ellison McCarthy (NY)
 Andrews Engel McCollum
 Baca Eshoo McDermott
 Baldwin Farr McGovern
 Barber Fattah McIntyre
 Barrow Filner McNeerney
 Bass (CA) Frank (MA) Meeks
 Becerra Fudge Michaud
 Berkley Garamendi Miller (NC)
 Berman Gonzalez Miller, George
 Bishop (GA) Green, Al Moore
 Bishop (NY) Green, Gene Moran
 Bonamici Grijalva Murphy (CT)
 Boren Gutierrez Nadler
 Boswell Hahn Napolitano
 Brady (PA) Hanabusa Neal
 Braley (IA) Hastings (FL) Olver
 Brown (FL) Heinrich Owens
 Butterfield Higgins Pallone
 Capps Himes Pascrell
 Capuano Hinchey Pastor (AZ)
 Carnahan Hinojosa Paul
 Carney Hirono Pelosi
 Carson (IN) Hochul Perlmutter
 Castor (FL) Holden Peters
 Chandler Holt Peterson
 Chu Honda Pingree (ME)
 Cicilline Hoyer Platts
 Clarke (MI) Israel Polis
 Clarke (NY) Jackson Lee Price (NC)
 Clay (TX) Quigley
 Cleaver Johnson (GA) Rahall
 Clyburn Johnson, E. B. Rangel
 Cohen Jones Reyes
 Connolly (VA) Kaptur Richardson
 Conyers Keating Richmond
 Cooper Kildee Rothman (NJ)
 Costa Kind Roybal-Allard
 Costello Kissell Ruppberger
 Courtney Kucinich Rush
 Critz Langevin Ryan (OH)
 Crowley Larsen (WA) Sánchez, Linda
 Cuellar Larson (CT) T.
 Cummings Lee (CA) Sanchez, Loretta
 Davis (CA) Levin Sarbanes
 Davis (IL) Lewis (GA) Schakowsky
 DeFazio Lipinski Schiff
 DeGette Loeb sack Schrader
 DeLauro Lofgren, Zoe Schwartz
 Deutch Lowey Scott (VA)
 Dicks Luján Scott, David
 Dingell Lynch Serrano
 Doggett Maloney Sewell
 Donnelly (IN) Markey Sherman
 Doyle Matheson Shuler

Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stark
 Sutton
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney

Tonko
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters

NOES—232

Adams
 Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amash
 Amodei
 Austria
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Bass (NH)
 Benishak
 Berg
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brooks
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Buerkle
 Burgess
 Johnson (IN)
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Canseco
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Lummis
 Dold
 Dreier
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Emerson
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Grengy (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
 Herrera Beutler
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Kelly
 King (IA)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Landry
 Lankford
 Latham
 LaTourrette
 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

NOT VOTING—8

Akin
 Blumenauer
 Broun (GA)

Herger
 Jackson (IL)
 King (NY)

Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Yarmuth

Nunnelee
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pence
 Petri
 Pitts
 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
 Shuster
 Shimkus
 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)

Ross (AR)
 Towns

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DICKS. 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 329, noes 91, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

AYES—329

Ackerman Culberson Hunter
 Aderholt Cummings Hurt
 Alexander Davis (CA) Israel
 Amodei DeFazio Issa
 Andrews DeGette Jackson Lee
 Austria DeLauro (TX)
 Baca Denham Jenkins
 Bachus Dent Johnson (GA)
 Baldwin Deutch Johnson (OH)
 Barber Diaz-Balart Johnson, E. B.
 Barletta Dicks Johnson, Sam
 Barrow Dingell Kaptur
 Bartlett Doggett Keating
 Bass (CA) Dold Kelly
 Bass (NH) Donnelly (IN) Kildee
 Becerra Doyle Kind
 Benishak Dreier King (IA)
 Berkley Duffy Kingston
 Berman Edwards Kinzinger (IL)
 Biggert Ellison Kline
 Bilbray Ellmers Lance
 Bilirakis Engel Langevin
 Bishop (GA) Eshoo Lankford
 Bishop (NY) Farenthold Larsen (WA)
 Bishop (UT) Farr Larson (CT)
 Black Fattah Latham
 Blackburn Filner LaTourrette
 Bonamici Fitzpatrick Latta
 Bonner Fleischmann Levin
 Boren Fortenberry Lewis (CA)
 Boswell Frelinghuysen Lewis (GA)
 Brady (PA) Fudge Lipinski
 Brady (TX) Gallegly LoBiondo
 Braley (IA) Garamendi Loeb sack
 Brown (FL) Garrett Lofgren, Zoe
 Buchanan Gerlach Long
 Bucshon Gibbs Lowey
 Buerkle Gibson Lucas
 Burgess Gonzalez Luetkemeyer
 Butterfield Goodlatte Luján
 Capps Granger Lungren, Daniel
 Capuano Graves (GA) E.
 Carnahan Green, Al Lynch
 Carney Griffin (AR) Maloney
 Carson (IN) Green, Gene Manullo
 Castor (FL) Grijalva Marino
 Chandler Grimm Markey
 Chu Guinta Matsui
 Cicilline Guthrie McCarthy (CA)
 Clarke (MI) Gutierrez McCarthy (NY)
 Clarke (NY) Hahn McCaul
 Clay (TX) Hanabusa McCollum
 Cleaver Johnson (GA) Hanna McGovern
 Clyburn Johnson, E. B. Harper McHenry
 Cohen Jones Harris McKinley
 Connolly (VA) Kaptur Hastings (FL) McMorris
 Conyers Keating Hastings (WA) Rodgers
 Cooper Kildee Hayworth McNeerney
 Costa Kind Heck Meehan
 Costello Kissell Heinrich Meeks
 Courtney Kucinich Hensarling Mica
 Critz Langevin Herrera Beutler Michaud
 Crowley Larsen (WA) Higgins Miller (MI)
 Cuellar Larson (CT) T. Miller (NC)
 Cummings Lee (CA) Sarbanes Moore
 Davis (CA) Levin Schakowsky Moore
 Davis (IL) Lewis (GA) Schiff
 DeFazio Lipinski Schrader Moran
 DeGette Loeb sack Schwartz Mulvaney
 DeLauro Lofgren, Zoe Schwartz Murphy (CT)
 Deutch Lowey Scott (VA) Murphy (PA)
 Dicks Luján Scott, David Holt
 Dingell Lynch Serrano Myrick
 Doggett Maloney Sewell Nadler
 Donnelly (IN) Markey Sherman Napolitano
 Doyle Matheson Shuler Neal
 Nugent

So the motion to motion to recommit was rejected.

Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher

Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stivers

Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Turner (NY)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—91

Adams
Altmire
Amash
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Berg
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brooks
Burton (IN)
Canseco
Capuano
Chabot
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Crenshaw
Davis (IL)
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emerson
Fincher
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gardner

Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Hartzler
Huelskamp
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Jordan
Kissell
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lee (CA)
Lummis
Mack
Marchant
Matheson
McClintock
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Neugebauer
Noem
Oliver

Paul
Peterson
Petri
Poe (TX)
Posey
Quayle
Rehberg
Rigell
Ross (FL)
Rush
Schilling
Schmidt
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Sensenbrenner
Shuler
Simpson
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Tsongas
Turner (OH)
Walsh (IL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Yoder

NOT VOTING—9

Akin
Blumenauer
Broun (GA)

Herger
Jackson (IL)
King (NY)

Miller, George
Ross (AR)
Towns

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1820

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAUTHORIZING CERTAIN VISA PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3245) to extend by 3 years the authorization of the EB-5 Regional Center Program, the E-Verify Program, the Special Immigrant Nonminister Religious Worker Program, and the Conrad State 30 J-1 Visa Waiver Program, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 3, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

YEAS—412

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (CA)
Bass (TX)
Bass (NH)
Critt
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly

Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly

Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinches
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly

Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCulloch
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Oliver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Terry
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt

Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Amash
Gohmert
Paul

NOT VOTING—14

Akin
Blumenauer
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Chandler

Cole
Eshoo
Grimm
Herger
Jackson (IL)

King (NY)
Ross (AR)
Ryan (WI)
Towns

□ 1827

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING THE SHOOTING THAT KILLED SIX INNOCENT PEOPLE AT THE SIKH TEMPLE OF WISCONSIN IN OAK CREEK, WISCONSIN, ON AUGUST 5, 2012

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 775, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 775

Whereas on Sunday, August 5, 2012, a shooting took place at the Sikh Temple of Wisconsin in Oak Creek, Wisconsin;

Whereas as a result of the shooting, six innocent individuals lost their lives while preparing to attend a Sunday morning worship;

Whereas three individuals were severely injured in the attack;

Whereas many individuals and members of the Sikh community selflessly sought to aid and protect others above their own safety; and

Whereas the quick action of law enforcement officials prevented additional losses of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the senseless attack at the Sikh Temple of Wisconsin in Oak Creek, Wisconsin, on Sunday, August 5, 2012;

(2) offers condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones who were killed in the attack and expresses hope for the full recovery of those injured in the attack;

(3) honors the selfless, dedicated service of—

(A) the emergency response teams and law enforcement officials who responded to the attack; and

(B) law enforcement officials who continue to investigate the attack; and

(4) remains hopeful, as additional details regarding the attack are gathered, that the citizens of this country will come together, united in a shared desire for peace and justice while standing with the Sikh community to grieve the loss of life.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLIDARITY WITH THE SIKH COMMUNITY

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in favor of the resolution I coauthored with the Wisconsin delegation here in solidarity with the Sikh community in Oak Creek and the Sikh community all across the United States.

In a strange coincidence, I had a previously scheduled meeting in California at a Sikh temple on the very day when that murderous attack in Oak Creek occurred. Obviously, our discussion shifted to the subject of that premeditated attack.

I was able to hear about the plight of being targeted because of one's religion, the plight of being targeted for one's appearance.

We are in a constant struggle against bad ideas, despicable ideas.

Passing this resolution will not ease the pain of those affected by this tragedy, but it does show to the world that people from across the United States can unite and denounce bigoted violence.

Our great country is rooted in religious tolerance. The Constitution makes freedom of religion first and foremost. There is no place in this country for religious-motivated terrorism, and this resolution that we passed reaffirms that.

I end by thanking Mr. RYAN and the Wisconsin delegation for their efforts on this resolution, but also I thank the leadership of both parties here today for working with us to make sure that this resolution came to the floor.

NO MONEY FOR LIBYA OR EGYPT

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I'm really disappointed today. We passed a CR for 6 months, and it contained language in there that was supposedly designed to keep Libya and Egypt from getting funds. My colleagues overwhelmingly voted for it. I do not criticize them for that.

But I do feel very strongly in my heart that we made a mistake by not, in the Rules Committee, passing an amendment which would make sure that the money in that bill for foreign assistance did not go to Libya or Egypt.

I read the document that they put out, and it does not prohibit the money from getting to Libya and Egypt. The Muslim Brotherhood runs Egypt. They hate the United States, and their President has said he wanted to model his country after Iran.

In Libya, they killed our Ambassador and scaled the walls. They burned our flag. They did it in Egypt, and they held up the al Qaeda flag; and we're going to give them money. It makes no sense.

If the American people were paying attention to this right now, they would raise hell.

HUNGER STRIKES IN CUBA

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

Mr. RIVERA. Mr. Speaker, this Monday, prominent Cuban dissident Marta Beatriz Roque launched a hunger strike in order to draw attention to the unwavering attempts by the Castro dictatorship to suppress pro-democracy supporters. She has since been joined in her hunger strike by an additional 25 dissidents. Roque suffers from diabetes,

and her water-only fast could easily kill her in days.

Castro's thugs have continually increased the level of repression against the opposition movement. It is intolerable that this has become the "norm" in Cuban society. Jailing, beating, and detaining peaceful protestors who are simply demanding their basic human rights is not the norm. It is unacceptable.

The Castro brothers will continue their violent and abusive ways and will stop at nothing to remain in power. How bad do things need to get before the international community finally recognizes the plight of the Cuban people? These brave men and women continue to risk their lives every day, and we must call attention to their struggle.

RUSSIA PNTR

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue that both Democrats and Republicans, and virtually every American, is talking about, and people all over the world are talking about. What is that issue? How do we increase global economic growth; and here in this country, how do we create more good American jobs.

It's obviously a key part of the Presidential campaign. We have Democrats and Republicans daily stand in the well of the House of Representatives and offer proposals, talk about their ideas as to how we can create good jobs.

We have the sad report of 380,000 people who fell off the rolls even looking for jobs. We have literally millions of our fellow Americans who are looking for jobs, and we have many businesses that are struggling.

One of the great challenges that President Obama put forward was the goal of doubling our exports, and we all know that he very much wanted to do that. We, as Members of Congress, came together after a decade, and we finally were able to successfully pass market-opening opportunities for U.S. workers to sell their goods and provide our services in Panama, Colombia, and South Korea.

□ 1840

It took us a long time to get there. I know that it's easy to point the finger of blame, but the fact is we've been ready for a long time. This institution

was ready for a long time, Democrats and Republicans alike, and we were finally able to get the legislation up here from down on Pennsylvania Avenue, and we were able to make it happen with strong bipartisan votes on all three of those agreements.

Well, Mr. Speaker, with recognition that opening up markets around the world for U.S. goods and services is a key way to create jobs here—because, again, as we debated the Panama, Colombia, and Korea Trade Agreements, there were Members on both sides of the aisle who stood up and argued in behalf of those great agreements—we now have before us what I believe is an absolute no-brainer, but tragically it's created some political consternation over a lot of confusion.

We know that the idea of seeing countries join the WTO, the World Trade Organization, creates a scenario whereby they have to comply with a rules-based trading system. We know that once they enter the WTO, there are constraints imposed on them along with the benefits that they get for their membership in the WTO. And there was a lot of negotiation, a lot of talk about Russia's entry into the World Trade Organization. The idea of seeing Russia forced to comply with a system that would prevent them from engaging in discriminatory practices, from engaging in the kinds of acts that prevent products and services from getting into their country, the structure of having to comply with a rules-based system is something that membership in the WTO forces and creates.

Again, there were a lot of negotiations. The last was dealing with a border dispute with Georgia that was resolved, and that was resolved several months ago. That put into place a structure that allowed, on August 22—last month—for Russia to enter the World Trade Organization.

Russia is part of the WTO. They are now, having been for over 3 weeks, a member of the World Trade Organization. That means, as I said, tremendous benefits that Russia gets. They have 140 million consumers, and there are going to be opportunities for countries around the world to export into Russia. We, last year, exported \$11 billion of goods and services into the WTO. But guess what, Mr. Speaker? We're not at the table anymore. We've lost out on our chance to be able to sell our goods and services into Russia, that market of 140 million consumers.

Now, why is it that we've lost out? Well, we haven't been able to have a vote here in the Congress on Russia's accession into the WTO. Why hasn't that happened? Well, I hate to be political—even though this is the time of year when people are especially political—but we need to get this sent up here to the Congress so that we can put together what I know is going to be broad bipartisan support to make this happen. When it comes up, I know that we will see tremendous support on the Republican side of the aisle. And I say

that because I'm particularly proud of the 73 newly elected Republican Members of Congress. Of the 87, 73 sent a letter to President Obama saying that they believe it very important for us to open up that market, so that if we all have this desire of creating more good jobs in the United States, let's open up that market to 140 million consumers. Well, unfortunately we're still waiting for that.

And I know that it's not just Republicans who are in support of this, Mr. Speaker. We have Democrats who are passionately and strongly in support of it. My very dear friend from New York (Mr. MEEKS) says he's going to join us. We've got other colleagues of ours who are going to join us in just a minute. But I want to say that this is something that absolutely should be done.

Now, I talked about the fact that I believe it's a no-brainer, but I recognize that there is a lot of political consternation about this because it's Russia. We all know that Russia has an absolutely horrendous human rights policy. We know that Russia has engaged in trying to expand its sphere to other former republics of the Soviet Union. We know that there is tremendous corruption and cronyism that exists in Russia today, and it is not acceptable. It is not acceptable to any of us.

Now, there are some, Mr. Speaker, who argue that for us to deny the U.S. an opportunity to have a vote on PNTR—basically repealing Jackson-Vanik and allowing us to proceed with this—would be a good thing and it would send a message to Russia, when in fact the exact opposite is the case. There is nothing that we could do as the United States of America that would be a greater boost to supporting the perpetuation of the aberrant behavior that we have seen from Russia than for us to deny a vote on permanent normal trade relations that would see us, then, have access to that market.

I said that last year we exported \$11 billion of goods and services to Russia. If we could pass PNTR here, projections are that by 2017 we would double that from \$11 billion to \$22 billion. Now, what does that mean? It means more good U.S. jobs. And what does it mean? It means an expansion of our American values. It means, again, this forced compliance with a rules-based trading system. It means creating a structure that will allow us to undermine the kind of political repression that exists in Russia.

Our sticking our head in the sand would be just plain wrong. Now, those are not just my words, Mr. Speaker. We, on the 12th of March, received a letter from seven of the most prominent and outspoken human rights activists in Russia. They, in a letter, an open letter that was sent to those of us who are considering this issue, said the following. Now this is from these very, very prominent dissidents and activists, some of whom I'm sure have been imprisoned. They've had long histories of being opposition leaders to Vladimir

Putin. So in the letter that they sent to us, Mr. Speaker, they said:

Some politicians in the United States argue that the removal of Russia from Jackson-Vanik would help no one but the current Russian undemocratic political regime. That assumption is flat wrong. Although there are obvious problems with democracy and human rights in modern Russia, the persistence on the books of the Jackson-Vanik amendment does not help to solve them at all. Moreover, it brings direct harm. It limits Russia's competitiveness in international markets for higher value-added products, leaving Russia trapped in its current petro-state model of development and preventing it from transforming into a modern, diversified, and more high-tech economy. This helps Mr. Putin and his cronies.

At the end of the day, those who defend the argument that Jackson-Vanik's provisions should still apply to Russia in order to punish Putin's anti-democratic regime only darken Russia's political future, hamper its economic development, and frustrate its democratic aspirations.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to include this letter from the seven dissidents in the RECORD in its entirety, underscoring how critically important it is for us to take this action so that we can boost those who are struggling to improve the plight of those Russians who are seeing their human rights jeopardized based on the current policies.

MARCH 12, 2012.

REMOVE RUSSIA FROM JACKSON-VANIK!

Removal of Russia from the provisions of the Cold War era Jackson-Vanik Amendment has long been an issue of political debate. Although the outdated nature and irrelevance of the amendment is widely recognized, some politicians in the United States argue that the removal of Russia from Jackson-Vanik would help no one but the current Russian undemocratic political regime.

That assumption is flat wrong. Although there are obvious problems with democracy and human rights in modern Russia, the persistence on the books of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment does not help to solve them at all. Moreover, it brings direct harm. It limits Russia's competitiveness in international markets for higher value-added products, leaving Russia trapped in its current petro-state model of development and preventing it from transforming into a modern, diversified and more hi-tech economy.

This helps Mr. Putin and his cronies, who continue to benefit from control over raw materials exports and who have no real interest in diversifying Russia's economy. During the period of their rule, dependence on oil and gas exports has become even greater than before. Needless to say, hanging in a petro-state limbo prevents the emergence in Russia of an independent and advanced middle class, which should be the main source of demand for pro-democracy political transformation in the future. More and more talented and creative Russians are leaving the country because there are better opportunities for finding good jobs in hi-tech industries abroad.

