



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2012

No. 22

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
February 9, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### PRAYER

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

We thank You once again that we, Your creatures, can come before You and ask guidance for the men and women of this assembly.

Send Your spirit of wisdom as they enter into a long weekend for constituent visits. May their ears and hearts be open to listen to the hopes and needs of those whom they represent.

Please keep all the Members of this Congress and all who work for the people's House in good health, that they might faithfully fulfill the great responsibility given them by the people of this great Nation.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done here this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LANKFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

### CALLING ON CONFERENCE COMMITTEE TO ACT ON TAX RATE

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam Speaker, with less than 3 weeks to go before the payroll Social Security tax extension expires, it is time for the conference committee to make up their mind on the way forward and to bring their proposal to the full House and Senate. Long secret negotiations are unjustified.

The House passed a full-year extension of the payroll tax deduction, major reforms to the unemployment insurance, and a 2-year extension to the Medicare doc fix 8 weeks ago. Since that time, nothing has been done in the daylight to resolve this issue. Our delay will cause companies all over the country to work overtime this month to revise their payroll formula. We should help the people who create the jobs around the country, not give them even more consternation.

Chad Richison, the CEO of Paycom, wrote a terrific op-ed in *The Hill* this week. He doesn't care which tax rate we set, but he's truly frustrated when we delay our decisions and then dump all the last-minute work on them and thousands of other companies around the country.

If we expect American companies to pay their taxes on time, we should get the tax rate done on time.

### STOCK ACT

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

Ms. HOCHUL. Madam Speaker, just a minute ago we heard our chaplain beseech us to be open to the hearts and minds of the people we represent. That is exactly why, today, we need to pass the STOCK Act to stop insider trading on congressional knowledge. This has waited too long, Madam Speaker.

My colleague from upstate New York, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, has led the charge for this for 6 years. It is now time for us to take action—and not a watered-down version. We need to stop the insidious practice of insider trading, giving Members of this body an unfair advantage over Americans who sent us here to represent them. This practice must stop.

I'm calling on all of my colleagues and calling on the leadership to give us a bill we can support, put an end to this insidious practice, and let us begin the long process of restoring the faith of the American people in this institution.

### CONGRATULATING GLENBROOK SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

☐ 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.

H643

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, this school year marks the 50th anniversary for Glenbrook South High School in Glenview, Illinois. I want to congratulate Glenbrook South on this impressive achievement.

Over the past five decades, over 27,000 students have graduated and are now proud alums. Glenbrook South has a rich tradition of preparing students to be future leaders, including two of my team members here in Washington, D.C.

Glenbrook South has received many accolades over the years, and that is due in large part to the dynamic teachers, the families who support the school, and the talented students who work hard to excel in academics, sports, music, debate, and more.

I have had the privilege of visiting with the students at Glenbrook South and talking with them about how their government works. I am deeply impressed with the students' insights and their desire to get involved and make the world a better place.

Congratulations to Glenbrook South High School on your achievement. I know there will be many more to come.

And that's just the way it is.

#### STOCK ACT

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge our colleagues to support the STOCK Act when it comes up later today.

The STOCK Act is the Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act. It essentially bans Members of Congress from using their position and information that is not available to the general public for their own personal gain, such as purchasing stocks based upon information we learn from a briefing here on Capitol Hill.

Public office is a public trust, and rules that apply to our neighbors and Americans all across the country should equally apply to Members of Congress.

I'd like to congratulate my colleagues, Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER from New York and Congressman TIM WALZ from Minnesota, who have worked on this legislation year in and year out.

Colleagues, we should all vote in favor of the STOCK Act.

#### BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING TRANSPARENCY ACT

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the House for passing the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act earlier this week. This much-needed reform will increase transparency and accuracy in budgeting for Federal credit programs like

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. In addition, this reform will require fair value accounting for Federal programs that make direct loans or loan guarantees.

Earlier this year with the Solyndra debacle, we found out that when Washington makes a bet the American taxpayer is often left with the bill. The Federal Government should consider fair value and market risk before betting on companies like Solyndra.

Since the financial crisis began, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have become the financial responsibility of the Federal Government. However, the Office of Management and Budget has not accounted for the Fannie and Freddie burden. This bill will fix that mistake.

If we're going to get out of this financial mess, we have to be honest about how much we're really spending. This is a commonsense reform that will help lawmakers be better stewards of our hardworking constituents' tax dollars.

#### EXTEND PAYROLL TAX CUT

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today because I believe this Congress needs to stop playing blame games and start working together to reignite the American Dream by helping our Nation's small businesses and entrepreneurs and empowering a thriving middle class.

Small businesses are the pulse of the American enterprise and the creators of jobs and economic growth up and down Main Streets across the United States of America. Entrepreneurs are the dreamers, movers, shakers, and builders that help take ideas and inventions and turn them into the manufacturing jobs of the future.

And a thriving middle class, well, that's the underpinning of support to make reigniting the American Dream even possible. A strong middle class leads to a strong America. The best functioning democracies around the world share one thing in common—a thriving middle class.

So, Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to enact policies and legislation that achieve these ends: to reignite the American Dream by building up our small businesses, encouraging our entrepreneurs, and empowering our middle class. We can start by extending the payroll tax cut for the remainder of the year without delay and without games.

I look forward to continuing to work toward these ends throughout the year.

□ 0910

#### AN ASSAULT ON THE FIRST AMENDMENT

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, those who say that conservative opposition

to the Obama administration's rules on forcing religious groups to provide birth control coverage in their insurance plans is an assault on women are wrong and shortsighted. That rule is an assault on all Americans and on the First Amendment of the Constitution.

It reminds me of a famous quote attributed to Pastor Martin Niemöller:

First they came for the Communists, and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a Communist.

Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a trade unionist.

Then they came for the Jews, and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a Jew.

Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn't speak out because I was a Protestant.

Then they came for me, and there was no one left to speak out for me.

Madam Speaker, we have to speak out on this issue. It is an assault on the First Amendment. It's an assault on the rights of all Americans.

#### IT'S TIME TO GET TO WORK

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, Members, when the U.S. economy is showing signs of progress, our House majority's threatening to take 2 percent of the gross national product out of our economy, killing the gains we've made, and doing it on the backs of the people who need help the most, the middle class and the unemployed.

Even though we were able to extend the payroll tax cut, unemployment insurance, and also the Medicare physician payments for just 2 months, millions of Americans dodged an average of \$1,500 from a GOP tax hike. Now it's time to get to work and pass a year-long extension of these three important programs.

We cannot afford to take more risks with the incomes of 160 million Americans the way the House majority did at the end of 2011.

#### SUPPORT THE STOCK ACT

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the STOCK Act, Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act, which strengthens current House rules banning Members of Congress from profiting financially from their position. It is absolutely unacceptable for those in any branch of government—the legislative, the judiciary, or the executive branch—to profit from nonpublic information.

Insider trading is not only unethical; it is illegal no matter who you are. But if it takes a stronger, tougher bill to set the record straight, then so be it. The American people elected us in good faith to lead, and we must do everything in our power to protect that trust.

The bill enhances transparency, something we've continually strived for in this 112th Congress, and I am proud to support the bill. I hope my colleagues will join me in passing this into law.

#### STOP TRADING ON CONGRESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE ACT OF 2012

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2038) to prohibit Members of Congress and employees of Congress from using nonpublic information derived from their official positions for personal benefit, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

S. 2038

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act of 2012" or the "STOCK Act".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **MEMBER OF CONGRESS.**—The term "Member of Congress" means a member of the Senate or House of Representatives, a Delegate to the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

(2) **EMPLOYEE OF CONGRESS.**—The term "employee of Congress" means—

(A) any individual (other than a Member of Congress), whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; and

(B) any other officer or employee of the legislative branch (as defined in section 109(11) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 109(11))).

(3) **EXECUTIVE BRANCH EMPLOYEE.**—The term "executive branch employee"—

(A) has the meaning given the term "employee" under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) includes—

- (i) the President;
- (ii) the Vice President; and
- (iii) an employee of the United States Postal Service or the Postal Regulatory Commission.

(4) **JUDICIAL OFFICER.**—The term "judicial officer" has the meaning given that term under section 109(10) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (U.S.C. App. 109(10)).

(5) **JUDICIAL EMPLOYEE.**—The term "judicial employee" has the meaning given that term in section 109(8) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 109(8)).

(6) **SUPERVISING ETHICS OFFICE.**—The term "supervising ethics office" has the meaning given that term in section 109(18) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 109(18)).

#### SEC. 3. PROHIBITION OF THE USE OF NONPUBLIC INFORMATION FOR PRIVATE PROFIT.

The Select Committee on Ethics of the Senate and the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives shall issue interpretive guidance of the relevant rules of each chamber, including rules on conflicts of interest and gifts, clarifying that a Member of Congress and an employee of Congress may not use nonpublic information derived from such person's position as a Member of Congress or employee of Congress or gained from the performance of such person's official responsibilities as a means for making a private profit.

#### SEC. 4. PROHIBITION OF INSIDER TRADING.

(a) **AFFIRMATION OF NONEXEMPTION.**—Members of Congress and employees of Congress are

not exempt from the insider trading prohibitions arising under the securities laws, including section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5 thereunder.

(b) **DUTY.**—

(1) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the amendment made by this subsection is to affirm a duty arising from a relationship of trust and confidence owed by each Member of Congress and each employee of Congress.

(2) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 21A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) **DUTY OF MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF CONGRESS.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the rule of construction under section 10 of the STOCK Act and solely for purposes of the insider trading prohibitions arising under this Act, including section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, each Member of Congress or employee of Congress owes a duty arising from a relationship of trust and confidence to the Congress, the United States Government, and the citizens of the United States with respect to material, non-public information derived from such person's position as a Member of Congress or employee of Congress or gained from the performance of such person's official responsibilities.

"(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

"(A) the term 'Member of Congress' means a member of the Senate or House of Representatives, a Delegate to the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; and

"(B) the term 'employee of Congress' means—

"(i) any individual (other than a Member of Congress), whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; and

"(ii) any other officer or employee of the legislative branch (as defined in section 109(11) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 109(11))).

"(3) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impair or limit the construction of the existing antifraud provisions of the securities laws or the authority of the Commission under those provisions."

#### SEC. 5. CONFORMING CHANGES TO THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT.

Section 4c(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6c(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting "or any Member of Congress or employee of Congress (as such terms are defined under section 2 of the STOCK Act) or any judicial officer or judicial employee (as such terms are defined, respectively, under section 2 of the STOCK Act)" after "Federal Government" the first place it appears;

(B) by inserting "Member, officer," after "position of the"; and

(C) by inserting "or by Congress or by the judiciary" before "in a manner"; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(i) by inserting "or any Member of Congress or employee of Congress or any judicial officer or judicial employee" after "Federal Government" the first place it appears;

(ii) by inserting "Member, officer," after "position of the"; and

(iii) by inserting "or by Congress or by the judiciary" before "in a manner";

(B) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting "or any Member of Congress or employee of Congress or any judicial officer or judicial employee" after "Federal Government"; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting "or by Congress or by the judiciary"—

(I) before "that may affect"; and

(II) before "in a manner"; and

(ii) in clause (iii), by inserting "to Congress, any Member of Congress, any employee of Congress, any judicial officer, or any judicial employee," after "Federal Government,".

#### SEC. 6. PROMPT REPORTING OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS.

(a) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—Section 103 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 103) is amended by adding at the end the following subsection:

"(1) Not later than 30 days after receiving notification of any transaction required to be reported under section 102(a)(5)(B), but in no case later than 45 days after such transaction, the following persons, if required to file a report under any subsection of section 101, subject to any waivers and exclusions, shall file a report of the transaction:

"(1) The President.

"(2) The Vice President.

"(3) Each officer or employee in the executive branch, including a special Government employee as defined in section 202 of title 18, United States Code, who occupies a position classified above GS-15 of the General Schedule or, in the case of positions not under the General Schedule, for which the rate of basic pay is equal to or greater than 120 percent of the minimum rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule; each member of a uniformed service whose pay grade is at or in excess of O-7 under section 201 of title 37, United States Code; and each officer or employee in any other position determined by the Director of the Office of Government Ethics to be of equal classification.

"(4) Each employee appointed pursuant to section 3105 of title 5, United States Code.

"(5) Any employee not described in paragraph (3) who is in a position in the executive branch which is excepted from the competitive service by reason of being of a confidential or policymaking character, except that the Director of the Office of Government Ethics may, by regulation, exclude from the application of this paragraph any individual, or group of individuals, who are in such positions, but only in cases in which the Director determines such exclusion would not affect adversely the integrity of the Government or the public's confidence in the integrity of the Government;

"(6) The Postmaster General, the Deputy Postmaster General, each Governor of the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service and each officer or employee of the United States Postal Service or Postal Regulatory Commission who occupies a position for which the rate of basic pay is equal to or greater than 120 percent of the minimum rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

"(7) The Director of the Office of Government Ethics and each designated agency ethics official.

"(8) Any civilian employee not described in paragraph (3), employed in the Executive Office of the President (other than a special government employee) who holds a commission of appointment from the President.

"(9) A Member of Congress, as defined under section 109(12).

"(10) An officer or employee of the Congress, as defined under section 109(13)."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to transactions occurring on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 7. REPORT ON POLITICAL INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

(a) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Congressional Research Service, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on the

Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the role of political intelligence in the financial markets.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by this section shall include a discussion of—

(A) what is known about the prevalence of the sale of political intelligence and the extent to which investors rely on such information;

(B) what is known about the effect that the sale of political intelligence may have on the financial markets;

(C) the extent to which information which is being sold would be considered nonpublic information;

(D) the legal and ethical issues that may be raised by the sale of political intelligence;

(E) any benefits from imposing disclosure requirements on those who engage in political intelligence activities; and

(F) any legal and practical issues that may be raised by the imposition of disclosure requirements on those who engage in political intelligence activities.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term “political intelligence” shall mean information that is—

(1) derived by a person from direct communications with an executive branch employee, a Member of Congress, or an employee of Congress; and

(2) provided in exchange for financial compensation to a client who intends, and who is known to intend, to use the information to inform investment decisions.

**SEC. 8. PUBLIC FILING AND DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FORMS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CONGRESSIONAL STAFF.**

(a) **PUBLIC, ONLINE DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FORMS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CONGRESSIONAL STAFF.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than August 31, 2012, or 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later, the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, shall ensure that financial disclosure forms filed by Members of Congress, candidates for Congress, and employees of Congress in calendar year 2012 and in subsequent years pursuant to title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 are made available to the public on the respective official websites of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 30 days after such forms are filed.

(2) **EXTENSIONS.**—Notices of extension for financial disclosure shall be made available electronically under this subsection along with its related disclosure.

(3) **REPORTING TRANSACTIONS.**—In the case of a transaction disclosure required by section 103(l) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, as added by this Act, such disclosure shall be filed not later than the date required by that section. Notices of extension for transaction disclosure shall be made available electronically under this subsection along with its related disclosure.

(4) **EXPIRATION.**—The requirements of this subsection shall expire upon implementation of the public disclosure system established under subsection (b).

(b) **ELECTRONIC FILING AND ONLINE PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FORMS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE, AND CONGRESSIONAL STAFF.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (6) and not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall develop systems to enable—

(A) electronic filing of reports received by them pursuant to section 103(h)(1)(A) of title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978; and

(B) public access to financial disclosure reports filed by Members of Congress, candidates

for Congress, and employees of Congress, as well as reports of a transaction disclosure required by section 103(l) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, as added by this Act, notices of extensions, amendments, and blind trusts, pursuant to title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, through databases that—

(i) are maintained on the official websites of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and

(ii) allow the public to search, sort, and download data contained in the reports.

(2) **LOGIN.**—No login shall be required to search or sort the data contained in the reports made available by this subsection. A login protocol with the name of the user shall be utilized by a person downloading data contained in the reports. For purposes of filings under this section, section 105(b)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 does not apply.

(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Pursuant to section 105(b)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, electronic availability on the official websites of the Senate and the House of Representatives under this subsection shall be deemed to have met the public availability requirement.

(4) **FILERS COVERED.**—Individuals required under the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 or the Senate Rules to file financial disclosure reports with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall file reports electronically using the systems developed by the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(5) **EXTENSIONS.**—Notices of extension for financial disclosure shall be made available electronically under this subsection along with its related disclosure.

(6) **ADDITIONAL TIME.**—The requirements of this subsection may be implemented after the date provided in paragraph (1) if the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives identifies in writing to relevant congressional committees the additional time needed for such implementation.

(c) **RECORDKEEPING.**—Section 105(d) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 105(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d)(1) Any report filed with or transmitted to an agency or supervising ethics office or to the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate pursuant to this title shall be retained by such agency or office or by the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate, as the case may be.

“(2) Such report shall be made available to the public—

“(A) in the case of a Member of Congress until a date that is 6 years from the date the individual ceases to be a Member of Congress; and

“(B) in the case of all other reports filed pursuant to this title, for a period of 6 years after receipt of the report.

“(3) After the relevant time period identified under paragraph (2), the report shall be destroyed unless needed in an ongoing investigation, except that in the case of an individual who filed the report pursuant to section 101(b) and was not subsequently confirmed by the Senate, or who filed the report pursuant to section 101(c) and was not subsequently elected, such reports shall be destroyed 1 year after the individual either is no longer under consideration by the Senate or is no longer a candidate for nomination or election to the Office of President, Vice President, or as a Member of Congress, unless needed in an ongoing investigation or inquiry.”

**SEC. 9. OTHER FEDERAL OFFICIALS.**

(a) **PROHIBITION OF THE USE OF NONPUBLIC INFORMATION FOR PRIVATE PROFIT.**—

(1) **EXECUTIVE BRANCH EMPLOYEES.**—The Office of Government Ethics shall issue such interpretive guidance of the relevant Federal ethics statutes and regulations, including the Stand-

ards of Ethical Conduct for executive branch employees, related to use of nonpublic information, as necessary to clarify that no executive branch employee may use nonpublic information derived from such person’s position as an executive branch employee or gained from the performance of such person’s official responsibilities as a means for making a private profit.

(2) **JUDICIAL OFFICERS.**—The Judicial Conference of the United States shall issue such interpretive guidance of the relevant ethics rules applicable to Federal judges, including the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, as necessary to clarify that no judicial officer may use nonpublic information derived from such person’s position as a judicial officer or gained from the performance of such person’s official responsibilities as a means for making a private profit.

(3) **JUDICIAL EMPLOYEES.**—The Judicial Conference of the United States shall issue such interpretive guidance of the relevant ethics rules applicable to judicial employees as necessary to clarify that no judicial employee may use nonpublic information derived from such person’s position as a judicial employee or gained from the performance of such person’s official responsibilities as a means for making a private profit.

(b) **APPLICATION OF INSIDER TRADING LAWS.**—

(1) **AFFIRMATION OF NON-EXEMPTION.**—Executive branch employees, judicial officers, and judicial employees are not exempt from the insider trading prohibitions arising under the securities laws, including section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5 thereunder.

(2) **DUTY.**—

(A) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the amendment made by this paragraph is to affirm a duty arising from a relationship of trust and confidence owed by each executive branch employee, judicial officer, and judicial employee.

(B) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 21A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u-1), as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **DUTY OF OTHER FEDERAL OFFICIALS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the rule of construction under section 10 of the STOCK Act and solely for purposes of the insider trading prohibitions arising under this Act, including section 10(b), and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, each executive branch employee, each judicial officer, and each judicial employee owes a duty arising from a relationship of trust and confidence to the United States Government and the citizens of the United States with respect to material, nonpublic information derived from such person’s position as an executive branch employee, judicial officer, or judicial employee or gained from the performance of such person’s official responsibilities.

“(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘executive branch employee’—

“(i) has the meaning given the term ‘employee’ under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code;

“(ii) includes—

“(I) the President;

“(II) the Vice President; and

“(III) an employee of the United States Postal Service or the Postal Regulatory Commission;

“(B) the term ‘judicial employee’ has the meaning given that term in section 109(8) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 109(8)); and

“(C) the term ‘judicial officer’ has the meaning given that term under section 109(10) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 109(10)).

“(3) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impair or limit the construction of the existing antifraud provisions of the securities laws or the authority of the Commission under those provisions.”

**SEC. 10. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or the interpretive guidance to be

issued pursuant to sections 3 and 9 of this Act, shall be construed to—

(1) impair or limit the construction of the anti-fraud provisions of the securities laws or the Commodity Exchange Act or the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission under those provisions;

(2) be in derogation of the obligations, duties, and functions of a Member of Congress, an employee of Congress, an executive branch employee, a judicial officer, or a judicial employee, arising from such person's official position; or

(3) be in derogation of existing laws, regulations, or ethical obligations governing Members of Congress, employees of Congress, executive branch employees, judicial officers, or judicial employees.

#### SEC. 11. EXECUTIVE BRANCH REPORTING.

##### (a) EXECUTIVE BRANCH REPORTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than August 31, 2012, or 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later, the President shall ensure that financial disclosure forms filed pursuant to title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 101 et seq.), in calendar year 2012 and in subsequent years, by executive branch employees specified in section 101 of that Act are made available to the public on the official websites of the respective executive branch agencies not later than 30 days after such forms are filed.

(2) EXTENSIONS.—Notices of extension for financial disclosure shall be made available electronically along with the related disclosure.

(3) REPORTING TRANSACTIONS.—In the case of a transaction disclosure required by section 103(l) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, as added by this Act, such disclosure shall be filed not later than the date required by that section. Notices of extension for transaction disclosure shall be made available electronically under this subsection along with its related disclosure.

(4) EXPIRATION.—The requirements of this subsection shall expire upon implementation of the public disclosure system established under subsection (b).

##### (b) ELECTRONIC FILING AND ONLINE PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FORMS OF CERTAIN EXECUTIVE BRANCH EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (6), and not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the President, acting through the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, shall develop systems to enable—

(A) electronic filing of reports required by section 103 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 103), other than subsection (h) of such section; and

(B) public access to financial disclosure reports filed by executive branch employees required to file under section 101 of that Act (5 U.S.C. App. 101), as well as reports of a transaction disclosure required by section 103(l) of that Act, as added by this Act, notices of extensions, amendments, and blind trusts, pursuant to title I of that Act, through databases that—

(i) are maintained on the official website of the Office of Government Ethics; and

(ii) allow the public to search, sort, and download data contained in the reports.

(2) LOGIN.—No login shall be required to search or sort the data contained in the reports made available by this subsection. A login protocol with the name of the user shall be utilized by a person downloading data contained in the reports. For purposes of filings under this section, section 105(b)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 105(b)(2)) does not apply.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Pursuant to section 105(b)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 105(b)(1)), electronic availability on the official website of the Office of Government Ethics under this subsection shall be deemed to have met the public availability requirement.

(4) FILERS COVERED.—Executive branch employees required under title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to file financial disclosure reports shall file the reports electronically with their supervising ethics office.

(5) EXTENSIONS.—Notices of extension for financial disclosure shall be made available electronically under this subsection along with its related disclosure.

(6) ADDITIONAL TIME.—The requirements of this subsection may be implemented after the date provided in paragraph (1) if the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, after consultation with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate, identifies in writing to relevant congressional committees the additional time needed for such implementation.

#### SEC. 12. PARTICIPATION IN INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERINGS.

Section 21A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u-1), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) PARTICIPATION IN INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERINGS.—An individual described in section 101(f) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 may not purchase securities that are the subject of an initial public offering (within the meaning given such term in section 12(f)(1)(G)(i)) in any manner other than is available to members of the public generally.”.

#### SEC. 13. REQUIRING MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE.

(a) REQUIRING DISCLOSURE.—Section 102(a)(4)(A) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 102(a)(4)(A)) is amended by striking “spouse; and” and inserting the following: “spouse, except that this exception shall not apply to a reporting individual—

“(i) described in paragraph (1), (2), or (9) of section 101(f);

“(ii) described in section 101(b) who has been nominated for appointment as an officer or employee in the executive branch described in subsection (f) of such section, other than—

“(I) an individual appointed to a position—

“(aa) as a Foreign Service Officer below the rank of ambassador; or

“(bb) in the uniformed services for which the pay grade prescribed by section 201 of title 37, United States Code is O-6 or below; or

“(II) a special government employee, as defined under section 202 of title 18, United States Code; or

“(iii) described in section 101(f) who is in a position in the executive branch the appointment to which is made by the President and requires advice and consent of the Senate, other than—

“(I) an individual appointed to a position—

“(aa) as a Foreign Service Officer below the rank of ambassador; or

“(bb) in the uniformed services for which the pay grade prescribed by section 201 of title 37, United States Code is O-6 or below; or

“(II) a special government employee, as defined under section 202 of title 18, United States Code; and”.

#### SEC. 14. TRANSACTION REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

The transaction reporting requirements established by section 103(l) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, as added by section 6 of this Act, shall not be construed to apply to a widely held investment fund (whether such fund is a mutual fund, regulated investment company, pension or deferred compensation plan, or other investment fund), if—

(1)(A) the fund is publicly traded; or

(B) the assets of the fund are widely diversified; and

(2) the reporting individual neither exercises control over nor has the ability to exercise con-

trol over the financial interests held by the fund.