At the end of the day, those who defend the argument that Jackson-Vanik's provisions should still apply to Russia in order to punish Putin's anti-democratic regime only darken Russia's political future, hamper its economic development, and frustrate its democratic aspirations.

Jackson-Vanik is also a very useful tool for Mr. Putin's anti-American propaganda

machine: it helps him to depict the United States as hostile to Russia, using outdated cold-war tools to undermine Russia's international competitiveness.

We, leading figures of the Russian political opposition, strongly stand behind efforts to remove Russian from the provisions of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Jackson-Vanik is not helpful in any way—neither for promotion of human rights and democracy in Russia, nor for the economic interests of its people. Sanctions which harm the interests of ordinary Russians are unhelpful and counter-productive—much more effective are targeted sanctions against specific officials involved in human rights abuse, like those named in the Senator Benjamin Cardin's list in the Sergey Magnitsky case (Senate Bill 1039).

It is time to remove Russia from Jackson-Vanik!

SERGEY ALEKSASHENKO,
*Political Council member,
People's Freedom Party (Parnas).*

ALEXANDER LEBEDEV,
Independent businessman and politician.

VLADIMIR MILOV,
Leader, "Democratic Choice" movement.

ALEXEY NAVALNY,
Attorney and civil activist.

BORIS NEMTSOV,
Co-chairman, People's Freedom Party (Parnas), "Solidarity" movement.

ILYA PONOMAREV,
*State Duma member,
Just Russia Party.*

VLADIMIR RYZHKOV,
Co-chairman, People's Freedom Party (Parnas).

I also want to say that as we look at this question of job creation and economic growth, it's not something that, again, is at all partisan, and it's something that transcends this institution. We have received a number of letters—and let me see if I can dig this one up here. We have a bipartisan letter from Governors across this country that was sent just weeks ago, on the 25th of July. It was sent to us by Governors from Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Iowa, Michigan, Mississippi, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Washington, a broad cross-section geographically and politically, Democrats and Republicans. All these Governors were signatories to this letter in which they say:

As Governors, we know from firsthand experience in our States that expanding opportunities for international trade and attracting foreign investment are essential to promoting U.S. economic growth and creating new and better jobs right here in America. Russia's impending membership in the World Trade Organization offers a significant opportunity to increase our trade and investment with the world's ninth-largest economy.

So I've got to say, Mr. Speaker, you can understand why I see this as a no-brainer.

□ 1850

To me, this is a pretty simple thing. But I recognize that some might be-

lieve that it's a reward to Russia and to Vladimir Putin, and I stand with them for all the reasons that they're opposing it. But I argue that the reasons that they and I oppose the actions of Vladimir Putin underscore why we need to ensure that the U.S. is at the table.

And so, with the President having stated that he has this goal of doubling U.S. exports, and we've got 140 million consumers there who very much want to have access to U.S.-manufactured products, to our goods and services, we need to get it done.

And why don't I begin, since I see a number of my colleagues here, by recognizing my very good friend from New York (Mr. MEEKS), who has joined us. As I recognize Mr. MEEKS, I'd like to say that a number of Members have come up to me from both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, and indicated that they very much wanted to be able to be here this evening to talk about this.

With that, I would like to yield time to my very good friend from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my friend from California (Mr. DREIER). And he's correct. This is a bipartisan bill that makes common sense, just common sense that we get this done.

So, as I stand here today, I say to you, it is the right thing for America, it is the right thing for businesses in America, and it's the right thing for us to create jobs in America, passing PNTR for Russia.

Mr. DREIER said Russia is the ninth largest market in the world and wants the United States-manufactured goods and services, and U.S. companies are eager to supply Russia's rapidly expanding consumer market. So why are we waiting to make this happen?

While we wait, the failure of the United States Congress to grant permanent normal trade relations to Russia has compromised the competitiveness of United States businesses, hindered the increase of export of goods and services, and stood in the way of growth for United States domestic jobs.

On August 22, the Russian Federation joined the World Trade Organization, concluding nearly 20 years of negotiations and discussions with the United States and about 150 other WTO members. And during these years, it wasn't easy, but Russia did complete numerous reforms of its businesses and trade practices and of its legal system to conform to the norms of the international community and to the WTO rules. These reforms will benefit—not hurt, benefit—U.S. companies. It puts them in a rules-based system.

Now, since August 22, Russia has significantly opened its markets to more than 150 WTO trading partners, with the sole exception—the sole exception—the United States of America. That means that, since August 22, businesses from more than 150 WTO member countries with, again, the sole ex-

ception of those of the United States, have conducted trade with Russian counterparts protected by the WTO dispute resolution mechanisms. And while we wait to act, U.S. businesses are at a competitive disadvantage.

Business analysts say that the U.S. exporters currently underperform with respect to Russia. They predict that with PNTR, U.S. trade with Russia could admittedly double over the next 5 years.

Now, I'm from New York, and I just look at what it means for New York, just a small piece. In New York, where exports to Russia nearly reached a half a billion dollars in 2001, half a billion dollars, now, that's a big deal. But when you consider the transportation, the shipping, the customs brokers, the airport personnel jobs involved, the potential economic impact is tremendous.

Clearly, increased trade is good for New York, but it's also good for every State in the United States and stands to benefit every State. Every State, I repeat, stands to benefit from the new opportunity to sell more American goods and services to Russia through PNTR. So, I say we've got to get it right.

Let me just conclude by saying this. I also am the ranking Democrat on Europe, and as I go and talk to a number of the nations who used to be part of the USSR, some who still have some conflicts with Russia, one of the things that I want to talk to them about, well, what do you think?

A, are you happy to be in the WTO? They all said yes.

B, should we get rid of Jackson-Vanik and make sure that we're able to trade? They all said yes, that it sends the right message and it compels Russia to play by some rules, and we then have a referee in which to make sure they do that.

So I'm hopeful that we get this together and, before we leave here, we pass PNTR for Russia, because every single day that we don't, we're losing out on creating jobs here in America.

I look forward to working with you, and hopefully we'll get this done.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his very thoughtful comments, and I would just like to underscore this notion of doubling our exports. Taking that level from \$11 billion in the next 5 years to \$22 billion will inure to the benefit of New York, of California, of Minnesota, of Louisiana, and it will provide benefits all across this country.

And at the same time, it will help us deal with this human rights question, which is such an important one, because I haven't talked about it, but obviously including the legislation that deals with the very tragic death of Sergey Magnitsky, who was a lawyer in Russia who was raising questions and, basically, a whistleblower of raising concerns about the behavior of the Russian Government. He was left to die in prison. And we, with this legislation,

will be ensuring that those who are responsible are brought to justice and that it never happens again.

And so I think that, all the way around, this can be a win-win for the cause of human rights and for the cause of creating jobs right here, and I thank my friend from New York for his thoughtful contribution.

We're very pleased to be joined, Mr. Speaker, by my good friend from Minnesota, with whom I've been privileged to travel and has a great understanding and grasp of the issue of globalization and how opening up new markets around the world will benefit his constituents. And I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. PAULSEN. Well, I thank the chairman for yielding.

And let me just first say, with the bipartisan support of this important issue, which I will concur in comments from Mr. MEEKS, but I want to say I want to thank Mr. DREIER, the chairman, because I think we're having these types of discussions on the floor today thanks to his many years of leadership to educate all of us in the House on a bipartisan basis about the benefits of trade, about selling American, and his leadership in establishing this Free Trade Caucus has been so valuable to me as a newer Member. And I know that our country is in great gratitude, and we're going to miss your leadership down the road, Mr. Chairman, in the future.

Let me just say that I also want to rise in strong support for passing this permanent normal trade relations status with Russia. We must pass this legislation to give American manufacturers, American farmers, and American service providers a fair chance to compete and then win and sell more of their goods in the markets of Russia.

□ 1900

Russia joined the WTO already. They already joined the World Trade Organization back on August 22. They've already begun to open their markets to the rest of the world, so now there are about 150 countries, except the United States, that can fully benefit from much better access to the Russian marketplace. Additionally, all of these nations, except the United States, can benefit from Russia's WTO entrance commitments, including stronger international property protections, greater transparency, recourse to the WTO's dispute settlement procedures if Russia fails to meet its commitments.

Until Congress approves PNTR, the United States cannot claim all the benefits that go along with Russia's entrance into the WTO membership obligations. From the President's Export Council, we've already heard some great statistics that are real. They are real, Mr. Speaker. They estimate that U.S. exports to Russia will double and triple over the next 5 years if we pass PNTR, adding jobs here in the United States. These are jobs in manufacturing; these are service jobs; these are

jobs in high-tech; and all across the spectrum of other industries. There is no doubt that Russia's demand for foreign services and goods is growing. This is a country with a population of 142 million people. It has got a rapidly growing middle class.

I will speak in particular about a company, Medtronic, which is a medical device manufacturer based in Minnesota, my home State. It's one of the companies that will lose out if we don't pass permanent normal trade relations soon. And Russia, as I mentioned, is one of the fastest-growing markets. It is also a fast-growing market for medical devices and medical technology. It's a key player in the Russian medical device market. In fact, since 2005, there have been 10,000 Russian health care professionals who have been trained in Medtronic technologies. In the last 5 years, these Medtronic technologies and therapies have benefited about 70,000 patients across Russia.

So Russia has now agreed to substantial tariff reductions for imported medical devices. Russian tariffs on these products will average about 5 percent. It is going to give U.S. medical technology companies the opportunity to significantly expand into the Russian market. Meanwhile, Russia PNTR does not require any tariff reductions or market liberalization by the United States. Yet all of this will go away and all of this will be at risk if we do not act in passing PNTR with Russia in the near future here.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the approval of Russia PNTR is a critical step towards ensuring that U.S. companies can benefit from Russia's WTO ascension and remain competitive in the markets today. Until we do that, all other WTO countries will continue to grab market share, market share that is much more difficult to grab back in today's global, competitive environment. So, when I think of a competitor and a company like Medtronic that's based in Minnesota, we want to make sure that their workers and their ingenuity and their innovation is going to continue to grow and prosper so we can sell American across the world. In other words, U.S. companies are being left behind as our competitors continue to grow in this very profitable market of medical devices, losing ground we may never be able to make up.

With other countries gaining this head start now in the Russian market, our time is running out, so this PNTR really benefits the United States. I hope that we act next week, Mr. Chairman, before we head back for the election season because this is critical for jobs; it's bipartisan; the President can claim great ownership and credit for this as well if we act soon. I will do all I can to continue to work with you, Mr. Chairman, to move this forward as well.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I thank my friend for his very strong commitment to this.

I would like to expand on this Medtronic example for a moment, if I

could, because we talk about big pictures; we talk about numbers; we say, yes, we want to create jobs, but the example of Medtronic is very clearly a specific opportunity.

I wonder if my friend has any examples or if he has talked to executives at Medtronic about the benefits of opening up that market in Russia, because it's true. We are horrified at the crony capitalism that exists in Russia, and we are horrified at the human rights violations that exist, but there are also many very, very good, dedicated, hard-working Russian people who would like to have an opportunity to have access to many of the products that are made right here in the United States. I know my friend and I have traveled around the globe, and one of the things that consistently comes forward is people saying we want to be able to purchase goods from the United States of America, goods manufactured in the United States of America.

I wonder if my friend might tell us a little bit about the success of Medtronic and what has happened and exactly what benefit we would see created for jobs here and also for the consumers in Russia.

Mr. PAULSEN. I will just say that, whether it's a company like a Medtronic or an agricultural-based company like a Cargill, which is based in my district in Minnesota as well, clearly there is the opportunity to sell American knowing that 95 percent of the world's consumers are outside of the United States. This opportunity in Russia with huge market share is going to mean more medical devices being sold in Russia. These are life-improving, these are life-saving technologies, and there is no doubt in a competitive environment that European companies are trying to access that market and are moving forward to do that. So a world-class leader like a Medtronic is going to have a vacuum unless it's able to move forward and unless Congress acts to give permanent normal trade relations.

Mr. DREIER. In reclaiming my time, my friend is absolutely right, and I just want to again express appreciation to his commitment to our Trade Working Group, which is on a wide range of issues. We've been able to focus on creating jobs for millions of Americans as we have sought to recognize the benefits of exports and imports as well when it comes to improving the standard of living and the quality of life for our fellow Americans. He has been very dedicated to his constituents, and I appreciate your participation this evening, too.

I am also very pleased to see that we are joined by my very good friend from Louisiana, another hardworking member of the House Ways and Means Committee and someone who understands the world extraordinarily well. I would like to recognize my friend Mr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Thank you, Chairman DREIER.

Let me say thank you, first of all, for your tremendous service to our country in your capacity as a Member of Congress and as chairman of the Rules Committee. I want to thank you for your leadership on international trade and in promoting America's role in international trade. I also want to thank you for your friendship and for your wise counsel. I've enjoyed the time I've been able to travel with you.

Mr. DREIER. We've still got months to go.

Mr. BOUSTANY. We still do, but I'll say this: I'll miss having you here, and I look forward to keeping in touch in the future.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely, we should do that.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Thank you for organizing this round of speeches tonight to talk about this crucial piece of legislation that we need to pass because what it will do will be to ensure a level playing field for U.S. workers, U.S. farmers, employers who are competing for business in Russia.

Now, we all know that, until Russia came into the WTO, it was a very difficult place to get market access for our businesses, especially, certainly, large companies, but small companies, mid-sized firms. I believe it is vital for Congress to grant Russia permanent normalized trade relations by removing them from the Jackson-Vanik amendment. If we don't do this, if we don't terminate that provision and grant PNTR, Russia will deny or could certainly deny U.S. exporters some of the market-opening concessions it has made to join the WTO, and the United States would not be able to challenge those actions in a rule-based system through the WTO's dispute settlement system.

This is critically important, especially if we talk about small- and mid-sized firms that are in manufacturing that want to export. They need that kind of rules-based system to work within. Otherwise, they don't have the recourse to fight protracted battles in a difficult market like Russia's.

Of course, it's with some trepidation that we undertake this as we know that the relationship between our two countries is somewhat tenuous. We know very well about Russia's human rights abuses. We know about the poor respect for the rule of law. We've heard extensive stories about the corruption. The reality, though, is that Russia has now become a full-fledged member of the World Trade Organization, and to avoid putting the U.S. at a disadvantage, we need to move forward and grant permanent normalized trade relations.

I'll say this: that the best thing we can do as a country from a foreign policy standpoint with our relationship with Russia is to move forward with normalizing trade relations with Russia. If you want to see political reforms in Russia, if you want to clean up the corruption, if you want to see the rule of law flourish in Russia, our commer-

cial relationship with Russia is critical because it will help build a strong, vibrant middle class in Russia, which will help bring about political reforms there and help overall in the world of security. At the same time, it's a win-win because this grants the United States' businesses and farmers access to a market which will help create good-paying, high-paying jobs here in the U.S.

PNTR will also make permanent the trade status the United States has extended to Russia on an annual basis for more than a decade. So we're not doing anything new. We're permanently normalizing this, which essentially grants Russia the same access to the U.S. market that all of our other trading partners enjoy.

□ 1910

This is nothing new or anything special for Russia. Rather, it is far more important for the United States, for our manufacturers, our service providers, our agriculture interests who are seeking open access into the Russian market.

In an attempt to continue a level playing field for international trade, the WTO requires members to extend normal trade relations to all other WTO members on an unconditional basis, unless a country does not want to apply WTO rules to another country. After 18 years of negotiations, Russia officially became a member of the WTO on August 22 of this year. Currently, the United States has a condition that is placed on Russia. It dates back to the 1970s when the Soviet Union had restrictive immigration policies preventing Jews from leaving its territory.

Congress passed the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974. However, since 1992, the United States has certified annually that Russia complies with the Jackson-Vanik amendment's provisions, and we have conferred normal trade relations on an annual basis to Russia. Only by graduating Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment, making these normal trade relations permanent will the U.S. be able to be in full compliance with its WTO obligations, enabling U.S. businesses and farmers to enjoy all the trade concessions and commitments that Russia has made in order to join the WTO.

Mr. DREIER. I'll just reclaim my time there to underscore the very important point that my friend has made, Mr. Speaker.

We all know that the intentions behind the Jackson-Vanik amendment were very good. We saw horrendous policies from the Soviet Union in a wide range of areas. Virtually everything they did was bad as the Soviet Union, a totalitarian country. But the denial of opportunities for Jews to emigrate, especially going back to Israel, is what led to that amendment to the 1974 agreement.

I would like to ask my friend to repeat again—he said that we've had

complete compliance that we've been able to certify for now exactly two long decades since 1992. That's 20 years ago, 1992 to 2012. For 20 years, we've had annual certification because there has been an opportunity in Russia since, thank God, the Soviet Union came down with the work of so many people. We saw it come down, and we now have seen really what you would call a Cold War-era provision that has been left in place for two decades.

Why in the world would we still have this? It seems to me that it's the right thing for us to do to ensure that we sweep this aside so that we can move ahead with these market-opening opportunities. I assume that's the point the gentleman was making.

I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. BOUSTANY. That's exactly right. This is a Cold War relic, this amendment that was put into place. The gentleman is correct that since 1992, we've on an annual basis waived its provisions, but we now need to move forward. The world has changed.

As we look to move forward with expanding market access for our farmers, our businesses, especially small and mid-sized firms, it's critical that we grant permanent normalized trade relations if we're going to maintain U.S. competitiveness globally. Right now we're slipping. We're losing our competitive edge.

A country like China, for instance, has consummated well over 100 trade agreements just in the last couple of years. We have done three, and it took us 5 years since the Bush administration to put in place three relatively small trade agreements. We need to take advantage of the WTO structure. And with Russia coming on board as the ninth largest economy, we have a huge opportunity to promote American competitiveness and American business interests at no cost to us. Staying out of this hurts us, and that's why we need to move forward.

If we don't act to grant PNTR to Russia, our Nation's dedicated workforce, our determined business community, we'll be left at a competitive disadvantage, vis-a-vis our foreign competitors. Given the slow growth of our economy and the continued high unemployment rate, we can't allow this to happen. And with Europe struggling, this is an important market to help with global growth by helping U.S. growth and jobs in the United States.

I was a cosponsor of the vital legislation to grant PNTR to Russia, to place additional reporting requirements, of course, on both Russia and the U.S. administration. These conditions ensure that Russia implements its WTO obligations and those obligations are enforced.

Some will raise the question of, Wait a minute, we had a problem with China when they came onto the WTO, and we're still struggling with that. We have learned from that process, and we have additional safeguards in this agreement that will help make sure

that Russia fully maintains its obligations under permanent normalized trade relations.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time just to underscore this point, this notion that the WTO, which is an entity that stems from an agreement that the postwar leaders put together in 1947 called the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the idea behind that was to diminish tariff and nontariff barriers. When we saw in the early 1990s the WTO put into place, the idea is to see issues like intellectual property violations, which we know are rampant around the world, in Russia, and we have intellectual property violations here in the United States, as well. We see lots of retaliatory action that is taken. With the structure of the WTO, there is pressure to live with a rules-based trading system to deal with these kinds of corrupt practices that go on with great regularity.

I'm happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. BOUSTANY. If we're going to work through these commercial types of agreements and eliminate the corruptions, the abuses, the intellectual property theft, we have to make the rules-based system work. And the WTO framework which basically grew out of the general agreement on tariffs and trade in the 1940s is that mechanism, and it works. That's what allows us to make a claim against China, for instance, when they're doing abusive practices. It is an equalizer. It basically puts in place a framework that ensures that trade is conducted fairly and openly. That's what U.S. workers and U.S. farmers are looking for.

It's also very important as a critical piece to maintaining global security. If we focus on international economics, commercial relationships through open navigation of the seas, open trade, we're going to see less conflict in the world. I think this is critical from a security standpoint, and it's critical from a standpoint of economic prosperity for the United States. As the United States continues to face economic challenges, our national exports have remained relatively strong. They've probably kept us out of a recession over the last several quarters.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I think the gentleman makes a very important point about what I like to refer to as the interdependence of economic and political liberalization.

We know people in this country are hurting. We all have constituents who are having a difficult time keeping a roof over their head, keeping food on the table. People have lost their jobs and their homes. We know it's been very tough. We know again that creating markets for these workers is very important. So seeing the standard of living improve throughout the rest of the world creates new markets for us, and it leads to political liberalization.

As we see that the many people in Russia who are suffering have opportunities to improve their quality of life

and their standard of living by buying U.S. goods and services, it seems to me that's going to lead towards greater pressure for political reform, to address these human rights problems, to address the crony capitalism that exists, to address the kind of outrageous behavior that we see with great regularity from Vladimir Putin.

I'm happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I agree with that.

Any of these things that will help promote the development of a middle class in these other countries, whether it be China or Russia in this particular class, creates a new consumer class for American goods.

Now, we're all patriotic. We want to buy American. I love to go to the store, and I'll buy something; and if the label says "Made in America," I feel good. I feel good about it. Most Americans do. But by God, I want a Russian mother to buy something on the shelf that says "Made in America." We need to sell America, sell American goods overseas. That's where 95 percent of the world's consumers are, and our economy has been too much mired in domestic consumption at the expense of not looking into the outside world to export American-made goods to these consumers who live outside the United States.

By normalizing our trade relationship with Russia, we will create the mechanism to do that with Russia. This will increase critical sales of American goods and services to Russia. Not only that, we will create very good high-paying jobs here in the United States. This is definitely a win-win situation.

We spoke about Russia being the ninth largest world economy, importing more than \$400 billion in goods and services. And as some of my colleagues may be aware, Louisiana, my State—it's a small State, but it's seventh among the 50 States in total exports because of our location on the Gulf of Mexico and our waterways and our ports.

□ 1920

In the first quarter of 2012, Louisiana farmers and small businesses exported nearly \$14.25 billion in goods and services to the rest of the world. In fact, in 2011, Louisiana exported \$135 million worth of goods to Russia, which created a lot of good jobs in Louisiana.

Louisiana was a top supplier of PVC plastics to Russia in 2011, with \$21.4 million in exports, but exporters in the EU and in China still accounted for more than 60 percent of Russian imports of that particular material. We have an opportunity to grow this if we grant this kind of permanent, normalized trade relations.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, just to underscore again, PVC is that material that's used in sprinklers. And I see this PVC material. I have been very familiar with it for many years.

What my friend is saying is there is an opportunity for exports to exceed

the \$24 million coming from Louisiana to Russia, but right now we're seeing other parts of the world transcend that. By virtue of the fact that they have access to that consumer market in Russia, it's denying the people of Louisiana from being able to see an increase in the level of exports of PVC material into Russia.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOUSTANY. That's exactly right. Louisiana produces a PVC plastic, or looking for opportunities to get into that market, and yet they're being superseded by countries in Europe and China.

In fact, Russia, when it joined the WTO, agreed to reduce its average tariffs on plastic products from 10 percent to 6.2 percent. If we don't do this, we're going to be subject to higher tariffs, putting us at a major competitive disadvantage, and our foreign competitors will take advantage of this. Again, we'll have the mechanisms in place, if we do grant trade relations, to have a dispute mechanism in place to ensure that Russia keeps its commitments to our workers, our businesses back here at home.

Now, there's no reason not to move forward with this, and I hope that we can see some action on this relatively soon, because as each day kicks by, we are losing competitiveness.

One last tidbit of information, Louisiana doesn't have large Fortune 500 companies. We have a couple, but we have a lot of small- and mid-sized firms that are manufacturers, and we are a leader in manufacturing on the small scale in the energy sector with equipment and services that are vital to energy production, energy security globally.

These companies would love to get into the Russian market, to have the right protections of law so that they could sell their goods and services. This would lead to a lot of economic activity in Louisiana. It would help, you know, create good-paying jobs once again, help promote our energy sector, development and manufacturing in the energy sector, of which Louisiana—and the United States, frankly—has been a leader.

Congress must continue to support these kinds of agreements to boost our economy here at home to create job opportunities, good-paying job opportunities right here at home. That's why it's so important to move forward on this.

Mr. DREIER. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me express my appreciation for the very thoughtful remarks. The dedication that my friend has shown to his Louisiana constituents and the American people is, really, very, very respected in this institution. And I want him to know how much, Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate his understanding of what it's going to take to create more jobs in Louisiana for the people there who are struggling and working so hard.

One issue that I wanted to mention, I talked about it earlier, but I think is

very important, and it's really what's led to people who are in opposition to this, and that is this question of human rights. We have horror story after horror story.

I have stood in this well and several times talked about the relationship that I developed with a man who is currently in prison in Russia, and this man's name is Mikhail Khodorkovsky. He was in the energy business, a company called Yukos. He was one of the most successful, dedicated, and hard-working Russians. He was one of the greatest philanthropists in Russia, giving huge sums of money to support many, many charitable causes.

But, Mr. Speaker, he was guilty of one thing and one thing only: He was not a supporter of Vladimir Putin. And he sat in my office in the Rules Committee, right upstairs here, and, having visited him in Moscow and then having him visit me here in the Capitol. He said that he was nervous, and he was concerned that he was going to face some consequences for his opposition to Vladimir Putin.

Today I'm embarrassed to say how I reacted. I laughed. I said, The Soviet Union no longer exists. We have moved to a country that is independent, free, strong, vibrant, moving away from corruption, and, you, Mr. Khodorkovsky—Mikhail, I was calling him then—I said, You are, in fact, one of the most successful people in the country. There's no way that you would face that kind of threat.

Well, Mr. Speaker, tragically, we saw Mikhail Khodorkovsky jailed for 7 years, and then we saw an extension, another 7-year extension of his sentence. I will tell you that that is one of the reasons, because of the dedication that I have to the name of Mikhail Khodorkovsky, who at this moment is suffering in a prison in Russia, it is for that reason that I want us to take every step that we can to ensure that we bring about the kind of reform and the change that is essential.

What we've done in this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is we have dealt with a specific case where a man died. Sergey Magnitsky was relatively young. He was in his thirties, a lawyer who raised questions and concerns about the behavior of Vladimir Putin's Russia. For that, he was sentenced to prison. He was beaten, tortured, and left to die.

That has raised concern here in the United States and around the world. That kind of action is not acceptable, and we have to do everything that we can to ensure that those who are responsible are brought to justice and that it never, ever happens again.

Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to say that in this legislation we have the so-called Magnitsky bill, which was reported unanimously out of our House Foreign Affairs Committee. This measure has passed the Senate. We need to see the melding of these. We need to see this put together and passed so that we can say that we're going to expand our American values, creating jobs in

the United States by opening up this market and, at the same time, saying we will ensure that whoever is responsible for this kind of outrageous behavior is brought to justice. We're seeing, obviously, horrendous human rights violations take place around the globe.

Yesterday morning I stood here to talk about our great, great Ambassador, an amazing Foreign Service Officer who represented the United States in Damascus, Jerusalem, and other spots in the world in his dedicated career. Tragically, Chris Stevens was killed, as we all know.

We are seeing a very, very dangerous world, and that's why it's important for us to stand up and take action, and that's exactly what this measure calling for the U.S. to be at the table with Russia by granting PNTR will do.

Again, my friend has said it perfectly. Mr. PAULSEN said it. Mr. MEEKS said it. My colleague, I know, in his talking points that I submitted for the record, Mr. MORAN, would have said it. KEVIN BRADY, the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee had to go to a meeting, but he very much wanted to be a part of our presentation this evening, and he passionately believes that this is the way for us to most effectively deal with the very, very serious problems that we have on economic growth and on human rights violations. I hope, I hope that we will be able to see passage as soon as possible.

Again, I know that this is the time of year, as I said at the very outset, just weeks before the election, to be very partisan. This is something that we can have a bipartisan victory on.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to implore President Obama to get engaged on this. I know that there are many issues, again, looking at Africa and the Middle East. I know he is campaigning in his quest to be reelected. This is something that Democrats and Republicans in the House will pass with strong support if he will get engaged and work with us, work with us to ensure that we can bring this together.

□ 1930

And so I hope very much that he will do that in the coming days and weeks to underscore his goal of creating jobs.

I'd like to further yield to my friend. It looks like he'd like to offer something.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the chairman for yielding some time back to me. I share his sentiments about the situation with human rights and liberty. America has always been the beacon of liberty—individual liberty. And it's also been the hope of the world with regard to human rights. And we have to understand, the American public has to understand that one of the most important tools that we have as a Nation is our economic strength. And it comes from each and every one of us in this country—from a plumber to a mechanic or someone engaged in small manufacturing, our farmers. That eco-

nomical strength comes from each and every one of us. It wells up into the mighty country that we have.

We think about American might in terms of military might. Yes, it's a great and wondrous thing, but our economic strength is even more important. And the way we use that to influence events in the world to help promote liberty, to promote human rights is to engage in trade. And the surest way that we're going to help promote changes in Russia for the better is to help that middle class. And by engaging in trade, that middle class will be stronger, it will be wealthier, it will want to engage; and that will lead to serious political reforms.

The last thing I want to say is I share your sentiments with regard to Ambassador Stevens. He was a wonderful man. He served his country in many hotspots, difficult places. He was fearless. And I would also say that we oftentimes talk about our military men and women and we put them up on the pedestal, where we should, rightly so, but we forget to talk about our diplomats and our foreign service officers who do the same sorts of things, putting themselves in harm's way in these very tough places around the world. They are extremely patriotic. They do their duty. They make us all proud. We lost a great patriot with Ambassador Stevens.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his very thoughtful contribution on that. As we talk about human rights violations and the kind of threat that exists to those lovers of freedom around the world, I will say that just a couple of hours ago I talked to a friend of mine who is Libyan. In fact, his father was the lead opposition for four decades to Muammar Qadhafi in Libya. And he was in tears in our conversation, saying that the people of Libya owe everything to the United States of America. He said Benghazi would have been completely lost were it not for the United States of America and what it is that we did to bring about the kind of liberation that they so desperately needed, having been repressed for 42 years under Muammar Qadhafi.

And he went on to say that as we look at Libya, it's important to note that the tragic murder of Ambassador Stevens did not come from the people of Libya. It came from individuals, a few individuals. He said the people of Libya love the American people and revere the American people. I suspect that as we're talking about Russian PNTR that the same thing exists in Russia. Because they're living with great oppression. They're living with what is little more than an authoritarian dictatorship with the kind of crony capitalism and the violations of human rights that we're speaking of. Mr. Speaker, the people of Russia—and I know many Russians; we all do—have great respect and love for us as well.

So, again, our goal is to bring an end to repressive policies and use, as my

friend so eloquently said, the economic strength of the United States that is exemplified in every American who is working in whatever capacity at all to see our economy grow. Because we're the only complete superpower left in the world today, the only complete superpower. By virtue of that, I mean militarily, economically, and geopolitically. And we have to step up to the plate and continue to exercise that strong leadership role; and passage of permanent normal trade relations, taking this step will go a long way towards doing just that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my friends who participated. And I know, as I've asked for general leave, others who wanted to be here who were unable to are going to be joining in submitting statements for the RECORD.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to underscore the importance of immediate approval legislation to repeal Jackson-Vanik establish U.S. permanent normal trade relations with Russia.

There is demonstrated and widespread bipartisan support for Russian PNTR among our colleagues in the House, as well as in the Senate. And we cannot and should not wait to pass this legislation which will greatly benefit American business and their employees as they seek entrée into the expanding Russian market.

We all share serious concerns with the ongoing human and political rights situation in the Russian Federation, but the maintenance Jackson-Vanik does nothing to address those concerns.

What it does do is deny the United States and our business the ability to fully take advantage of the benefits of Russian accession to the WTO both in terms of market access and trade enforcement.

PNTR will provide the United States with important benefits at no cost to us.

With PNTR, American companies will be able to take full advantage of lower Russian tariffs, stronger IP protections, and other market-opening concessions that the Russians agreed to as part of joining the World Trade Organization.

Last month's WTO accession promises to open that country large and growing consumer market to exporters around the world.

Unfortunately, because we have yet to establish PNTR with Russia, all the members of the WTO except the United States are now fully benefiting from increased access to the growing Russian market, which is the world's 9th largest economy.

Unlike the United States, other countries also have the ability to use the WTO's dispute settlement process to help ensure Russia honors its new WTO commitments. This is particularly important in a market such as Russia's which is relatively new to market capitalism and continues to present serious problems for foreign businesses.

Anders Aslund and Gary Hufbauer from the Peterson Institute for International Economics predict that U.S. exports to Russia should double within 5 years after accession to the WTO. Evidence from countries that joined the WTO between 2000 and 2010 suggest this statistic to be true, and maybe even a con-

servative estimation. If Exports to Russia grow at the same rate as they did for exports to Ukraine and the Baltics, exports could triple, approaching \$30 billion. This would place Russia among America's large second tier-markets, such as Australia, India and France.

Every day we have not passed PNTR is a day where we put this opportunity in jeopardy by according a competitive advantage to non-American companies doing business in Russia.

We have the opportunity now to pass bipartisan legislation that advances American economic interests, which should not dither and continue to allow the partisan politics of election season to prevent us from grasping that opportunity.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, my name is KEITH ELLISON. I'm the cochair of the Progressive Caucus. Tonight, I come before the people on the floor of the House of Representatives to discuss important issues facing our economy and the huge challenges that our Nation is facing, particularly with regard to the events that are going to take shape right after the election.

The Progressive Caucus has come together, Mr. Speaker, and thought very carefully about what a deal would look like and should look like. I want to talk about that tonight. I want to go into what we call the Deal for All and to elaborate on some of the complexities that are facing our country and how this is a time where we really need to focus on the real core of what is important to make sure that as all these fiscal matters come together, the United States and the people of America, particularly the working people, come out on top and in the right space.

Before I dive into that, Mr. Speaker, I do want to yield just for a moment to talk about the great service of Ambassador Chris Stevens. Ambassador Stevens was a dedicated public servant, and he and the individuals who lost their lives in Benghazi recently have to be remembered for the dedicated service that they lent to our country. It's important to note that Chris Stevens loved Libya, loved Libyans; and it's not any accident that Libyans took to the streets not to attack America, but really Libyans came to the street holding up placards apologizing for the act of these terrorists who killed Americans and Libyans when they assaulted the consulate in Benghazi, and many of them held up placards extolling the great virtues of Chris Stevens. And it's important to point out that as Americans are watching these things unfold across the Middle East, that the last thing Chris Stevens would want would be for us to withdraw or pull out of Libya.

This horrible incident that occurred in Benghazi was not done by the Liby-

an people. It was done by terrorists who have nothing but contempt for the democracy in Libya, which is unfolding; and that is why they would take their action against the consulate as they did do. But it's important to note that there were about seven Libyans who died. The numbers are yet coming in. Of course, they're subject to being revised. But there were a number of Libyans who lost their lives trying to defend that consulate. And I think Americans should keep that in mind. They also should keep in mind that as the outbreak of these protests across the Middle East—you have one in Yemen, you have them in Libya, you have them in Egypt—it is important to point out that leaders of these countries have apologized for these things, particularly Yemen and Libya. And Egypt eventually got there.

And it's important to point out that Americans should know that this is not representative of certainly the will of the Libyan people. And there are a lot of people across the region who support the United States and support a good relationship with the United States. We should not allow ourselves to be confused by these events. I could easily see how people could be; but when you see dedicated public servants risking their lives to build bridges, the last thing we want to do is withdraw and abandon these relationships that have been fought hard for and now have been paid for in the blood of our heroes, Ambassador Chris Stevens being one of them.

So I do want to just wrap up this section of my discussion tonight and just point out Chris Stevens, a dedicated servant of the United States, a dedicated and committed man who has gone and offered the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of his country to build bridges between people and particularly to help build democracy in the weak state of Libya, a state that threw off a dictator.

Chris Stevens went there to help the people and to help them build a democracy, and he must be remembered for his great sacrifice and also that of the individuals who lost their lives with him, four Americans and several Libyans. And as the names come forward and as their names are released, we'll come back to this microphone and share the information with the people.

□ 1940

So now let's talk about the business we're here to talk about, Madam Speaker. Tonight, we're talking about the Progressive Caucus message. The Congressional Progressive Caucus is the organization in Congress dedicated to talking about what's good for the average working American, making sure that the average American's interests are looked out and regarded highly as we move forward.

I want to talk a little bit about the Budget For All, and not only the Budget For All, but also the Deal For All.

I want to get right to the point. Everybody is talking about the fiscal

cliff. The sequestration cuts are going to come into effect. These are significant cuts both in military and non-military domestic discretionary spending, which will be devastating to important programs like transportation, like health care, like research, like education. They'll put significant cuts in these important programs, lay off a lot of people, perhaps even exacerbating our already too-high unemployment rate.

But not only that, we see that the Bush tax cuts will expire, the payroll tax will expire, the so-called doc fix will expire, the AMT will expire. There's a number of things coming together, and many people who watch the news know that after this election, we're going to see a significant amount of activity around how we Members of Congress will be able to pull our fiscal situation back together in a way that hopefully avoids big cuts to important programs, hopefully avoids great pain that working class people might suffer if we don't come together and come up with some deal.

You've heard a lot of discussion about a grand bargain. But if we do any deal, the core values of the deal, we need to say first and upfront what this deal must include.

The first thing this deal must include, and I'll start with this poster here, Madam Speaker, is protection for America's social safety net. Let me start with a quote from President Roosevelt where he says: "Every man, woman, and child is a partner." In 2012, these words come to life when we see that more than 58 million people rely on Medicaid. That's a lot of people, Madam Speaker; 48 million rely on Medicare; more than 61 million rely on Social Security.

So with the idea in mind that everybody is included, everybody counts, everybody is contemplated in our American life, it's important to point out that as we move forward with this Deal For All, or any deal that we might have, that it's important to maintain the social safety net, particularly in very difficult economic times. If you slice Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, you are going to literally be harming the interests of millions and millions of Americans. Therefore, a key feature of any deal will be preservation of benefits for the people who need them most—Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security.

Madam Speaker, the next slide, the next poster here is a poster that talks about how we need to move our Nation's military towards the ability to deal with 21st-century threats. That will mean that we need to do some changes, some adjustments; and Cold War-era weapons systems are just not what this particular moment calls for.

So the second feature of the Deal For All will be that the military, which has seen its budget literally double since 2001, will have to share and do some paring down, but not just paring down, literally advancing. But some of these

old Cold War-era weapons systems and some of these things that are fit for dealing with the Soviet Union just aren't necessary any more. They're expensive, cost a lot of money, and they don't help us meet the threats we're facing right now.

So the second feature of the Deal For All would be moving our military to a position where it's dealing with 21st-century threats, not simply maintaining old expensive programs that we don't really need.