#### SEC. 15. APPLICATION TO OTHER ELECTED OFFICIALS AND CRIMINAL OFFENSES.

##### (a) APPLICATION TO OTHER ELECTED OFFICIALS.—

(1) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 8332(o)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting “, the President, the Vice President, or an elected official of a State or local government” after “Member”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting “, the President, the Vice President, or an elected official of a State or local government” after “Member”.

(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 8411(l)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, the President, the Vice President, or an elected official of a State or local government” after “Member”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, the President, the Vice President, or an elected official of a State or local government” after “Member”.

(b) CRIMINAL OFFENSES.—Section 8332(o)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) The offense—

“(I) is committed after the date of enactment of this subsection and—

“(aa) is described under subparagraph (B)(i), (iv), (xvi), (xix), (xxiii), (xxiv), or (xxvi); or

“(bb) is described under subparagraph (B)(xxix), (xxx), or (xxxi), but only with respect to an offense described under subparagraph (B)(i), (iv), (xvi), (xix), (xxii), (xxiv), or (xxvi); or

“(II) is committed after the date of enactment of the STOCK Act and—

“(aa) is described under subparagraph (B)(ii), (iii), (v), (vi), (vii), (viii), (ix), (x), (xi), (xii), (xiii), (xiv), (xv), (xvii), (xviii), (xx), (xxi), (xxii), (xxv), (xxvii), or (xxviii); or

“(bb) is described under subparagraph (B)(xxix), (xxx), or (xxxi), but only with respect to an offense described under subparagraph (B)(ii), (iii), (v), (vi), (vii), (viii), (ix), (x), (xi), (xii), (xiii), (xiv), (xv), (xvii), (xviii), (xx), (xxi), (xxii), (xxv), (xxvii), or (xxviii).”;

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

“(B) An offense described in this subparagraph is only the following, and only to the extent that the offense is a felony:

“(i) An offense under section 201 of title 18 (relating to bribery of public officials and witnesses).

“(ii) An offense under section 203 of title 18 (relating to compensation to Member of Congress, officers, and others in matters affecting the Government).

“(iii) An offense under section 204 of title 18 (relating to practice in the United States Court of Federal Claims or the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit by Member of Congress).

“(iv) An offense under section 219 of title 18 (relating to officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals).

“(v) An offense under section 286 of title 18 (relating to conspiracy to defraud the Government with respect to claims).

“(vi) An offense under section 287 of title 18 (relating to false, fictitious or fraudulent claims).

“(vii) An offense under section 597 of title 18 (relating to expenditures to influence voting).

“(viii) An offense under section 599 of title 18 (relating to promise of appointment by candidate).

“(ix) An offense under section 602 of title 18 (relating to solicitation of political contributions).

“(x) An offense under section 606 of title 18 (relating to intimidation to secure political contributions).

“(xi) An offense under section 607 of title 18 (relating to place of solicitation).

“(xii) An offense under section 641 of title 18 (relating to public money, property or records).

“(xiii) An offense under section 666 of title 18 (relating to theft or bribery concerning programs receiving Federal funds).

“(xiv) An offense under section 1001 of title 18 (relating to statements or entries generally).

“(xv) An offense under section 1341 of title 18 (relating to frauds and swindles, including as part of a scheme to deprive citizens of honest services thereby).

“(xvi) An offense under section 1343 of title 18 (relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television, including as part of a scheme to deprive citizens of honest services thereby).

“(xvii) An offense under section 1503 of title 18 (relating to influencing or injuring officer or juror).

“(xviii) An offense under section 1505 of title 18 (relating to obstruction of proceedings before departments, agencies, and committees).

“(xix) An offense under section 1512 of title 18 (relating to tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant).

“(xx) An offense under section 1951 of title 18 (relating to interference with commerce by threats of violence).

“(xxi) An offense under section 1952 of title 18 (relating to interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises).

“(xxii) An offense under section 1956 of title 18 (relating to laundering of monetary instruments).

“(xxiii) An offense under section 1957 of title 18 (relating to engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity).

“(xxiv) An offense under chapter 96 of title 18 (relating to racketeer influenced and corrupt organizations).

“(xxv) An offense under section 7201 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to attempt to evade or defeat tax).

“(xxvi) An offense under section 104(a) of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (relating to prohibited foreign trade practices by domestic concerns).

“(xxvii) An offense under section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (relating to fraud, manipulation, or insider trading of securities).

“(xxviii) An offense under section 4c(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6c(a)) (relating to fraud, manipulation, or insider trading of commodities).

“(xxix) An offense under section 371 of title 18 (relating to conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States), to the extent of any conspiracy to commit an act which constitutes—

“(I) an offense under clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), (vii), (viii), (ix), (x), (xi), (xii), (xiii), (xiv), (xv), (xvi), (xvii), (xviii), (xix), (xx), (xxi), (xxii), (xxiii), (xxiv), (xxv), (xxvi), (xxvii), or (xxviii); or

“(II) an offense under section 207 of title 18 (relating to restrictions on former officers, employees, and elected officials of the executive and legislative branches).

“(xxx) Perjury committed under section 1621 of title 18 in falsely denying the commission of an act which constitutes—

“(I) an offense under clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), (vii), (viii), (ix), (x), (xi), (xii), (xiii), (xiv), (xv), (xvi), (xvii), (xviii), (xix), (xx), (xxi), (xxii), (xxiii), (xxiv), (xxv), (xxvi), (xxvii), or (xxviii); or

“(II) an offense under clause (xxix), to the extent provided in such clause.

“(xxxi) Subornation of perjury committed under section 1622 of title 18 in connection with the false denial or false testimony of another individual as specified in clause (xxix).”

#### SEC. 16. LIMITATION ON BONUSES TO EXECUTIVES OF FANNIE MAE AND FREDDIE MAC.

Notwithstanding any other provision in law, senior executives at the Federal National Mort-

gage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation are prohibited from receiving bonuses during any period of conservatorship for those entities on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 17. POST-EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATION RESTRICTIONS.

(a) RESTRICTION EXTENDED TO EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an individual required to file a financial disclosure report under section 101 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 101) may not directly negotiate or have any agreement of future employment or compensation unless such individual, within 3 business days after the commencement of such negotiation or agreement of future employment or compensation, files with the individual's supervising ethics office a statement, signed by such individual, regarding such negotiations or agreement, including the name of the private entity or entities involved in such negotiations or agreement, and the date such negotiations or agreement commenced.

(b) RECUSAL.—An individual filing a statement under subsection (a) shall recuse himself or herself whenever there is a conflict of interest, or appearance of a conflict of interest, for such individual with respect to the subject matter of the statement, and shall notify the individual's supervising ethics office of such recusal. An individual making such recusal shall, upon such recusal, submit to the supervising ethics office the statement under subsection (a) with respect to which the recusal was made.

#### SEC. 18. WRONGFULLY INFLUENCING PRIVATE ENTITIES EMPLOYMENT DECISIONS BY LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 227 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading of such section, by inserting after “Congress” the following: “or an officer or employee of the legislative or executive branch”; and

(2) by striking “Whoever” and inserting “(a) Whoever”;

(3) by striking “a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress or an employee of either House of Congress” and inserting “a covered government person”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) In this section, the term ‘covered government person’ means—

“(1) a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress;

“(2) an employee of either House of Congress; or

“(3) the President, Vice President, an employee of the United States Postal Service or the Postal Regulatory Commission, or any other executive branch employee (as such term is defined under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by amending the item relating to section 227 to read as follows:

“227. Wrongfully influencing a private entity's employment decisions by a Member of Congress or an officer or employee of the legislative or executive branch.”

#### SEC. 19. MISCELLANEOUS CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) REPEAL OF TRANSMISSION OF COPIES OF MEMBER AND CANDIDATE REPORTS TO STATE ELECTION OFFICIALS UPON ADOPTION OF NEW SYSTEMS.—Section 103(i) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 103(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(i)” and inserting “(i)(1)”; and

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

“(2) The requirements of paragraph (1) do not apply to any report filed under this title which is filed electronically and for which there is online public access, in accordance with the systems developed by the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives under section 8(b) of the Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act of 2012.”

(b) PERIOD OF RETENTION OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(c) of the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007 (2 U.S.C. 104e(c)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, or, in the case of reports filed under section 103(h)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, until the expiration of the 6-year period which begins on the date the individual is no longer a Member of Congress.”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any report which is filed on or after the date on which the systems developed by the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives under section 8(b) first take effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 2038, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, every Member of this House has sworn a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution and to faithfully execute the office to which they have been entrusted by their constituents. The Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act, or STOCK Act, goes to the heart of what it means to faithfully execute public office.

The government exists to promote the public good, not to enrich government officials and employees. Those who are entrusted with public office are called public servants because their work should always serve the public rather than themselves. No one should violate the sacred trust of government office by turning “public service” into “self-service.”

The risk of government self-dealing is heightened by the huge growth in recent years of the Federal Government and its increasing entanglement with the private economy. The risk of self-dealing increases when the government undertakes to spend nearly \$1 trillion in stimulus money on private companies like Solyndra, or when the government inserts itself into the one-fifth of our economy represented by health



care and dictates the terms of private insurance policies.

The decisions made by Big Government can have big money consequences. Big Government can move markets. That's why we need strong rules to reassure the public that decisionmakers are not enriching themselves by investing based on insider knowledge of government policies.

This is the goal of the STOCK Act, and the House version of the STOCK Act achieves this goal. It strengthens the Senate proposal by expanding the scope of the bill to require more disclosure and prevent all office holders from profiting from insider information.

The House bill expands the legislation so that the ban on insider trading applies to all legislative, executive, and judicial branch officials and their staffs. The American people deserve to know that no one in any branch of government can profit from their office. All three branches should be held to the same standard because all three branches must be worthy of the public's trust.

And the bill ensures that Members of Congress who commit a crime do not receive a taxpayer-funded pension. The STOCK Act clarifies that Members of Congress and other government insiders have to play by the same rules against insider trading that have applied to the private sector for nearly 80 years.

Under the House bill, no Federal Government official may use nonpublic information which they learn about by virtue of their office for the purpose of making a profit in the commodities or stock markets.

The bill strengthens financial disclosure rules for public officials. Financial disclosure forms will be made publicly available in searchable, downloadable databases on government Web sites.

The bill requires prompt reporting of significant securities transactions by key legislative and executive branch officials. This will bring the financial dealings of public servants into the light of day.

The STOCK Act also strengthens disclosure of officials' mortgages so that public servants do not receive special rates and offers by virtue of their office.

The bill expands the list of crimes that result in a forfeiture of government pension rights, and it prevents Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac from paying lucrative bonuses to the executives who bear so much responsibility for the housing crisis.

The House bill adds a provision to prevent government officials from receiving special early access to the initial public offerings of stock, which can result in major profits for the well-connected.

The bill requires executive branch officials to disclose their negotiations for private sector jobs, just like legislative branch officials do under current law. And the bill makes it a crime for executive branch officials to pressure pri-

vate businesses to hire employees of a certain political party, a government law that currently only applies to Congress.

The STOCK Act increases disclosure and accountability for every branch of the Federal Government and ensures that public servants don't breach the trust of the American people.

Madam Speaker, for all the above reasons, I support this legislation and encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, Members of the House, we come here this morning as the leaders of the Judiciary Committee, and I have to assume that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. SMITH, like myself, is deeply disappointed that we're bringing a bill that we've never had a hearing on before the committee before the Congress for disposition.

□ 0920

Here was a bill referred to six committees: Financial Services, Agricultural, Judiciary, House Administration, Ethics, and the Rules Committee. Only one hearing was held in one of these committees on this measure. It's never been before Judiciary or any other committee, and so I want to begin by complimenting the author of this measure, the ranking member, former chairwoman of the Rules Committee, the gentlelady from New York, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, for a serious and important amendment that has never been treated fairly.

Now, I don't know what the explanation is. Maybe we can get to it during this proceeding. But I think that this is not the way that we want to move forward with a bill that was supposed to get to an insider trading ban that everybody wanted, because there's no reporting requirement in this bill.

So, I will reserve the balance of my time and look forward to the discussion.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS) who's an active member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. ROSS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the STOCK Act today and in support of extending its reach to the executive branch. All of us who have been honored by our fellow citizens with the enormous responsibility of protecting the liberties of this Republic have a duty to hold ourselves to the highest of standards.

You know, it's ironic that in 2012 we are here debating a bill that would prevent public officials from enriching themselves through our positions.

It's ironic because one of the great causes that impelled the separation from Great Britain was the common practice of public officials using their office to increase their personal wealth.

Madam Speaker, 236 years ago, those patriots said "enough." That spirit is in America's DNA, and we would do a disservice to all who came before us if we failed to act. I know that a vast majority of my friends on the other side of the aisle share this belief as well. A calling to service knows no party label.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to recognize the original author of this bill, and because of her deep concern about this matter, I am going to yield the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) as much time as she may consume.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his generosity.

Try as they may, Majority Leader CANTOR and the House Republican leadership were unable to move forward with the STOCK Act without keeping at least some of the reforms that we included in this bill 6 years ago. However, when it comes to K Street, it appears that Republican leadership couldn't stomach the pressure from the political intelligence community.

After working behind closed doors, the majority removed the major provision that would have held political intelligence operatives to the same standards as lobbyists who come before the Congress.

I need to put into the RECORD that political intelligence is worth \$400 million a year. It is unregulated, unseen, and operates in the dark. Fortunately, Democrats and Republicans alike are fighting to keep political intelligence as part of the final bill.

Senator GRASSLEY shares my outrage that Mr. CANTOR would let the political intelligence community off the hook. Together with a supermajority, Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, Senator GRASSLEY followed my lead and included the political intelligence requirement in the Senate version of this bill.

I think his statement yesterday tells you all you need to know about his desire to see this language inserted back into the STOCK Act before it reaches the President's desk.

I would like to read that into the RECORD if I may.

"It's astonishing and extremely disappointing," Senator GRASSLEY said, "that the House would fulfill Wall Street's wishes by killing this provision. The Senate clearly voted to try to shed light on an industry that's behind the scenes. If the Senate language is too broad, as opponents say, why not propose a solution instead of scrapping the provision altogether? I hope to see a vehicle for meaningful transparency through a House-Senate conference or other means. If Congress delays action, the political intelligence industry will stay in the shadows, just the way Wall Street likes it."

And it's hard. The STOCK Act is a statement of how we in Congress view ourselves and our relationship with

those who sent us here. No matter how powerful our position may be or we believe it is, nor how hallowed the Halls that we walk, none of us is above the law.

With the passage of the STOCK Act, we can move one step closer to living up to the faith and trust bestowed upon us by the American people, the citizens whom we serve.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) who is also a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, I certainly want to thank the chairman for yielding, and thank you for your leadership. I also want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WALZ, for your leadership with regard to the STOCK Act.

Madam Speaker, the American public believes that Congress has the ability to profit from their position, and while this is illegal today in insider trading laws, I think that we've got an obligation to make it even stronger and even clearer to the American public and to everyone that we here in the United States Congress hold ourselves up to a higher standard. I think this is expected of us as public servants.

I am pleased to say that in the STOCK Act, in this legislation moving forward, is language from my bill, H.R. 2162, the No Pensions for Felons bill. This language will strengthen and expand the existing law to require that Federal lawmakers convicted of a public corruption felony forfeit their taxpayer-funded congressional pension.

I know this sounds like common sense, but actually today there are those that are collecting taxpayer-funded pensions that have been convicted of a public corruption charge while serving in public office.

This provision adds 21 new public corruption offenses to the current law, including violations for insider trading and others. Additionally, this will prohibit the former Members of Congress from receiving a congressional pension if they are convicted of a covered offense that occurred while they are subsequently serving in any other publicly elected office.

Sadly, we have seen this before, where former Members of this Chamber, like one from my State, former Governor Rod Blagojevich, convicted of felony corruption charges and yet at age 62 he'll be eligible for a taxpayer-funded pension. Not only is this wrong, this is an insult to the American taxpayers. This provision will address such violations of the public trust in the future.

I want to thank the chairman for your leadership, and I want to urge my colleagues, not just on my side of the aisle, but across the aisle to support this important legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished

gentleman from Minnesota, TIM WALZ, who joined with the ranking member of the Rules Committee in introducing the original bill.

Mr. WALZ. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

I'd also like to thank the chairman for his support of this bill and eloquent response on it.

It's been a long 6-year journey to pass this reform. It has taken hard work and a bipartisan effort. The American people expect and deserve that.

When I first came to Congress in 2006 after spending a lifetime of teaching social studies in the public school classroom, I was approached by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and Brian Baird, our former Member from Washington State. He said, You were sent here to make a difference and do things differently. If you really believe in reform, take a look at this bill.

I got involved right after that, and Representative SLAUGHTER, I can say, has been a stalwart supporter of this bill. She understood this is far more than just about clarifying insider trading. This is about restoring faith to the institution.

□ 0930

She was concerned about the ethics of this body before ethics seemed to be in vogue. It has been in vogue her whole lifetime. She has lived that sermon of ethics and of living by the rules instead of just giving it, and that I appreciate.

The integrity of this institution stands above all else. As the sacred holders of the privilege, the honor and the responsibility given to us by our neighbors to self-govern ourselves, we must make sure that this institution is never tarnished; and this bill goes a long way to doing that.

The perception is that Members of Congress are enriching themselves. That's not only an affront to our neighbors that we're not playing by the rules; it is a cancer that can destroy the democracy. Each Member of Congress has a responsibility to hold himself not just equal to his neighbors but to a higher standard. The public wants us to come here and debate how we educate our children, how we serve our veterans, how we build our roads, how we protect this Nation, how we spend those taxpayer dollars. That's what makes us strong—all these differing ideas coming together for a compromise and moving forward. If there is a perception that someone is enriching himself, it undermines our ability to do those things.

We're not here today to pat ourselves on the back. This might be the only place where doing the right thing gets you kudos when it's expected of everyone else. So we're here to say that this is a victory, not for us, but it is one tiny step on a journey, which is about restoring the faith of the American people and the institution. They can

believe with all their hearts that we are wrong. They cannot believe that we are corrupt. They will have us and we will pass and we will be dust, and this place—this building, this podium right here—will still stand.

That's what we're doing here today. So I implore folks, let's come together in a bipartisan manner.

I agree with the gentlelady: I'm disappointed the political intelligence piece isn't in here; but as I said, I believe this is a first step. We can't wait for the perfect to move something forward, so I think it's a good bipartisan compromise. I implore my colleagues to join us on this first step. Give this win to the American public, and then let's get back in here and start working on jobs. Let's get back in here and start working on the national debt. Let's get back in here and figure out how we're going to protect this Nation and educate our children into the future. This lets us do that and, I think, shows the American public we can come together. Let's get it passed, and let's have the President sign it. Then let's get on to real business.

With that, I would be remiss not to mention a person who was one of the original seven folks on this bill. WALTER JONES has been our Republican colleague, and has been a stalwart supporter of this. This is a truly bipartisan piece. Ethics crosses the aisle. Our folks in here are good people who are coming together for the good of their citizens, and for that I am grateful for today.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my Texas colleague, Mr. CANSECO, who is a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. CANSECO. I thank my colleague, Chairman SMITH, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, too often the American people feel that Members of Congress live by and benefit personally from a different set of rules than those by which ordinary Americans live.

To me, this lack of confidence is unacceptable. It is imperative that we rebuild the trust of the American people in their elected Representatives.

The STOCK Act will help do just that. It explicitly bans Members of Congress and congressional staff from using information obtained on the job and using it to profit from securities trading and gives the Securities and Exchange Commission the ability to investigate and prosecute them just like any other American.

The American people expect that those who serve in government do so with integrity. The STOCK Act will help ensure that those in government meet this expectation.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia, BOBBY SCOTT, the ranking member of the subcommittee to which this measure would have gone had we been able to hold hearings.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.



Madam Speaker, the bill we're considering today, the STOCK Act, would prohibit Members of Congress and other legislative branch employees, as well as executive and judicial branch employees, from using nonpublic information for personal benefit derived from an individual's position or gained from the performance of an individual's duties.

Today, we are amending the Senate-passed bill, S. 2038, with a substitute that makes some changes to the Senate text, such as regrettably eliminating the requirement that certain political intelligence activities be disclosed under the Lobbying Disclosure Act. These intelligence firms obtain inside information from Members of Congress and their staffs, and then they sell that information to investment firms. The public should be informed of these types of contacts.

With this bill, our goal is to hold Members of Congress, as well as other government officials, to the same standard as those in corporations who have the duty not to trade on information that is not available to the general public.

Most Members of Congress believed that this type of activity was wrong whether explicitly prohibited by criminal law or at least subject to Ethics Committee sanctions. Most of us assumed that a Food and Drug Administration official could not call a stockbroker shortly before a blockbuster drug were to be approved and profit off of that insider knowledge. We just assumed that that was wrong. So this bill codifies what most of us thought was already in the law.

This is not a complicated issue. This is the same standard that applies to those in the corporate context. It is wrong to trade on nonpublic information for our benefit and to the detriment of the public. The public has the right to expect that the public interest comes first, and people should not have to worry about what may be motivating our actions as we make decisions that impact them.

I want to acknowledge the work of my colleagues, the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ), for their leadership in drafting and introducing the House version of the STOCK Act.

This legislation represents an appropriate acknowledgment of what most of us thought was already the law, that national government officials of all branches should not benefit financially from nonpublic information they learned by virtue of their positions, and so I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DUFFY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

I think we are all aware that this issue came out when Peter Schweizer

wrote a book called "Throw Them All Out." After that, "60 Minutes" did a special story about how Members of Congress were benefitting by using insider information or information that the rest of the public wasn't privy to. In the succeeding several months, I think that story has created a deficit of trust between Members of Congress and the American constituents.

I introduced a version that would deal with this issue, I think, very simply. I thought what we should do is mandate that Members put their assets into a blind trust so there will be a bright line between information that they have as Members and their trading portfolios, and if they were to choose not to do that, they would have to aggressively disclose every trade within 3 days.

Now, my bill is not on the floor today, but the version that we have here today, I think, is much improved from the original version that came out. We have an improved reporting requirement that goes, not from 3 days, but from 90 days to 30 days, which is much improved from the original legislation. We've included the executive branch, which I think is imperative; and we have language that uses the blind trust as a potential opt-out if you're not actually managing your funds.

As we gather around and debate and vote on this bill, I think it is important to know that this is the first step, a step in the right direction. Then as we come together and reevaluate what we've done here, I think there will be many more steps to take to ensure that Members of Congress don't profit from the information they come across as Members of this institution.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, STEVE COHEN, a member of the Judiciary Committee, one who has worked on this matter even though we couldn't hold hearings.

□ 0940

Mr. COHEN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan, Ranking Member CONYERS.

Madam Speaker, this is a very important bill, and I appreciate the efforts put in it by Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. WALZ, who have championed this for over many, many, many years, and I appreciate the Republicans for coming in with a bipartisan effort.

The bill has, indeed, been improved by the Senate; and it was improved through the honest services statute that was added to it, which our committee debated and passed, I believe, in good fashion. I don't know if it was unanimous or not, but that was one of the most important aspects, in my opinion, of this bill.

There are public officials throughout this country who have abused their position of trust, and using their position for personal gain has hurt all of government. The honest services statute

used to be a vehicle by which U.S. attorneys could go after them. The Supreme Court ruled that there was a defect in that law. That has been corrected in this bill, which means we have more effective ways to clean up folks who are using public service for their own benefit, and are able to restore public trust in public officials, from the courthouse to Congress. Further, it makes clear that nobody can use their inside information here to be making money in the stock market or in other places, all of which destroys the public trust which we hold.

This Congress is so, so, so, so much better than the ratings the public gives it. Some of it is because of a few bad apples, and some of it is because of a misunderstanding about what we do. This bill will go a long way toward cleaning up Congress and local officials and the appearance of impropriety, which is as important as impropriety. We need to be like Caesar's wife, beyond reproach, and this bill will do a lot towards it.

I take my hat off, again, to Ms. SLAUGHTER, the champion of this bill, and Mr. WALZ, who have done so much. And I am proud to be one of the original nine.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Texas.

Madam Speaker, our government was founded on a promise. This promise was built on a trust between the people and their elected officials. We all have a duty to honor the trust of the American people and to work faithfully on their behalf.

Madam Speaker, it is unacceptable for anyone, any elected official or their staff, to profit from information that is not available to the public. People in this country have a right to know and trust that officials at all levels of government are living under the same rules that they are. If there is even the slightest appearance of impropriety, we ought to go ahead and prevent that from taking place.

It is incumbent upon each of us to start restoring the trust between the people and their elected representatives. That's what the STOCK Act is all about.

Madam Speaker, Members from both sides of the aisle have worked hard on this issue. I would especially like to express my appreciation to Representatives TIM WALZ and LOUISE SLAUGHTER for their years of work on this effort. Congressman WALZ has been a leader on the STOCK Act since he took office at the start of the 110th Congress, and I particularly want to recognize his willingness to reach across the aisle and keep the lines of communication open as we worked to make clear that elected officials abide by the same rules as the American people.

This bill we are bringing to the floor today puts in place measures that both

strengthen and expand the Senate's work on the STOCK Act, as well as removes provisions that would have made the bill unworkable or raised far more questions than they would have answered. We expanded the bill to ensure that executive branch officials and their employees are subject to the same reporting and disclosure requirements as those in Congress. We must all live under the same rules.