The third feature of the Deal For All would be that we would ask Americans who have been well-to-do Americans, people who have benefited tremendously under the Bush tax cuts, to do a little more. Now, I know my friends in the Republican caucus and some conservatives often say that taxes, why would you want to punish somebody for being successful. Well, we think that America has done so much for so many that to help pay a little bit more to this country that you love is not a punishment. In fact, it's actually something that we would expect people to do. And there's a lot of very well-to-do people who agree with that point of view.

We actually have a piece of an idea called the Buffett rule because a very rich man says that, hey, a rich man like Warren Buffett should not be paying a lower tax rate than his secretary, which he does.

So Americans of various economic classes agree taxes are not a punishment. They are the cost of funding a civilized society; and if we're going to meet the budget challenges facing our Nation, we're going to have to get some revenue, and it might well come from the people who have benefited so much under the Bush-era tax cuts.

Then, finally, but perhaps most importantly, Madam Speaker, we need to get Americans to work. This is a key feature of what any Deal For All must include.

So tonight, we're talking about the Deal For All, and we're talking about the fiscal cliff, and we're talking about what any fair agreement would have to include. This is not bargaining chips, Madam Speaker. All four of these things are key. In order to have a safe, sound budget fix or grand bargain, we're going to have to have something to get Americans back to work, and we're talking about an infrastructure bank, a longer-term transportation bill, various things I'm going to talk about tonight.

But putting Americans back to work, asking the military to share in the cuts, and to revamp our military for a 21st-century world.

Three, asking the top 2 percent to pay a little bit more by allowing the Bush-era tax cuts to expire for the top echelon. It would only mean that the top rates would go from 35 to 39½ percent.

Finally, we're going to protect Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid because these programs are essential and

vital, particularly in times where people are truly having tough economic times.

□ 1950

So that's where we start the conversation tonight, focused on dealing with a proper resolution to these huge budget fights that we are about to have because so many important features of our fiscal reality are coming to expiration on December 31.

So I want to say that this deal that I think that we should have, we should work on, Mr. Speaker, and this Budget for All, this Deal for All as well, it's something that I think we can reach, we should reach. The American people need us to try to work toward a solution. This is why the Progressive Caucus has come together and said this is what we should do:

We should have a deal. The deal will be comprehensive, a deal that could help us avoid the harsh realities of sequestration, that could avoid the complete expiration of all the Bush tax cuts or the extension of all the Bush tax cuts, a deal that will help us do the doc fix and do all the things we need to do.

We do need some kind of agreement, but the agreement has to have some key benchmarks. I've laid them out to you, and I'll just repeat:

Ask the richest to help pay the freight for America;

Ask the military to share in the cuts; good, safe, sound cuts that will help position us for the 21st century are available;

We need to make sure that we protect those who benefit from Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid;

And, most importantly, we need to grow the economy by investing in jobs.

But we have had some difficulty getting together, and I'm not surprised. Colleagues on the other side of the aisle, on the Republican side of the aisle, have been, Mr. Speaker, slow to try to come together and work out the deals that we need, but we do extend our hand. Hopefully, we will be able to come together and work out these problems because the American people depend upon us to do that.

But I do want to say that we have seen some real challenges over the course of the year just in terms of getting things done. So I think this is the time when we really need to come together and focus on what's needed. But in order to be fair, Mr. Speaker, I think the people should know what some of the real serious challenges that we've been facing are.

I just want to make note right now that we have had a Congress where obstruction has been the norm. It doesn't have to stay that way—and I urge colleagues on all sides of the aisle to work together. But I'll never forget being in this Chamber just about a year ago, a little more than a year ago, when, because of obstructionism, we could not come together. The Republican caucus refused to vote to raise the debt ceiling, something that had been done literally dozens of times both under

Democrats and Republicans. But they refused to do it, and this political rancor resulted in the downgrade of America's bond rating.

This was a tragic moment that happened a year ago, but it marks the obstruction that we've seen. Hopefully, this kind of obstruction will not be what we see going forward.

But I think it's important that much of the obstruction that we began to see had to do with the budgetary position that we saw starting with the Congress from the very beginning. The bottom line is that it started with the idea that we could only have massive cuts and no revenue. Our colleagues even continue to this day to talk about how terrible the economy continues to be, but their only prescription for fixing it is to take, as President Obama said, two tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and call us in the morning. That's funny, but it's, sadly, true as well. Tax cuts seems to be their only prescription for all problems facing the American economy.

We started out this Congress with a budget being laid out. It was talked about as the Ryan budget, but really it was the Republican budget. He may have been the author of it, but they all voted for it, embraced it. But this budget, where we started out with massive cuts, didn't balance for a long, long time. The budget never really added up, and it still doesn't.

So in order to get to a deal or some kind of grand bargain to deal with our fiscal challenges that are coming right up soon, we need a new spirit of cooperation, and it cannot be based on the budget that was offered by PAUL RYAN and backed by the Republican Congress. Like I said, it didn't add up.

The fact is that my Republican friends think that businesses always want a tax cut. I owned a small business myself. I was a lawyer. I had a law firm. I had staff that I had to pay. I had machines I had to purchase. I had rent that I had to pay. I had a payroll that I had to make. What I needed was clients coming through the door so that would justify me adding and hiring more people. But just tax cuts alone is not what small business people need. What they really need is greater demand, which is what we're not addressing if we don't deal with the key feature in the Deal for All, which is to invest in jobs.

If people can't buy, Mr. Speaker, then stores can't sell; if stores can't sell, they can't hire; and if they can't hire, people can't buy. This is the heart of the problem: slack demand, high unemployment, people who do have jobs nervous about making purchases. This is the heart of the problem and what we've got to address. Misunderstanding these simple ideas about the importance of the American consumer having enough wherewithal to buy things that they need is really part of the heart of this problem that we're in right now.

This idea of thinking that, oh, yeah, just a tax cut will solve the problem,

or, oh, yeah, and get rid of all the health and safety regulations, too, these two things could never bring America prosperity. But making sure that Americans are working and optimistic about their economic future will absolutely help this economy, and it's what we've got to do. I think through the Deal for All, any bargain we come to will put us on the right footing as long as we keep those key features in place.

So here's the thing: We've got to get to the point where we're working together. The key to that is to scrap this budget, this Ryan budget the Republicans have adopted. We've got to scrap that idea that we can't raise any taxes, that raising taxes is bad, that taxes are wrong, and that taxes are always a problem and that they're a punishment. We've got to scrap that idea. We know better than that.

So many of our colleagues even signed pledges that they wouldn't raise taxes, and this, of course, has been a problem. The only pledge I say around here is the Pledge of Allegiance.

But the fact is that we've got to scrap this idea so that when we face this real serious fiscal cliff, some people are calling, that we are able to negotiate. This means letting go of some of our long-held attachments, starting with the so-called Ryan Republican budget and these no-tax pledges. If we were able to do that, we could solve our problems.

Again, it's not all tax raising. It's going to be cuts, too. We have some ideas about where we can cut in a way that makes our country stronger, but there will have to be a mixture of both of these things.

I just want to talk a little bit about the Ryan Republican budget and just to help dramatize what some of the key problems are with it and why it's not workable and why we need to reject it as we move into this fiscal time. We're going to have to deal with this fiscal cliff, as has been named.

One of the key features of why it's not going to work and why it's wrong is that it ends the Medicare guarantee. It replaces it with vouchers. Some people around here like to talk about ObamaCare. Well, I far prefer ObamaCare to voucher care. And it makes it dangerously more expensive for seniors and the disabled. We don't want to put seniors in a more precarious financial situation, which is what the Ryan voucher care idea would do.

The Ryan budget, adopted by the Republicans, would also cut Medicaid funding by 34 percent. It cuts away tens of millions of needy people and turns the program into an underfunded block grant program. This is a sad way to treat some of our most vulnerable citizens. And you should know, Mr. Speaker, that Medicaid actually impacts seniors, too, because so much of the money that funds nursing home care is from Medicaid. So it's not just Medicare. Medicaid cuts, 34 percent, would be very harmful.

The Ryan budget also cuts transportation by 25 percent. Now, transportation is a job creator. Transportation puts Americans to work—building roads, bridges, transit, helping people get from here to there. I can imagine high-speed railcars.

I'm from Minnesota. I'd love to see us have a high-speed train from Duluth to Minneapolis to Chicago. It would be a great thing. It would put lots of people back to work, and it would improve productivity. It would allow people, after it's built, to get from here to there faster so they can get to meetings, so they can do what they need to do, and stop the bottleneck, cut down on carbon emissions and move people around, not just cars.

□ 2000

Transportation, a huge job creator, cut 25 percent in the Ryan budget.

Cuts education by 40 percent, 45 percent. Now, if there's one engine of economic development, having smarter, better-trained people has got to be the core of that, and yet education is cut by 45 percent in the Ryan budget.

So the bottom line is, these are some of the key things that are wrong with this budget. There are many more. I plan on talking about them.

But I want to just return to my theme a little bit, Madam Speaker, to say that we are facing a fiscal cliff. Americans do need to focus on it and do need to call their Members of Congress and say focus on the job at hand. We need you to focus your attention. We do know all these things are expiring. What are you people in Congress going to do about it?

What we're saying we've got to do about it in the Progressive Caucus is that we do need to come together and have a deal, but the deal has to have four pieces. And I'll repeat, Madam Speaker.

We need to make sure the military shares in the cuts by being more efficient. We need to make sure that we protect Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. And we need to make sure that we are putting jobs up front and investing in American jobs to a very large degree. And we need to ask the wealthiest among us to contribute a little bit more so we can meet our budgetary challenges. That's what the Progressive Caucus says we need to do.

We've had difficulty coming together because, well, quite frankly, obstruction, Republican obstruction has made it difficult to move forward and do anything.

Why did we have the obstruction?

Because we started out with signing pledges that we won't raise taxes, and we had a Ryan budget that imposed significant and deep cuts that have already resulted in a number of public sector workers being laid off and Federal employees having a reduction in their health care. And so these things, this sort of obstructive nature and insisting on cuts only, has been the source of the problem.

In order to get to a solution, we need people to come off these rigid positions so that we can do the people's business.

I mean, just to sort of like think about the level of obstruction, I already mentioned, Madam Speaker, last August, how dramatic it was when the Republican majority refused to raise the debt ceiling and caused us to have a downgrade in our bond rating. That was a sad moment.

But we've also wasted a lot of time. For example, we voted 32 times to repeal ObamaCare. And I do call it ObamaCare because Obama does care, which is more than I can say for some. But in this time, we had time for cutting or voting to repeal ObamaCare 32 times, but we didn't have any time to offer serious fixes to the economy.

And I just want to mention that President Obama, to his credit, has done, I think, great and excellent work in offering solutions. They just simply, Madam Speaker, have been ignored. I mean, it's really kind of sad when you think about the fact that the President has offered real serious and important solutions to the problems of the Nation and yet, they really, really have not been seriously addressed.

For example, the President called us all here and talked about the American Jobs Act. This is a great piece of legislation. But, do you know, Madam Speaker, we've never even had a vote on it. We never even had an opportunity to say who wants the American Jobs Act. It was simply something that the Republican majority in the House wouldn't even address.

The fact is that there were great ideas in this bill, and I just want to talk a little bit about those ideas because I think that they would really do a lot of good.

It includes a national infrastructure bank bill, a proposal that we would be able to fund by the Federal Government putting some seed money and then leveraging that money, that public money, with some private sector bonds. We would then have a fund of money that we could then use to make investment in important infrastructure that would be a key and important element of the program.

We would be able to make investments in the transmission lines that would help take wind energy from the western part of my State in Minnesota and bring it to where the population centers are.

We would be able to improve our grid and have a smart grid that would make energy use much more efficient and much more effective. And we would be able to use this infrastructure bank bill to be able to fund programs all over the United States where we wouldn't only build things that we need, we would improve them.

The American Society of Civil Engineers has addressed this issue, Madam Speaker, and what they said is about \$2.3 trillion of infrastructure maintenance needs to be done. You know, I come from the city of Minneapolis and

in my city, about 5 years ago we had a bridge fall into the Mississippi River.

Maintenance in this country is critical. We have bridges that are old and deteriorating all over this country. We have bridges that are in need of repair, roads as well.

And we also have other projects that need to be taken care of in terms of our grid, in terms of wastewater treatment, in terms of all types of important infrastructure tools, but we are not investing in them. In fact, we're relying on the things that our grandparents gave us. We're relying on Eisenhower-era infrastructure because we haven't, in our age, focused on the needs of the American people to have an infrastructure bill.

You know, just to talk a little bit more about the American Jobs Act, it would also extend cutting payroll taxes in half for 98 percent of businesses. It would also offer a complete payroll tax holiday for added workers or increased wages. It would extend 100 percent expensing throughout this year, and if we were to pass it, maybe even longer. And this continues to be an effective way to incentivize new investment.

And also, it would address and reform regulatory reductions to help entrepreneurs and small businesses access capital. We do need to help small business people be able to get the money they need to do investment in their company, and that means access to capital.

The American Jobs Act would also have a returning heroes hiring tax credit for veterans. This is something we addressed already, which is a great thing, but it would move on from there, and it would prevent up to 280,000 teacher layoffs.

Madam Speaker, you should know, we have had, now, about 30 months of private sector growth. But we have had also significant number of months of public sector layoffs, mostly teachers. This is because of these draconian cuts that the Federal Government has made, and State governments have been affected by and, therefore, city and local governments. But we would be able to address these massive public sector worker layoffs, which are really hurting our economy. And of course, teachers have been some of the most negatively impacted of all.

We also would move from that idea to another great one: modernizing at least 35,000 public schools across the country. You know, our public schools across this Nation, our kids go there, they spend hours and hours a day trying to learn there. But many of them are in very bad repair. Some 35,000 public schools need help. We can support new science labs, Internet-ready classrooms, and renovations to schools across the country in rural and urban America.

The American Jobs Act, with all these great ideas, never got a shot in this Congress. It would, as I said, call for infrastructure investment with a national infrastructure bank, which I've talked about already.

I didn't mention airport improvements. I did mention waterways. But it would put literally thousands of workers back on the job.

And also, we need to wire up this country. We would expand access to high speed wireless, as part of a plan for freeing up the Nation's spectrum.

□ 2010

Now, I want to just remind you, Madam Speaker, that our Nation at one time didn't have the entire country on the electrical grid. There was a program called Rural Electrification, which was a program under the Roosevelt administration by which our Nation just decided that you would not have to leave the countryside, the rural areas, to take advantage of electric lights, but we would wire the whole country—and we did.

The new wiring, the new Rural Electrification program, is connecting all of America with high-speed wireless. This is a project we should embark on. It's worthy, and it would help improve economic activity. It would help revitalize rural communities, and people wouldn't have to move to the urban centers for work. It would be a great thing.

The American Jobs Act also included pathways back to work for Americans looking for work. Of course, we have a serious unemployment problem, and we see some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle shaking their fingers, criticizing. Well, where are the jobs? I remember Speaker BOEHNER asking, Where are the jobs? Often, when I hear that from my colleagues, I think to myself, well, the jobs are in the American Jobs Act. Can we take it up? Can we have a vote on it?

There is something we can do for Americans who are looking for work. One of the most innovative reforms to the unemployment insurance program in 40 years is a program which is part of an extension of the unemployment insurance to prevent 5 million Americans who are looking for work from losing their benefits.

The President's plan would include innovative work-based reforms to prevent layoffs and give States greater flexibility to use unemployment insurance benefits to fund and support job seekers, including things like, one, work sharing, unemployment insurance for workers whose employers choose work sharing over layoffs; two, a new bridge-to-work program, a plan that builds on and improves innovative State programs and where those displaced workers take temporary voluntary work and pursue on-the-job training; three, innovative entrepreneurship and wage insurance programs. States could also be empowered to implement wage insurance to help reemploy older workers in programs that make it easier for the unemployed workers to start their own businesses.

So these are a number of things contained in the American Jobs Act which we have never had a shot at, and it's a

key feature of what we propose in the Deal For All: get to work. We've got a country to rebuild. This is absolutely the case, but if the Republican majority would allow us to take up the American Jobs Act, I am confident there is something in there that my colleagues would like.

Maybe they'd like the \$4,000 tax credit to employers for hiring long-term unemployed workers. That would be a great benefit to workers and employers.

They might like another feature of the American Jobs Act, that of prohibiting employers from discriminating against unemployed workers when hiring. We know now that many workers who have been out of work and out of the market for a while are asked, Do you have a job? No. Have you been unemployed? If the answer is—yes, for a certain amount of time—well, we're not going to hire you, which simply prolongs the problem. These are valuable workers with good skills, and they should have a shot in getting back into the workforce.

We might also find support for expanding job opportunities for low-income youth and adults through a fund for successful approaches for subsidized employment, innovative training programs and summer and year-round jobs for youth. One of the groups of people that has been really hard hit during this recession is young people. The American Jobs Act proposed by President Obama addresses youth employment; yet we haven't had a chance to deal with it because of Republican obstructionism.

I want to encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to let go of their attachments. Let go of the pledges. Let go of the Ryan budget. Let's come together to solve our problems. Many of them can be found in the American Jobs Act.

For example, there is a whole section in there on tax relief for every American worker and family. Now, I don't think we need to extend tax cuts for the richest folks, because they don't need them; but when people do need them, Democrats are happy to cut taxes, and we have. We cut payroll taxes for about 160 million workers. We could extend that if the President's plan will expand the payroll tax cut passed last year. Another thing is allowing more Americans to refinance their mortgages at today's near 4 percent interest rates. It would put nearly \$2,000 a year in a family's pocket.

But the American Jobs Act—an excellent vehicle for putting Americans back to work—never really had a shot because, as the minority leader in the Senate said, the number one priority for the Republican caucus was to make President Obama a one-term President. Is it right to make getting rid of Obama your top priority when we have so many Americans out of work and when we have an economy that really has never come back? I think that is not a good thing, and I wish we could

move away from that and start focusing on the things that people really, really, really need.

In fact, I go back to the Deal For All, which is the Progressive Caucus' idea for how we negotiate what the basic foundation of any deal needs to be. It's simple the way things are shaping up. After all the dust has settled from the 2012 election, an average middle class family could face tax increases of \$2,000 unless Congress acts. That's how important it is for us to do something and to act. This fiscal cliff they talk about is an opportunity to address the budget in a responsible way that grows our economy and puts Americans back to work.

We talked about the American Jobs Act. There are other great ideas, as well; but too many folks in Washington and too many folks here in the Capitol would rather cut Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, which are benefits that millions of Americans depend on.

As I said, this particular chart shows it all. When you see the huge numbers of people who rely on Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, rather than getting together and working on a problem, they'd rather cut Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security benefits that millions of Americans depend on and raise taxes on middle class Americans to protect tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires. It's as simple as that.

So let's just take a look at what's at risk, Madam Speaker. One in every four families depends on our Social Security system—61 million folks, including 36 million retired Americans. It's important for people to remember that Social Security also cares for people with disabilities and survivor benefits for people who have parents who pass on. So many children in this country today are surviving on those benefits which some of us in Congress are trying to protect and others are trying to cut. Nearly every American senior can depend on Medicare to cover health care costs.

Turning Medicare into a voucher system, as the Republicans have proposed, would not only make seniors pay thousands more for Medicare—about \$6,000 more estimated—but it would leave as many 65- and 66-year-olds without any health care coverage at all, which would be a shame. It would return our Nation to a time when seniors were in desperate and bad shape.

So that's why the Progressive Caucus is proposing the Deal For All. They are commonsense proposals that would solve our deficit problems and protect the American middle class.