We also included a provision, championed by Representative ROBERT DOLD, to ensure that Members of Congress who are convicted of a crime do not receive a taxpayer-funded pension after the fact. And finally, Madam Speaker, we added a provision to prohibit Members of Congress, executive branch officials, and their staffs from receiving special access to initial public offerings due to their positions.

Madam Speaker, we intend to act quickly to send the President a strengthened, workable bill that delivers on our promise to uphold the trust of the American people. And I urge all my colleagues to support the STOCK Act.

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

May I ask the distinguished majority leader one question, why he took political intelligence out of this provision?

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. Sure. I would respond to the gentleman, I think that is a provision that raises an awful lot of questions. I think there is a lot of discussion and debate about who and what would qualify and fall under the suggested language that came from the Senate. And that is why, in the STOCK Act, we are calling for a study of that issue, to ensure that the integrity of this process is maintained.

But I would remind the gentleman, the thrust of this bill is about making sure that none of us, in elected office or those in the executive branch, are able to profit from nonpublic information. The political intelligence piece is outside of this body, and we are talking about us and the perception that has gathered around our conduct.

Mr. CONYERS. Well, I thank the gentleman because there are some Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle that say, if Congress delays action on the political intelligence industry, we will stay in the shadows, just the way Wall Street likes it. So I think we ought to think about that. And I'm hoping that the leader will continue the examination of the political intelligence industry piece.

I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, NANCY PELOSI, the distinguished leader on our side of the aisle.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for giving us this opportunity to discuss an important matter—the integrity of Congress—on the floor of the House.

I, too, want to join the distinguished majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, in praising

the leadership of Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER, our ranking member on the Rules Committee, and Congressman TIM WALZ for their extraordinary leadership over time, their persistence, the approach that they have taken to this to remove all doubt in the public's mind, if that is possible, that we are here to do the people's business and not to benefit personally from it.

I listened attentively to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. CANTOR's remarks about the STOCK Act and its importance. And it just raises a question to me as to, if it is so important, and it certainly is, why we could not have worked in a more bipartisan fashion either to accept the Senate bill which was developed in a bipartisan fashion and passed the Senate—what was it?—94-6. It's hard to get a result like 94-6 in Congress these days, but they were able to get the result because they worked together to develop their legislation.

We had two good options. One was to accept the Senate bill, or to take up the Slaughter-Walz legislation which has nearly 300 cosponsors. Almost 100 Republicans cosponsored the original STOCK Act. The discharge petition has been calling upon the leadership to bring that bill to the floor. What's important about that is that if we passed that bill, we could go to conference and take the best and strongest of both bills to get the job done.

Instead, secretly, the Republicans brought a much-diminished bill to the floor. It has some good features. So I urge our colleagues to vote for it to bring the process along. What's wrong with it, though, is that it makes serious omissions. And I want to associate myself with the remarks that had been made earlier; but I think they bear repetition, in any event.

Senator GRASSLEY's remarks are stunning. It is really a stunning indictment of the House Republicans in terms of their action on this bill. And I know my colleague has read this into the RECORD already, but I will, too.

Senator GRASSLEY said: "It's astonishing and extremely disappointing that the House would fulfill Wall Street's wishes by killing this provision"—that would be the provision on political intelligence. "The Senate clearly voted to try to shed light on an industry that's behind the scenes. If the Senate language is too broad, as opponents say, why not propose a solution instead of scrapping the provision altogether? I hope to see a vehicle for meaningful transparency through a House-Senate conference or other means. If Congress delays action, the political intelligence industry will stay in the shadows, just the way Wall Street likes it."

□ 0950

Well, the Senator's statement is very widely covered. The Hill today has a big, full page, "Grassley: Republicans caved. Iowa Senator says House doing Wall Street's bidding."

I think it is important to note that on the Senate side there was interest in doing this study that is now in the House bill, and it was rejected by the Senate by a 60-39 vote, to include the political intelligence provision in the bill, rejecting the study. Now that that has already been rejected in the Senate, it's resurrected on the House side, a weakening of the bill.

So whether it's the political intelligence piece proposed by Senator GRASSLEY or Senator LEAHY's piece about corruption, I think it is really important that those two elements be included in the bill. A good way to do that, to find a path to bipartisanship in the strongest possible bill, is to pass the bill today despite its serious shortcomings. And it is hard to understand why the shortcomings are there, but nonetheless they are. But pass the bill today and go to conference. To pass earlier or to accept the Senate bill, or to take the original STOCK Act, strong STOCK Act to the floor. Both of those were rejected. Pass this bill and go to conference. It is very important that the House and the Senate meet to discuss these very important issues. With all due respect to a study on political intelligence, that's really just a dodge. That is just a way to say we're not going to do the political intelligence piece.

So again, with serious reservations about the bill but thinking that the better course of action is to pass it, and I don't want anybody to interpret the strong vote for it to be a seal of approval of what it is, but just a way of pushing the process down the line so that we can move expeditiously to go to conference for the strongest possible bill.

I want to close again by saluting Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER and Congressman TIM WALZ for their relentless persistence and dedication to this issue. Had they not had this discharge petition and the nearly 300 cosponsors, bipartisan, nearly 100 of them Republicans, I doubt that we would even be taking up this bill today. So congratulations and thank you.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) who is a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and also chairman of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, let me just point out a couple of things in response to what has been said on the floor about the bill before us. Had we adopted, had we accepted the Senate bill, we would have had 16 drafting errors not corrected; 16 misstatements in the Senate bill that drafted the wrong provisions of the ethics laws that already existed and would have ensured that what was said on the Senate floor and is being said here would not be enforced in law, number one.

Number two, if we had taken the Senate bill, the absolute prohibition

about Members participating in IPOs would not be before us. That is an addition that we have in the House bill. That is an additional prohibition. That makes that an illegal act. It has not been in the past. The Senate bill did not even talk about that.

Third, with respect to the issue of political intelligence, I respect the Senator from Iowa very much, but I doubt he has ever prosecuted anybody and put them in prison for conflict of interest during their public service. I have.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I understand when you do that, you have to deal with the very careful constitutional questions of people dealing with their right to apply before the government their grievances. That has become known now as lobbying. It is a constitutionally protected activity.

And the idea that we have a Congress committed to transparency means that we give out as much information as we possibly can. Those are difficult, conflicting interests that have to be carefully determined if we're going to deal with the question of political intelligence. It does us no good to pass a bill that will be rendered unconstitutional. And it does us no good to not carefully consider this. As a matter of fact, on the Senate floor, it was Senator LIEBERMAN who asked his fellow colleagues to give them time on the Senate side to study the issue so that, precisely, they would not render the bill unconstitutional. I might add that Senator LIEBERMAN also served as Attorney General of his State, and knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would just like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California who was an Attorney General himself and is very sharp on these matters. Could you make available to us these 16 drafting errors of the Senate? I'd be delighted to get them from you.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If the gentleman would send someone over here, you can make a copy of it right now.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman very much.

I'm pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Congresswoman SLAUGHTER and Congressman WALZ for their tremendous work.

I stand here and urge our Members to support this bill, but certainly I have my concerns. House Republicans stripped out of a bipartisan bill that passed the Senate overwhelmingly key provisions that were supported by

Democrats and Republicans alike. Senator GRASSLEY, the Senator from Iowa who I work with quite a bit, was among the first to criticize their actions. And after they stripped out his provision to require greater transparency over so-called political intelligence, Senator GRASSLEY said, and it has been said again and again, but I think it needs to be in the DNA of every cell of our brains, that "It's astonishing"—and these are his words—"and extremely disappointing that the House would fulfill Wall Street's wishes by killing the provision."

That is an incredible indictment, and I share his disappointment that this bill does not go far enough to require the transparency that we need. Let me be clear: no Members of Congress should be able to benefit personally from information they gain by virtue of their service in the Congress. However, House Republicans have rushed to the floor weakened legislation that Members have not had a chance to read the way they should have had. Perhaps as a result of the rush, this bill also appears to have drafting problems that need to be corrected. For example, the Office of Government Ethics has indicated that the current bill could be interpreted as requiring that confidential financial disclosure forms filed by low-level employees, such as staff assistants in the executive branch, must be posted online.

Mr. Speaker, while I support the purpose of this legislation, while I will vote for this legislation, I have my deep concerns. But as Mr. CANTOR said, hopefully we'll be able to address these issues in the future and come out with a better bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, we are prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I'm prepared to close, and I do so by yielding the balance of my time to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the members of the Judiciary Committee, both the chairman and the ranking member, and, as all have applauded, Congresswoman SLAUGHTER and Congressman WALZ for their continued leadership. And I am very pleased to have been one of the, as they say, long-suffering cosponsors since, I believe, the 110th Congress.

It's important for our colleagues to understand that I think we all come here with the intent to serve this country, and to serve it well. And I believe that when we self-regulate, we only enhance this institutional body that has

such enormous history because of the changing times.

I don't believe that Members of Congress are spending their time dwelling on information that they have and using it for self-purpose, but we now stand here united saying that Members of Congress, employees of Congress, and all Federal employees are prevented from using any nonpublic information derived from the individual's position as a Member of Congress or employee of Congress, or gain from performance of the individual's duties, for personal benefit.

□ 1000

That is waving a flag to all of our constituents, to the Nation that says that we're here to stand united for you. I hope that helps us as we move forward on payroll tax relief and unemployment. But there is a challenge that I think we have missed, and I think Senator GRASSLEY has carefully analyzed why he is in essence offended, even with 16, if you will, drafting errors, which I hope that as we move to conference—that we must do—will be corrected.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentle lady yield to me just briefly?

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. Because we've got the 16 from our distinguished Judiciary colleague Mr. LUNGREN. These are merely technical errors that are corrected by the enrolling resolution that surely he must have heard about. These aren't errors that would have gone into the bill.

I thank the gentle lady for yielding.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for clarifying it.

I still think that we should rush quickly to conference because what is missing from this—and we can't say it more often than over and over again, from the Abramoff matter that all of us knew of years ago and by "political intelligence" refers to information that is potentially market-moving, is nonpublic, or not easily accessible to the public, is gathered and analyzed. Therefore, we are missing a large gap by leaving out the provision on political intelligence, a \$100 million industry.

Yes, we're going to support this legislation, but we can't get to conference soon enough to make this bill comparable and ready for the American people. We must regulate ourselves because they have trusted us to lead this Nation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), chairman of the House Administration Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 6½ minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, at the very outset, I would like to thank Members on both

sides of the aisle for attempting to try and deal with a serious issue. I'd like to particularly point to staff who have worked over this last weekend, including four attorneys on my House Administration Committee, who spent a good portion of this last weekend going through the Senate bill and trying to come up with what we believe is a responsible bill, a tough bill that could pass this House, and frankly did not include the errors that we found in the bill on the Senate side.

Several months before the STOCK Act debuted in the Senate, questions were raised publicly about the application of existing laws relating to insider trading. Specifically, there were questions as to whether or not the current laws applied to Members of Congress or their staff. As chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I and my staff carefully reviewed current law, and we concluded that the prohibition on insider trading and the criminal penalties associated with it are very much applicable, and not just to Members of Congress and staff of the legislative branch.

Let me be clear. Let us disabuse anyone of the notion that somehow they could engage in insider trading between now and the time the bill gets on the President's desk and he signs it. It is already illegal. That is the advice I've given Members when I've been asked. That's the advice I've given to the press when they've asked. It's the advice that's been given by the Ethics Committee to Members of Congress and to staff. No one within the House of Representatives or the Senate or the executive branch or even the judicial branch, regardless of responsibility, title or salary, should be under the false impression that they are somehow exempt under these laws. They are not.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you, sir.

Why are we passing this law if the conduct we are prohibiting is already illegal?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I would be very happy to respond to that, and I will a little bit later on in my statement. Thank you very much.

In addition to the Congress sometimes dedicated to redundancy, there is a question of clarification. The fact that we've had questions asked of us over the last several months as House Administration chairman, as the Ethics chairman has done, gives rise to the question that some have asked, and we have tried to disabuse them of that notion all along. Although we create and uphold the laws of the land, we are not above them. As their elected representatives, we owe our constituents the assurance that the decisions we make here in the people's House are, in fact, for the people and not ourselves. This

assurance, Madam Speaker, must be government-wide. America not only needs to know that all of their government officials are subject to insider trading laws, but also need to know and need proof that they are adhering to them, which is exactly what the amended version of the S. 2038 accomplishes.

In 2010, the Supreme Court issued a decision in *Skilling v. United States* that set out several specific questions that it said must be answered in criminal statutes on honest services. The Senate bill ignored the Supreme Court's guidance and failed to answer the questions it set out. The amendment does more than eliminate the Senate's defective provisions and numerous drafting errors.

Our bill before us also strengthens the previous House and Senate proposals by first clarifying the broad application of insider trading laws, making sure no one questions it. As I say, it is already against the law, and no Member ought to rush out now and attempt to use his insider trading information for insider trading thinking that he or she is not covered. They are already covered.

It expands the financial transaction disclosure requirements. We are going to be required now, in terms of actual financial transactions, to report within a 30-day period as opposed to doing it quarterly. We're also going to be required to disclose our mortgages, which are not required right now. So we are expanding the disclosure requirements. We extend the post-employment negotiation restrictions. We expand prohibitions on influencing private hiring decisions. This is an additional point.

I would say to my friend from Michigan, the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, we end the preferential treatment of government officials by prohibiting them from accepting exclusive access to IPOs. That has not been against the law. There's been some suggestion that might have been carried on by some Members. I have no evidence whether it has or it has not; but that is an additional prohibition placed in this, which I believe was not in the Senate bill, is not under current law, but it does make it explicit. Members of Congress cannot participate in accepting exclusive access to IPOs.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Certainly.

Mr. CONYERS. I want to thank the gentleman for bringing us this information. I will take back to everybody on this side of the aisle not to rush out and try to do any last-minute deals because it is already illegal if you will do the same with the Members on your side.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I would be happy to if they don't know that already. But when you read the newspapers, you would think that somehow it is proper and appropriate.

I want to make it clear not only to our colleagues but to the American public, it is against the law now, it has been against the law. If anybody has evidence of this, they should report it to the proper authorities because it is against the law.

Madam Speaker, the amendment before us, when applied to the underlying bill, creates the clarity and accountability necessary to ensure that government officials—elected, appointed, and otherwise—adhere to Federal insider trading laws. It prohibits Members, officials, and employees of every branch of government from using non-public privileged information for personal gain, and it creates a disclosure mechanism for finding out when they do so. Additionally, the bill denies pensions for Members convicted of crimes. That is an addition to current law. It eliminates bonuses for senior executives at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. That is an addition to current law. And it directs the GAO to utilize—

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. With that, I would urge that all vote for this strong, strong STOCK Act.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, may I have unanimous consent to ask one brief question that's pertinent to this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman seek unanimous consent to extend the debate time?

Mr. COHEN. Yes, please. For 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee to extend the debate time?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I am afraid I will have to object. The gentleman's time has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act, also known as the STOCK Act. As a sponsor of the original bill in 109th Congress, I am a firm believer that Members of Congress should receive no greater privilege than that of our own constituents. Although I am grateful for the passage of this bill today, it is reprehensible that it has taken six long years for this legislation to finally come to the Floor for consideration.

As President Lincoln stated, our government was intended to be a "government of the people, by the people, for the people." Sadly, we have fallen away from those founding principles. Today, many government officials live in Washington, secluded from their constituents, and out of touch with reality. They benefit from financial insight used to improve their own stock portfolios, enjoy luxury trips disguised as CODELS, and upon retirement, receive generous pensions despite their own actions while in office. Politicians come to Washington not to represent their constituencies, but for their own avail.

Vainglorious acts such as these, committed by our country's leaders, are simply unacceptable.

I have introduced several pieces of legislation intended to reduce government waste, hold Members accountable for their actions, and increase transparency within our federal government. For example, the STAY PUT Act would require the completion of a study on the costs of Congressional foreign travel claimed to meet criteria of “official business,” by Members, officers, and employees of Congress. Another piece of legislation I have introduced, the Citizen Legislator Act, aims to cut the time spent in Washington, DC in half, cuts Congressional salaries and budgets in half, allows Members to work jobs outside of public office, and increases the time Members spend in their districts with the people who elected them.

Madam Speaker, while, many of us may attempt to project the appearance that our motives are truly altruistic, the time has come for real action. I applaud my colleagues for passing the STOCK Act today and encourage them to consider additional legislation bearing similar objectives, to listen to their constituents, and to spend more time in their districts. I remain optimistic that many of us still remember why we find ourselves here today: to serve the American people.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2038, the STOCK Act. I have always stood for the strictest ethical standards for all government employees, and today is no different. Government employees cannot be allowed to profit privately in the performance of their official duties. Indeed, throughout my career, it has always been my understanding that the House Ethics Rules specifically prohibit this sort of behavior.

I will vote in favor of S. 2038. I am very pleased that the bill contains a rule of construction to preserve the Securities Exchange Commission’s, SEC, existing anti-fraud enforcement authorities. Nevertheless, I have lingering concerns about the bill’s practicability and other unintended consequences. I believe these matters might have been clarified if the bill had undergone regular order. Absent that, Members of the House should have been given a briefing about the bill prior to taking it up. In fact, I requested such a briefing in a February 7, 2012, letter to Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR, but that request appears to have fallen on deaf ears.

It is uncertain to me whether House Leadership will insist on convening a conference committee with our friends in the Senate to forge a compromise. If that is to occur, I strongly urge House conferees to consider and solve the rather ticklish problem of how the SEC and House Committee on Ethics will interact under the Act. Furthermore, I have deep, dark fears that influential members of the House, Senate, and associated political organizations might exert pressure on the Commission to open or never begin a congressional insider trading investigation for political gain. Such an incident would fly in the face of the STOCK Act’s otherwise meritorious intent.

In closing, I can only stress that this matter would have been best addressed in the various committees of jurisdiction and according to regular order. Observance of this institution’s rules and procedures has produced well-written laws which have endured for years. I observed regular order as chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and held numerous hearings on securities fraud in the 1980s. These hearings produced P.L. 98–

376, the “Insider Trading Sanctions Act of 1984,” and P.L. 100–704, the “Insider Trading and Securities Fraud Enforcement Act of 1988,” which are the only major insider trading laws on the books.

Madam Speaker, I am ashamed to say I was right in predicting that banks would become “too big to fail” when I opposed the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act on the floor in 1999. I hope I am wrong in predicting that the STOCK Act, if not subjected to serious scrutiny and amended, will produce an administrative morass and, worse, an enforcement tool subject to the perils of political manipulation.

That in mind, I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of S. 2038.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the STOCK Act. I regret having to miss a vote on this significant legislation, but I had to return to Maine to attend a family funeral. Had I been present, I would have voted for the House Amendment to S. 2038.

These commonsense rules will help ensure that no member of Congress profits from the nonpublic information they receive in their official capacity. The voters in our districts sent us here to work hard on their behalf. It is simply wrong that anyone would consider using insider information he or she gains while working for his or her constituents to make investment decisions.

Faith in Washington is at an all time low. Unfortunately, the STOCK Act is only a small step towards restoring the public’s trust in their elected officials. However, it is an important step that will help hold every one of us more accountable.

I was proud to join two hundred eighty-four of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle as a cosponsor of the original House version of the STOCK Act. I am hopeful that this strong show of bipartisanship can continue on the other important issues that face our country.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the House amendment to S. 2038, the Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge, STOCK, Act, but I must share my deep disappointment with the House Republican leadership’s move to weaken this legislation.

As a cosponsor of the House version of the STOCK Act that has 285 bipartisan cosponsors, I strongly believe we need to restore trust in our public officials and those who work closely with them by clarifying that the same insider trading rules that everyone else must follow apply to all three branches of our government as well. The STOCK Act will prohibit Members of Congress and employees of Congress from profiting from nonpublic information they obtain via their official positions. It will also require Members of Congress to report on their stock sales.

The Senate version added a provision that would require firms specializing in “political intelligence,” that may use information obtained from Congress to make financial transactions, to register with the House and Senate—just as lobbying firms are now required to do. House Republicans watered down this bill in the middle of the night by dropping this provision, even though it was unanimously approved by the House Judiciary Committee this past December.

The measure before us today is an important first step, but once it is passed, I call on my colleagues to conference with the Senate

to strengthen this legislation. If we wish to restore confidence in our government, we must start by using fair and transparent legislative procedures.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor and strong supporter of the STOCK Act.

The STOCK Act includes the Congressional Integrity and Pension Forfeiture Act, which Congressman DOLD and I introduced last year.

The Pension Forfeiture Act ensures that former Members of Congress forfeit their pensions if they are convicted of committing a public corruption crime while serving in elected public office.

Corrupt former legislators who continue to collect pensions on the taxpayer dime are taking advantage of the American people even after they have left office.

This legislation will protect taxpayer dollars and end what could only be viewed as a reward for those who have abused the public’s trust.

In my home state of Illinois, we know all too well about the costs of corruption.

Two former governors of Illinois, George Ryan and Rod Blagojevich, are serving extensive prison time for corruption.

Blagojevich, who previously represented the Illinois 5th District, continues to claim his federal pension because of a loophole in existing law.

Congressman DOLD and I believe that this loophole should be closed.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the STOCK Act and restoring transparency, accountability, and trust in government and public service.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, insider trading is and has been against the law no matter who you are. The bill we are debating is not about simply banning Members from insider trading, it is about holding Members of Congress and members of the administration to a higher standard as I think we should be. Confidence in Congress is at an all time low and restoring trust with the American people is paramount. While affirming the ban on insider trading the STOCK Act also significantly broadens prohibited activity and establishes a new reporting system that will allow for unprecedented transparency.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill because even the appearance of operating outside the law needs to be addressed forcefully. By shining the brightest light possible on the financial transactions of Members of Congress and the administration we can help ensure that no one is taking advantage of their positions. Madam Speaker, the American people have elected us to be their representatives and that means conducting ourselves with the highest of ethical standards. Anything less is a disservice to this office and to those who sent us here.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to debate the S. 2038—Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge, STOCK, Act which would amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 and the Ethics in Government Act. The legislation would require the Senate and the House of Representatives to implement an electronic filing

system for financial disclosure forms and provide the public with on-line access to that information in a searchable database. S. 2038 also would make clear that Members of Congress, Congressional employees, and federal employees are prohibited from using nonpublic information for personal financial benefit. In addition, the legislation would require more timely reporting of information about financial transactions by Members and staff.

The STOCK ACT would prohibit Members of Congress, employees of Congress, and all federal employees from using “any nonpublic information derived from the individual’s position as a Member of Congress or employee of Congress, or gained from performance of the individual’s duties, for personal benefit.”

The bill before us today is not the same measures that had received overwhelming bipartisan support in the Senate or the House. The measure before us today has been brought onto the Floor under the cover of darkness. There was zero transparency in the process and there is no opportunity to offer amendments.

I firmly and unequivocally believe that the American people deserve to know that their elected officials only have one interest in mind, which is doing what is best for the country rather than their own financial interests. This behavior is particularly disturbing at a time when so many Americans are struggling to make ends meet. Members of this body and any public servant should not have a financial edge because of information they have attained while serving the American people.

The issue before us today is not whether an insider trading law should exist for lawmakers. The issue before us today is one of fairness and transparency. As we attempt to shine a spotlight on those who may profit on insider knowledge, the Republican led majority in the House has closed out the possibility of improving this bill.

The night before last, the Rules Committee passed a rule on a straight party-line vote. The rule has allowed the Republican majority to bring up their own version of the STOCK Act under a suspension of the rules.

Let me be clear; Republican leadership has brought a bill onto the Floor under a suspension of the rules. They utilized the most restrictive process the House has to offer. In fact, this process is so restrictive that it is often reserved for noncontroversial items such as naming post offices, buildings, or even playgrounds.

For this bill, of all bills, to be brought up under suspension of the rules is unfathomable. The Republican-led majority has given Democrats no opportunity to offer their own amendments in order to improve the bill. In addition, there is no chance for the Democrats to offer our own alternative, under a Motion to Recommit.

As a Senior Member of the Judiciary Committee, I find the actions of the Republican-led House to be outrageous. It is a direct contradiction to the original bipartisan effort supported in this House by 285 Members of this body pushed by Ms. SLAUGHTER, a bill which was composed over the course of 6 years.

Further, considering the bipartisan support received for the initial Senate version of the STOCK Act and the significant bipartisan support received by the bill introduced by my dear colleague Ms. SLAUGHTER it is curious that the Republicans have chosen to put forward their

own version of the STOCK Act which waters down government reform and leaves out a critical piece of the STOCK Act—namely, the registration of the political intelligence industry.

Registration of the political intelligence industry was included in the Senate passed bill, but stripped out of this watered down Republican version. Instead of requiring registration, my Republican colleagues only require a study of the industry.

It is as though the Majority wishes to ignore the fact that regulation of the political intelligence community was supported by 285 Members of Congress who were co-sponsors of the original Slaughter-Walz bill. Instead, what we now know is that after emerging from behind closed doors, the bill introduced by Republicans does nothing to regulate the political intelligence community.

Regulating the political intelligence industry is vital to this piece of legislation. A study will not have the same impact as a requirement that these firms register and come out from the shadows.

Political intelligence firms or people who have special relationships with government officials can obtain nonpublic legislative information or learn about pending legislative decisions by attending lobbying sessions, or communicating directly with lobbyists and lawmakers.

The term “political intelligence” refers to legislative information that is potentially market-moving, is nonpublic or not easily accessible to the public, and is gathered, analyzed, and sold to or shared with interested parties by firms or people with access to such information. Political intelligence is typically sold to independent companies or third parties whose business demands knowledge of upcoming market and industry affecting legislative decisions.

The political intelligence industry must be regulated. These firms have grown drastically over the last few decades, and are now a \$100 million a year industry. Every day these firms help hedge funds and Wall Street investors unfairly profit from nonpublic congressional information. These firms have no congressional oversight and can freely pass along information for investment purposes. In 2005, insiders profited from a last-minute government bailout of companies who were embroiled in asbestos litigation. We must prevent such windfalls from happening again.

The U.S. House of Representatives Ethics Manual states that its members should “never use any information coming to him confidentially in the performance of governmental duties as a means for making private profit,” and the Senate Ethics Manual states that its Conflict of Interest Rule 37(1) provides for “a broad prohibition against members, officers or employees deriving financial benefit, directly or indirectly, from the use of their official position[s].” No arrests or prosecutions, however, have ever been made against members of Congress for insider trading based on non-public congressional knowledge.

While Members of Congress are not exempt from federal securities laws, including insider trading prohibitions, it remains unclear whether a member of Congress has a fiduciary duty to the United States—misappropriating information gained through an employment relationship is illegal, but case law conflicts as to whether members of Congress actually constitute “employees” of the federal govern-

ment—whether the information on which the Member trades is “material”—Is there “a substantial likelihood” that a reasonable investor “would consider it important” in making an investment decision?—and whether the information on which the Member traded is “non-public.”

The bill before us today has utilized Senate language which clarifies federal ethics rules and establishes a fiduciary duty against insider trading by all three branches of government. This measure does give the Securities Exchange Commission, SEC, Department of Justice, DOJ, and Commodities Futures Trading Commission, CFTC, clear authority to prosecute insider trading cases throughout the federal government, as well as clarifying that 28,000 executive branch employees will be subject to the same online, public financial disclosure rules as will be applied to Congress. In addition it adds more specific disclosure restrictions on executive branch officials, and requires that their disclosures be online within 30 days of submission.

Even so, this measure is still a watery version of Ms. SLAUGHTER’S bill. We have been denied the opportunity to amend the bill on the Floor today in a manner that would ensure bipartisan support.

Again, Republican-led House has gone too far. They not only not eliminated the political intelligence registration requirement and replaced it with a 12-month GAO study. They have also removed from this measure the anti-corruption provision that restored criminal penalties in some public corruption cases. This provision had been unanimously approved by House Judiciary in December.

House Republican leadership should have allowed this bill to be finalized in an open and transparent manner. Instead, the Majority continued their “my-way-or-the-highway” approach. They shut out their colleagues, and made partisan changes to what was a bipartisan bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I support the Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge, STOCK, Act. This bill clarifies that Members of Congress, congressional staff, executive branch officials, and judicial officers are subject to the same insider trading rules as everyone else. It is common sense to ensure that taxpayers do not pay the salary of people who take advantage of privileged conversations to make a profit. I am pleased that the STOCK Act has such strong bipartisan support, but I am disappointed in the way that Republican leaders are ushering the bill through the House.

For a bill that ends insider trading and is supposed to bring transparency to the influence peddling industry in Washington, it is disappointing that—literally in the dark of night—Republican leaders listened to the complaints of lobbyists and changed the bill. Republicans removed two important provisions that shine light on the shadowy world of political intelligence and that empower federal investigators to bring criminal corruption charges against public officials.

The STOCK Act that I cosponsor, and that passed the Senate with 96 votes, requires that political intelligence consultants register their activities, similar to the manner of lobbyists. These consultants gather inside information from Members of Congress and staff and then sell that information to Wall Street, lobbyists



and hedge funds. This is a \$400 million industry and yet we know very little about it; political intelligence consultants work in anonymity.

Public officials are entrusted by the public to conduct their duties with integrity. Those who abuse this trust should be held accountable and prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. That is why the original version of the STOCK Act gave prosecutors tools to identify, investigate, and prosecute criminal conduct by public officials. This is an important provision that holds public officials accountable for their actions and protects the integrity of government institutions.

These two provisions should be reinstated when the House and Senate go to conference.

Despite its shortcomings, the STOCK Act offers much to support. In addition to the insider trading rules, this bill expands existing law that bans Congressional pensions for Members of Congress convicted of committing a felony. It also prohibits bonuses for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac executives while the GSEs are still supported by taxpayer dollars.

It is important that Members of Congress be held to the same ethical standards as our constituents. The STOCK Act is a critical piece of legislation that is long overdue. I am pleased that it is moving forward with strong bipartisan support, but I hope that it is strengthened when the House and Senate go to conference.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor of the original House STOCK Act, H.R. 1148, I commend my colleagues TIM WALZ and LOUISE SLAUGHTER for their leadership on this issue and will support the version of the legislation we are being asked to vote on today so that we can send it to conference and finalize a stronger product for the American people.

While there is broad, bipartisan agreement that Members of Congress, their staff and executive branch officials should not be profiting from non-public information, there are other steps we can and should take to promote transparency and protect the integrity of government. For example, the Senate-passed bill and the original House version of the STOCK Act would require public registration for the "political intelligence" industry. That requirement was stripped from today's legislation.

Madam Speaker, while I believe this particular version of the STOCK Act can clearly be strengthened, I will support it to move the process forward.

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, S. 2038, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion to suspend will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 3630.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 2, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—417

Ackerman	Amash	Bachus
Adams	Amodei	Baldwin
Aderholt	Andrews	Barletta
Akin	Austria	Barrow
Alexander	Baca	Bartlett
Altmire	Bachmann	Barton (TX)

Bass (CA)	Fattah	Larsen (WA)	Richardson	Schwartz	Tipton
Bass (NH)	Filner	Larson (CT)	Richmond	Schweikert	Tonko
Becerra	Fincher	Latham	Rigell	Scott (SC)	Towns
Benishek	Fitzpatrick	LaTourette	Rivera	Scott (VA)	Tsongas
Berg	Flake	Latta	Roby	Scott, Austin	Turner (NY)
Berkley	Fleischmann	Lee (CA)	Roe (TN)	Scott, David	Turner (OH)
Berman	Fleming	Levin	Rogers (AL)	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Biggert	Flores	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Serrano	Van Hollen
Bilbray	Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher	Sessions	Velázquez
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Lipinski	Rokita	Sewell	Vislosky
Bishop (GA)	Foxo	LoBiondo	Rooney	Sherman	Walberg
Bishop (NY)	Frank (MA)	Loeback	Ros-Lehtinen	Shimkus	Walden
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Lofgren, Zoe	Roskam	Shuler	Walsh (IL)
Black	Frelinghuysen	Long	Ross (AR)	Simpson	Walz (MN)
Blackburn	Gallegly	Lowey	Ross (FL)	Sires	Wasserman
Bonamici	Garamendi	Lucas	Rothman (NJ)	Slaughter	Schultz
Bonner	Gardner	Luetkemeyer	Roybal-Allard	Smith (NE)	Waters
Bono Mack	Garrett	Luján	Royce	Smith (NJ)	Watt
Boren	Gerlach	Lummis	Ruppel	Smith (TX)	Waxman
Boswell	Gibbs	Lungren, Daniel	Rush	Smith (WA)	Webster
Boustany	Gibson	E.	Ryan (OH)	Southerland	Welch
Brady (PA)	Gingrey (GA)	Lynch	Ryan (WI)	Speier	West
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Mack	Sánchez, Linda	Stark	Whitfield
Braley (IA)	Gonzalez	Maloney	T.	Stearns	Wilson (FL)
Brooks	Goodlatte	Manzullo	Sanchez, Loretta	Stivers	Wilson (SC)
Broun (GA)	Gosar	Marchant	Sarbanes	Stutzman	Wittman
Brown (FL)	Gowdy	Marino	Scalise	Sullivan	Wolf
Buchanan	Granger	Markey	Schakowsky	Sutton	Womack
Bucshon	Graves (GA)	Matheson	Schiff	Terry	Woolsey
Buerkle	Graves (MO)	Matsui	Schilling	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth
Burgess	Green, Al	McCarthy (CA)	Schmidt	Thompson (PA)	Yoder
Butterfield	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)	Schock	Thornberry	Young (FL)
Calvert	Griffin (AR)	McCauley	Schrader	Tiberi	Young (IN)
Camp	Griffith (VA)	McClintock		Tierney	
Canseco	Grijalva	McCollum			
Cantor	Grimm	McCotter			
Capito	Guinta	McDermott	Campbell	Woodall	
Capps	Guthrie	McGovern			
Capuano	Gutierrez	McHenry			
Carnahan	Hahn	McIntyre	Blumenauer	Fudge	Shuster
Carson (IN)	Hall	McKeon	Burton (IN)	Michaud	Thompson (MS)
Carter	Hanabusa	McKinley	Cardoza	Paul	Westmoreland
Cassidy	Hanna	McMorris	Carney	Platts	Young (AK)
Castor (FL)	Harper	Rodgers	Edwards	Rogers (MI)	
Chabot	Harris	McNerney			
Chaffetz	Hartzler	Meehan			
Chandler	Hastings (FL)	Meeks			
Chu	Hastings (WA)	Mica			
Ciulline	Hayworth	Miller (FL)			
Clarke (MI)	Heck	Miller (MI)			
Clarke (NY)	Heinrich	Miller (NC)			
Clay	Hensarling	Miller, Gary			
Cleaver	Herger	Miller, George			
Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Moore			
Coble	Higgins	Moran			
Coffman (CO)	Himes	Mulvaney			
Cohen	Hinchee	Murphy (CT)			
Cole	Hinojosa	Murphy (PA)			
Conaway	Hirono	Myrick			
Connolly (VA)	Hochul	Nadler			
Conyers	Holden	Napolitano			
Cooper	Holt	Neal			
Costa	Honda	Neugebauer			
Costello	Hoyer	Noem			
Courtney	Huelskamp	Nugent			
Cravaack	Huizenga (MI)	Nunes			
Crawford	Hultgren	Nunnelee			
Crenshaw	Hunter	Olson			
Critz	Hurt	Olver			
Crowley	Inslee	Owens			
Cuellar	Israel	Palazzo			
Culberson	Issa	Pallone			
Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Pascrell			
Davis (CA)	Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)			
Davis (IL)	(TX)	Paulsen			
Davis (KY)	Jenkins	Payne			
DeFazio	Johnson (GA)	Pearce			
DeGette	Johnson (IL)	Pelosi			
DeLauro	Johnson (OH)	Pence			
Denham	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter			
Dent	Johnson, Sam	Peters			
DesJarlais	Jones	Peterson			
Deutch	Jordan	Petri			
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)			
Dicks	Keating	Pitts			
Dingell	Kelly	Poe (TX)			
Doggett	Kildee	Polis			
Dold	Kind	Pompeo			
Donnelly (IN)	King (IA)	Posey			
Doyle	King (NY)	Price (GA)			
Dreier	Kingston	Price (NC)			
Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)	Quayle			
Duncan (SC)	Kissell	Quigley			
Duncan (TN)	Kline	Rahall			
Ellison	Kucinich	Rangel			
Ellmers	Labrador	Reed			
Emerson	Lamborn	Rehberg	Ackerman	Altmire	Bachus
Engel	Lance	Reichert	Adams	Amodei	Baldwin
Eshoo	Landry	Renacci	Aderholt	Andrews	Barletta
Farenthold	Langevin	Reyes	Akin	Austria	Barrow
Farr	Lankford	Ribble	Alexander	Baca	Bartlett

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

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—14

□ 1035

Messrs. WALDEN, HINCHEY, and HARPER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against: Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 47, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3630, TEMPORARY PAYROLL TAX CUT CONTINUATION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 3630) offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 15, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—405

Ackerman	Altmire	Bachus
Adams	Amodei	Baldwin
Aderholt	Andrews	Barletta
Akin	Austria	Barrow
Alexander	Baca	Bartlett

Barton (TX) Farenthold  
 Bass (CA) Farr  
 Bass (NH) Fattah  
 Becerra Filner  
 Benishkek Fincher  
 Berg Fitzpatrick  
 Berkley Fleischmann  
 Berman Fleming  
 Biggert Flores  
 Bilbray Forbes  
 Bilirakis Fortenberry  
 Bishop (GA) Foxx  
 Bishop (NY) Frank (MA)  
 Bishop (UT) Franks (AZ)  
 Black Frelinghuysen  
 Bonamici Gallegly  
 Bonner Garamendi  
 Bono Mack Gardner  
 Boren Garrett  
 Boswell Gerlach  
 Boustany Gibbs  
 Brady (PA) Gibson  
 Brady (TX) Gingrey (GA)  
 Braley (IA) Gohmert  
 Brooks Gonzalez  
 Broun (GA) Goodlatte  
 Brown (FL) Gosar  
 Buchanan Gowdy  
 Bucshon Granger  
 Buerkle Graves (GA)  
 Burgess Graves (MO)  
 Butterfield Green, Al  
 Calvert Green, Gene  
 Camp Griffin (AR)  
 Canseco Griffith (VA)  
 Cantor Grijalva  
 Capito Grimm  
 Capps Guinta  
 Capuano Guthrie  
 Carnahan Gutierrez  
 Carson (IN) Hahn  
 Carter Hall  
 Cassidy Hanabusa  
 Castor (FL) Hanna  
 Chabot Harper  
 Chaffetz Harris  
 Chandler Hartzler  
 Chu Hastings (FL)  
 Cicilline Hastings (WA)  
 Clarke (MI) Hayworth  
 Clarke (NY) Heck  
 Clay Heinrich  
 Cleaver Hensarling  
 Clyburn Herger  
 Coble Herrera Beutler  
 Coffman (CO) Higgins  
 Cohen Himes  
 Cole Hinchey  
 Conaway Hinojosa  
 Connolly (VA) Hirono  
 Conyers Hochul  
 Cooper Holden  
 Costa Holt  
 Costello Honda  
 Courtney Hoyer  
 Cravaack Huizenga (MI)  
 Crawford Hultgren  
 Crenshaw Hunter  
 Critz Hurt  
 Crowley Inslee  
 Cuellar Israel  
 Culberson Issa  
 Cummings Jackson (IL)  
 Davis (CA) Jackson Lee  
 Davis (IL) (TX)  
 Davis (KY) Jenkins  
 DeFazio Johnson (GA)  
 DeGette Johnson (IL)  
 DeLauro Johnson (OH)  
 Denham Johnson, E. B.  
 Dent Johnson, Sam  
 DesJarlais Jones  
 Deutch Jordan  
 Diaz-Balart Kaptur  
 Dicks Keating  
 Dingell Kelly  
 Doggett Kildee  
 Dold Kind  
 Donnelly (IN) King (IA)  
 Doyle King (NY)  
 Dreier Kingston  
 Duffy Kinzinger (IL)  
 Duncan (SC) Kissell  
 Duncan (TN) Kline  
 Ellison Kucinich  
 Ellmers Labrador  
 Emerson Lamborn  
 Engel Lance  
 Eshoo Landry

Langevin  
 Lankford  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Latta  
 Lee (CA)  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loebsack  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lujan  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Lynch  
 Mack  
 Maloney  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Markey  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCaul  
 McCollum  
 McCotter  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McHenry  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Moran  
 Rodgers  
 McRaney  
 Meehan  
 Meeks  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Miller, George  
 Moore  
 Moran  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Myrick  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Nunnelee  
 Olson  
 Olver  
 Owens  
 Palazzo  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Paulsen  
 Payne  
 Pearce  
 Pelosi  
 Pence  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Petri  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Pitts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Polis  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price (GA)  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Reed  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Richmond

Rigell  
 Rivera  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross (AR)  
 Ross (FL)  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Runyan  
 Ruppersberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Scalise  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schilling  
 Schmidt  
 Schock  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz

Amash  
 Bachmann  
 Blackburn  
 Campbell  
 Flake

Blumenauer  
 Burton (IN)  
 Cardoza  
 Carney  
 Edwards

Schweikert  
 Scott (SC)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Scott, David  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Sewell  
 Sherman  
 Shimkus  
 Shuler  
 Simpson  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Southerland  
 Speier  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Stivers  
 Sullivan  
 Sutton  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tierney  
 Tipton  
 Tonko

NAYS—15

Huelskamp  
 Long  
 Lummis  
 McClintock  
 Neugebauer

NOT VOTING—13

Fudge  
 Michaud  
 Paul  
 Platts  
 Ribble

Towns  
 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)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Woolsey  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)  
 Young (IN)

Quayle  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Stutzman  
 Wolf  
 Yoder

Shuster  
 Terry  
 Thompson (MS)

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 99

Whereas enslaved African-Americans provided labor essential to the construction of the United States Capitol;

Whereas in 2005 Congress created the Slave Labor Task Force to study the role that enslaved African-Americans played in the construction of the Capitol and to make recommendations to Congress on how to commemorate their contribution;

Whereas the report of the Architect of the Capitol entitled "History of Slave Laborers in the Construction of the United States Capitol" documents the role of slave labor in the construction of the Capitol;

Whereas enslaved African-Americans performed the backbreaking work of quarrying the stone which comprised many of the floors, walls, and columns of the Capitol;

Whereas enslaved African-Americans also participated in other facets of construction of the Capitol, including carpentry, masonry, carting, rafting, roofing, plastering, glazing, painting, and sawing;

Whereas the marble columns in the Old Senate Chamber and the sandstone walls of the East Front corridor remain as the lasting legacies of the enslaved African-Americans who worked the quarries;

Whereas slave-quarried stones from the remnants of the original Capitol walls can be found in Rock Creek Park in the District of Columbia;

Whereas the Statue of Freedom now atop the Capitol dome could not have been cast without the pivotal intervention of Philip Reid, an enslaved African-American foundry worker who deciphered the puzzle of how to separate the 5-piece plaster model for casting when all others failed;

Whereas the great hall of the Capitol Visitor Center was named Emancipation Hall to help acknowledge the work of the slave laborers who built the Capitol;

Whereas no narrative on the construction of the Capitol that does not include the contribution of enslaved African-Americans can fully and accurately reflect its history;

Whereas recognition of the contributions of enslaved African-Americans brings to all Americans an understanding of the continuing evolution of our representative democracy;

Whereas in 2007 the Slave Labor Task Force recommended to Congress the creation of a marker commemorating the contributions of enslaved African-Americans in the construction of the Capitol; and

Whereas the marker dedicated to the enslaved African-Americans who helped to build the Capitol reflects the charge of the Capitol Visitor Center to teach visitors about Congress and its development: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

**SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO UNVEIL MARKER DEDICATED TO ENSLAVED AFRICAN-AMERICANS WHO HELPED BUILD THE CAPITOL.**

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on February 28, 2012, for a ceremony to unveil the marker which acknowledges the role that slave labor played in the construction of the United States Capitol.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1044

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

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

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 47 and 48, I missed both votes due to an automobile accident. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" in both cases.

**AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR A CEREMONY TO UNVEIL THE MARKER WHICH ACKNOWLEDGES THE ROLE THAT SLAVE LABOR PLAYED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL**

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 99, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 1 p.m. in pro forma session. No votes are expected. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition, the House will consider H.R. 7, the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act of 2012. The House may also consider legislation relating to H.R. 3630, the Temporary Payroll Tax Cut Continuation Act.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information with respect to the two pieces of legislation and the suspension bills.

If I might inquire, Mr. Leader, of the timing. The conference committee has met, as all of us know, a few times since being appointed on December 23. They were supposed to have a meeting today, but apparently that meeting was cancelled. We adopted a motion to instruct conferees on January 18, with only 16 Republicans opposing and just a few Republicans opposing this time on a similar motion to instruct, urging the conferees to report back by February 17.

You know as well as anybody, we will be off for the President's week work period, and we will not be back until the night of the 27th, which only gives us the 2 days and that evening to pass this bill if we do not pass it before the 17th.

In December, we almost, as you well know, did not extend the payroll tax holiday or the unemployment or the SGR package. That would have resulted, as the gentleman knows, in 160 million Americans having a tax increase, benefits lost for many unemployed Americans—almost 2.3 over the next 3 months—and we only have 3 full days left before the February break. Of course, the gentleman, Mr. CAMP, the

chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, chairs that conference.

Can the gentleman tell us whether or not there is a reasonable expectation that we will be able to act on this bill and have the conference committee report on the House floor?

Mr. CANTOR. I will say to the gentleman, as I said before and as reflected by the vote that just occurred on the motion to instruct conferees, we, too, desire a resolution of this issue next week. I think the gentleman knows that we've been on this floor before in the same discussion where it is imperative for us to send a signal to the hardworking taxpayers of this country that they're not going to have their taxes go up. So it is my hope that we're going to see some productivity out of the conference committee.

I think the gentleman knows my position as to why there has been no productivity. Frankly, last week, I urged the gentleman to point his ire to the other side of the Capitol because it is that side of the Capitol and Leader REID who have been unwilling to come forward with a resolution to this issue.

□ 1050

As the gentleman knows, the House has taken its position. We believe we ought to extend the payroll tax holiday for a year and do so in a responsible manner so as not to raid the Social Security trust fund. But there's been no willingness on the part of Leader REID and his conferees to even offer a suggestion as to how to resolve this impasse.

So, again, I say to the gentleman, we are committed to making sure taxes don't go up on hardworking people in these economic times.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I am pleased to hear that.

As the gentleman knows, Mark Zandi just a few days ago said that failure to extend the payroll tax and the unemployment insurance benefits "would deliver a significant blow" to our fragile economic recovery and could cost our economy 500,000 jobs and raise the unemployment rate by at least three-tenths of a point and lower economic growth by seven-tenths of a point.

Now I'm pleased to hear what the majority leader has said, but of course we still have some concern. Representative PAUL BROWN, one of your Members from Georgia said, This payroll tax holiday is just a gimmick to try to get Obama reelected. This is bad policy. Representative CHAFFETZ from Utah, one of your colleagues, said, Tax holidays just are bad policy. A year is pretty short. The chairman of your campaign committee, PETE SESSIONS, was quoted in the L.A. Times. Representative PETE SESSIONS of Texas, who heads the House Republican campaign committee, called Obama's plan—that is, the extension of the payroll tax—"a horrible idea." He said GOP candidates would have no difficulty explaining to voters why they

want to let the tax break expire. And then, of course, the chairman of the conference committee, my good friend, for whom I have a great deal of respect, apparently does not agree with what the majority leader just said in wanting to extend this tax cut, because he said, I'm not in favor of that. I don't think that's a good idea.

Now that was, admittedly, back in August, so it was some months ago when he said that. But it gives us some concern that the leadership of the conference committee, Mr. CAMP and others, are in the position where they don't really think, as seemed to be reflected in the last year, that this tax cut ought to be extended. They do, however, believe—very strongly, as I understand it—that the tax cut for the wealthiest in America, the Bush tax cuts, ought to be extended, and they ought to be extended without paying for it. And, in fact, you provided in your rule that you adopted in this Congress that they could be extended without paying for them.

I don't think that's your position, as I understand it, with respect to tax cuts for middle class Americans. Would the gentleman like to comment on those observations?

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say, really it's not productive to engage in politics and division. We ought to be about multiplication here. We ought to be about growing the economy. We ought not be talking in the way that the gentleman suggests, that somehow we Republicans prefer one group of people over another. That's not true. We're here fighting for the hardworking taxpayers.

I just said, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman, that we, as Republicans in this House, do not support taxes going up on anybody. We believe that Washington spends too much money. We don't believe you ought to tax anybody, especially the job creators, the small businessmen and women who we're relying on to create jobs and get this economy back to where it needs to be, in a growth mode.

So the gentleman knows very well my position, and it is the position of our conference. We do not want to see taxes going up on hardworking taxpayers. I said it before, and I will say it again: We hope that the conferees can produce something for us to vote on, but we are not in any way, shape, or form advocating for taxes to go up on hardworking people. No. We are for making sure that doesn't happen. So, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many times I can say that to underscore our commitment.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his recommitment to that proposition.

Let me ask the gentleman, therefore, given the fact, am I correct that you do not believe the extension of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts need to be paid for? Is that still your position?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, again, the question has to do with the gentleman and his side's and the President's insistence that somehow the math requires us to raise taxes on small businessmen and women. We don't believe that. We don't believe that we ought to let tax rates go up and create a tax hike on the small business people of this country because, number one, that exacerbates the challenge that we're already dealing with in trying to get this economy growing. And number two, it will put more money into the hands of Washington to begin spending that money without paying down the debt.

The gentleman knows very well our commitment to making sure we get the fiscal house in order. He knows very well that we believe you've got to fix the problem and not go in and ask the small businessmen and women to pay more taxes to dig a hole deeper. We believe you ought to fix the problem, stop taking small business money away from the men and women who make it, and let them continue to put it back into their enterprises and create jobs. That's what we're trying to do. And I look forward to working with the gentleman to make sure we accomplish that end.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's answer. It doesn't surprise me, but he didn't answer my question.