The Deal For All says that any plan cannot slash benefits for millions of America's seniors, children and disabled Americans who depend on Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

The Deal For All says we must make and ask and expect that the wealthiest 2 percent pay their fair share of taxes and close loopholes that let companies ship jobs overseas.

The Deal For All makes smart cuts to defense spending—not just any old cuts, smart cuts, efficient cuts—to focus our Armed Forces on combating 21st-century risks.

The Deal For All also calls for any plan to invest in America's future by putting Americans back to work.

Yes, we are facing a fiscal cliff, as some call it, but that doesn't mean the middle class should get pushed over the edge of that cliff.

□ 2020

If working and middle class people are going to take a hit in tough times, it shouldn't be to pay for tax breaks for rich folks and millionaires and billionaires and oil companies. It's time for all Americans of every economic situation to step up and do what's right for this country, and it's time we had a deal in Washington that reflects our values.

I just want to elaborate on this a little bit by telling you, Madam Speaker, about how the Progressive Caucus has been bringing experts together to study this issue. This is not just something we've thought up. We've brought experts from the field, economists, people who really focus hard and have expertise in Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, jobs, how to reduce the military budget in a wise way. We've brought folks together to discuss this.

In fact, yesterday was one of the hearings that we've had, and the Progressive Caucus was hard at work holding a hearing. We're going to put some of it online so people can see it. We had these experts from across the political spectrum—some conservatives—to detail the best ways to avoid the fiscal cliff and to rejuvenate the economy without harming essential protections for the middle class. The pending fiscal cliff is an enormous opportunity to address our jobs crisis. I say "jobs" first, Madam Speaker, and then we need to put our country on the path to fiscal health.

The Progressive Caucus is laying the groundwork to make sure that any agreement reflects these core values. Our bipartisan panel yesterday confirmed that the best way to grow our economy is from the middle out, not from the top down. No trickle down. We also cannot expect to put Americans back to work unless we protect Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and ask the wealthiest to contribute their fair share.

We had Larry Korb come in, and he is a person with an extensive background, a very wise gentleman, is politically on the conservative side, but has done a lot of important research on how we can reduce our military footprint in a smart way. Mr. Larry Korb was a very well-prepared witness and shared his views and was really a big help as he laid out his presentation.

I just want to share with you a little bit about what he had to say, Madam Speaker, because it really was fascinating. I would urge people to check

out Mr. Korb's presentation online. He had a number of things that would really provoke a lot of important thought, and they're online. You can go to the Progressive Caucus Web site and see some of that.

Let me talk a little bit about what he said. Mr. Larry Korb was asked how best to summarize his take on the current defense budget, and he pointed to our poster, this one right here. Mr. Korb made himself very clear when he said, Don't pay for a 20th-century military in the 21st century, which I think sums it up. I'll elaborate more on what he had to say, but we had another expert who I think I would like to direct people to listen to, Ms. Maya Rockeymoore. She is the chair of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare. She said, "Changes to programs must be based on what is best for the beneficiaries, not on what is expedient for reducing America's debt." She also went on to add that Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are vital to the economic and health security of millions of senior Americans.

Chad Stone was also there, and he talked about the jobs picture. He actually referenced our poster right here, as well. Chad Stone, he is the chief economist for the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. He said that piling tax cuts on will only lead to Draconian cuts in programs that millions of Americans rely on. So we can't go with this cuts-only approach. We've got to have some jobs, and we've got to have some investment.

Steve Wamhoff from the Citizens for Tax Justice put it best. He said:

I think all of us here agree that the most important job for Congress right now is to help the economy to create jobs. Tax cuts are one of the least effective tools to accomplish this goal.

We had a great lineup. I urge folks to go on our Web site and study what they had to say. But I do want to go back for a moment to just talk about the ideas Larry Korb had to share. He mentioned sequestration. He said that sequestration is certainly not a smart way to cut the defense budget because it's just an across-the-board cut, but close analysis and careful cuts and strategic ones could help a lot. He talked about how the Pentagon actually is pretty well endowed. He talked about how if the automatic sequestration defense cuts were to go into effect the fiscal year of 2013, non-war expenditures of the 2013 base, he said the budget will be reduced by about \$55 billion down to what is about \$500 billion and remain at that level in real terms for quite a while. He said that this will result in total reduction of about \$500 billion over a decade from the projected levels in defense spending. He also went on to note that it also means that the Pentagon will still be spending more in 2013 after sequestration than it did in 2006. So they're not going to be poor by any means.

At the height of the Iraq war in 2006, we still would have been spending more

than that if sequestration goes into effect, but he's not just saying do sequestration. He's actually promoting a strategic and smart way to do some cuts. He says that the United States military can do well, defend our Nation, and protect our country for about \$500 billion, and that seems to make sense to me. We'd still be spending so much more than any other country in the world.

He went on to also note that in short the military really doesn't have a resource problem. They have what they need to defend the country. He noted that if sequestration goes into effect, it would not be ideal to just do across-the-board cuts, but there are a number of weapon systems that could be retired and a number of strategies for reducing the military budget that would not hurt national security, but would really put our country in a position where we are dealing with our financial problems in a forthright way. I think that it makes sense to really look carefully at these ideas.

Maya Rockeymoore went on to note, when she talked about Social Security, that it does not contribute to our Nation's deficit. If you look at Social Security, it actually runs a surplus, and we don't need to cut Social Security. What we need to do is to recognize that this important program is a program that has been one of the most successful in the history of the United States; and if we abandon our commitment to our seniors and the disabled, we will be abandoning a core principle of our country.

Mr. Chad Stone was important in his testimony, as well. As we wrapped up, I was most impressed that it's not just about cuts, that we also need to grow our way out of this recession. That means investing in jobs. I think the American Jobs Act and many other things would put us farther down the line if we were to make those proper investments.

That's what I want to say about the economy tonight. I'd like to urge people, Madam Speaker, to focus their attention on the so-called "fiscal cliff." It is coming up. We will see expiration of the Bush tax cuts. We will see expiration of the payroll tax. We will see expiration of the doc fix. We will see expiration of the AMT. There will be a number of things coming together all at the same time. There will be budgetary negotiations.

But no matter what they are, they've got to include protection of our social safety net: Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. The military must share in the cuts. The wealthiest Americans must help us get some revenue. Finally, we've got to put jobs up front and center and grow this economy.

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

□ 2030

ADMINISTRATION IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NOEM). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, in the summer of 1973, it was a real honor for me to be selected to go on an exchange program. Of course I had to borrow the money to go and had to pay that back by working hard to take care of the loan, but I went on an exchange program to the Soviet Union, 1973, that summer. It was quite an eye-opener for me.

Despite how wonderful the country was made to sound and how great it was that the government, they proclaimed, was the safety net for everybody in the country, they were proclaiming because the government was in charge of everything and in charge of everybody's business, there was 100 percent employment. They talked about how wonderful their socialized medicine was.

There were eight Americans on this program that were allowed into the Soviet Union that summer, and we all had very different backgrounds, had different political views. There were a lot of big hearts in the group on both ends of the political spectrum.

But, for me, a kid growing up in east Texas, it was an extraordinary education. Because even though people talked about how wonderful it was to have socialized medicine, everybody had a safety net because the government was the safety net, that country's economic system was rotting from within.

I went to a medical school. It reminded me of pictures of American medical schools from 40 to 50 years before. We went to an economic exhibition, kind of like a world's fair in Moscow, at one point. It reminded me of the pictures from a 1940 or early 1950s world's fair, you know, things like tractors sitting out there with people oohing and aahing over tractors. I'm going, good grief, because I knew we didn't need a world's fair to see tractors like that. You could go to any used tractor dealer and find tractors that nice in the U.S., but everybody was told how wonderful it was.

During the course of the summer, during the course of my time down in the Ukraine, I got to be good friends with a few of the students there. They were very standoffish at first. I spoke some Russian back in those days, and they spoke better English than I did Russian. But one guy in particular, he'd bring his dictionary with him and translate, because both of us—you know, it's amazing. You take a language course—I had two years of Russian at Texas A&M. You know, you're taught to converse about, "I'm going to the library" and "I have a dog" and these kinds of things, but when you want to talk about really serious life issues, we weren't prepared for those things. We needed a dictionary so we could get our ideas across.

At one point he said, "You seem surprised that our country wouldn't want

better." He grabbed my shirt and he said, "We don't have material this good." I just had, you know, a regular polo-type shirt. He said, "We don't have material this good for our individuals, and we fought two world wars on our soil. We don't have it as good as you do in your country, that's obvious. But people will always be reluctant to leave the best they've ever known for something they're not sure about."

When we got to 1989 and the Soviet Union fell because of the economic disease and decay that was pushed into the death spiral by President Reagan's actions, followed by President George H. W. Bush, it collapsed. Then we began to see all of the economic problems that were eating away at that country because the government tried to be the safety net for everything and everybody, and it won't work that way.

At a collective farm, way out from Kiev, I was surprised. I have worked on farms and ranches, and you usually try to get your work done before midafternoon when the sun gets its hottest, and that means you start early, start as close to daybreak as you can, and mid-morning is prime time.

Here it was midmorning, and these farmers were sitting around in the shade there in the farming village. I had been looking out at these fields. You could hardly tell what was cultivated and what wasn't. They looked terrible.

They had some really nice gardens right around their individual dwelling places. Yeah, those were kept up. Those they got to have for themselves. But the fields just didn't look good at all.

I tried to be nice, and in my best Russian I could, I said, "When do you work out in the fields?" They kind of laughed, and one of them said in Russian, "I make the same number of rubles if I'm here or if I'm out there, so I'm here."

Boy, was that a lesson in why a big, huge, nothing but safety net country can't work. Free markets work until they decide it's time to be socialistic, progressive, whatever you want to call it, and so they go that way. Then the free market forces fail because they have been taken over by progressive socialist structures.

Now, it's a good thought. I mean, it's a wonderful idea to think, gee, well, we'll just decree, as did the Pilgrims, as did the early New Testament Church, we'll just bring everything into a common storehouse and split it equally. It sounds like a great idea.

As the Apostle Paul found, as the Pilgrims found, eventually you have to say, You know what? This isn't working out very well. We're going to have to have some strict rules. The Pilgrims found, if you divide it up into private property and allowed people to eat what they grew, not only do they grow enough for themselves, but they actually would grow enough to use, trade, barter, sell, and that could be very effective.

I heard my friend across the aisle mentioning earlier about the so-called Ryan voucher care, and I know they know—and in fairness to my friend PAUL RYAN, and it was great to see him on the floor this evening—that actually anybody over 55 gets Medicare. The Paul Ryan proposal, it's not exactly like the bill that I previously proposed, but, you know, my friend's brilliant. He's on the right track. He says, if you're over 55, you get Medicare.

Now, I would go a step further, because I know what's being proposed for those under 55 is going to end up being so much better giving control back to patients, getting control back between the doctor and the patients instead of having an insurance company or the government between the patient and the doctor.

This business is a safety net. Clearly, they're not talking safety net. They're talking government takeover of everything.

□ 2040

But PAUL RYAN's plan would make sure that those under 55 had health care—and had it affordable. And so there are all kinds of reforms that need to be made. We did not need a full takeover of health care by the government.

My friend had mentioned that, because we kept passing bills to repeal ObamaCare—and actually there were very few bills that dealt with a massive repeal of ObamaCare, but there were many bills that picked out specific parts. Look, friends across the aisle, you surely don't want to be responsible for this terrible part of ObamaCare. So when people go back and say, Oh, you voted to repeal it 33 times, well, there were different aspects, and we couldn't even get our friends to vote to repeal parts that they knew, once they found out after they passed it, what was in it. Wouldn't even vote for things to be repealed that they knew would not be good.

My friend said that, basically, the President called us here and asked us to pass his American Jobs Act. And I was so glad he brought that up. I'd about forgotten about the American Jobs Act. He came and stood right there, Madam Speaker, and told us, I forget, 16, 17 times: Pass my bill, right here, right now, over and over. And so I kept wanting to get a copy of the bill. He was chastising us for not passing it. Well, show it to me. Let me see it. So we kept calling the White House trying to get it. A week later, it was clear there was no bill.

So I figured, well, if there's no bill, and he keeps running around the country spending all the taxpayers' money flying around on Air Force One, what sounded and looked like campaign stops, but government paid for it all—so he's out there saying over and over and over, Tell Congress to pass my American Jobs Act. Pass the American Jobs Act. He had banners: Pass the

American Jobs Act. American Jobs Act. I thought, Well, good grief, if he's going to keep telling us we need to pass the American Jobs Act, there really ought to be one. So I put a 2-page bill together that would eliminate the 35 percent tariff that we put on all American-made goods here in America, made by any company in America. It's called a corporate tax; an insidious tax because it deceives people into thinking that, gee, if you tax the evil old mean corporations, then we don't have to pay it. Baloney. If a corporation, a company doesn't pass that tax on to its customers, clients, people buying its services, then they go out of business. That's how it works. Thirty-five percent tax. The highest tariff that any country in the world puts on its own goods. And we were doing that. So mine says, let's eliminate that. And we'd heard from people around the world that, good grief, if you just dropped your corporate tax 12 percent, manufacturing jobs would come flooding back into this country.

You want to talk about pro-union. I know this side of the aisle wants to see the government unions grow more and more. I can never understand that. I can understand retired government workers needing a union because they don't have leverage. But to have government workers in a country where the government is the people. All of us that are elected here, we're public servants. Everybody that is hired by the Federal Government is supposed to be a government servant. We work for the people of America. Why in the world would you need a union to conspire against the people of America? Because, obviously, the role of any government union would be to get government bigger and bigger and more and more benefits, to the detriment of those who are paying for all of that. So, anyway, I don't understand why we need Federal Government unions. Neither did Franklin D. Roosevelt. But that's where all this goes.

By the way, when we eventually got a copy of the President's idea of a Jobs Act, we found that although he had been telling everybody in America he was only going to increase taxes on millionaires and billionaires, what he did was increase taxes on everybody that made over \$125,000 individually. He said he was going after Big Oil. He's going to end the giveaways to Big Oil. But when you look to around page 130 or so, the pages that dealt with oil companies, they were not going to affect the Big Oil companies at all. But since 94, 95 percent of all the oil and gas wells in America are drilled and operated by independent oil companies, run by Americans, you look at what was eliminated, it was really only the things that were going to devastate the independents, some of them basically mom-and-pop-type services that worked on oil wells, gas wells. It's going to shut them down. They wouldn't be able to afford business. It would eliminate the passthrough deduction for investing in wells. If the

independents can't get people to invest in the wells, they can't drill them. But the Big Oil companies, they don't have to get people to invest in oil wells. They've got enough money to do that.

It was incredible. I couldn't believe it. I got it to CPAs that do work for independent oil and gas companies, small ones, and they were saying, Oh, my word. If this goes into law, we'll be out of business. We can't stay in business. What does that do? It ends 94, 95 percent of the oil and gas wells in America. It also means that gasoline goes up even further than the doubling that this President has already done.

Oh, wind energy. We heard about wind energy, smart grid. Think about it. We've had these hearings in our Natural Resources Committee. Doc HASTINGS has done a fabulous job. Amazing the stuff you find out. And what we found out even just this week, last week, actually, when you talk about using wind or solar energy, since wind doesn't blow all the time and sun doesn't shine all time, and since we don't have an effective way to hold electricity, there's no massive battery that we've developed yet that holds significant amounts of electricity, so you have to use that electricity immediately, because you can't hold it. When we get to the point where we have some way to hold electricity, then we're on our way. Then solar, wind, those things will be a whole lot more helpful. But as it is, if you declare we're going to have to have wind energy and we're going to have to use solar energy, then for those times when the wind is not blowing or the sun is not shining but people still need electricity, then you're going to have to have a coal-fired power plant, you're going to have to have a natural-gas powered plant, a nuclear powered plant.

So you're going to have to have all of those things standing by to produce the energy when these other things don't. You're going to have to have different sets of wires taking electricity from the regular power plants and also send them out to the windmills way out wherever they are, where they're out there chopping up endangered species, birds and all, and bring that electricity in. You're going to end up having to have different wires going out to solar places. And so actually you're going to be paying two and three times as much for energy because you have to have two to three times the infrastructure just so that you can say we're getting some of our power from wind and from sun.

What it did was set up more government. You read the bill like I did—and yes, I'm anal enough, I read some of these stupid bills, including the President's idea of a Jobs Act. It created more government. It took over more control over the Internet. It took over more control of cable. It's just a disaster.

So I hear about the President's great ideas for helping the economy, and I

say thank goodness the President didn't pass that disaster because the economy would be doing even far worse. Well, except for the people that suck out the millions and hundreds of millions and billions, like the President's friends at Solyndra and things like that.

□ 2050

By the way, I see today this article, September 13, 2012: "AP reports weekly U.S. jobless aid applications jump to 382,000," by Christopher Rugaber.

Anyway, jobless claims jump to a 2-month high. Not exactly the progress the President says was happening.

I've been mentioning, ever since I found out from Gold Star parents Billy and Karen Vaughn, they told me two-thirds of the deaths and the wounds of our military in Afghanistan have occurred under President Obama. I couldn't believe that. So we got the official numbers. I've got a poster around here somewhere. I don't have time to use it right now.

But when we got the official numbers, it turns out 70 percent of those who have been killed in Afghanistan have been killed under President Obama's command, even though he's been in command in Afghanistan only half the time of President Bush. Eighty-four percent of those people losing arms, legs, hands, terribly disabling wounds from IEDs and other injury sources, 84 percent of those have occurred under Commander in Chief Obama compared to the 16 percent that occurred under President Bush in Afghanistan.

Article here from Breitbart by Tony Lee:

On the somber 11th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks, nearly 2,000 members of the U.S. military have died in Afghanistan since the war started in response to the attacks in 2011.

By the way, this President Obama, when he was running for President, called it the "good war."

But this article by Tony Lee goes on and points out what I've been talking about ever since Billy and Karen brought that to my attention, and I was greatly sorry that I did not know that without them pointing it out to me.

It was also interesting to read an article by John Nolte, 12 September, 2012. Obviously, I like the guy. I like his cynicism. He says:

Oh, that awful Mitt Romney. Just a few minutes before the White House itself disavowed the Cairo Embassy apologizing for free speech, Romney rightfully condemned the appeasing statement in no uncertain terms. And as a result, all day long, the corrupt media has been on a rampage to make Romney pay for the unpardonable sin of criticizing Their Precious One.

You see, there's no precedent for a political opponent immediately criticizing a sitting President after a foreign policy crisis. Oh, wait.

Then it has reference to other articles where that's gone on, a flashback to Kerry slamming Bush. Over and over

it's happened when it's a Republican President.

The article says:

So with the entire institution of the media circling the wagons for Obama today, in a futile attempt to rescue him from his own foreign policy blunders, we now have CBS News riding to the rescue in order to give the same President who condemned Romney before he condemned the terrorists an opportunity to further politicize this tragedy:

"There's a broader lesson to be learned here. Governor Romney seems to have a tendency to shoot first and aim later."

That's what President Obama had to say. Yes, that's the President talking about spouting off too quickly.

But the President is right about Mitt Romney: guilty as charged. Romney did shoot first to defend the principles of free speech that the people who work for Obama in Cairo were so eager to fitter away. Yes, that damn Mitt Romney saw this outrageous example of simpering in the face of terror coming from American officials and immediately spoke out against it.

It goes on to make a great point. Romney stood up for free speech.