My question was: you amended your rules in this House so that the extension of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts did not have to be paid for. I'm asking, is that the gentleman's position now? It's a very simple question. Yes or no? It is, or it is not.

Mr. CANTOR. If I could, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, does he think that the payroll tax holiday extension for the year needs to be paid for?

Mr. HOYER. I don't necessarily think it needs to be paid for for exactly the reason you pointed out. What you pointed out was, you don't want to depress—either by increasing the taxes on small business, as you point out—we're not for increasing taxes on small business. We are for asking those who have made the best in our society over the last 10 years, make the most, make \$1 million or more, we do believe, yes, a greater contribution is in order because our country has a challenged situation that we need to respond to.

Having said that, I believe that it ought to be consistent, in terms of your application of not paying for tax cuts, for it to be also applicable to middle income, hardworking Americans who find themselves in a real pinch in this present economy, that we would take a similar position.

All I'm asking the gentleman, is your position on the middle class tax cut, which we are talking about, and it is in conference, the same as it is on the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003? That's all I'm asking.

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

I would ask in response to that, does he not agree that there is a difference between the nature of the tax relief in the payroll tax and the nature of existing tax rates on the marginal level as well as capital gains? And along those lines, would he not, then, be advocating a position that would say, it's okay to raid the Social Security trust fund if you're not going to pay for the extension of the payroll tax holiday?

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman goes off in about seven directions on that question, in my view. What I believe is that it ought to be a consistent policy, as it relates to keeping taxes down on hardworking Americans, that we apply to the wealthiest in America. Now whether they're temporary or permanent, it makes an economic difference to the people in question. And hardworking Americans—160 million of them—are hoping that their taxes will not go up on March 1. The only way they're going to not go up on March 1 is if we pass—as we had a great struggle doing in December—if we pass a conference report that will be reported out of the conference committee headed up by Mr. CAMP which in fact makes sure that those taxes don't increase.

You say you don't want them to increase. I say we don't want them to increase. We seem to have an agreement on that rhetorically, although I have quoted a number of your leaders who say they think it's a bad idea.

But having said that, my question to you is: is your position consistent with both the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts and these tax cuts? That's all I'm asking.

□ 1100

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I respond to the gentleman, I was not in seven different directions. It's very simple. I asked the gentleman: Are you okay with raiding the Social Security trust fund? Because your response to my question indicated to me that it's fine for you and your side to say: Let's just raid the Social Security trust fund, extend the payroll tax holiday without any pay-fors; is that okay?

Mr. HOYER. Your President, who you supported very strongly, of course, as I recall, when he wanted to raid the Social Security trust fund said there was no trust fund. Now, I believe there is a trust fund, and I think we have a moral responsibility to make sure that that trust fund is kept whole. And, in fact, as you well know, we will keep it whole. We will sign the proper IOUs so that that trust fund is intact. There will be no reduction in the Social Security tax, and the gentleman knows it. The gentleman knows that that trust fund will be as secure tomorrow as it is today, and I presume that both of us have a commitment to that end. Yes, we will have to make whole the trust fund money that does not come in on the tax cut, just as we had to make money for the war, for the prescription drug bill, and the Bush tax cuts whole by borrowing from somebody, usually China and other nations around the world.

We went from a \$5.6 trillion surplus to a \$10-plus trillion deficit. Why? Because we did things and didn't pay for them. So if the gentleman is asking me do I believe the Social Security trust fund ought to be kept whole, the answer is an emphatic, absolute yes.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I'd say to the gentleman, he has answered the same question in two different ways. And he's also gone off not in seven different directions but nine or ten when he starts talking about the former President George Bush. George Bush has nothing to do with this debate, has nothing to do with the issue before it.

What I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, is, number one: Does he not agree that if we pay for the extension of the Federal tax holiday, we are making sure that we attempt to address the raid on the Social Security trust fund? And is that not different than talking about marginal rates on small business men and women? Is that not different than talking about keeping the capital gain rates the same on investors and entrepreneurs in America? We need to put investment capital back into the economy, the private economy. And so my point was not seven different directions, my point is just that.

Again, I would say to the gentleman that it bothers me to hear that the gentleman just wants to rely on an IOU. The public is tired of saying, yes, we'll owe it. We'll owe it. We'll pay it later. What we're saying is let's make sure that we don't dig the hole any deeper. Let's make sure we don't raid the Social Security trust fund. That's why we are saying let's pay for it.

But again, to the gentleman's point about trying to expedite things so we can have a result out of the conference committee, there has been no activity, no activity on the part of the Senate. They're not serious. They're not serious on wanting to address the issue—at least, they've not been thus far—and we're running out of time.

So again, I guess the gentleman's solution is go ahead and raid the Social Security trust fund and let's extend the payroll tax holiday. And if that's the gentleman's position, then we know the position I would imagine of the minority on this position.

Mr. HOYER. Well, the gentleman has talked a lot but hasn't answered my question. And the question was a simple one: Do you believe the same principle applies to the '01-'03 tax cuts as applied to the middle income working people's tax cut that we're talking about?

And I'll tell you this, my friend, if we were talking about the taxes that you're talking about, they would go through like greased lightning and there would be no question but, oh, of course, we've got to continue those tax cuts. But when it comes to average working Americans, and the only way we can get them a tax cut—this is the first time we've really talked about real tax cuts for middle-income working Americans. It has got a logjam that

has hit. It hit in December, and we came that close to not having that tax cut, and we're about to come that close again. I'm just telling the gentleman that if he applies the same principle, we could get this done.

Now I'm for paying for, frankly, the middle-income tax cut. I'm for paying for it, as the gentleman well knows, by a surtax on those who have done the best, not because I want to penalize them, but because all of us in this room, maybe not all of us, but most of us in this room, have done pretty well. There are some people in this country who haven't done pretty well. And as Clint Eastwood walked down that road that we saw during the Super Bowl, he said at half time, "We can do better." And I'll tell you what they said in the locker room: Every one of us, according to our ability to get it done, needs to get it done. That's what I'm saying to my friend.

I think the position you would be taking would be radically different and that that conference committee would have had a report out on this floor if we were talking about tax cuts for millionaires that would have passed like that. Absolutely, that's my position. I believe it. And, very frankly, I think the American people believe it.

I yield to my friend if he would like to comment on that, and then we will go to the infrastructure bill, which I know you'd like to talk about as well.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'll just wrap it up by saying I don't think there was anybody, any working American that did not benefit from the '01-'03 tax relief. So again, the gentleman's attempt to divide this country, saying that some benefit from this and others benefited from that, it's not the way that I think most Americans look at it. We're all in this together, okay.

So again, we're trying to make sure that taxes don't go up on anybody. We're trying to do it responsibly. And the gentleman does, and acknowledges, that the payroll tax holiday involves a tax that is dedicated to the viability of the Social Security trust fund. And the gentleman knows that if we pass that bill because of his insistence and the insistence of the leader on the Democratic side of the aisle in the Senate, the majority leader in the Senate, that if we have to go ahead and just do it unpaid for, then we have created more of a problem and raided the Social Security trust fund.

So again, if that's the choice, if the gentleman is saying that his side is not going to support an extension of the Federal tax holiday unless it's unpaid for, then I guess we know where we stand, and the American people know where we stand, because they'll force a raid on the Social Security trust fund.

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

The gentleman has a habit that, frankly, disturbs me, I'll tell my friend. I didn't say that at all. As a matter of fact, my last comment was I think it ought to be paid for. Now, let me explain what that means.

I think it ought to be paid for. I have been consistent on that position. Frankly, I was consistent on that position on all of the bills that we passed through this House, including your two tax bills of '01 and '03. I thought they ought to be paid. You thought they ought not be paid for. And the gentleman talks about looking at the past; they didn't work out so well. They were supposed to grow our economy. They were supposed to explode jobs. We lost jobs in the private sector. The only reason we had a plus 1 million over 8 years was because we grew in the public sector. We lost jobs in the private sector on that economic program. It didn't work, in my opinion. Paid for or not paid for, it did not work. But it did blow a hole in the deficit.

What I'm saying and will say again, yes, I think it ought to be paid for. What I think it ought not be paid for with is by taking it out of the hide of average working people in this country, which is part of the way you want to pay for it. I don't think that is good policy because I think that will further depress the economy and take dollars out of the hands of hardworking people.

Yes, I think it ought to be paid for, and paying for things is tough. And we didn't pay for things in the last decade, and that's why we dug this deep, deep hole we're in.

Now, if we want to go on to the infrastructure bill, I'd like to do that unless the gentleman wants to make an additional comment.

On the infrastructure bill, you indicate that it may come to the floor. Can you tell me under what kind of a rule that will come to the floor? Will it be an open rule, as has been projected?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I'd say to the gentleman, the Rules Committee has announced that there is an amendment deadline for Members to get their amendments in by Monday morning, and it will then proceed in the normal process to vote on a rule to govern the debate on the American Energy Infrastructure Jobs Act.

Mr. HOYER. It's my understanding, Mr. Leader, this bill is over 1,000 pages long. It was marked up just shortly after it was introduced and finalized. Is the gentleman concerned by the length of that bill and the short time that Members have to review it? And the very short time that the public, which will essentially have almost no opportunity to review it, is the gentleman concerned about that?

□ 1110

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, maybe the gentleman is confusing this majority with the one he was the leader in, because we have now seen all the committees, Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, mark up and consider amendments from both sides. H.R. 7, in its entirety, was posted

at approximately noon yesterday, February 8. At noon yesterday, it was on line for everyone to see. The vote is scheduled for next Friday, February 17.

Given the process of all the committees and all of the markups and the willingness to entertain amendments from both sides and now posting yesterday, Wednesday, when the vote is next Friday, I think that we are providing and living up to the commitment we've made, that we're going to have a much more open process, that the public is going to be able to enjoy its right to know what we're doing, and Members and their staffs, as well, can do what they need to do to prepare for their amendments and their votes on this bill.

Mr. HOYER. What I was confusing was your rhetoric now and your rhetoric as it related to a bill that was longer in pages but had 10 times a greater period of time for debate and discussion, considered by an extraordinarily large number of committees in both the Senate and the House, town meetings all over this country about that bill. What I'm confusing is your rhetoric as it related to the Affordable Care Act and your rhetoric related to the transportation bill, which has had probably one-twentieth or one-thirtieth of the time to be considered by the public. I don't know that anybody has had a town meeting or had the opportunity for the public to have input on this bill as it is now written. Very frankly, I may be confusing it with the bill that we just adopted on suspension of the calendar without any opportunity to amend it, which was filed less than 24 hours ago.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows where I'm going on that last comment, because I will just point out the fact that, when he was the majority leader, that bill, the STOCK Act, had sat dormant, and he refused as the majority leader to pick up the bill and bring it to the floor of the House.

Given the vote that we just saw, I think that there was probably legitimate work to improve and strengthen the bill, which indicated and was reflected in the vote that we just had on the STOCK Act. As for the gentleman's suggestion that somehow I'm confusing this bill with others and his reference to the Affordable Care Act, the public doesn't like that bill; right? It doesn't. I'm thinking that perhaps the gentleman is confusing this bill with one that came up during his term as majority leader when the cap-and-trade bill was filed at 2 a.m. and then we were asked to vote on it at 10 o'clock the next morning.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that we have provided for over a week's time and then some for Members to take a look at the full version and to give Members time to prepare their amendments until next Monday so that we can have a full and robust debate on this bill.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman says full time, but very frankly there wasn't participation

by everybody in this full discussion. In fact, as I said last week and I will reiterate this week, because he hasn't changed his position, Ray LaHood, Republican, former chief of staff to the Republican leader in this House, former chairman of an appropriations subcommittee on the Republican side of the aisle, says:

This is the most partisan transportation bill I've ever seen, and it is almost the most antisafety bill I've ever seen. It hollows out our number one priority, which is safety; and, frankly, it hollows out the guts of the transportation efforts that we have been about for the last 3 years. It is the worst transportation bill I've ever seen during 35 years of public service.

Ray LaHood, Republican, Secretary of Transportation.

Whatever time the gentleman has spent that he thinks exposing this bill, he didn't expose it on our side and he apparently didn't expose it in a way that reached bipartisan agreement from the Secretary of Transportation.

I will tell you, I lament the fact, Mr. Leader, when I was the majority leader—the gentleman likes to refer to that—the transportation bill passed with an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote. Every transportation bill that I've seen in the 30 years I've been in the Congress of the United States has passed on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, and it came out of committee almost unanimously. This bill, as the gentleman knows, came out on a purely partisan vote. Actually, it was a bipartisan opposition because Mr. PETRI, long-time member of the Transportation Committee, and, of course, Mr. LATOURETTE are not too happy with the bill either, as the gentleman knows, who is a senior Member on your side, one of your leaders on your side of the aisle. So I will tell my friend that unfortunately we have a situation where you're going to bring a bill up next week which clearly is a partisan bill, which does not enjoy bipartisan support, contrary to every transportation bill that I think we've passed in this House in the 30 years I've been here.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I am just marveling at the fact that I don't understand what the gentleman is seeing here. The Washington Post has just done extensive coverage and a story on that transportation bill and the 5,000-plus earmarks that were involved in the bill that he is bragging about.

We're in a new day here. We're shining the light of day. We're saying no more earmarks. We're not doing things the way we used to do them, and that is exactly what the people want. They want a reformed Congress that belongs to them, that works for them, and not the other way around.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that I look forward to his amendments that he submits for Monday to be considered by the Rules Committee so that we can proceed, as we have on so many bills, in an open debate on the floor of this House, unlike

we ever experienced in majorities past. I would say to the gentleman, let's really try and agree. We have to reform this system. We are standing up for reform, whether it be no more earmarks, whether it be continued positing of positions online so that Members have enough time to review, with an open announcement of how long the amendment deadline is, with a continued pattern of allowing for debate on amendments on both sides of the floor. We're trying to change this institution so it can actually live up to what the people are expecting and for us to be able to abide by their trust.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that comment.

I think the American people apparently don't think we're accomplishing that objective that you want to accomplish by virtue of their response to the polls about what they think of the job that we've done over the last year.

Let me say in addition to that, the bills I was referring to, my friend—yes, while I was the majority leader, we had the House and the Senate. I said 30 years. Of the 12 years that your party had the chairmanship of the Transportation Committee, we passed bills on a bipartisan basis, and we respected transparency.

As the gentleman knows on earmarks, you quadrupled the number of earmarks under your leadership—not your personal leadership, but under Republican control of the House of Representatives. When we came in, what we did was said they all had to be online. Members had to put them on their Web site, and committees had to identify where those came from. Now, personally, we made them very transparent. You've eliminated them temporarily. We'll see whether that holds.

But we will move on to the question of whether or not, when you say we're going to have open amendments, whether or not the amendments that are germane will be made in order so that, in fact, we can impact on the bill.

The gentleman says he is interested in seeing my amendments. I think most of the amendments will come from our committee members. They are the ones that are struggling to find out exactly what this bill does. And we don't believe it is paid for, by the way, as I think the gentleman probably has seen in the CBO report.

Let me ask you this: do you believe this bill is a jobs bill?

Mr. CANTOR. I believe that what is needed, Mr. Speaker, is some certainty so that the agencies at the State level can operate with their plans going forward for infrastructure needs. I believe that the private sector that is heavily involved with the infrastructure industry can know how to plan so they can make investments necessary so that we can see the maintenance, repair, and expansion of our infrastructure system in this country.

We're about trying to say let's grow. Let's grow. Let's try and work together so we can grow this economy. The

economy is dependent upon an infrastructure future that is certain.

□ 1120

The gentleman also knows that we have in the bill a pay-for that is derived from the expansion of the ability to explore in the deep ocean off our coasts because it's an energy resource that we should be utilizing. That, as well, holds a potential for thousands of new jobs.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are all about job creation. And I hope that the gentleman can join us in what is titled the American Energy Infrastructure Jobs Act.

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

Am I to take it, therefore, he disagrees with Speaker BOEHNER when Speaker BOEHNER said, just a few days ago, We're not making the claim that spending taxpayer money on transportation projects creates jobs. We don't make that claim.

So, this would not be a jobs bill from that standpoint; am I correct?

Mr. CANTOR. Again, the gentleman, if he wants to play gotcha—

Mr. HOYER. I'm not playing gotcha. I want to figure out whether this is a jobs bill. We haven't had a jobs bill in over 400 days.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just heard what I said: we can create jobs if we open up the ability for more energy exploration. We can create jobs if we provide some certainty to the industries and the State agencies—as well as the Federal agencies—that are involved in planning and charting the course for infrastructure maintenance, repair and expansion in this country.

Growth requires infrastructure that is at top notch, and we know we're a far cry from that in this country. So the gentleman understands my point: growth comes from better infrastructure; growth comes from expanding the ability to explore our natural resources off our coast, something that, unfortunately, most Members on his side of the aisle have not been supportive of in terms of charting a more certain and responsible energy future.

Does the gentleman have any more scheduling questions?

Mr. HOYER. These are all scheduling questions. These are scheduling questions as to whether or not we're going to have legislation on the floor that can get us from where we are to where we want to be.

The gentleman knows that the Senate has passed a bipartisan bill out of committee with Senator INHOFE, a Republican, and Senator BOXER—not exactly ideological soul mates—coming together and agreeing on infrastructure. Why? Because they believe it creates jobs.

What I'm trying to figure out from you, you go from other aspects of the bill that create jobs, and you say infrastructure is necessary for growth. My



reading of that is, as the President's pointed out, investing in infrastructure does, in fact, grow jobs.

To the extent that we can pass a bill, scheduling a bill that has bipartisan support here and bipartisan support there, and the support of the President of the United States, is what we ought to be doing. Doing it in a partisan fashion undercuts our scheduling of moving that forward. That's my point. I think the gentleman understands that point.

But I would hope that, as we work on this bill, we could do what the Senate's done, which they don't do very often, and come together in a bipartisan way, as we have historically done in this House on Transportation and Infrastructure bills, so important for the growth of our country and the creation of jobs and the moving forward—as you say, and I believe as well, we ought to come together and accomplish.

Unless the gentleman has anything further, I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

**ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY,  
FEBRUARY 9, 2012 TO MONDAY,  
FEBRUARY 13, 2012**

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Monday, February 13, 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

**REMEMBERING KELSEY LOMISON**

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Kelsey Lomison, 77, of Orviston, Pennsylvania, from the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, died on Monday, February 6, of this week.

Centre and Clinton Counties lost a great friend. Kelsey Lomison lived his 77 years serving and making a difference in the lives of individuals, families, and communities. He was an extraordinary caring leader in many facets of life, from singing for area churches, organizing benefits for persons and families in need, and serving Curtin Township and his home community of Orviston.

As a community leader, Kelsey demonstrated a deep commitment to serving his neighbors. His leadership within the Howard Area Lions Club and the Clinton County Fair represents just two of the countless efforts he performed.

He touched many lives and provided an excellent example to all who knew him. His determination, bright outlook on life, and phenomenal voice will be remembered.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Barb, sons Wes and Dave, and their entire family.

Kelsey Lomison's kindness, professionalism, talent and unselfish service will be missed. Rest with the Lord, my friend.

**STOCK ACT SOLD SHORT**

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, what the public saw today in the House of Representatives was a STOCK Act sold short. Unfortunately, what could have been an outstanding bill was changed by the Republican leadership by taking the two most important aspects put in the Senate bill out. One was a public corruption provision that would have allowed prosecutors to prosecute, from the courthouse to the Capitol, public corruption. This was something Senator LEAHY had, and in the House it was Representative SENSENBRENNER, a Republican, passed unanimously by the Judiciary Committee. But for some reason unbeknownst to me, it was stripped by the leadership of the Republican side out of the bill. Democrats didn't have an opportunity to participate in the drafting of the bill, and what was the work of LOUISE SLAUGHTER and TIM WALZ was hijacked from them.

Another important provision was the political intelligence provision. It was taken out by K Street lobbyists working with the leadership—late. That should not have been taken out.

The two best parts of the STOCK Act were sold short, and the American public should have had better today. We passed something, but not what we should have done.

**LINE-ITEM VETO**

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, because government has spent money we don't have and borrowed money we can't pay back, our national debt now stands at \$15 trillion. My daughter, Sarah, who is 2 years old, now has \$50,000 as her share of the national debt.

Congress and the President have an obligation to make the tough decisions to reduce spending so we can provide a brighter future for our kids. That's why I was proud to support the Expedited Legislative Line-Item Veto and Rescissions Act this week. The bipartisan legislation provides a constitutional line-item veto solution and creates more checks and balances against runaway spending.

Alone it won't solve our problems; however, combined with a biennial budget and a balanced-budget amendment, it can deliver our children, like Sarah, from a future of debt to one of opportunity.

**VISA WAIVER PROGRAM**

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the highest unemployment rate in the Nation, Nevadans are struggling. That's why we in Washington should be focusing on creating good-paying, middle class jobs. Unfortunately, Washington Republicans are focused on a divisive, ideological agenda.

Our jobs crisis cannot be fixed by restricting access to mammograms for women. It's not going to be fixed by killing Medicare, by turning it over to private insurance companies. And it cannot be fixed by protecting taxpayer giveaways to Big Oil companies.

Our jobs crisis can be fixed by getting real about job creation. We can do that right now by passing legislation expanding our Visa Waiver Program, which allows tourists from certain countries up to 90 days of visa-free travel in the U.S.

In 2010, nearly 18 million people visited our country due to this program. What will happen if we expand it? The answer for tourism-dependent States like Nevada is simple: it will put people back to work.

I urge my Republican colleagues in the House and the Senate to drop their ideological agenda and join me in making job creation our top priority.

**CARDIAC ARREST SURVIVAL ACT  
AND SAVE A LIFE DAY**

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, February is Heart Month. I rise today to recognize Save a Life Community Heart Training Day. This is an effort by the American Red Cross, the Texas Arrhythmia Institute, and the Methodist DeBakey Heart and Vascular Center in Houston, Texas, to raise awareness about the importance of adult CPR and AED use.

Sudden cardiac arrest, also known as SCA, is the leading cause of death in the United States, with roughly 300,000 Americans dying from SCAs every year. Both of my grandfathers died of SCA before I was born. I always dreamed of what it would be like to go fishing with Grandpa.

The best chance for survival is defibrillation—delivery of an electric pulse shock to the heart. An SCA victim has a 50-75 percent chance of survival if a shock is administered to the heart within 5 minutes of collapse. Awareness and training are critical to saving and enhancing lives.

Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of legislation designed to encourage Good Samaritans to use AEDs to save lives, I'm proud to recognize Save a Life Day. Get trained, so a young boy can go fishing with Grandpa.

□ 1130

## SENDING UP A SIGNAL FLARE

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to send up a signal flare about a grievous concern that has foisted itself upon this Nation from the Obama administration, and that is this: the Obama administration is now going up to communities of faith and poking their chest and saying, either you will change the dictates of your conscience, or we will fine you. We will use the long arm of the Federal Government to manipulate you into our view of the world, not the view of the world that you think is bestowed upon you by God.

Mr. Speaker, that is a grievous error. That is a provocation that needs to be answered, and, in a nutshell, we have a foreshadowing of what happens when that isn't answered. It's a foreshadowing that comes in the form of a quote from Pastor Martin Niemoller, an anti-Nazi activist, who said:

First they came for the Jews, and I didn't speak out because I was not a Jew.

Then they came for the Communists, and I didn't speak out because I was not a Communist.

Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn't speak out because I was not a trade unionist.

And then they came for me, and there was no one left to speak out for me.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for this country to rise and to speak out and to push back on this outrageous provocation from the Obama administration.

## HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Before my Pennsylvania friends get all freaked out, I appreciate you letting me come to the floor for 5 minutes to do what is now a weekly constitutional of mine and talk about high level nuclear waste in Yucca Mountain.

What I have been doing, to set the stage, is going around the country highlighting locations where there's nuclear waste throughout this country, and just making the statement that it is in the national interest, and actually it's national Federal law that this waste be consolidated in a centralized storage facility. And so with that, I'll begin.

Today we're headed to the great State of Minnesota, and we're looking at a nuclear power plant called Prairie Island. Now, Prairie Island has 725 million tons of uranium, of spent fuel, on-site. Prairie Island has waste stored above the ground in pools and dry casks.

Prairie Island is in the Mississippi River floodplain, as you can see from

the photo here. And Prairie Island is 50 miles from the Twin Cities.

Now, where should this waste be? Well, this waste should be where an 1982 energy policy, the Waste Policy Act, and then the amendments in 1987 said, by Federal law, it should be, which is underneath a mountain in a desert. And where is that mountain? The mountain's called Yucca Mountain.

Currently, after \$15 billion spent researching and preparing the site, we have zero nuclear waste onsite. If we were storing the nuclear waste there, it would be 1,000 feet underground. It would be 1,000 feet above the water table, and it would be 100 miles from the nearest body of water, which would be the Colorado River.

Now, look at the difference between Yucca Mountain, 100 miles from the Colorado River, versus nuclear waste right next to the Mississippi River, actually in the Mississippi River floodplain.

So, why aren't we doing what the law has dictated? Well, we have the majority leader of the Senate who's been blocking funding and stopping any movement to do the final scientific study. In fact, the will of the House was spoken last year when we voted, I think, 297 votes, bipartisan votes, to complete the funding and the study.

So let's look at the Senators from the region of where this nuclear power plant is. And it's very curious: The two Senators from Minnesota, Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator FRANKEN, they're silent. They're silent on nuclear waste in their own State. It's very curious. Not only nuclear waste, but nuclear waste on the river.

And then you go to North Dakota. Senator CONRAD has voted "no." Senator HOEVEN supports it.

South Dakota, Senator JOHNSON voted "no." This is all in the region.

Senator THUNE supports. Senator NELSON votes in support of Yucca Mountain. Senator JOHNSON votes in support of Yucca Mountain.

Now, Minnesota has two sites, three reactors; two of them are right in this location. So, as I've been coming down to the floor, if you add these new Senators to the total tally, right now we have 40 Senators who have expressed support for moving high-level nuclear waste. We have 12 who are curiously silent on nuclear waste in their State or in their region, and we have 10 who have stated a position of "no."

It's in the best interest of our country, for the safety and security of this country, that we consolidate in a centralized location, underneath a mountain, in a desert, in the defined spot by law, which is Yucca Mountain.

And again, I want to thank my colleagues and friends from Pennsylvania for allowing me to intrude upon their hour.

I yield back the balance of my time.

## COMMEMORATING ARIZONA'S CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 56 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a milestone in Arizona's history, the centennial of our great State. After nearly 49 years as a U.S. Territory, Arizona became part of the United States on February 14, 1912.

Today Arizona is a bustling, contemporary oasis of more than 6 million people. Its natural wonders—the Grand Canyon, the Petrified Forest, the Red Rocks of Sedona, the Painted Desert, coupled with modern conveniences, most notably air-conditioning—draw millions of visitors from around the world every year. But it wasn't always so.

Early settlers, ranchers, farmers, and miners had to wonder what they'd gotten themselves into. Such was the case with my ancestors. Allow me to tell a sliver of their story because it tells a little about Arizona's history.

William Jordan Flake, my great-great-grandfather arrived in Arizona territory in 1878. When he bought a ranch on the Silver Creek, he was warned by the previous owners not to invite any other families because the land and water would not sustain them. Fortunately, he didn't listen. Soon the town of Snowflake was born, becoming the hub of activity in what was then Arizona territory.

Not long after, William Jordan's son, James Madison Flake, was deputized, along with his brother, Charles Love Flake, to arrest an outlaw who had drifted into town. As they disarmed the outlaw, the outlaw reached into his boot, drew a weapon, and shot Charles in the neck, killing him instantly. James received a bullet in the left ear before returning fire, killing the outlaw.

Just 3 years later, James Madison Flake sat at the bedside of his beloved wife as she passed away, leaving him with nine children. "Once again I must kiss the sod and face a cloudy future," he poignantly wrote in his journal.

□ 1140

But like so many other pioneers who settled Arizona, he not only faced the future, he shaped it. Along with raising these children and many others that would come later, James Madison Flake involved himself politically in the issues of the day. Notably, he tells in his journal of attending numerous meetings and conventions around Arizona and Colorado to promote the cause of women's suffrage. No doubt, he was proud when, just after Statehood in 1912, Arizona became the seventh State to approve the right of women to vote. Just a few years later, the Nation followed with the 19th amendment to the Constitution.

James Madison Flake would be proud to know that Arizona has many women

legislators, has had a number of women Governors, and that the first woman appointed to the Supreme Court, Sandra Day O'Connor, is a proud Arizonan. He would surely be proud to know of Gabby Giffords, daughter of Arizona and one of this Nation's enduring symbols of hope, who served this Nation's House of Representatives so ably.

Over the past 100 years, Arizona has been home to a number of colorful and transformative figures: Carl Hayden, Barry Goldwater, Mo Udall, and JOHN McCAIN.

With so many unsuccessful Presidential candidates, it's often joked that Arizona is the only State where mothers don't tell their children, Some day you can grow up to be President. In fact, mothers get to tell their children something better: You have the privilege of being an Arizonan.

One thing is certain. Because of the hard work and sacrifice of those who have gone before, Arizona's next 100 years promise to be even better than the first because in Arizona, the beauty of the sunset in the evening is only eclipsed by the sunrise in the morning.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### HONORING JOE PATERNO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 52 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with colleagues from Pennsylvania to recognize the accomplishments of Joe Paterno, the longtime Penn State football coach who passed away last month.

Paterno's accomplishments as a teacher and a coach rank him among the very best in the history of the country. His accomplishments were both on the field and on the campus.

I'm pleased today to be joined by a number of my colleagues from Pennsylvania and pleased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY. I'm glad to be here with my colleagues from Pennsylvania.

My thoughts of Coach Paterno go way back to the time when I was a really young guy in Butler, Pennsylvania, and Coach Paterno at that time was an assistant coach for Rip Engle. Coach Paterno would come into our high school, and he was very close friends with my high school coach, Art Bernardi.

But the thing I remember most about Coach Paterno, he had the ability to

inspire you to do things that maybe you didn't think you could do. He had the ability to get you to go beyond being tired into being better. As a young guy growing up, he would come into our study halls and he would come into our halls, and I had the chance to go to Penn State many times to see him as an assistant coach, and always enjoyed the moments we had, and then go over to his house with Mrs. Paterno, and he would say to Mrs. Paterno, Hey, these guys are hungry. Can you get them a sandwich? Can you get them something to eat? They were always so nice to us, and the kids were small then.

So I can understand the sense of loss that not only the Paterno family has but the State of Pennsylvania, and in particular, Penn State University, because Coach Paterno was part of the fabric of that which is Penn State. He was the leaven that held Penn State together. He was the man that transcended not just football, because football was only a very small part of our life, but it was that game that taught us about life that was to come and the adversity that you would face and the problems that you would have to solve, and the idea that, yeah, well, you may not have done it real well on that last play. The only sin was not getting up off the deck and getting ready for the next play.

So I join my colleagues from Pennsylvania, and there's a deep sense of loss for all of us in Pennsylvania, and especially all of those folks at Penn State who have lost a true leader and a true icon—not just for college football and not just for athletics, but for the American life.

So I am deeply indebted to Coach Paterno for what he taught us. I also am grieving with the family and with the rest of the State of Pennsylvania for the loss of a truly great American, Joe Paterno.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for his comments, for joining us and honoring and remembering a great individual in Joe Paterno.

It's now my honor to recognize Mr. GERLACH, another colleague that I've had the privilege and honor to serve with since coming to Congress.

I yield to Congressman GERLACH.

Mr. GERLACH. I appreciate this opportunity to join you here today.

Mr. Speaker, I'm joining my colleagues from Pennsylvania in recognizing Coach Joe Paterno and the legacy he forged during more than 60 years at Penn State University.

Most major college football programs measure success solely on what happens on a hundred-yard patch of grass on Saturday afternoons in the fall. If you measured a career only in wins and losses, what Coach Paterno achieved is historic: 409 times he walked off the field victorious, the most wins of any coach in Division I college football.

However, what set Coach Paterno apart was that he demanded excellence

from his players every day of the week. Success with honor was what Coach Paterno expected, whether his players were performing in front of a hundred thousand fans in Beaver Stadium or taking an exam in a classroom.

As someone who played football through youth league all the way through college, I fully appreciate the special role that a football coach can play in the lives of his players. A coach is, above all, a teacher, and one who can build his players' character and instill the values of hard work, persistence, and teamwork—lessons that last a lifetime. Coach Paterno did just that.

Football was the means by which he molded players into leaders and forever transformed a university. He prepared his players to be winners in life, not just on Saturday afternoons.

That is why when Joe Paterno passed away on January 22, Pennsylvania lost a legendary football coach who graciously used the spotlight that he was given to help his players, Penn State University, and our great Commonwealth.

May he rest in peace.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for participating today and this remembering and celebrating.

Mr. Speaker, in the times of my life I have had opportunity to reflect back on and think of as special times, there is one time in particular when I was a senior in high school. I grew up in Center County. I went to Penn State, I'm a proud Penn State alumni. I grew up in the shadow of the Nittany Lion and Joe Paterno. One of my most meaningful memories having played high school football was the day I got word that Coach Joe Paterno had asked for game films to look at me as a prospect for that great team. That was going well until he saw that as an offensive guard I was less than 200 pounds.

But today, I still treasure that, that he looked at my performance and at least saw something there.

Joe Paterno grew up in Brooklyn, the descendant of Albanian and Italian immigrants. He derived a toughness from that heritage, describing his father and Albania as a land of quiet, hardheaded people. His toughness was seasoned by a deep appreciation of the classics.

Virgil, which he read in the original Latin, was a key source of inspiration for Paterno. He wrote, "I'll never forget the majestic ring of the opening lines of 'The Aeneid': 'Arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris,'" which he translated as "Of arms and the man I sing."

Paterno drew inspiration from Virgil's hero Aeneas. Of Aeneas he wrote, "He yearns to be free of his tormenting duty, but he knows that his duty is to others, to his men."

He attended Brown on a football scholarship, where he met and combated prejudice—prejudice from those who thought that football players lacked the intellectual firepower of other students, prejudice from those

who thought birth gave status instead of personal excellence and hard work, prejudice based on religion.

As a player and later as coach, Paterno gave everything to his men, his players, and his team.

I'm now very proud to yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania, also a Penn State alumni Nittany Lion, Mr. DENT.

□ 1150

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for organizing this Special Order hour in order to discuss the life of Joseph Vincent Paterno. As has been said, there have been many eulogies said about Joe Paterno, and he was an extraordinary man by anyone's measure.

As has been mentioned, he came to us via Brooklyn and Brown University. I believe he studied English literature, and he always took great inspiration from the books he read and the classics. In fact, he turned down a life in professional football in order to stay at Penn State and stay in this university, academic environment. He actually liked meeting with the faculty and enjoyed discussing English literature and other weighty matters. This man was quite complex. He was more than just football, although certainly that was such an important part of his life, and a big part of his life.

We should also note that some of us would always watch Joe Paterno over the years. My mom is a Penn State alumna and I'm a Penn State alumnus. Our family goes back many, many decades, so we have some acquaintance with Joe Paterno. Many people fondly remember him—the guy with the thick Coke-bottle lenses and the khaki pants—flood pants—with athletic shoes. That's how they'd see him out on the field, getting a little agitated from time to time with the officials, but he was much more complex than all that.

A few things: first, if there is a theme about Joe Paterno's life, it was that he was about setting clear standards, as one of his children had told me. He has five wonderful children and a wonderful devoted wife, Sue Paterno. He often said that Joe said things like this:

Take care of the little things, and the big things take care of themselves. You either get better or you get worse. You never stay the same. Most importantly, he said, Make an impact. That was the wisdom that his father passed on to him and that Joe passed on to his children—make an impact.

So when you think about it, Joe Paterno's life was about making an impact, and football was just a means to that greater end for him. He and his wife, Sue, would see a need, and they would meet it one small thing at a time until the big things, a legacy of philanthropy and caring, took care of themselves. They gave a lot of their own time as well as their own money.

His son said something to me, and I'm just going to read this. One of his

children sent this to me. He said that, over the years, Joe attended hundreds of dinners and functions, raising billions of dollars for Penn State, for the Special Olympics—I know his wife, Sue, was particularly devoted to the Special Olympics—for the Catholic Church, and for education at all levels.

He said, I once asked him why he did it, why he smiled when he signed his 30th autograph while getting a paper, and he said with that twinkle in his eye, The moment they don't care about Penn State football, we can't do the things that matter.

He understood that, as a symbol and as a person, he had to let people own a piece of him to get them to buy in to the larger vision. They did, and the results were spectacular. From the Paterno Library to scholarships to what's called THON, the dance marathon where they raise so much money for children with cancer, he said, My dad helped them all. He made an impact.

That's really what it was about. It has often been stated, too, that Joe Paterno really wasn't supposed to go to Penn State at all. He was supposed to go from Brown University and become an attorney, as his father had expected. Basically, he told his dad at one point, No, I'm never going to be a lawyer. He was enjoying Penn State. He enjoyed the football program. He said his father took it all right, but closed with a mandate that drove him his whole life.

His dad said, It's not enough for you to be just a good football coach. You need to make an impact. So that was imparted from his father on to Joe.

There are a lot of people out there who played football for him. Some of these were young men who had a lot of talent in many cases, and some of them were maybe a little bit pampered, as some athletes are at the high school level who are quite good; and Joe could be a pretty strict disciplinarian for a lot of them. In fact, one of his former players, Kenny Jackson, who attended Penn State when I did, still calls him "teacher" first. Hundreds of players called him a surrogate father. The lessons they learned translated across the whole spectrum of their lives, creating a living legacy, and that will make an impact decades past his passing.

There are so many people who spoke of him. Since his death and just prior to his death, I spoke to some of his former players and friends who knew him well, and they often talk about the impact he made on their lives and how much they cared for him all these decades after playing for him. In fact, there was one story, too, that I want to share.

I remember back in the 1980s there was a player named Bob White. He became an All-American and was on the national championship team. I think he even played in the NFL for a while. I just remember how the Paternos took him under their wing. Apparently, he was a fairly marginal student. He had some trouble reading and, in fact,

wasn't very good at it. So Sue Paterno would basically give him books, and he would have to read the books and then give her a book report. I mean, this is the coach's wife taking an interest in one player who was academically not very strong at the time. Today, he is quite successful and does quite well.

I just wanted to share that story. It's one of those stories you really don't hear about or about the anonymous contributions that have been made by him that have been discovered recently because people have spilled the beans, so to speak. He didn't want people to know that he was helping them. He did all of these things without any recognition.

He was an extraordinary man, and he will be deeply missed. All I can say is that he was a great Pennsylvanian even if he did spend the first few years of his life in Brooklyn. He was very proud of that by the way. I just wanted to say that I'll always have very fond memories of him. The university is a better place because of what he has done throughout his life, and I think we will always remember him.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Winning was important for Joe Paterno, and he won a lot. Last fall, he achieved a record, becoming with 409 wins and 136 losses the winningest coach in Division I college football. His wins record surpassed legendary coaches, including Bear Bryant in 2001, Bobby Bowden in 2008, and Eddie Robinson in 2011. Penn State is one of just seven teams with more than 800 wins in its history, and Joe Paterno was active with the program for 704 of those games, over 61 seasons, with an amazing record of 514, 183 losses, seven ties—or 73 percent.

It is my pleasure and privilege now to yield to another great Pennsylvania Congressman, Congressman LOU BARLETTA.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it's easy to judge Joe Paterno's career by the numbers—409 career wins, which is a Division I coaching record; 37 bowl game appearances with 24 wins; five undefeated seasons; 62 years at one university, 46 of them as the head football coach.

Many of those numbers will never be equaled or passed, but those numbers weren't the most important things to Joe Paterno. JoePa coached the greatest players in Penn State football history—Franco Harris, Shane Conlan, LaVar Arrington, Curt Warner, John Cappelletti, Kerry Collins. More than 350 of his players signed NFL contracts—79 first-team All-Americans. Again, those numbers weren't the most important things to Joe Paterno. Here is what mattered to JoePa:

Forty-seven academic All-Americans, 37 of them first team; an 87 percent player graduation rate in 2011—20 points higher than the national average—and according to the New America Foundation, no achievement gap between its black and white players.

Joe Paterno loved coaching at the college level because he loved preparing young men to succeed in life. He turned down several offers of coaching in the NFL. He made far less than any other college football coach. During the memorial service for JoePa, a native son of my district, Jimmy Cefalo of Pittston, captured the essence of his coach.

Cefalo said, "He took the sons of the coal miners, and he took the sons of steel mill workers and of farmers in rural Pennsylvania with the idea that we would come together and do it the right way, the Paterno way. Those thousands, literally thousands, of young men taken from generally small communities, looking for direction at a very young age, this is Joe Paterno's legacy."

□ 1200

That sums it up perfectly. Without Joe Paterno, thousands of young men from the smallest towns and townships of Pennsylvania might not have received a quality college education. He saw all of these young men as his sons, and he wanted the best for each and every one of them.

Outside of college football, JoePa lived a life as plain as Penn State's uniforms. He lived in the same simple ranch house for 45 years. His home phone number could have been found in the White Pages. For years, he drove a Ford Tempo. His trademark rolled-up pants were not a fashion statement but a practicality. He rolled up the cuffs to save on dry cleaning bills.

But when it came to the university he loved, the university that educated his five children and thousands of his players, Joe Paterno was exceedingly generous. Joe Paterno and his wife, Sue, and their five children announced a contribution of \$3.5 million to the university in 1998, bringing Paterno's lifetime giving total to more than \$4 million.

Joe Paterno's personal life was humble, his humanitarian life was remarkable, and his professional life was legendary.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend for sharing his thoughts on Coach Joe Paterno.

You know, among Joe Paterno's accolades in 46 years as head coach were two national championships, seven undefeated seasons, 23 finishes in the Top 10 rankings, and three Big Ten Conference championships since joining the conference in 1993. Joe Paterno had 24 bowl wins and 37 bowl game appearances, both of which are the most of any coach in history.

In his many decades as a coach at Penn State, Paterno built a team dedicated to excellence on the field and off the field, as you heard many of my colleagues refer to today. He saw football as important, but he kept even football in perspective. In his view, the players who have been most important to the success of Penn State teams have just naturally kept their priorities

straight—football, a high second, but academics, an undisputed first, in his words.

Paterno said that he hounded his players to get involved. Don't let the world pass you by. Go after life. Attack it. Ten years from now, I want you to look back on college as a wonderful time of expanding yourself, not just 4 years of playing football. The purpose of college football is to serve education, not the other way around.

He understood that education required an effort by both students and teachers. Another of his quotes:

Even the most talented teacher can try what he or she thinks is teaching, but it won't really take unless the student takes charge of the most important job, learning.

Thus began Joe Paterno's grand experiment at Penn State, where players would not just be model athletes but model students and model citizens. His players responded, consistently ranking at or near among the top of the leading football programs in graduation rates.

Under his tenure, the Penn State football team had 16 Hall of Fame Scholar Athletes, 49 Academic All-Americans, and 18 NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship winners. Penn State had more Academic All-Americans than all other Big Ten schools and ranked number three among all 120 football bowl division schools.

In 2009, the graduation rate of Joe Paterno's players was 89 percent, and the graduation success rate was 85 percent, both of which were the greatest among all football programs in the final 2009 Associated Press Top 25 poll.

I am now pleased to yield back to my good friend, Mr. DENT.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman.

And as we wind down this Special Order this hour, talking about Joe Paterno, we should also probably note one other thing, too.

Of course Joe Paterno was about success with honor, he was about making an impact, but he was also about family. And also, I just want to say, too, that many players over the years, their children would come to the school. In some cases, three generations have played with him. It's a remarkable story.

I think of a guy from my hometown, Mike Guman. Many of my colleagues from Alabama will remember Mike Guman for the famous goal-line stand, Penn State-Alabama Sugar Bowl, 1979. I wish the end result had been different. But nevertheless, Mike Guman was a running back. I had so many kind, wonderful things to say about him. And his son, too, Andy Guman, played at Penn State. That was the kind of program that I think Joe wanted. It was very family-oriented.

I also wanted to mention, too, that one of the eulogies about Joe that is probably worth sharing—I believe it was given by his son Jay. He often talked about his sense of humor and that of his wife. Joe and Sue were utterly devoted to each other, very inde-

pendent-minded people, but very much dependent upon one another. I am going to read an excerpt from that eulogy:

Humor was a large part of my parents' marriage. My mom and dad, speaking together, was always entertaining. My mom would jump up with a smart comment when he was talking, and you'd get a glimpse of how the two of them interacted. Neither one of them took themselves too seriously.

And he says:

One of my favorite lines that they had was about how they stayed married so long. They had a deal—whichever leaves the marriage first had to take the children. So neither one of them ever left.

And that was sort of the sense of humor they had, but they were so utterly devoted to each other, to their five children, and to their many grandchildren. That's something we don't speak much about Joe Paterno.

He didn't have a whole lot of hobbies either. He was devoted to family and his football program and his university. That's what he was about. So it really speaks volumes about him. He will be deeply missed.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Altoona, Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman from Allentown for yielding.

It's a great privilege for me to be here on the House floor today talking about someone whom I had the highest regard for, and over the years I was able to watch just what a tremendous thing he did at Penn State University. It's not just about winning football games. Of course he won 409 games in his 46 seasons, five undefeated teams, and led Penn State to two national championships. But he did more than that. He did more for the university.

And I know my colleagues have already talked about—it's the only Division I school in the country that has a wing of the library named after the head football coach. That's because of his and Sue's dedication and contributions to building not only that library but that institution. And a lot of that building came about because he built those football teams and brought national attention to Penn State.

But for me, on a personal level, probably one of the proudest moments I had was to stand on the House floor when—I believe it was when he surpassed Walter Camp's winning record of 309 victories, I think it was, about 10 years ago. And John Peterson, the Congressman from Pennsylvania who represented that part of the country at that time—G.T.'s predecessor—we had a Special Order on the floor. John Peterson started first, and then the great coach Tom Osborne—which I don't know if many people know, but Tom Osborne served in Congress in the early 2000s. So Tom Osborne then got up and spoke about Joe Paterno and his respect for him. So then I got to follow Tom Osborne. I'm following a legendary football coach talking about a legendary football coach, which really, even to this day, I'm getting

goosebumps remembering that time because it was really an exciting moment that I will always remember.

But again, what Joe Paterno did, which stood him apart from many other coaches, was his dedication to education and academic excellence. Unlike many other schools with Division I programs, Paterno recruited players, speaking first about Penn State's academic excellence. And during that time in the early 2000s, when I served with Coach Tom Osborne, those were lean years for Penn State and for Joe Paterno. And when we would come to town on a Monday or a Tuesday night for votes, Coach Osborne would summon me over on the floor and talk to me about what was going on in central Pennsylvania, how was the media treating Joe; and there was a real concern that Coach Osborne had for Joe Paterno and a real respect came through.

So after several of these meetings, I finally asked Coach Osborne, I said, It's obvious you have this great respect for Joe Paterno. Is that because you thought he was a superior coach to you? And he said, Oh, no, absolutely not. I have a higher winning percentage than Paterno. But I do have a great respect for Joe because Joe could do something that nobody ever was able to achieve; and that is, year in and year out, Joe Paterno would graduate roughly 85 percent of his players, but always the highest graduation rate in Division I. And on top of that, he had quality football teams and he recruited quality players and he could compete at a national level. So, he said, that's something none of us could do.

Then Coach Osborne went on to tell me about how he would talk to Joe in the off-season and try to understand the programs and the discipline and the things he did, because he wanted to be able to get to that level with Joe. And Coach Osborne told me that, I believe, the highest he ever got was a 79 percent graduation rate.

□ 1210

So that's from one of the great all-time coaches, the great respect he held for Joe Paterno. And again, it was not just about his football; it was about what he was, about building young men, about instilling in them the need to educate themselves and to be excellent when it came to their academic efforts.

He often said you have to start with the idea that a kid has to be a student first. Paterno said in a 1982 Gannett News Service interview: We preach there are three things in a student's life when it comes to Penn State: studies, academics, and social life, and you must keep them in that order and you can never back away from that.

So again, Joe Paterno's education-first mindset paid off for those thousands of young men that came to Penn State. I don't know if you watched the ceremony, the dedication to his life and his funeral, but you saw that come

clear through, not just from superstars but from kids who couldn't even play after a couple of years because of injury, but Joe Paterno stuck with them and encouraged them and instilled in them the performance of academics in their life and making sure that they get that education. Because as we know full well, when kids play Division I sports, whether it's football, it's basketball, it's baseball, they don't always—99 percent of them never make it to the pro level. But they got an opportunity to go to college.

And places like Penn State and other universities, when you have coaches like Joe Paterno and coaches who aspire to be like Joe Paterno, they instill in those kids that those 99 percent who can't make it big in the pros, they still can get an education. They still can graduate from college and go out and get a good job and provide for their families and become productive citizens. Again, that's something that Joe Paterno always preached, to be productive, to be a good citizen, to give back to your community. He lived that life, and he will be sorely missed, not only in Pennsylvania, but I believe throughout the college ranks and throughout the Nation. He'll be one of those people you can look to and say: That's the kind of coach I want to be. That's the kind of program that I want to build, and those are the kind of kids that I want to turn into young, productive citizens of the United States of America.

So again, I'm pleased to be here with my colleagues from Allentown and—Bellefonte? Close to Bellefonte.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Howard.

Mr. SHUSTER. That's even smaller. And I'm actually from Everett, CHARLIE. Altoona is a big city to me. I don't even know my way around Altoona.

But again, thanks a lot for you guys doing this. I appreciate it greatly.

Mr. DENT. I have to apologize for making that error. I knew you were from Everett, not from Altoona. But Blair County, the whole of Bedford, it's a wonderful area. We love it.

I wanted to say one other thing my friend, Mr. SHUSTER, just reminded me of: how Coach Paterno, Joe Paterno, recognized that most of his players were not going to become pros, and he celebrated the accomplishments of his players off the field. In fact, I remember one fellow who went to school with me, a guy named Stu McMunn, Stewart McMunn, I think he was captain of special teams. They won the national title the year after I graduated. He talked with pride about that young man. He's not going to be a pro, but he's all of this spirit, all this fight in him, he's a smart kid, and all that. And he became a dentist. He was very proud of the fact that was one of his players. That was kind of the way he was. He wanted to see his players succeed. He wasn't so concerned about the next 5 years after graduation, but the next 15, you know, 20, 30, 50 years, to see what they're

doing with their lives. So I think that's something they shouldn't lose sight of.