The movie that's been fussed about sounds like a ridiculous thing that should not be done, except that this is America where people, whether it's Howard Stern or anybody else, they have a right to say things, no matter how offensive they may be, unless they go so far that they actually harm other people.

Another article: "No Record of Intel Briefings for Obama Week Before Embassy Attacks." This was written by Wynton Hall, 12 September, 2012, and it points out:

According to the White House calendar, there is no public record of President Barack Obama attending his daily intelligence briefing—known as the Presidential Daily Brief (PDB)—in the week leading up to the attacks on the U.S. Embassy in Cairo and the murder of U.S. Libyan Ambassador Chris Stevens and three American members of his staff.

I've got to say. I read an account and a story of the administration reporting the name of one of the other three killed as part of the Libyan Embassy personnel. They gave that man's name, pointed out he was a former SEAL team member but was in a private security force. Then, according to the article, the administration reported that he was killed while running for cover.

Madam Speaker, I know something about SEAL team members. In the mind of a SEAL team member or a former SEAL team member, he is never running for cover. He is running for a place, if at all, from which to launch a better attack. Even in death, this administration can't be respectful to the people that have laid down their lives for this administration.

Even though the White House says that, gee, the President does read briefings, he just hasn't been getting them personally, I would hope that he would start doing that. There are people's lives at stake, and he is President. He's such a fantastic campaigner, and I know it's inconvenient, but I sure hope that he'll get back to being President.

To give credit where credit is due, it was very wonderful of the President to

take a minute and a half or whatever it was, a minute, minute and a half, to pay tribute to those who laid down their lives for their country at the Libya Embassy where they didn't have adequate security, and where this administration enabled al Qaeda and others to take over the government. It was nice of him to take a minute and a half to pay tribute to them giving their lives in the middle of his campaign event before he went on with the celebration.

I recall President George W. Bush. People here know we certainly had our differences, and I certainly disagreed with him on a number of things. But I had great respect for the man. He said:

How can I go play golf when I am Commander in Chief and I have sent soldiers, our military, into harm's way? It just doesn't feel right for me to be out on a golf course having a good time when our men and women are in harm's way.

But it did look like a fun celebration there that President Obama was having in Las Vegas.

Another article: "Libyan Official: U.S. At Fault in Attacks." Written by Awr Hawkins, 12 September, 2012.

He points out that although the head of Libya's National Assembly has formally apologized for the killing of U.S. Ambassador Christopher Stevens, other higher-ranking Libyan officials refuse to apologize and continue to contend the U.S. is to blame.

The story talks about those contentions. Hey, it was our fault. Kind of like the ridiculous claims that sometimes those of us who were judges or prosecutors heard from a guilty rape defendant who said, "Well, you know, she was asking for it." Excuse me?

That was abominable what happened at the Libyan Embassy. It is a tragic fact that this administration, against the will of Congress, without even ask-

ing what the will of Congress was, said, Well, gee, the U.N., Organization of Islamic Conference, they want us there. So, why not? We ought to go. That's all he needed. He didn't care what Congress thought.

He enabled them. He used American bombers. And then when the American public obviously was upset, eventually, that it was taking so long—hey, hey, keep in mind, it's not the U.S.; it's NATO. He may not have gotten a briefing that let him know that over 60 percent of the NATO military is American military.

Here's a flashback article. I just think it's important, when these terrible things are happening around the world, that we take a quick look at how we got where we are so maybe we don't keep doubling down on things that get Americans killed and hurt our national security. This article by Dana Loesch, 12 September 2012, "Flashback: Obama Admin Endorsed Muslim Brotherhood," it points out from a New York Times article even August 1 this year, it said:

Leon E. Panetta, the United States Defense Secretary, said on Tuesday that President Mohammed Morsi of Egypt was "his own man," a strong declaration of American support for Mr. Morsi, a former leader of the Muslim Brotherhood whose future course in Egypt remains a great unknown to the Obama administration.

Well, it didn't keep us from enabling him to be there.

Another article: "Obama Admits He Lost Egypt As American Ally." It goes on to talk about how the President, because of our turning our back, or stabbing a man with whom this administration had made agreements, who was trying to uphold the Israeli-Egyptian Accord that was brokered by President Carter—one nice thing that President Carter did. President Obama now ad-

mits, well, they're not really an enemy, but they're not an ally. We lost them as an ally because of the incompetence of this administration.

"Obama Declines Meeting With Netanyahu," and let me just finish with this. Although he doesn't have time for Netanyahu, apparently he has time to attend a Jay-Z and Beyonce fundraiser. They're fabulous entertainers, I understand that. But there's a country to run, there are Americans being killed, and it's time somebody around this town picked up the responsibility and acted responsibly. I don't think doing a CR is the way to do it, but certainly not running off to fundraisers when people are giving their lives for you on foreign soil is the way to go either.

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6336. An act 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 United States Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 14, 2012, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second and third quarters of 2012 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, ROBERT KAREM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 10 AND JUNE 18, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Robert Karem	6/10	6/13	South Korea		1,050.03						1,050.03
	6/10	6/18	Japan		2,262.29						2,262.29
Committee total											3,312.32

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MR. ROBERT KAREM, July 25, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, BARRY JACKSON, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 5 AND AUG. 13, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Barry Jackson	8/5	8/8	Vietnam		812.00		314455				15267.00
	8/8	8/10	Cambodia		349.00						349.00
	8/10	8/12	Burma		512.00						512.00
	8/12	8/13	Malaysia		255.00						255.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, BARRY JACKSON, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 5 AND AUG. 13, 2012—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Committee total											16,383.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Airfare inclusive for entire trip.

MR. BARRY JACKSON, Sept. 12, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ESTONIA, RUSSIA, GEORGIA, AND IRELAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 29 AND JULY 8, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Hon. Peter Roskam	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Hon. Tom Rooney	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Hon. Kay Granger	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Hon. Mike Kelly	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Hon. Adrian Smith	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Hon. Karen Bass	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Tim Berry	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Natalie Buchanan	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Brittany Carey	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Erica Elliott	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Emily Murry	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Stephen Pinkos	6/30	7/2	Estonia		652.00		(3)				652.00
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		550.00				1,858.00
Hon. Peter Roskam	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		550.00				1,858.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		550.00				1,858.00
Hon. Tom Rooney	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		550.00				1,858.00
Hon. Kay Granger	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		612.00				1,920.00
Hon. Mike Kelly	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		612.00				1,920.00
Hon. Adrian Smith	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		550.00				1,858.00
Hon. Karen Bass	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		550.00				1,858.00
Tim Berry	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		550.00				1,858.00
Natalie Buchanan	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		550.00				1,858.00
Brittany Carey	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		550.00				1,858.00
Erica Elliott	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		550.00				1,858.00
Emily Murry	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		550.00				1,858.00
Stephen Pinkos	7/2	7/5	Russia		1,308.00		550.00				1,858.00
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Peter Roskam	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Tom Rooney	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Kay Granger	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Mike Kelly	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Adrian Smith	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Karen Bass	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Tim Berry	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Natalie Buchanan	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Brittany Carey	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Erica Elliott	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Emily Murry	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Stephen Pinkos	7/5	7/7	Georgia		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Hon. Peter Roskam	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Hon. Tom Rooney	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Hon. Kay Granger	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Hon. Mike Kelly	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Hon. Adrian Smith	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Hon. Karen Bass	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Tim Berry	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Natalie Buchanan	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Brittany Carey	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Erica Elliott	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Emily Murry	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Stephen Pinkos	7/7	7/8	Ireland		411.00		(3)				411.00
Committee total											49,300.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY, Aug. 7, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO LIBERIA, TUNISIA, KENYA, MADAGASCAR, AND MOROCCO, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 30 AND JULY 9, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. David Dreier	6/30	7/2	Liberia		500.00		(3)				500.00
Hon. David Price	6/30	7/2	Liberia		500.00		(3)				500.00
Hon. Ed Whitfield	6/30	7/2	Liberia		500.00		(3)				500.00
Hon. Susan Davis	6/30	7/2	Liberia		500.00		(3)				500.00
Hon. Mike Ross	6/30	7/2	Liberia		500.00		(3)				500.00
Hon. Gwen Moore	6/30	7/2	Liberia		500.00		(3)				500.00
Barry Jackson	6/30	7/2	Liberia		500.00		(3)				500.00
Brad Smith	6/30	7/2	Liberia		500.00		(3)				500.00
Thomas Wickham	6/30	7/2	Liberia		500.00		(3)				500.00
Rachael Leman	6/30	7/2	Liberia		500.00		(3)				500.00
John Lis	6/30	7/2	Liberia		500.00		(3)				500.00
Robert Lawrence	6/30	7/2	Liberia		500.00		(3)				500.00
Hon. David Dreier	7/2	7/4	Tunisia		396.00		(3)				396.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO LIBERIA, TUNISIA, KENYA, MADAGASCAR, AND MOROCCO, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 30 AND JULY 9, 2012—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. David Price	7/2	7/4	Tunisia		396.00		(3)				396.00
Hon. Ed Whitfield	7/2	7/4	Tunisia		396.00		(3)				396.00
Hon. Susan Davis	7/2	7/4	Tunisia		396.00		(3)				396.00
Hon. Mike Ross	7/2	7/4	Tunisia		396.00		(3)				396.00
Hon. Gwen Moore	7/2	7/4	Tunisia		396.00		(3)				396.00
Barry Jackson	7/2	7/4	Tunisia		396.00		(3)				396.00
Brad Smith	7/2	7/4	Tunisia		396.00		(3)				396.00
Thomas Wickham	7/2	7/4	Tunisia		396.00		(3)				396.00
Rachael Leman	7/2	7/4	Tunisia		396.00		(3)				396.00
John Lis	7/2	7/4	Tunisia		396.00		(3)				396.00
Robert Lawrence	7/2	7/4	Tunisia		396.00		(3)				396.00
Hon. David Dreier	7/4	7/6	Kenya		700.00		(3)				700.00
Hon. David Price	7/4	7/6	Kenya		700.00		(3)				700.00
Hon. Ed Whitfield	7/4	7/6	Kenya		700.00		(3)				700.00
Hon. Susan Davis	7/4	7/6	Kenya		700.00		(3)				700.00
Hon. Mike Ross	7/4	7/6	Kenya		700.00		(3)				700.00
Hon. Gwen Moore	7/4	7/6	Kenya		700.00		(3)				700.00
Barry Jackson	7/4	7/6	Kenya		700.00		(3)				700.00
Brad Smith	7/4	7/6	Kenya		700.00		(3)				700.00
Thomas Wickham	7/4	7/6	Kenya		700.00		(3)				700.00
Rachael Leman	7/4	7/6	Kenya		700.00		(3)				700.00
John Lis	7/4	7/6	Kenya		700.00		(3)				700.00
Robert Lawrence	7/4	7/6	Kenya		700.00		(3)				700.00
Hon. David Dreier	7/6	7/8	Madagascar		474.00		(3)				474.00
Hon. David Price	7/6	7/8	Madagascar		474.00		(3)				474.00
Hon. Ed Whitfield	7/6	7/8	Madagascar		474.00		(3)				474.00
Hon. Susan Davis	7/6	7/8	Madagascar		474.00		(3)				474.00
Hon. Mike Ross	7/6	7/8	Madagascar		474.00		(3)				474.00
Hon. Gwen Moore	7/6	7/8	Madagascar		474.00		(3)				474.00
Barry Jackson	7/6	7/8	Madagascar		474.00		(3)				474.00
Brad Smith	7/6	7/8	Madagascar		474.00		(3)				474.00
Thomas Wickham	7/6	7/8	Madagascar		474.00		(3)				474.00
Rachael Leman	7/6	7/8	Madagascar		474.00		(3)				474.00
John Lis	7/6	7/8	Madagascar		474.00		(3)				474.00
Robert Lawrence	7/6	7/8	Madagascar		474.00		(3)				474.00
Hon. David Dreier	7/8	7/9	Morocco		250.00		(3)				250.00
Hon. David Price	7/8	7/9	Morocco		250.00		(3)				250.00
Hon. Ed Whitfield	7/8	7/9	Morocco		250.00		(3)				250.00
Hon. Susan Davis	7/8	7/9	Morocco		250.00		(3)				250.00
Hon. Mike Ross	7/8	7/9	Morocco		250.00		(3)				250.00
Hon. Gwen Moore	7/8	7/9	Morocco		250.00		(3)				250.00
Barry Jackson	7/8	7/9	Morocco		250.00		(3)				250.00
Brad Smith	7/8	7/9	Morocco		250.00		(3)				250.00
Thomas Wickham	7/8	7/9	Morocco		250.00		(3)				250.00
Rachael Leman	7/8	7/9	Morocco		250.00		(3)				250.00
John Lis	7/8	7/9	Morocco		250.00		(3)				250.00
Robert Lawrence	7/8	7/9	Morocco		250.00		(3)				250.00
Committee totals											27,840.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. DAVID DREIER, Aug. 1, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Tim Holden	5/20	5/21	South Korea		338.90		(3)				338.90
	5/21	5/24	China		1,115.89		(3)				1,115.89
	5/24	5/26	India		582.63		(3)				582.63
	5/26	5/27	Germany		291.00		(3)				291.00
Hon. Glenn Thompson	6/09	6/10	Azerbaijan		270.00		(3)				270.00
	6/10	6/11	Afghanistan		16.00		(3)				16.00
	6/11	6/13	Pakistan		549.00		(3)				549.00
	6/13	6/14	Bahrain		46.00		(3)				46.00
	6/14	6/15	Yemen				(3)				
	6/15	6/16	Egypt		92.00		(3)				92.00
Committee total											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. FRANK D. LUCAS, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Barbara Lee	4/2	4/3	Uganda		305.00						305.00
Misc. delegation costs									150.00		150.00
Commercial Airfare											
Hon. Jack Kingston	4/2	4/3	Rwanda		337.75						337.75
Local ground transportation								126.48			126.48
Commercial Airfare								204.00			204.00
Hon. John R. Carter	4/20	4/22	United Arab Emirates		429.00						429.00
	4/22	4/23	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	4/23	4/24	Qatar		341.00						341.00
Misc. delegation costs									166.80		166.80
Commercial Airfare								5,411.90			5,411.90
Hon. Steven C. LaTourette	4/3	4/5	Turkey		894.66		(3)				894.66

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Misc. delegation costs	4/5	4/6	Israel		498.00		(³)				498.00
	4/6	4/8	Jordan		588.00		(³)				588.00
	4/8	4/9	Ireland		243.59		(³)				243.59
Hon. Steve Austria	4/3	4/5	Turkey		894.66				1,766.11		1,766.11
Misc. delegation costs	4/5	4/6	Israel		498.00		(³)				498.00
	4/6	4/8	Jordan		588.80		(³)				588.80
	4/8	4/8	Ireland		243.59		(³)				243.59
Hon. Jack Kingston	6/09	6/10	Azerbaijan		373.00		(³)		1,766.11		1,766.11
Misc. delegation costs	6/10	6/11	Afghanistan		56.00		(³)				56.00
	6/11	6/13	Pakistan		622.00		(³)				622.00
	6/13	6/14	Bahrain		124.00		(³)				124.00
	6/14	6/15	Yemen		226.62		(³)				226.62
	6/15	6/16	Egypt		266.05		(³)				266.05
	Committee total				7,557.72		5,742.38		3,849.02		17,149.12