I did read from a eulogy given at the celebration of Joe's life by one of his children, and I submit it for the RECORD.

Again, I just want to conclude by saying that Joe Vincent Paterno, a great Pennsylvanian, a great American, a strong leader, a mentor to so many, a mentor even to many people who never met him, but he had an impact on their lives. So, Joe Paterno, you did in fact make an impact.

MOM AND DAD. I don't know much about Greek Mythology, so forgive me if I botch this reference. But in the past few months I've been reminded of some kind of Greek myth. Apparently, we were once one body with a male head and a female head and we were all happy. Some angry god, as punishment for some slight—sliced all of the happy two headed beings apart—forever dooming us to run around the world looking for our other half. Anyone who knows my parents also knows that they were among the lucky people who were able to find their other half: their soul mate, their best friend.

We've stated over these past days just how blessed and lucky my Dad was—and he knew it. One of the stories you won't hear from a former Letterman is the time that Coach Paterno became smitten with his girlfriend and didn't ask her out. No, sneaky Joe waited until Sue realized that this player was not for her and went in for the kill. After a courtship that involved reading Albert Camus, walking on the beach, and pretending that he had money, they married and soon started their family.

Over the years when my Dad would talk about retirement or getting older, he would remind me, "You know, your mother is a young woman." It almost became a joke. Whenever she was late coming back from a meeting or something, I'd say "Well you know, your mother is a young woman." He'd always chuckle. But he did worry about her and always wanted to make sure that she would be OK once he was gone.

They were absolutely devoted to their family: my Dad was comfortable letting my Mother handle the more traditional roles of diaper changing, but he loved to bounce us around on his knee, try to teach us table manners, have discussion-filled family dinners, and take us for walks; walks that would continue into our adulthood and would be one of his primary ways of sharing his wisdom and insights with us. I shared some of those walks in late November and I am forever grateful for having that opportunity.

Their relationship was unique in some ways. Two fiercely independent and strong people, yet two people utterly devoted and dependent on each other. Best friends who challenged each other to be better, who supported each other yet reminded the other when they might be mistaken, who knew each other so well that they knew what the other was thinking before they even said it. This was a relationship that started with respect and friendship and remained strong with faith, love, and commitment to each other. They made each other better.

Humor was a large part of my parents marriage. My Mom and Dad speaking together was always entertaining—my Mom would jump in with a smart comment when he was talking, and you'd get a glimpse of how the two of them interacted. Neither one of them took themselves too seriously. One of my favorite lines they had was about how they stayed married so long. They had a deal—whichever leaves the marriage first had to



take the children, so neither one of them ever left.

But that was really not the reason. They were devoted to each other without fail. The compassion and love they showed for each other during these past few months was indescribable. Weaker marriages may have splintered at the incredible amount of pain they endured. Yet theirs only grew stronger.

My Mom's only concern these past few months was for my Dad, and my Dad's was only for my Mom. just a week ago, I was talking to him and I didn't want him to get discouraged. I said to him—Hey, you've got to keep fighting. For Mom. He barely had his voice then but he nodded and whispered back "fight, for Mom." And he was. And he did until the end when we assured him that we would take care of Mom.

Like my mother, we are all heartbroken at the days and years ahead when we continue our lives without being able to pop in on him for a quick visit, ask him for advice about our children. Or, in my case just to see him and be reminded of what a great father I've had. We have faith in God and his plan for all of us, and I can only be grateful that I was a witness to a beautiful marriage and that I had the best father and role model I could possibly ask for. I love you and will miss you Dad. And don't worry—we will take care of Mom. I do know that my mother is a young woman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Joe Paterno claimed that the long run success of his teams was in the contributions his players made to society after graduation. Joe Paterno decided not to accept lucrative NFL coaching offers because he loved being an educator as a college coach. He also criticized NFL teams that took too much of his players' time during their senior years. Paterno pushed the NCAA to adopt rules requiring higher levels of academic performance from college athletes, pushing higher standards for both high school and college graduates. Paterno's dedication to education extended far beyond the players he coached.

In the early 1980s, he pushed Penn State leadership to expand fundraising from alumni in order to advance academic programs. Paterno and his wife donated several million dollars to Penn State University, and he helped them raise many millions more.

Coach Paterno once said: When I'm gone, I hope they write that I made Penn State a better place, not just that I was a good football coach.

Well, Coach, that is what they're writing today.

He envisioned that increasing the resources available to the university through fundraising would help its students attain academic excellence. And the great things that Penn State has attained over the years are in part a testament to his vision and his dedication to that cause. Often universities name athletic facilities after great coaches. Penn State named a new wing of its library after Paterno.

Paterno's contributions extend beyond Penn State. He was heavily involved, he and his wife, Sue, in the Special Olympics, and was also a national spokesperson for the Charcot-Marie-Tooth Association.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday I had the opportunity to visit with one of the Special Olympic athletes, an ambassador for that program from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Chris Jagielski. And the first thing Chris did in coming to my office was to express his sorrow for the loss of Coach Joe Paterno.

Paterno wrote that he had been strongly influenced by this line from St. Ignatius: "Always work as though everything depended on you. Yet always pray knowing that everything depends on God." Over the years, that dynamite thought has exploded to something larger and larger in my life. It means to me now, Never be afraid to accept your own limitations or the limitations of others. Accept that we're all pretty small potatoes. Yet always know how great each of us can be."

So the winningest coach in college football history was, I think, among the most humble of men based on those remarks that he made. The enormous positive impact that Joe Paterno has made on thousands of players, hundreds of thousands of students and millions of fans and admirers across central Pennsylvania and around the world cannot be understated. He was a man but his legend continues. For combining humility with a dedication to greatness, Joe Paterno stands as a model for all of us. With the passing of Joe Paterno, we're all Penn State, and we mourn his loss. Thank you, Joe Paterno.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, as a Penn State graduate, I would like to add to this evening's special order on the career of Joe Paterno by sharing a column by Bill Kline that ran in newspapers across the country following Paterno's death.

[From the Tribune, Jan. 23, 2012]

PATERNO BUILT PENN STATE ON, OFF THE FIELD

(By Bill Kline)

Every great man has a flaw.

Critics of Joe Paterno, who died Sunday at 85, will cite at least one flaw of the legendary Penn State football coach—what they will call his poor moral judgment in the Jerry Sandusky sex-abuse scandal involving the Second Mile charity and Penn State.

That assertion might be argued for decades, as JoePa's proponents will say that he did nothing wrong and did what he was supposed to do a decade ago when he received information about his former assistant coach Sandusky—Paterno told his superiors and asked them to look into it.

But whatever side of the argument you support, know this about Joseph Vincent Paterno: No one did more for Penn State University and, in turn, its hundreds of thousands of students—not just for the athletes—over the past six decades. And likely no one ever did more for Penn State in the 157-year history of the institution built on former farmland in rural central Pennsylvania.

You see, rightly or wrongly, Penn State had an image of an agricultural college when Paterno arrived on campus in 1950—and even to some degree when he became head coach in 1966.

Paterno not only raised the profile of the Penn State program, he raised the profile of the university itself. And it was not just

wins on the football field that helped Penn State become the national university it is today.

Paterno helped in many other ways, too, most notably leading the charge to raise money for Penn State's library, its endowment, to pay for professors, to pay for academic scholarships, to pay for new buildings and just in general for academic purposes. And Joe and his wife Sue donated their own money, too, having given more than \$5 million to Penn State over the years.

JoePa's support of academics and the success of his team combined to make Penn State a desirable place for students—not just athletes. Penn State's enrollment has exploded over the years to 85,000, including those at its satellite campuses. Some years, 70,000 or more high school seniors apply for the 7,000 or so freshman-class openings at Penn State's University Park campus.

Penn State has become a strong academic institution—not just a strong football program—in large part because of Joe Paterno. For example:

Since 1966, when Paterno became head coach, Penn State's endowment has grown from practically nothing to \$1.67 billion as of 2007.

Paterno's fund-raising efforts have resulted in about \$2 billion for Penn State.

The University Park campus has nearly doubled in size since 1966.

He probably was the most underpaid coach, relatively speaking, in the history of big-time college football, last fall making less than all but one other coach in the Big Ten Conference.

He won the National Heritage Award of the Anti-Defamation League for his role as humanitarian and philanthropist.

Paterno was named Sportsman of the Year by Sports Illustrated.

He has produced 74 Academic All-Americans, and Penn State football consistently is a national leader in the percentage of its players who graduate—and that includes high graduation rates for minorities, too.

He measured the success of his teams not in wins and losses, but how those players later influenced society as teachers and surgeons and engineers and leaders.

And through it all, Penn State remained a force on the football field and was doing just fine.

Two of Paterno's last three recruiting classes were ranked in the top 11 nationally, according to the recruiting site scout.com.

Since 2005 Penn State's winning percentage under Paterno was better than his all-time winning percentage.

He captured two Big Ten titles since then and was unbeaten in conference play and in first place in the Big Ten's Leaders Division when he was ousted in November because of the Sandusky scandal.

And Paterno, of course, set yet another record last fall with his 409th career victory.

But victories and championships—and flaws—should not be how we remember Joe Paterno. He would not want that.

Joe Paterno should be remembered as an educator who truly placed academics before athletics.

He should be remembered for building 18-year-old boys into men and productive members of society.

And he should be remembered for building a university that benefits all.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is easy to judge Joe Paterno's career by the numbers.

409 career wins—a Division I coaching record.

37 bowl game appearances, with 24 wins.

Five undefeated seasons. 62 years at one university. 46 of them as the head football coach.

Many of those numbers will never be equaled or passed. But those numbers weren't the most important things to Joe Paterno.

JoePa coached the greatest players in Penn State football history. Franco Harris. Shane Conlan. LaVar Arrington. Curt Warner. John Cappelletti. Kerry Collins. More than 350 of his players signed NFL contracts. 79 first-team All-Americans.

But again, those numbers weren't the most important things to Joe Paterno.

Here's what mattered to JoePa:

47 Academic All-Americans; 37 of them first-team.

An 87 percent player graduation rate in 2011—20 points higher than the national average.

And, according to the New America Foundation, no achievement gap between its black and white players.

Joe Paterno loved coaching at the college level because he loved preparing young men to succeed in life. He turned down several offers to coach in the NFL. He made far less than other college football coaches.

During the memorial service for JoePa, a native son of my district, Jimmy Cefalo of Pittston, captured the essence of his coach.

Cefalo said, quote, "He took the sons of the coal miners, and he took the sons of steel mill workers, and of farmers in rural Pennsylvania with the idea that we would come together and do it the right way. The Paterno way."

Those thousands, literally thousands, of young men taken from generally small communities looking for direction at a very young age . . . this is Joe Paterno's legacy." End quote.

That sums it up perfectly. Without Joe Paterno, thousands of young men from the smallest towns and townships of Pennsylvania might not have received a quality college education.

He saw all of these young men as his sons, and he wanted the best for each of them.

Outside of college football, JoePa lived a life as plain as Penn State's uniforms. He lived in the same simple ranch house for 45 years. His home phone number could have been found in the White Pages.

For years, he drove a Ford Tempo.

His trademark rolled-up pants were not a fashion statement but a practicality: he rolled up the cuffs to save on dry cleaning bills.

But when it came to the university he loved, the university that educated his five children and thousands of his players, Joe Paterno was exceedingly generous.

Joe Paterno, his wife, Sue, and their five children announced a contribution of \$3.5 million to the University in 1998, bringing Paterno's lifetime giving total to more than \$4 million.

Joe Paterno's personal life was humble. His humanitarian life was remarkable. And his professional life was legendary.

#### THE PROGRESSIVE MESSAGE

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, there are a lot of important issues facing the American people, none more important

than their economic livelihood and viability. So we're going to be talking today during this Special Order about economic justice, economic opportunity, and the fight for the American middle class.

□ 1220

Mr. Speaker, I'm cochair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. The Congressional Progressive Caucus is that caucus that comes to Congress to band together to stand up for the American Dream, the idea that all Americans, no matter which color they may be, whether they are disabled or not, whether they are straight or gay, or what their religion is, have a right to full participation and opportunity to grab that American Dream as one of our core beliefs. The Progressive Caucus believes in clean air and a clean environment, believes that all Americans, all people across the world have a right to clean air, clean water, and food free of pesticides and toxins.

The Progressive Caucus is the organization that is four square for civil rights for all people. We believe that it's a national disgrace that women are paid 80 cents for every dollar a man makes. We think it's a national disgrace to not be able to love whomever you love and want to be with. We think it's a national problem that people in our society, which was founded on the idea of religious tolerance, sometimes find themselves the target of religious hate in this area.

And we are four square dedicated to the idea that peace should be the guiding principle of our Nation and that diplomacy and development are good things, and that war is almost always a bad thing. Although sometimes it's necessary, diplomacy is always better. We don't send our people into harm's way. That's who the Progressive Caucus is. That is what we are about, and I'm going to offer time tonight, Mr. Speaker, for a progressive message.

So let me begin with that progressive message. We are here to talk about the progressive message; and tonight, we're going to address the issue of economic viability. Working American families are getting crushed, and our middle class is shrinking every day. But here in Washington, our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Republican caucus, is in control of the House. And while millions of people are facing foreclosure and unemployment, sadly, we see Americans continuing to hurt, and their problems are not being addressed.

This week in Congress, if I could just talk about what we did this week, the Republican majority did not bring up a single jobs bill. We didn't talk about jobs this week. Here we are at the close of the week, and we're not talking about jobs. They did not bring up a bill to keep Americans in their homes and address foreclosure, nor did we talk about cleaning up our air and our water, or building our economy or our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. No, we weren't doing that. We were doing

something else, and it had to do with scoring points in an election.

One of the things we did today, which I think was important, but it was an idea that came from the Democratic-majority Senate and originated with great Democrats TIM WALZ and LOUISE SLAUGHTER, is that we voted on a bill to stop trading on congressional knowledge, the STOCK Act. Today, we voted on a bill designed to stop Members of Congress from profiting on confidential information they receive while doing their jobs. You would think that this goes without saying. But, sadly, that is exactly what some politicians have been doing. We voted on the STOCK Act today, the Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act, and I was happy to support this bill.

Although my colleagues, LOUISE SLAUGHTER and TIM WALZ, are pushing a bill which I think was a better version, we voted on the Senate version today. But the price for getting that bill in front of us, the price for fighting to get that bill in front of us was a carve-out for a special interest, and that is too bad.

The bill came before us today, and I voted for it. But the public should know a few things about the legislation. Only after stripping out a provision to stop the so-called political intelligence would the majority even consider voting to stop Members from making bets on confidential information. We wonder why Congress has a 10 percent approval rate. After months of calls for action by House Democrats, House Republicans have finally relented; and the House took up the STOCK Act today, clarifying that Members of Congress and congressional staff, executive branch officials, and judicial officers are subject to the same insider trading rules as everyone else.

Unfortunately, leadership in the majority House caucus took transparency and accountability measures and rewrote them in secret in the dark of night. And the majority caucus, the Republican caucus, weakened the bill, dropping a provision that will require those who peddle political intelligence for profit to register and report, and eliminating the anti-corrupting provision added by the Senate and unanimously approved by the House Judiciary Committee in December. Regarding the political-intelligence provisions, Senator GRASSLEY, Republican of Iowa, responded, It's astonishing and extremely disappointing that the House would fulfill Wall Street's wishes by killing this provision.

So Republican Senator GRASSLEY even had to admonish the House to say, why would we weaken the bill, dropping a provision that would require those who peddle political intelligence for money to register and report their activities? That's too bad. If Congress delays action, the political-intelligence industry will stay in the shadows—just the way Wall Street likes it.

It's time to act on this legislation and take a first step toward restoring

trust in government. We must hold a swift House-Senate conference to strengthen this Republican-majority bill that passed through here that's a weakened piece of legislation.

Last week, the Senate bill passed a stronger measure by a vote of 96-3, and a stronger bipartisan House bill is co-sponsored by 285 Members, including 99 Republicans. The so-called political-intelligence industry serves no one. All it does is really pad Wall Street profits off of a rigged game. This insider trading is nothing more than Wall Street insiders pumping Washington insiders for information so that they can place bets on stocks. Political-intelligence firms have grown drastically over the last few decades and are now a \$100 million industry.

Every day, these firms help hedge funds and Wall Street investors unfairly profit from nonpublic congressional information, and these firms have no oversight and can freely pass along information for investment purposes. A 2005 story on insiders profiting off of a last-minute government bailout of companies embroiled in asbestos litigation was a catalyst to the STOCK Act. A recent Wall Street story on the prevalence of the intelligence industry reinforces the need for this bill. Without the STOCK Act, enforcement officials are left in the dark on who is paying and playing in the political-intelligence industry.

This is why we need the whole STOCK Act. The Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act, the STOCK Act, would shed necessary light on a lucrative industry that has been lurking in the shadows since the 70s. H.R. 1148 establishes regulations for the political-intelligence industry by amending the Lobbying Disclosure Act to apply the registration, reporting, and disclosure requirements to all political-intelligence activities just as they apply to lobbyists now. This is an important provision, and it's an essential piece to the STOCK Act's purpose of banning insider trading based on congressional knowledge.

Regarding support for the STOCK Act, the STOCK Act has a lot of support, Mr. Speaker. The STOCK Act has a broad base of support from organizations dedicated to government reform, including Public Citizen, Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, Common Cause, Democracy 21, the League of Women Voters, Project on Government Oversight, the Sunlight Foundation and U.S. PIRG.

Here is a summary of the STOCK Act, and this is a bill authored by TIM WALZ and LOUISE SLAUGHTER, of which I'm an original co-sponsor. It's a stronger version than what came through here today, and it's what our country needs. The STOCK Act requires firms that specialize in political intelligence who use information obtained from Congress to advise financial transactions to register with the House and Senate, just like lobbying firms are required to do.

It prohibits Members, their staff, executive branch employees, and any other person from buying or selling security swaps or commodity futures based on congressional and executive branch nonpublic information. It requires a more timely disclosure of financial transactions above \$1,000 for those Members and staff that are already required to file annual financial disclosures.

□ 1230

It amends the House ethics rules to prohibit Members and their employees from disclosing any nonpublic information about legislative action for investment purposes. My constituents don't have insider traders looking out for their bottom line.

Now, let me just talk a little bit more about the STOCK Act.

While the House voted this morning on the STOCK Act, making clear that rules against insider trading apply to Members of Congress, congressional staff, executive branch officials, and judicial officers and employees, the version brought to the floor by Leader CANTOR was weakened by Republicans before it actually came to be voted on. The GOP rhetoric suggesting otherwise isn't fooling anybody.

The Associated Press weighed in on this issue, and they said:

The House passes Republican-written insider trading bill that has heavy Wall Street influence. The House has passed a bill to ban Members of Congress and executive branch officials from insider trading, but critics from both parties accuse House Republican leaders of caving in to investment firms by eliminating a proposal to regulate people who try to pry financial information from Congress.

The New York Times had something to say, too. Here's what they said in an editorial:

The House's Less Persuasive Ban on Insider Trading. House Republican leaders appear ready to bow to election-year pressure and pass a bill banning lawmakers from using nonpublic information they hear on the job to make financial investments. The House legislation, however, is missing two vital provisions that are in the Senate bill that won overwhelming approval last week. If the goal is to root out corruption and raise the public's low opinion of Congress, the House should approve the full range of reform in the Senate bill.

The Washington Post also had something to say about this, Mr. Speaker. What they had to say is:

The House should take the opportunity to help crack down on public corruption. The House of Representatives is expected to take up, Thursday, a useful measure to prohibit insider trading by Members of Congress and to beef up disclosure of lawmakers' financial transactions. Unfortunately, the version of the measure produced by the House majority leader, ERIC CANTOR, omits one of the most important parts of the bill passed by the Senate, a provision that would restore prosecutors' ability to go after official corruption.

So, Politico, which is one of our local papers that talks about Congress, took up this issue and writes, "Cantor under fire over STOCK Act." What the Politico writes is this, Mr. Speaker:

House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) has released his version of a congressional insider trading ban, and it strips a provision that would require so-called "political intelligence" consultants to disclose their activities, like lobbyists already do. It also scraps a proposal that empowers Federal prosecutors going after corruption by public officials. That stoked backlash from Democrats—yes, it did—and even some Republicans, who are furious at Cantor and are accusing the Virginia Republican of watering down the popular legislation that easily passed the Senate last week.

"It's astonishing"—this is a quote from the Politico article:

It's astonishing and extremely disappointing that the House would fulfill Wall Street's wishes by killing the provision. That's what Senator Chuck Grassley said in a statement. If Congress delays action, the political intelligence industry will stay in the shadows, just the way Wall Street likes it.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, Roll Call had to weigh in on this issue as well. It sounds like there's a pretty strong consensus that the House version we passed was weakened and watered down and not what the public was expecting.

Roll Call says:

Grassley, others rip House STOCK Act. Senator Chuck Grassley is ripping the House version of a major reform bill passed last Tuesday, calling it "astonishing" that House GOP leaders would drop a provision requiring political intelligence consultants to register as lobbyists. Senator Grassley joined a chorus of watchdog groups and Democrats criticizing the House version.

Melanie Sloan, President of Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, said: "The Cantor provision is a sham and aimed at tricking Americans into thinking he's dealing with the issue." That was a quote.

So, whether you're talking about Politico, Washington Times, Washington Post, Associated Press, Roll Call, or whether you're just talking about members of the House Democratic Caucus or citizens across the Nation, we did pass a version of the STOCK Act today. It was a weakened version. It wasn't good enough. And, Mr. Speaker, if Americans across this country decided that they were going to demand that there be a conference committee in which the stronger provisions were adopted, I think that would be a very good thing.

Americans across this country, I think they agree with what's written in this Washington Post article. They write:

A scaled-back ethics bill headed toward likely passage in the House Thursday despite complaints from Senators that Republican leaders are jettisoning—that means getting rid of—several key provisions that won overwhelming support in the Senate last week.

Of course Think Progress probably echos the sentiments of the American people, too, Mr. Speaker, as they wrote in their blog, "House Republicans prepared to vote on watered-down congressional insider trading ban." Here's what they say:

Since a “60 Minutes” report showed that Representative Spencer Bachus (R-Al.) profited from information he obtained in a private economic briefing in 2008, Congress has moved quickly to pass a bill to ban insider trading by its Members. House Majority Leader Eric Cantor has made several changes to the legislation which appear intended to at least weaken the final product, if not kill it outright.

That is what they said at Think Progress.

Of course the New York Times, they're in this, too. This is an issue of serious public concern, and we would expect their editorial writers to weigh in. And what they said was this, Mr. Speaker:

With the House poised to take up a major ethics bill, Republican leaders have deleted a provision that would, for the first time, regulate the collection of political intelligence from political insiders for the use of hedge funds, mutual funds, and other investors.

Representative Louise Slaughter, Democrat of New York, said lawmakers and the public need to know more about the activities of these professionals, who she said “glean information from Members of Congress and staff and sell it to clients who make a lot of money off it.”

You know, Mr. Speaker, I'm betting that a lot of people across America don't even know that this practice even takes place. I'm betting that a lot of people across America don't realize that there are people who sort of scurry around in the shadows, looking for tidbits of information which they could use to make an investment decision, and that this is a multimillion-dollar industry.

Let me also move back and just say that, Mr. Speaker, I doubt that the American people really realize that there is important information that can affect stock price that is thrown around around here. You would think that it would be just common sense, Mr. Speaker, that as we as Members of Congress are hired to pursue the public interest, that no one would ever use that information to advance their private commercial interests. There's nothing wrong with Members of Congress owning a business or something like that. I mean, this is America. But to say you're going to Congress to get information to try to trade stocks and then getting rich off that information seems, to me, a real problem.

Now, I don't know what the facts are. All I know is what I saw on “60 Minutes.” But it was alleged that a Member of Congress was in a meeting, pursuing his responsibility to promote the public interest, left that meeting, and using information from that meeting, purchased stock options and basically made a bet that the economy would go down.

So I ask you, Mr. Speaker, can a person, charged with a public duty to uphold the public interest simultaneously pursue their private interests? And what happens, Mr. Speaker, when those two things are at odds?

If your job is to keep the economy afloat, but it would make you money if the economy goes down because you

have essentially bought stock options where you would financially gain from the loss of value, what is one to do? Well, if they're a public service employee, if they're a public official, they should pursue the public interest, and the law should forbid them from trying to pursue their private interests at the public's expense.

□ 1240

And yet, we do know that these things, that there's good evidence that these things may well have happened and that there needs to be accountability all around. And it is disappointing that when we finally, after these things finally get to the point where we're going to pass a bill, that we don't go all the way. We make carve-outs for the political intelligence industry. We make carve-outs for people here and there. This is not right.

The Senate version, which has accountability, which has prosecution authority, and which bans this political intelligence industry from just operating in the shadows, that is what we should be doing, not making carve-outs for them and sweetheart deals.

So I'm joined now by my good friend from the great State of Ohio, representing the northern Ohio area. There's really no one, Mr. Speaker, who has been a greater advocate for consumers than MARCY KAPTUR.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank my dear colleague from Minnesota, and thank you for your leadership on so many issues here.