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Ghana, Tanzania, United Arab Emirates Germany with CODEL Inhofe, April 9–16, 2012:											
Hon. Jeff Miller	4/9	4/11	Ghana		31.14						31.14
	4/11	4/14	Tanzania		180.50						180.50
	4/14	4/16	United Arab Emirates		84.76						84.76
	4/16	4/17	Germany		10.00						10.00
Visit to Afghanistan, United Arab Emirates with CODEL Gochmert, April 19–23, 2012:											
Hon. Madeleine Z. Bordallo	4/20	4/21	United Arab Emirates		337.33						337.33
	4/21	4/22	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	4/22	4/23	United Arab Emirates		359.38						359.38
Commercial airfare							7,504.70				7,504.70
Visit to Afghanistan, Bahrain, Belgium, May 18–23, 2012:											
Hon. Martha Roby	5/19	5/20	Belgium		112.00						112.00
	5/20	5/21	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	5/21	5/22	Bahrain		365.19						365.19
	5/22	5/23	Ireland		111.00						111.00
Hon. Susan Davis	5/19	5/20	Belgium		112.00						112.00
	5/20	5/21	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	5/21	5/22	Bahrain		365.19						365.19
	5/22	5/23	Ireland		111.00						111.00
Hon. Kathy Hochul	5/19	5/20	Belgium		112.00						112.00
	5/20	5/21	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	5/21	5/22	Bahrain		365.19						365.19
	5/22	5/23	Ireland		111.00						111.00
Jaime Cheshire	5/19	5/20	Belgium		112.00						112.00
	5/20	5/21	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	5/21	5/22	Bahrain		365.00						365.00
	5/22	5/23	Ireland		111.00						111.00
Debra Wada	5/22	5/23	Ireland		111.00						111.00
	5/20	5/21	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	5/21	5/22	Bahrain		365.19						365.19
	5/22	5/23	Ireland		111.00						111.00
Delegation expenses			Bahrain					106.10			106.10
Visit to India, China, South Korea, Germany with CODEL Kline, May 18–27, 2012:											
Hon. Mike McIntyre	5/20	5/21	South Korea		338.90						338.90
	5/21	5/24	China		1,115.89						1,115.89
	5/24	5/26	India		582.63						582.63
	5/26	5/27	Germany		291.00						291.00
Visit to Uganda, Kenya with CODEL Coons, May 25–31, 2012:											
Hon. Adam Smith	5/26	5/29	Uganda		198.00						198.00
	5/29	5/31	Kenya		46.00						46.00
Paul Arcangeli	5/26	5/29	Uganda		198.00						198.00
	5/29	5/31	Kenya		286.00						286.00
Visit to Tanzania, Senegal, Tunisia, May 29–June 5, 2012:											
Craig Greene	5/31	6/1	Tanzania		546.00						546.00
	6/1	6/2	Senegal		760.73						760.73
	6/4	6/5	Tunisia		196.00						196.00
Commercial airfare							15,782.00				15,782.00
Paul Arcangeli	5/30	6/1	Tanzania		546.00						546.00
	6/1	6/2	Senegal		388.00						388.00
Commercial airfare							15,782.00				15,782.00
Debra Wada	5/30	6/1	Tanzania		546.00						546.00
	6/1	6/2	Senegal		760.73						760.73
	6/4	6/5	Tunisia		196.00						196.00
Commercial airfare							15,782.00				15,782.00
Timothy McClees	5/30	6/1	Tanzania		546.00						546.00
	6/1	6/2	Senegal		760.73						760.73
	6/4	6/5	Tunisia		196.00						196.00
Commercial airfare							15,782.00				15,782.00
Delegation expenses			Tunisia					134.91			134.91
Visit to Germany, Burkina Faso, Niger, May 29–June 5, 2012:											
Peter Villano	5/30	5/31	Germany		114.00						114.00
	5/31	6/2	Niger		435.36						435.36
	6/2	6/4	Burkina Faso		281.95						281.95
Commercial airfare							11,648.00				11,648.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mark Lewis	5/30	5/31	Germany		114.00						114.00
	5/31	6/2	Niger		435.36						435.36
	6/2	6/4	Burkina Faso		281.95						281.95
Commercial airfare							11,648.00				11,648.00
Visit to Denmark, Romania, France, United Kingdom, Germany, June 8–18, 2012:											
Hon. Michael Turner	6/9	6/10	Denmark		145.00						145.00
	6/10	6/11	Germany		177.00						177.00
	6/11	6/13	United Kingdom		1,024.78						1,024.78
	6/13	6/16	France		2,252.95						2,252.95
	6/16	6/17	Romania		92.00						92.00
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	6/9	6/10	Denmark		145.00						145.00
	6/10	6/11	Germany		177.00						177.00
	6/11	6/13	United Kingdom		1,024.78						1,024.78
	6/13	6/16	France		2,252.95						2,252.95
	6/16	6/17	Romania		92.00						92.00
Timothy Morrison	6/9	6/10	Denmark		145.00						145.00
	6/10	6/11	Germany		177.00						177.00
	6/11	6/13	United Kingdom		1,024.78						1,024.78
	6/13	6/16	France		2,252.95						2,252.95
	6/16	6/17	Romania		92.00						92.00
Leonor Tomero	6/9	6/10	Denmark		145.00						145.00
	6/10	6/11	Germany		177.00						177.00
	6/11	6/13	United Kingdom		1,024.78						1,024.78
	6/13	6/16	France		2,252.95						2,252.95
	6/16	6/17	Romania		92.00						92.00
Delegation expenses			United Kingdom						541.11		541.11
			France						5,300.00		5,300.00
Visit to Afghanistan, Pakistan, Qatar, June 11–16, 2012:											
Hon. Robert Wittman	6/13	6/14	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	6/14	6/15	Pakistan		294.00						294.00
Commercial airfare							2,531.70				2,531.70
Hon. K. Michael Conaway	6/13	6/14	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	6/14	6/15	Pakistan		294.00						294.00
Commercial airfare							9,766.00				9,766.00
Hon. Steven Palazzo	6/13	6/14	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	6/14	6/15	Pakistan		294.00						294.00
Commercial airfare							10,569.70				10,569.70
Michele Pearce	6/13	6/14	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	6/14	6/15	Pakistan		294.00					294.00	294.00
Commercial airfare							9,766.00				9,766.00
Paul Lewis	6/13	6/14	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	6/14	6/15	Pakistan		294.00						294.00
Commercial airfare							9,766.00				9,766.00
Alex Gallo	6/13	6/14	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	6/14	6/15	Pakistan		294.00						294.00
Commercial airfare							9,766.00				9,766.00
Delegation expenses			Pakistan						855.89		855.89
Visit to South Korea, Japan, June 9–18, 2012:											
Roger Zakheim	6/10	6/13	South Korea		1,050.03						1,050.03
	6/13	6/18	Japan		2,527.52						2,527.52
Commercial airfare							5,006.70				5,006.70
Jenness Simler	6/10	6/13	South Korea		1,050.03						1,050.03
	6/13	6/18	Japan		2,256.12						2,256.12
Commercial airfare							5,006.70				5,006.70
Michael Casey	6/10	6/13	South Korea		1,050.03						1,050.03
	6/13	6/18	Japan		2,256.12						2,256.12
Commercial airfare							5,006.70				5,006.70
Delegation expenses									327.76		327.76
Visit to Japan, South Korea, June 9–15, 2012:											
Jeanette James	6/10	6/12	Japan		750.63						750.63
	6/12	6/15	South Korea		1,050.00						1,050.00
Commercial airfare							11,178.40				11,178.40
Jeanette James	6/10	6/12	Japan		750.63						750.63
	6/12	6/15	South Korea		1,050.00						1,050.00
Commercial airfare							11,178.40				11,178.40
Delegation expenses			South Korea						333.30		333.30
Visit to Azerbaijan, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Bahrain, Yemen, Egypt with CODEL Platts, June 8–16, 2012:											
Hon. John Fleming	6/9	6/10	Azerbaijan		249.75						249.75
	6/10	6/11	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	6/11	6/13	Pakistan		427.63						427.63
	6/13	6/14	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
	6/14	6/15	Yemen		226.62						226.62
	6/15	6/16	Egypt		174.05						174.05
Visit to France, June 17–19, 2012:											
Timothy Morrison	6/17	6/19	France		1,096.00						1,096.00
Commercial airfare							2,364.50				2,364.50
Leonor Tomero	6/17	6/19	France		1,096.00						1,096.00
Commercial airfare							2,364.50				2,364.50
Committee total					48,213.61		188,200.00		7,599.07		244,012.68

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, Chairman, July 31, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Tom Price	4/3	4/5	Turkey		759.00		(3)				759.00
	4/5	4/6	Israel		493.00		(3)				493.00
	4/6	4/8	Jordan		588.80		(3)				588.80
	4/8	4/9	Ireland		243.59		(3)				243.59
Jennafer Spealman	4/3	4/5	Turkey		759.00		(3)				759.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	4/5	4/6	Israel		493.00		(³)				493.00
	4/6	4/8	Jordan		588.80		(³)				588.80
	4/8	4/9	Ireland		243.59		(³)				243.59
Control Room	4/2	4/5	Turkey						1,027.32		1,027.32
Control Room	4/5	4/6	Israel						340.00		340.00
Parking Fees	4/3	4/9					105.00				105.00
Committee total					4,168.78		105.00		1,367.32		5,641.10

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. PAUL RYAN, Chairman, July 27, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Kline	5/20	5/21	Republic of Korea		338.90		(³)				338.90
Hon. Virginia Foxx	5/20	5/21	Republic of Korea		338.90		(³)				338.90
Hon. David "Phil" Roe	5/20	5/21	Republic of Korea		338.90		(³)				338.90
Hon. Tim Walberg	5/20	5/21	Republic of Korea		338.90		(³)				338.90
Elizabeth Barrett Karr	5/20	5/21	Republic of Korea		338.90		(³)				338.90
Angelyn Shapiro	5/20	5/21	Republic of Korea		338.90		(³)				338.90
Casey Buboltz	5/20	5/21	Republic of Korea		338.90		(³)				338.90
Delegation expenses	5/20	5/21	Republic of Korea						5,800.76		5,800.76
Hon. John Kline	5/21	5/24	People's Republic of China		1,115.89		(³)				1,115.89
Hon. Virginia Foxx	5/21	5/24	People's Republic of China		1,115.89		(³)				1,115.89
Hon. David "Phil" Roe	5/21	5/24	People's Republic of China		1,115.90		(³)				1,115.89
Hon. Tim Walberg	5/21	5/24	People's Republic of China		1,115.90		(³)				1,115.89
Elizabeth Barrett Karr	5/21	5/24	People's Republic of China		1,115.90		(³)				1,115.89
Angelyn Shapiro	5/21	5/24	People's Republic of China		1,115.90		(³)				1,115.89
Casey Buboltz	5/21	5/24	People's Republic of China		1,115.89		(³)				1,115.89
Delegation expenses	5/21	5/24	People's Republic of China						7,137.92		7,137.92
Hon. John Kline	5/24	5/26	India		582.63		(³)				582.63
Hon. Virginia Foxx	5/24	5/26	India		582.63		(³)				582.63
Hon. David "Phil" Roe	5/24	5/26	India		582.63		(³)				582.63
Hon. Tim Walberg	5/24	5/26	India		582.63		(³)				582.63
Elizabeth Barrett Karr	5/24	5/26	India		582.63		(³)				582.63
Angelyn Shapiro	5/24	5/26	India		582.63		(³)				582.63
Casey Buboltz	5/24	5/26	India		582.63		(³)				582.63
Delegation expenses	5/24	5/26	India						5,387.97		5,387.97
Hon. John Kline	5/26	5/27	Germany		291.00		(³)				291.00
Hon. Virginia Foxx	5/26	5/27	Germany		291.00		(³)				291.00
Hon. David "Phil" Roe	5/26	5/27	Germany		291.00		(³)				291.00
Hon. Tim Walberg	5/26	5/27	Germany		291.00		(³)				291.00
Elizabeth Barrett Karr	5/26	5/27	Germany		291.00		(³)				291.00
Angelyn Shapiro	5/26	5/27	Germany		291.00		(³)				291.00
Casey Buboltz	5/26	5/27	Germany		291.00		(³)				291.00
Committee total					16,298.94				18,326.65		34,625.59

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military or transportation.

HON. JOHN KLINE, Chairman, July 27, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mary Bono Mack	4/13	4/15	Colombia		214.00		(³)				214.00
Hon. Michael Burgess	4/20	4/20	United Arab Emirates		143.00		10,779.00				19,922.00
Hon. Phil Gingrey	6/9	6/10	Denmark		340.00		(³)				340.00
	6/10	6/13	England		360.00		(³)				360.00
	6/13	6/13	Scotland		290.00		(³)				290.00
	6/13	6/16	France		492.00		(³)				492.00
	6/16	6/17	Romania		250.00		(³)				250.00
Committee total					2,089.00		10,779.00				21,868.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. FRED UPTON, Chairman, Aug. 3, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Andre Carson	4/3	4/5	Turkey		1,097.61		(³)				1,097.61
	4/5	4/6	Israel		498.00		(³)				498.00
	4/6	4/8	Jordan		588.00		(³)				588.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	4/1	4/5	Saudi Arabia		1,857.58		16,813.20				18,670.78

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Stevan Pearce	4/9	4/10	Ghana		241.14		(³)				241.14
	4/10	4/13	Tanzania		635.57		(³)				635.57
	4/14	4/15	United Arab Emirates		398.80		(³)				398.80
Hon. Thaddeus McCotter	4/15	4/16	Germany		175.06		(³)				175.06
	4/20	4/22	Taiwan		582.69		(³)				582.69
	4/22	4/25	South Korea		1,013.00		(³)				1,013.00
Hon. Donald Manzullo	6/9	6/11	Denmark		651.32		(³)				651.32
	6/11	6/12	France		235.68		(³)				235.68
Hon. Bill Huizenga	6/9	6/11	Denmark		828.00		(³)				828.00
	6/11	6/12	France		324.00		(³)				324.00
Committee total					10,722.14			16,813.20			27,535.34

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. SPENCER BACHUS, Chairman, July 31, 2012.7

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Karen Bass	5/26	5/29	Uganda		928.68		8,851.90				9,780.58
Eric Williams	5/26	5/29	Uganda		851.95		1,934.60				2,786.55
	5/29	6/1	Kenya		964.13		(³)				964.13
Gregory Simpkins	6/1	6/2	Tanzania		195.84		(³)				195.84
	6/2	6/3	Egypt		174.05		(³)				174.05
	3/31	4/4	Nigeria		1,483.96		12,094.76				13,578.72
Algene Sajery	3/31	4/4	Nigeria		1,615.00		9,970.80				11,585.80
Hon. Dan Rohrabacher	4/23	4/24	Qatar		453.00		4,342.10				4,795.10
Paul Berkowitz	4/23	4/24	Qatar		453.00		4,342.10				4,795.10
Hon. Steve Chabot	5/19	5/20	India		237.00		12,487.00		633.18		13,357.18
	5/20	5/22	Laos		293.00		81.31				374.31
Kevin Fitzpatrick	5/22	5/23	Burma		158.00						158.00
	5/24	5/25	Yemen		49.00						49.00
	5/19	5/20	India		241.00		12,487.00				12,728.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	5/20	5/22	Laos		288.00						288.00
	5/22	5/23	Burma		158.00						158.00
Sheri Rickett	5/24	5/25	Yemen		29.00						29.00
	6/10	6/16	Bolivia		801.89		9,838.17				10,640.06
Priscilla Koepke	6/10	6/16	Bolivia		764.44		9,838.17				10,602.61
Dennis Halpin	6/10	6/14	Thailand		728.85		8,825.20		253.31		9,807.36
	6/14	6/16	Cambodia		491.65				160.36		652.01
Lisa Williams	6/10	6/14	Thailand		737.00		7,499.50				8,236.50
	6/14	6/16	Cambodia		468.00		5,398.70				5,866.70
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	6/10	6/14	Thailand		847.00		7,534.50				8,381.50
	6/14	6/16	Cambodia		513.00		5,398.70				5,911.70
Hon. Jean Schmidt	5/20	5/22	Taiwan		545.08		(³)		8,926.08		9,471.16
	5/20	5/25	South Korea		1,023.10		(³)		2,678.30		3,701.40
Hon. Dan Burton	5/20	5/22	Taiwan		545.07		(³)				545.07
	5/20	5/25	South Korea		1,023.10		(³)				1,023.10
Dennis Halpin	5/20	5/22	Taiwan		545.07		(³)				545.07
	5/20	5/25	South Korea		1,023.10		(³)				1,023.10
Jay Henderson	5/20	5/22	Taiwan		545.07		(³)				545.07
	5/20	5/25	South Korea		1,023.10		(³)				1,023.10
Brad Goehner	5/20	5/22	Taiwan		545.07		(³)				545.07
	5/20	5/25	South Korea		1,023.10		(³)				1,023.10
Janelle Perez	5/20	5/22	Taiwan		545.07		(³)				545.07
	5/20	5/25	South Korea		1,023.10		(³)				1,023.10
Andrew Lee	5/20	5/22	Taiwan		545.07		(³)				545.07
	5/20	5/25	South Korea		1,023.10		(³)				1,023.10
Hon. Connie Mack	4/13	4/15	Colombia		1,127.37		(³)				1,127.37
Hon. Jeff Duncan	4/13	4/15	Colombia		1,127.37		(³)				1,127.37
Hon. David Rivera	4/13	4/15	Colombia		1,127.37		(³)				1,127.37
Hon. Albio Sires	4/13	4/15	Colombia		1,127.37		(³)				1,127.37
Eddy Acevedo	4/13	4/15	Colombia		1,127.37		(³)				1,127.37
Peter Quilter	4/13	4/15	Colombia		1,127.37		(³)				1,127.37
Jason Steinbaum	4/13	4/15	Colombia		1,127.37		(³)				1,127.37
Hubbell Knapp	4/13	4/15	Colombia		1,127.37		(³)				1,127.37
Kristin Jackson	4/13	4/15	Colombia		1,127.37		(³)				1,127.37
Hon. Tom Marino	6/9	6/10	Azerbaijan		323.00		(³)				323.00
Hon. Karen Bass	6/10	6/11	Afghanistan		6.00		(³)				6.00
	6/11	6/13	Pakistan		572.00		(³)				572.00
Hon. Renee Ellmers	6/13	6/14	Bahrain		74.00		(³)				74.00
	6/14	6/15	Yemen		176.62		(³)				176.62
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	6/15	6/16	Egypt		216.05		(³)				216.05
	4/10	4/14	Guatemala		979.08		914.50				1,893.58
Paul Berkowitz	5/18	5/20	Belgium		112.00		(³)				112.00
	5/20	5/21	Afghanistan		11.00		(³)				11.00
Greg McCarthy	5/21	5/22	Bahrain		365.19		(³)				365.19
	5/22	5/23	Ireland		111.00		(³)				111.00
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	4/20	4/23	United Arab Emirates		1,485.00		1,284.70				2,769.70
	4/20	4/21	United Arab Emirates		480.00		1,284.70				1,764.70
Paul Berkowitz	4/21	4/22	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
	4/22	4/23	United Arab Emirates		645.00		(³)				645.00
Greg McCarthy	5/4	5/5	Belgium		348.05		3,995.90				4,343.95
	5/5	5/6	Jordan		310.00		(³)				310.00
Hon. Karen Bass	5/6	5/8	Iraq								
	5/8	5/9	Kuwait								
Committee total					43,026.67		128,404.31		30,148.23		201,579.21

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Chairman, July 31, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee	4/14	4/15	Colombia		530.09		4 898.1				1,428.19
Hon. Henry Cuellar	4/13	4/15	Colombia		999.50		(3)				995.00
Per diem returned					(63.47)						(63.47)
Hon. Mike Rogers	3/31	4/2	China		750.86		12,518.50				13,269.36
	4/2	4/3	Korea		393.05						393.05
	4/3	4/6	Japan		1,360.40						1,360.40
Per diem returned					(75.00)						(75.00)
Hon. Billy Long	3/31	4/2	China		750.86		12,449.50				13,200.36
	4/2	4/3	Korea		393.05						393.05
	4/3	4/6	Japan		1,360.40						1,360.40
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee	4/2	4/3	Korea		393.05		12,262.90				12,655.95
	4/3	4/5	Japan		882.25						882.25
Mike Russell	3/31	4/2	China		750.86		7,252.70				8,003.56
	4/2	4/3	Korea		393.05						393.05
	4/3	4/6	Japan		1,360.40						1,360.40
Per diem returned					(135.00)						(135.00)
Amanda Parikh	3/31	4/2	China		750.86		13,553.50				14,304.36
	4/2	4/3	Korea		393.05						393.05
	4/3	4/6	Japan		1,360.40						1,360.40
Per diem returned					(50.00)						(50.00)
Marisela Salayandia	3/31	4/2	China		750.86		13,295.50				14,046.36
	4/2	4/3	Korea		393.05						393.05
	4/3	4/6	Japan		1,360.40						1,360.40
Control room (CODEL Rogers)	3/31	4/1	China					509.13			509.13
Telephone charges	4/1	4/1	China					79.05			79.05
Hon. Patrick Meehan	4/3	4/5	Turkey		729.00		(3)				729.00
	4/5	4/6	Israel		493.00						493.00
	4/6	4/8	Jordan		310.00						310.00
	4/8	4/9	Ireland		297.00						297.00
Kevin Gundersen	4/3	4/5	Turkey		729.00		(3)				729.00
	4/5	4/6	Israel		493.00						493.00
	4/6	4/8	Jordan		310.00						310.00
	4/8	4/9	Ireland		297.00						297.00
Per diem returned					(92.00)						(92.00)
Committee total					17,102.85		71,332.60				89,023.63

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

⁴ Returned military air transportation.

HON. PETER T. KING, Chairman, July 18, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Thomas Alexander	5/4	5/5	Belgium		542.10						542.10
	5/5	5/6	Jordan		275.00						275.00
	5/6	5/8	Iraq								
	5/8	5/9	Kuwait								
Commercial airfare							3,597.50				3,597.50
James Lewis	5/4	5/5	Belgium		527.98						527.98
	5/5	5/6	Jordan		287.56						287.56
	5/6	5/8	Iraq								
	5/8	5/9	Kuwait								
Commercial airfare							3,597.50				3,597.50
Carlos Uriarte	5/4	5/5	Belgium		542.10						542.10
	5/5	5/6	Jordan		289.50						289.50
	5/6	5/8	Iraq								
	5/8	5/9	Kuwait								
Commercial airfare							3,597.50				3,597.50
Hon. Todd Platts	6/9	6/10	Azerbaijan		323.00						323.00
	6/10	6/11	Afghanistan		16.00						16.00
	6/11	6/13	Pakistan		56.50						56.50
	6/13	6/14	Bahrain		202.37						202.37
	6/14	6/15	Yemen		266.05						266.05
	6/15	6/16	Egypt								
Delegation expenses			Pakistan						1,045.25		1,045.25
Delegation expenses			Egypt						2,396.10		2,396.10
Delegation expenses			Bahrain						293.91		293.91
Hon. Stephen Lynch	6/9	6/10	Azerbaijan		373.00						373.00
	6/10	6/11	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	6/11	6/13	Pakistan		622.00						622.00
	6/13	6/14	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
	6/14	6/15	Yemen		226.62						226.62
	6/15	6/16	Egypt		266.05						266.05
Ashok Pinto	6/9	6/10	Azerbaijan		334.19						334.19
	6/10	6/11	Afghanistan		11.00						11.00
	6/11	6/13	Pakistan		537.43						537.43
	6/13	6/14	Bahrain		109.00						109.00
	6/14	6/15	Yemen		169.62						169.62
	6/15	6/16	Egypt		256.05						256.05
Tyler Grimm	6/9	6/10	Azerbaijan		310.00						310.00
	6/10	6/11	Afghanistan		37.47						37.47
	6/11	6/13	Pakistan		526.00						526.00
	6/13	6/14	Bahrain		114.00						114.00
	6/14	6/15	Yemen		204.62						204.62
	6/15	6/16	Egypt		231.39						231.39
Bruce Fernandez	6/9	6/10	Azerbaijan		347.00						347.00
	6/10	6/11	Afghanistan								
	6/11	6/13	Pakistan		572.00						572.00
	6/13	6/14	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
	6/14	6/15	Yemen		226.62						226.62
	6/15	6/16	Egypt		243.05						243.05
Committee total											24,263.03

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA, Chairman, Aug. 13, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Donna Edwards	5/19	5/20	Belgium		112.00		(³)		55.88		167.88
	5/20	5/21	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
	5/21	5/22	Bahrain		365.19		(³)		69.09		434.28
	5/22	5/23	Ireland		111.00		(³)		33.27		144.27
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	6/29	6/30	Latvia		258.00		(³)				258.00
	7/1	7/3	Kazakhstan		730.00		(³)				730.00
	7/3	7/5	Kyrgyz Republic		622.00		(³)				622.00
	7/5	7/6	Tajikistan		325.00		(³)				325.00
	7/6	7/7	Uzbekistan		279.00		(³)				279.00
	7/7	7/8	Spain		399.00		(³)				399.00
Committee total					3,229.19				158.24		3,387.43

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. RALPH M. HALL, Chairman, Aug. 2, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SAM GRAVES, Chairman, July 31, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Randy Hultgren	4/3	4/4	Turkey		329.00		(³)				329.00
	4/4	4/5	Turkey		430.00		(³)				430.00
	4/5	4/6	Israel		493.00		(³)				493.00
	4/6	4/8	Jordan		310.00		(³)				310.00
	4/8	4/9	Ireland		297.00		(³)				297.00
Committee total					1,859.00						1,859.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. JOHN L. MICA, Chairman, July 30, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jeff Denham	6/30	7/2	Slovakia		992.00				1,714.85		2,706.85
Committee total					992.00				1,714.85		2,706.85

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JEFF MILLER, Chairman, Aug. 10, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Kathryn Wheelbarger	4/09	4/19	Asia		1,805.46						1,805.46
Commercial aircraft									16,203.00		18,008.46
Ashley Lowry	4/09	4/19	Asia		1,805.46						1,805.46
Commercial aircraft									16,203.00		18,008.46
Carly Scott	4/09	4/19	Asia		1,805.46						1,805.46
Commercial aircraft									16,203.00		18,008.46
Hon. Mac Thornberry	4/10	4/12	SE Asia		566.00						566.00
	4/12	4/14	SE Asia		628.00						628.00
	4/14	4/15	SE Asia		437.00						437.00
Commercial aircraft									11,643.20		13,274.20
Hon. Devin Nunes	4/10	4/12	SE Asia		566.00						566.00
	4/12	4/14	SE Asia		628.00						628.00
	4/14	4/15	SE Asia		437.00						437.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial aircraft							12,520.60				14,151.60
Geof Kahn	4/10	4/12	SE Asia		565.00						
	4/12	4/14	SE Asia		628.00						
	4/14	4/15	SE Asia		437.00						
Commercial aircraft							11,643.20				13,274.20
Amanda Rogers Thorpe	4/10	4/12	SE Asia		565.00						
	4/12	4/14	SE Asia		628.00						
	4/14	4/15	SE Asia		437.00						
Commercial aircraft							11,643.20				13,274.20
Hon. Mike Rogers	4/29	4/30	Asia/Middle East		155.00						
	4/30	5/02	Asia/Middle East								
Commercial aircraft							14,457.62				14,613.62
Hon. Dutch Ruppersberger	4/29	4/30	Asia/Middle East		155.00						
	4/30	5/02	Asia/Middle East								
Commercial aircraft							14,457.62				14,613.62
Michael Allen	4/29	4/30	Asia/Middle East		155.00						
	4/30	5/2	Asia/Middle East								
Commercial aircraft							14,457.62				14,613.62
Mike Shank	4/29	4/30	Asia/Middle East		155.00						
	4/30	5/2	Asia/Middle East								
Commercial aircraft							14,457.62				14,613.62
Hon. Devin Nunes	5/20	5/21	Asia		470.50						
	5/21	5/22	Asia		573.45						
Commercial aircraft							12,292.80				
George Pappas	5/20	5/21	Asia		470.50						
	5/21	5/22	Asia		573.45						
Commercial aircraft							12,292.80				13,336.75
Hon. Michele Bachmann	5/20	5/22	Asia		416.97						
	5/22	5/24	Asia		1,054.38						
	5/24	5/25	Asia		368.01						
Commercial aircraft							17,108.70				18,948.06
Hon. Devin Nunes	5/22	5/24	Asia		1,054.38						
	5/24	5/25	Asia		368.01						
Commercial aircraft							12,144.10				13,566.49
Hon. Dutch Ruppersberger	5/20	5/22	Asia		416.97						
	5/22	5/24	Asia		1,054.38						
	5/24	5/25	Asia		368.01						
Commercial aircraft							11,930.90				13,770.26
Hon. Adam Schiff	5/20	5/22	Asia		416.97						
	5/22	5/24	Asia		1,054.38						
	5/24	5/25	Asia		368.01						
Commercial aircraft							15,399.90				17,239.26
Darren Dick	5/20	5/22	Asia		416.97						
	5/22	5/24	Asia		1,054.38						
	5/24	5/25	Asia		368.01						
Commercial aircraft							14,006.70				15,846.06
Susan Phalen	5/20	5/22	Asia		416.97						
	5/22	5/24	Asia		1,054.38						
	5/24	5/25	Asia		368.01						
Commercial aircraft							14,006.70				15,846.06
Robert Minehart	5/20	5/22	Asia		416.97						
	5/22	5/24	Asia		1,054.38						
	5/24	5/25	Asia		368.01						
Commercial aircraft							11,930.00				13,769.36
Chelsey Campbell	6/10	6/11	Central America		83.00						
	6/11	6/13	Central America		398.00						
Commercial aircraft											481.00
Sarah Geffroy	6/10	6/11	Central America		83.00						
	6/11	6/13	Central America		398.00						
Commercial aircraft											481.00
Alonzo Robertson	6/10	6/11	Central America		83.00						
	6/11	6/13	Central America		398.00						
Commercial aircraft											481.00
Hon. Jeff Miller	6/10	6/11	SE Asia		208.00						
	6/11	6/14	SE Asia		628.29						
	6/14	6/17	SE Asia		553.89						
Commercial aircraft							14,978.60				16,368.78
George Pappas	6/10	6/11	SE Asia		208.00						
	6/11	6/14	SE Asia		628.29						
	6/14	6/17	SE Asia		920.31						
Commercial aircraft							14,978.60				16,735.20
Linda Cohen	6/10	6/11	SE Asia		208.00						
	6/11	6/14	SE Asia		628.29						
	6/14	6/17	SE Asia		920.31						
Commercial aircraft							14,978.60				16,735.20
Committee total											340,058.54

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MIKE ROGERS, Chairman, July 31, 2012.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7635. A letter from the Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Water and Waste Disposal Loans and Grants (RIN: 0572-AC26) received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7636. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting The Fiscal Year 2011 Inventory of Contracts for Services for the Military Departments, Defense Agencies, and Department of Defense Field Activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7637. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Inflation Adjustment of Threshold for Acquisition of Right-Hand Drive Passenger Sedans (DFARS Case 2012-D016) (RIN: 0750-AH65) received Au-

gust 24, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7638. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0003] received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7639. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0003] [Internal Agency Docket

No.: FEMA-8241] received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7640. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0003] received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7641. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development [Docket No.: FR-5542-F-02] (RIN: 2501-AD55) received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7642. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority; National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program—Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (RRTCs) on Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) and Developing Strategies to Meet Employer Needs in Changing Economic Environments [CDFA Number: 84.133B-1] received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7643. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority; Technical Assistance on State Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting — National IDEA Technical Assistance Center on Early Childhood Longitudinal Data Systems [CDFA Number: 84.373Z] received August 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7644. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority; Technical Assistance on State Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting — National IDEA Technical Assistance Center on Early Childhood Longitudinal Data Systems [CDFA Number: 84.373Z] received August 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7645. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities and Definitions; State Personnel Development Grants received August 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7646. A letter from the Director, Directorate of Construction, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cranes and Derricks in Construction: Demolition and Underground Construction [Docket: ID-OSHA-2007-0066] (RIN: 1218-AC61) received August 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7647. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Westfield, New York) [MB Docket No.: 12-51] (RM-11647) received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7648. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory

Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — NRC Regulatory Issue Summary 2012-09 Endorsement of Nuclear Energy Institute Guidance for Using an Alternative Method to Manage Cumulative Fatigue at Nuclear Power Reactor Sites received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7649. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting copy of the report entitled "District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals through the 3rd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2012", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7650. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting in accordance with Pub. L. 105-270, the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (FAIR Act), the Administration's inventory of commercial activities until June 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7651. A letter from the Chairman, National Capitol Planning Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2011 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7652. A letter from the Chair, Cost Accounting Standards Board (Acting Administrator, OFPP), Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's final rule — Cost Accounting Standards: Cost Accounting Standards 412 and 413 — Cost Accounting Standards Pension Harmonization Rule received August 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7653. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for *Ipomopsis polyantha* (Pagosa skyrocket), *Penstemon debilis* (Parachute beardtongue), and *Phacelia submutica* (DeBeque phacelia) [Docket No.: FWS-R6-ES-2011-0040] (RIN: 1018-AX75) received August 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7654. A letter from the Branch Chief, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for 23 Species on Oahu and Designation of Critical Habitat for 124 Species [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2010-0043] (RIN: 1018-AV49) received August 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7655. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the 2011 Report of Statistics Required by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7656. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Patent Term Adjustment Provisions Relating to Appellate Review [Docket No.: PTO-P-2011-0058] (RIN: 0651-AC63) received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7657. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Implement Miscellaneous Post Patent Provisions of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act [Docket No.: PTO-P-2011-0072] (RIN: 0651-AC66) received August 20, 2012,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7658. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report on stalking for 2010; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7659. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the fourth annual report of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7660. A letter from the Under Secretary and Director, Patent and Trademark Office, transmitting the Office's final rule — International Trademark Classification Changes [Docket No.: PTO-T-20123-0027] (RIN: 0651-AC80) received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7661. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Belle Pass Dredge Operations, Belle Pass, Mile Marker 1.0 to Mile Marker (-0.2), Port Fourchon, Lafourche Parish, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0392] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7662. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Kemah Boardwalk Summer Season Fireworks, Galveston Bay, Kemah, TX [Docket Number: USCG-2012-0240] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7663. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Catawba Island Club Fire Works Catawba Island Club, Port Clinton, OH; Pacing for Recovery, Lake Erie, Sterling State Park, Monroe, MI; Put-In-Bay Fireworks, Fox's the Dock Pier, South Bass Island, Put-In-Bay, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0374] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7664. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety and Security Zones; OPSAIL 2012 Connecticut, Thames River, New London, CT [Docket Number: USCG-2011-1029] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received August 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7665. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — OPSAIL 2012 Virginia, Port of Hampton Roads, VA [Docket Number: USCG-2012-0174] (RIN: 1625-AA00, AA08, AA11) received August 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7666. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; City of Ogdensburg Fireworks, St. Lawrence River, Ogdensburg, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0608] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7667. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Village of Sackets Harbor, Lake Ontario, Sackets Harbor, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0460] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7668. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bay Village Independence Day Fireworks, Lake Erie, Bay Village, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0553] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7669. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Conneaut 4th of July Festival, Lake Erie, Conneaut, OH [Docket Number: USCG-2012-0480] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7670. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; A Salute to our Heroes Fireworks, Hamlin Beach State Park, Hamlin, NY [Docket Number: USCG-2012-0354] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7671. A letter from the Chairman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection With Licensing and Related Services — 2010 Update [Docket No.: EP 542 (Sub-No. 20)] received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7672. A letter from the NASA Chief Scientist, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Research Misconduct [Docket No.: NASA-0031] (RIN: 2700-AD84) received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

7673. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2012-53] received August 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7674. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2011 annual report on the operation of the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative and the Tropical Forest Conservation Act; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of the rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 6083. A bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-669. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3409. A bill to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations before December 31, 2013, under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (Rept. 112-670). 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. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY):

H.R. 6388. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 6389. A bill to replace automatic spending cuts with targeted reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, House Administration, Natural Resources, Rules, Appropriations, Agriculture, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. WATT):

H.R. 6390. A bill to establish a grant program to enhance existing secondary education programs for the purpose of teaching high school students about the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the individual States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 6391. A bill to terminate the designation of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan as a major non-NATO ally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 6392. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate covered part D drug prices, 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 Mr. BARBER (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 6393. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to consider the best interest of the veteran when determining whether the veteran should receive certain contracted health care, to amend the Wounded Warrior Act to improve access to certain medical care for former members of the Armed Forces with severe injuries or illnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' 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. POLIS (for himself, Mr. HINO-JOSA, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 6394. A bill to facilitate affordable workforce homeownership in, and develop the full-time resident communities of, high tourism areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. BACA:

H.R. 6395. A bill to provide homeowners with additional protections and safeguards

against foreclosure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 6396. A bill to establish a grant program to test and mitigate radon levels in public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 6397. A bill to prohibit Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac from purchasing, the FHA from insuring, and the Department of Veterans Affairs from guaranteeing, making, or insuring, a mortgage that is secured by a residence or residential structure located in a county in which the State has used the power of eminent domain to take a residential mortgage; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' 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. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 6398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and extend the credit for nonbusiness energy property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 6399. A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to reauthorize a provision to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 6400. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States for the purpose of assisting the States in operating an RDOCS program in order to provide for the increased availability of primary health care services in health professional shortage areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 6401. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to carry out a pilot program on providing veterans with access at One-Stop Centers to Internet websites to facilitate online job searches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 6402. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to 10 States for demonstration projects for the expansion of State registries on childhood immunization or health to include data on body mass index (BMI), collected and submitted to the State by health care providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6403. A bill to provide for grants in lieu of expensing under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for energy efficient commercial buildings placed in service by manufacturers; 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. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 6404. A bill to make available funds from the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 for funding pension benefits with respect to former employees of Delphi Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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 Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 6405. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide grants for the revitalization of waterfront brownfields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 6406. A bill to expand whistleblower protections to non-Federal employees whose disclosures involve misuse of Federal funds; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, 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. TIERNEY (for himself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 6407. A bill to ensure that students and taxpayers receive the full value of their education investments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALSH of Illinois:

H.R. 6408. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require each individual who desires to vote in an election for Federal office to provide the appropriate election official with a government-issued photo identification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 6409. A bill to streamline the administration of whistleblower protections for private sector employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. RUSH):

H.J. Res. 119. A joint resolution expressing support for designation of September 2012 as "Gospel Music Heritage Month" and honoring gospel music for its valuable and long-standing contributions to the culture of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.J. Res. 120. A 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.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 781. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of October 2012 as National Principals Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOSWELL (for himself and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H. Res. 782. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Suicide Prevention and Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H. Res. 783. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the attacks on United States diplomats in Libya and Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. SCHMIDT (for herself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. HALL):

H. Res. 784. A resolution celebrating the life and achievements of Neil A. Armstrong, a United States patriot who humbly and selflessly served his country, State, and community as a naval aviator, test pilot, astronaut, aeronautical engineer, university professor, and businessman; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

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. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 6388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 6389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Preamble of the Constitution identifies "providing for the common defense" as one of the core responsibilities of the federal government. Additionally, Article 1 Section 8 clauses 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16 make clear national defense was a priority for the founders as they drafted the Constitution. Furthermore, this legislation restores a proper balance of power between the federal government and state governments as the 10th Amendment intended.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 6390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 6391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 6392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 6393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 6394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 6395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 6396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 6397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 6398.

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. HEINRICH:

H.R. 6399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 6400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 6401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 6402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress, authority regarding Defence [sic] and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 6404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 6405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 1

Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 18

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 6406.

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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 6407.

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.

By Mr. WALSH of Illinois:

H.R. 6408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1: The Times, Places, and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed by each state by the legislature

thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 6409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced under the powers granted to Congress under Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 119.

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 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government's ability to accept the original Smithsonian donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate one of the earlier enumerated powers, such as the authority granted in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 referred to above.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 100: Mr. YODER.
 H.R. 191: Mr. REYES.
 H.R. 327: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 382: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 414: Mr. SARBANES.
 H.R. 456: Mr. BARBER.
 H.R. 458: Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 733: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. BARBER.
 H.R. 860: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. BARBER.
 H.R. 890: Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 998: Mr. BARBER.
 H.R. 1054: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 1084: Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 1137: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1206: Mr. TURNER of Ohio and Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 1236: Mr. SHULER.
 H.R. 1265: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
 H.R. 1370: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
 H.R. 1404: Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 1416: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 1479: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 1485: Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 1513: Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 1653: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1895: Ms. EDWARDS.
 H.R. 1910: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 1946: Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 1984: Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 2077: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2082: Mr. REED.
 H.R. 2088: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2353: Mr. HARRIS.
 H.R. 2492: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BACA, Ms. BASS of California, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
 H.R. 2505: Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 2524: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 2530: Mr. CRITZ.
 H.R. 2547: Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 2672: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 2730: Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 2953: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 3097: Mr. HERGER and Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 3098: Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 3125: Mr. MCKEON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 3144: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 3238: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. HANABUSA.
 H.R. 3269: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 3423: Mr. PITTS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 3485: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. BARBER.
 H.R. 3511: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
 H.R. 3612: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 3665: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 3773: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H.R. 3783: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 3790: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 3842: Mr. YODER.
 H.R. 4007: Ms. BUERKLE.
 H.R. 4066: Mr. DOLD, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 4120: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 4165: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 4183: Mr. SHULER.
 H.R. 4250: Mr. COBLE and Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 4296: Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 4378: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BLACK.
 H.R. 4405: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 4965: Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4972: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 5741: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H.R. 5745: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 5747: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 5817: Mr. OWENS and Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 5840: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H.R. 5879: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 5909: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 5925: Mr. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 5942: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 5943: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCHILLING, and Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 5977: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 5979: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
 H.R. 6107: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 6118: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 6139: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 6150: Ms. WATERS, Mr. STARK, and Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 6155: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 6163: Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 6170: Mr. KING of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 6218: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 6220: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 6278: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 6292: Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 6307: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 6310: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 6320: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 6325: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 6331: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FARR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 6349: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H.J. Res. 92: Mr. SARBANES.
 H.J. Res. 118: Mr. HERGER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. MICA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
 H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. REED and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HARPER, and Ms. SUTTON.
 H. Res. 134: Mr. POSEY and Mr. GARDNER.
 H. Res. 564: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H. Res. 705: Mr. HULTGREN.
 H. Res. 772: Ms. FOXF.
 H. Res. 777: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. Res. 177: Mr. HULTGREN.