I listened with care to what you've been presenting today to give voice to the American people from coast to coast. And I want to thank you, in particular, for the work you've done on mortgage foreclosures, on holding Wall Street accountable, Congressman ELLISON. No one has fought harder. Minnesota's been affected, your home city of Detroit, all across northern Ohio, Toledo to Sandusky to Lorain to Cleveland to Parma, all these communities struck so hard by Wall Street's malfeasance.

And I wanted to join you today as you keep a focus on who the wrongdoers really have been, and how we help the Republic heal; to thank the Obama administration for the efforts they've made to date on a major settlement that's being announced during the same timeframe as we speak here, where individual States and five of the major Wall Street banks who are responsible, who used widespread fraudulent paperwork that precipitated the foreclosure crisis, that this settlement will actually bring some measure of justice.

And we ought to claim a great deal of credit because the Progressive Caucus has been working so hard on this, and housing and the mortgage foreclosure crisis has been at the top of our agenda.

The settlement, the initial settlement will reportedly impose a \$26 bil-

lion penalty against Wells Fargo, Bank of America, JPMorgan Chase, Allied Financial, and Citigroup that were at the heart of the schemes that led to the securitization and collateralized debt obligation risk-taking. The total amount could grow to \$30 billion or \$45 billion if additional banks join the settlement. Given the extent of the damage they've caused, it's a start, and frankly, a very important one.

We can't forget that millions of America's families lost their homes, and countless more are still dealing with foreclosure. And our cities have empty hulks of neighborhoods that are struggling as a result.

If you come to places that I represent, as you've mentioned, in northern Ohio you can see the thousands of vacant structures that these banks left to decay. They didn't even manage them well once they possessed them. In neighborhood after neighborhood, the damage these banks inflicted is incalculable as they achieved the largest transfer of equity and wealth from Main Street to Wall Street. They've made every community more poor.

This agreement is the largest joint Federal/State settlement ever obtained and the result of unprecedented coordination between the various corners of our government and the States. And it needs to be a major settlement.

One in five American families with a mortgage today—this is an astounding number—owe more than the house is actually worth by an average of over \$50,000. The collective negative equity across the Nation is over \$700 billion.

For years I've come to this floor urging Congress to do more, and one critical part of this agreement is that it does not provide blanket immunity to the banks for their misdeeds. While the ink is barely dry on this agreement, the press is reporting, and I quote, Officials will also be able to pursue any allegations of criminal wrongdoing.

And I know the congressman and I want to go down that road, and I wish to place in the RECORD an article from The New York Times this week that talks about how African American New Yorkers making more than \$68,000 are nearly five times as likely to hold high interest mortgages as Caucasians of similar income.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 2012]

THAT COMEBACK TRAIL FOR THE ECONOMY?  
HERE, IT'S LITTERED WITH FORECLOSURES

(By Michael Powell)

To walk 145th Street in South Jamaica, past red-brick homes with metal awnings and chain-link fences, is to find a storm of immense destructive power still raging.

Three years ago, when I wandered this block south of Linden Boulevard in Queens, banks had foreclosed on eight homes. In the years since, banks have filed notice against a half-dozen more owners. Some of those homes sit abandoned, plywood boards nailed across doors and windows, as if to guard against further spread of this plague.

We are accustomed to hearing politicians talk of a halting recovery from the recession. They detect heartbeats in the job market and flickers of life in house sales. New

York and New Jersey, our governors proclaim, are on the comeback trail.

Not here.

A dozen miles from Midtown Manhattan, the foreclosure belt stretches across the heart of black homeownership in this city, from Canarsie and East New York in Brooklyn, to Springfield Gardens and St. Albans, Queens, where Fats Waller, Count Basie and Ella Fitzgerald once owned handsome Tudor-style homes.

Black Americans came late to homeownership for reasons deeply rooted in our tragic racial history. Black New Yorkers making more than \$68,000 are nearly five times as likely to hold high-interest mortgages as whites of similar income, and their default rates are much higher. Now a generation watches as its housing wealth is vaporized.

Organizers with the Neighborhood Economic Development Advocacy Project pored over 2011 mortgage default data. They found that 345,000 city mortgages were in default or delinquent last year. In corners of southeast Queens, banks filed as many as 150 delinquency notes for every 1,000 housing units.

Attorney General Eric T. Schneiderman says that statewide the number of New Yorkers at risk of losing homes exceeds the population of Buffalo, Syracuse and Rochester combined.

In Jamaica, “for sale” signs sit two, three and four to a block. Real estate agents resemble fishermen who’ve kept lines in the water too long. Of late, matters have grown worse. The federal government has stopped paying counselors and lawyers for those at risk of foreclosure, and Gov. Andrew M. Cuomo, who takes pride in his reinvention as a fiscal conservative, has declined to foot the bill.

I stop Randy Ali, a Guyanese ironworker, as he tinkers with his SUV on 145th Street. Which is his house? He nods at a two-story brick home. “I paid \$360,000.” He gives a mournful nod. “I just got a notice from the city that it’s valued at \$215,000.”

He looks embarrassed. How could he foresee a housing collapse this huge? “You have a family, you want a place to live.” Pause. “Do I walk away?”

Say this much: New Yorkers are better off than those who live in the acres of foreclosed homes in the deserts around Phoenix and Las Vegas. Our politicians are not always an inspiring lot, but New York has a social democratic tradition, and they wove a safety net.

Banks must submit to months of mediation before foreclosing, and lawyers must attest that the bank can prove ownership. Judges here show waning patience for the three-card monte act of some banks.

Just a few weeks ago, the Appellate Division of State Supreme Court took the unusual step of ruling that Bank of America could not foreclose on an Orange County home of a New York City police officer. The judges upheld a lower court ruling that the bank’s “conduct was nothing short of appalling.”

Still, the fevers rage on.

On Friday, I stepped off the elevator in State Supreme Court in Queens. Shafts of sun poured across the marble floor, as dozens of men and women sat in shadow, awaiting mediation.

A computer list is taped to the wooden door frame. Every foreclosure case has been adjourned 4, 5, 10 times. More homeowners hold tight to their homes than a few years ago, but the cost is weeks of missed work and legal bills piled high.

Freeman N. Hawes Sr. walks into the mediation room. He’s a husky, cheerful black man, from Rosedale. The bank agent nods pleasantly. She thinks the bank might grant him a mortgage modification. But she can’t get the bank on the phone just now.

Perhaps next time?

The mediator sets a new date. Mr. Hawes walks to a bench and, from a brown plastic bag, pulls dog-eared letters from Nationstar Mortgage. Nationstar, the letters show, agreed that he had made his payments and promised to modify his mortgage in 2010, and again in July 2011: It broke both promises.

He has lived in Rosedale, a black middle-class neighborhood, for decades. He’s edging toward 70 and holds two jobs with no plans of retiring.

“I’m not one to hold grudges,” he says. “The Lord says I can live 125 years, so I’ll keep paying the bank. But why can’t I get to the finale?”

That’s a question that haunts thousands of homeowners.

Madam Speaker, a major settlement was just reached between the individual states and 5 of the major Wall Street banks whose widespread use of fraudulent paperwork fueled the foreclosure crisis.

This initial settlement will reportedly impose \$26 billion in penalties against Wells Fargo, Bank of America, JP Morgan Chase, Ally Financial and Citigroup. The total amount could grow to \$30 billion or \$45 billion if additional banks join the settlement. Given the extent of the damage that they caused, it’s a start, and an important one.

We cannot forget that millions of American families lost their homes, and countless more are still dealing with foreclosure. If you come to places I represent in Northern Ohio, you can see the thousands of vacant structures that these banks left to decay throughout individual neighborhoods. The damage these banks inflicted is incalculable.

This agreement is the largest joint federal-state settlement ever obtained, and it is the result of unprecedented coordination between various corners of the government. And, it needs to be. One in five American families with a mortgage owe more than the house is actually worth today, by an average of \$50,000. The collective negative equity across the nation is \$700 billion.

For years, I have come to this floor urging Congress to do more. One critical part of this agreement is that it does not provide blanket immunity to the banks for their misdeeds. While the ink is barely dry on this agreement, the press is reporting that “Officials will also be able to pursue any allegations of criminal wrong doing.” And, this is very important. According to the Justice Department, “the agreement does not prevent any claims by any individual borrowers who wish to bring their own lawsuits.”

Yes this is an important step, but we must remember the scope of the damage and the magnitude of fraud that was committed. Much work still needs to be done.

During the past decade, we as a country failed to take white collar crime seriously, and we as a country are still dealing with the damage that was done to our housing market. Already back during the Bush Administration, the FBI testified before Congress that they were seeing an epidemic in white collar crime and that we did not have anywhere near enough agents to deal with it. Well, history has shown that we never provided the FBI and other investigators and prosecutors with the full resources they needed. During the much smaller Savings and Loans crisis of the 1980s, we set up a series of strike forces based in 27 cities, staffed with 1,000 FBI agents and forensic experts and dozens of

Federal prosecutors. We did not do that this time around.

I have a bill that I have been asking for my colleagues to support, week in and week out. It is H.R. 3050, “The Financial Crisis Criminal Investigation Act.” This bill would authorize an additional 1,000 FBI agents, a sufficient number of forensic experts, and additional employees by the Attorney General to prosecute violations of the law in the financial markets.

Like today’s announcement, we have seen some progress in getting more FBI agents, but more needs to be done. In last year’s appropriation, Congress made a bipartisan decision to include funding for more than two hundred additional agents. It’s good news, but we cannot be soft on this kind of crime. Families, neighborhoods, and whole communities were victims.

Earlier this week, the New York Times reported on what it described as a foreclosure belt that runs through the heart of African American homeownership in New York City. I want to include this article in the record, because it details a very important element of the foreclosure crisis. According to the Times, black New Yorkers making more than \$68,000 are nearly five times as likely to hold high-interest mortgages as whites of similar income, and their default rates are much higher. Now a generation watches as its housing wealth is vaporized.”

In Cleveland, we see neighborhoods struggling to survive as well. In Cuyahoga County alone, there now are an estimated 30,000 vacant structures. We see shocking pictures of homes stripped of everything from the siding to the kitchen sink, even the floor boards. We see homes that were once worth \$100,000 stripped of their entire value. We see whole communities that were victimized by the actions of Wall Street.

Just last month, the President announced during the State of the Union a new working group to look into mortgage fraud. It will coordinate efforts between the FBI, the Justice Department, and various states to go after those on Wall Street who have perpetuated fraud in the markets, using mortgage backed securities. Yet another good step, but we have a lot more work to do.

It is well past time for Wall Street to accept responsibility for its role in the housing crisis. Big Wall Street banks and the secondary markets made obscene profits during the 1990s up to the market crash in 2008. During that period, banks targeted communities, looking for individuals to take on mortgages the banks knew they could not afford. And then Wall Street went looking to make fast money on individual American dreams and local mortgage markets. Those responsible did not care what ultimately happened to families, communities, or whole cities. And when the market collapsed, the American taxpayer actually bailed them out. Today’s settlement is big news, and it’s well past time that Wall Street started to pay up. But, we cannot forget that this story is far from over, and our work is not over.

I think the civil rights aspect of what has gone on is extraordinarily important. I don’t want to overstep my time boundaries here, Congressman ELLISON. Do I have a couple of extra minutes in this period or not?

Mr. ELLISON. Well, yes you do. But may I ask a question before you continue on?

Ms. KAPTUR. Please.

Mr. ELLISON. We may see as many as 10 million homes go into foreclosure from the beginning of this crisis to the end. How important to the average home owner is this settlement? Is it going to help them?

I yield back to the gentlelady.

Ms. KAPTUR. I think what's going to happen with this is, even though over a million homeowners are likely to be helped and several hundred thousand get some recompense, maybe an average of \$2,000 per household, what's going to happen is it's going to precipitate more foreclosures as the system continues to progress. And that is a deep concern of mine because these banks have not been noted for treating customers well.

According to the Justice Department, however, the agreement does not prevent any claims by individual borrowers who wish to bring their own lawsuits. And I think it's incumbent upon lawyers across this country, our Progressive Caucus, to look for legal remedies to continue to gain sweet justice for those who have been so harmed.

Mr. ELLISON. Reclaiming my time, now here's the other thing. So we know that there may be 10 million people who lost their homes in foreclosure. Maybe a million will get help. That's good. I hope they get it.

But has anybody gone to prison for mortgage fraud schemes? I mean, here's why, I want you to address this question, but let me lay it out just a tad for you.

So what we have here, we know, is that people were drawn in with high pressure tactics to get in a mortgage that they didn't understand, and sometimes were even misstating the income. There are people who would say, look, I didn't borrow that much money. I have no idea where that amount came from.

And then was a bunch of signing stuff that happened that people were not aware of. And that sort of skirted the reality.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman would yield, the robo-signing.

Mr. ELLISON. The robo-signing. That's right.

And then another kind of amazing thing that happened was that people would underwrite mortgages, not based on the ability of the borrower to pay, but based on their ability to sell that mortgage into the secondary market. And then it would get repackaged into a mortgage-backed security which, somehow miraculously, you know, these things that were stated income, no income, no job loans, falsified income for these things, made it into a mortgage-backed security which then was rated as triple A in many cases.

There's got to be some fraud and misrepresentation there. And so it just seems like the system was full of misrepresentation, fraud and all that. Have we investigated this thing to the point where there are people to hold

accountable before we're settling this case?

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, you know what's important to point out. You asked a critical question because this settlement does not deal with those that originated mortgages. It only deals with those mortgages that were held in the secondary market. And so it doesn't claw back to the perpetrators of the scheme, and that's why I'm saying this is an important first step.

We also need, in every city, as we had during the savings and loan crisis, strike forces of FBI agents. There were maybe 55 agents working on this. We tried to boost that number to 200. During the S&L crisis we had 1,000. We need accounting and forensic experts to piece together what happened in community after community.

Congressman, in my area there were liars loans that were targeted to senior citizens and the disabled.

Mr. ELLISON. Liar loans?

Ms. KAPTUR. Liars loans. They would go up to a senior citizen, a woman after she'd lost her husband and they would say, ma'am, you know, we feel very sorry for you, but we want you to know we have a deal. You'll never have to worry about your financial future again. And they got her to cash out her equity, and they put one of these balloon payments on there, so she ended up having to pay more than she could afford 10 years out.

This is what happened to people. There's so much crime inside of what was done in community after community. And what's been happening at the FBI is they have not been able to beef up their Financial Fraud Division, and they've been held—that's why you haven't had the people arrested.

Mr. ELLISON. Reclaiming my time, I want to ask you a question about that.

So over the course of the last several months, our friends on the Republican side of the aisle—I'm just being honest, and I don't think even they would disagree with this—have been trumpeting this idea, the government's too big. We've got to cut. We've got to cut. We just have to cut. Cut, cut, cut, cut, cut, just cut. Scale it back, shrink it down, make it smaller. Get rid of government.

One iconic conservative figure said we've got to shrink government to the size where you can drown it in a bathtub.

□ 1250

Now, if we were to shrink government to the size where we can drown it in a bathtub, where are we going to get these lawyers and investigators to investigate mortgage fraud?

Ms. KAPTUR. There will be no justice.

The Congressman has pointed out something that is extraordinarily important. There are those who seek to harm the American people, whether it's through financial crimes or those who are true enemies of our Republic; and we have to be strong on all fronts.

In this arena of prosecution, we have been very weak.

Mr. ELLISON. Have we really investigated the extent of the wrongdoing before we settled the case? I mean, I'm glad there has been a settlement. I hope that it brings justice to everyone. I suspect it will bring justice to some people. I hope so. But my question is, Do we know the extent of the harm of the bad actors?

Here's the thing. The originators might not be part of this, but these secondary-market actors, in my view, are culpable, too, because they had to know if they read the mortgages, if they read the documentation, they had to say, Wait a minute, something's funny here. We've got a 72-year-old retired widow with a stated income of \$160,000 a year or \$500,000 a year. It just doesn't make sense that there would be that many widows earning that kind of income. Now, there might be some who have that kind of wealth, but that kind of income when they're in their retirement years? There's got to be something fishy here.

Ms. KAPTUR. It reminds me of baseball. You've got some players who are out on the field. They're saying, Well, you've got to hold the shortstop accountable for a little bit of what he did when he's out there on the field. But you've got the team coach sitting in the dugout. Right? They haven't touched the coach. They haven't even touched all the players yet, and they sure haven't seen the one who's calling all the plays.

So what they're dealing with here are some of the mortgages in the secondary market; they haven't touched the coaches. They haven't touched the originators on the mortgages in this particular settlement.

Now, in terms of you said how much does it help, the hole to our economy is several trillion dollars, counting unemployment and lost revenues and so forth. Overall, the TARP was \$700 billion. I didn't support it. This settlement is maybe \$25 billion. Ohio alone had a gap about that large. So when you look at the settlement, it's important, it's a victory. But we've got to take the next step. We've got to get the first baseman, the third baseman, the catcher, the batter, and then we've got to go after the coaches in the dugout.

Mr. ELLISON. You mentioned the S&L crisis. In the S&L crisis, we had a thousand Justice Department lawyers going after this thing. We've got 50,000 Justice Department lawyers going after this recent housing foreclosure crisis. Can we even compete with some of these titans who the Justice Department has to deal with with that small number?

Ms. KAPTUR. I'll tell you, Congressman, one thing we need to do is look at some of the people that sit over at the Justice Department and where they used to work before they got there, because I think one of the reasons that prosecution isn't occurring at the level that it should is there is some paralysis in some places because of those



who are able to block a play. They're able to block prosecution.

We have a bill, H.R. 3050, the Financial Crisis Criminal Investigation Act, that would authorize an additional 1,000 FBI agents. That's just as many as we had during the S&L crisis, which is much smaller than what we have today.

But across our cities, across our regions, we don't have the agents in place to go after the crimes we've been talking about.

Mr. ELLISON. I would like to ask the gentlelady from Ohio, we've talked about who lost. Homeowners lost, even homeowners who never lost their home in foreclosure and never missed a payment, their home value dropped; a lot of people lost. But did some people really make a lot of money off of this crisis?

Ms. KAPTUR. They made the highest salaries in the country, bonuses. We didn't take a penny away. I had a bill to take 100 percent of the bonuses away. Guess what? They never bring it on the floor. We couldn't even take the bonuses away, much less their yachts, their seven houses, all the fancy cars. They're living a great life, and they believe they are immune from prosecution.

Mr. ELLISON. So far they're right.

Ms. KAPTUR. It's not a pretty picture.

Mr. ELLISON. Many, many people suffered in this foreclosure crisis. It's also that cities suffered as cities were required—they used to have a tax-paying citizen in the home. Now, after the foreclosure with all of this stated income and the dishonesty and everything, they have no one living there, they have weeds growing, dead dogs there, they have an attractive nuisance where, you know, sometimes awful things happen in those abandoned houses. So cities have seen their coffers drained. They went from a plus-property taxpaying person to now an expense on the tax rolls.

We've seen a reduction in the overall property tax revenue of cities which they need to put on vital services for residents of cities, streets, cops, fire, all of that stuff.

Ms. KAPTUR. And the school districts, Congressman ELLISON. When you look at the revenues that are bleeding away from school districts, the harm these big banks did—and they used to be speculation houses—and then they changed their name to banks. They got to be holding banks then.

But if you look at the harm that they caused across America, it's still not over; and they're not being held accountable. Actually, they got richer. As a result of this crisis, six banks now control two-thirds of the finances of this country.

Before the crisis, they controlled about 40 percent. So they just got bigger and more powerful while community after community has been struck with more homelessness, with declin-

ing revenues to school systems, declining revenues into coffers so they can't hire police. The drug trade has just locked down in some of these communities as people struggle to earn their way forward in the most unfortunate way.

You look at the harm this has caused around the country, it's profound.

I gave a Special Order the other day, and I said I think what we ought to do with these big bankers, places like Goldman Sachs and Citigroup, they ought to come to our homeless shelters and scrub the floors. Once we get them prosecuted, and I wait for that day, wouldn't it be great if the CEO of Goldman Sachs had to come to a homeless shelter in Minneapolis and scrub the floors and join Habitat for Humanity for a couple of years and go try to fix up some of these houses in these communities?

They haven't confronted their damage. They feel they're being held harmless, and you know what, they are.

Mr. ELLISON. What happens is they profit from this mortgage fraud. They make exorbitant monies as they securitize these bad mortgages. They make exorbitant money as they collected on these credit default swaps as these mortgage-backed securities went bad. Various people made gobs of money, bonuses that just boggle the mind how big they are.

But then, see, your point is interesting because they don't see the damage that they caused because they have—some of them even helicopter from their homes to their offices. Others of them are in limousines just flying down the highway back to their country villa from their downtown Manhattan skyscraper, so they don't see the damage. They don't drive through Cleveland and Detroit and Minneapolis and other places where whole neighborhoods have been sucked out because of the damaging behavior that they engaged in.

I think that it would be important after they served their jail time to come and be with the people who they harmed and have to explain the reason that we have created and exacerbated homelessness is because we just love money that much. Having two or three yachts and a couple of boats wasn't good enough. We needed more and more and more; and that's why we wrecked your city, damaged your neighborhood, and put you out of your home.

Ms. KAPTUR. What they have done are capital crimes. They have harmed our Republic so much with this massive transfer of wealth. I think the best thing the American people can do is if they are paying a mortgage loan or a car loan or a student loan to any one of these big institutions that harmed America, take it out, renegotiate that loan with a local institution, credit union, community bank that didn't do this harm to the Republic. That's something every American family can do.

Then when you think about it, what this group of bankers did—and I call

them speculators because they really weren't prudent bankers.

Mr. ELLISON. Bankers collect deposits and loan money to the communities they represent and help people do what they need to do.

Ms. KAPTUR. What this group did was they actually have threatened the entire system of capital formation in this country because they have disrupted the measurement of value at the local parcel level. So our normal system of recording deeds and value in Minnesota, in Ohio, was thrown out the window as they went to the MERS system, the electric registration system.

Mr. ELLISON. Right.

□ 1300

Ms. KAPTUR. They went over the heads of all of our local property recording offices, our titling offices. That is at the heart of capitalism, itself. You would think there would be a roar out of other economic interests in this country, saying, Hey, you fellows, you almost brought down capitalism. You almost brought down the whole market economy.

And they actually did if you see the damage still rippling through this country. Yet they're not being prosecuted? Think about that.

Mr. ELLISON. I'll tell you, it's all sort of an interlocking mess. I mean, we've been told since the days that Milton Friedman first hit the scene that regulations were a problem in our economy and that having rules to protect health and safety and fairness simply were disrupting the market and that we needed to get rid of these job-killing regulations—what our Republican friends called them all the time—rather than commonsense protections to protect people.

So we got rid of those things. We didn't enforce the laws that we already did have. We shrank government to the point where, because we didn't want to pay any taxes, government couldn't even afford itself, so we didn't have the people to make sure that consumers were being treated fairly, that mortgages were fair and that rules were being abided by. Then, as the technology and everything changed, we weren't able to change regulation so that it would keep up to date with the necessity of the market.

What I have in mind now is an heroic figure named Brooksley Born, who tried to tell them that this OPEC "insurance" market—I put "insurance" in quotes—this credit default swap market, needed to be regulated. Instead of regulating it, we actually passed a bill in 1999 that it would not be regulated. Then as a result, when the music stopped in 2008, we were at the mercy of—what?—\$54 trillion.

Ms. KAPTUR. When that bill was passed, I would venture to say 99 percent of the Members of Congress didn't even know it was in there because it was buried in an omnibus appropriations bill. Nobody even knew it was in there. So that was sort of the final

straw that broke the camel's back. I wanted to say to the gentleman that I'm sure in Minnesota—and you can verify this for me—just like in Ohio, business after business tells me, MARCY, we can't get a loan.

Mr. ELLISON. Oh, yes. That's right. Ms. KAPTUR. The normal banking system isn't working, and what they're trying to do at the Federal level is to focus attention just on the secondary market activity rather than on the loan originators. So they're saying, Oh, the problem was at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were the second in line.

Mr. ELLISON. Right.

Ms. KAPTUR. The first in line were the originators, the very institutions we're talking about here: Citicorp; Bank of America; Goldman Sachs is now involved in that; Wells Fargo; HSBC; UBS. It's all these institutions, and they originated through their intermediaries, like Countrywide, which was involved. When the bad loan was made, they then sold it to the secondary market. So now most of the prosecution has been of the secondary market activities, which really soured in about 2007, 2008, but the real perpetrators started well over a decade earlier. That's where we need to go—

Mr. ELLISON. Yes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Which is to the originators who created the schemes that allowed, as you say, the lid to be blown off the regulation of derivatives and of these fancy schemes.

Right now, yes, we're trying to get ahold of the secondary market activity, but they only received the ball from the original passer—I call them the “coach”—the ones who were actually developing the game plan, and you have to go back a decade. That's why we need robust prosecution at the FBI.

Mr. ELLISON. Absolutely.

Does the gentledady have any more news to report about the settlement?

Ms. KAPTUR. All I know is that it's big news and that we're receiving it well. It's an important first step. I think it's like somebody just hit a solid first base hit, and we've got some other bases to go around until we get to home plate.

I really want to thank the gentleman very much for allowing me time today as we try to repair the Republic. This is a very helpful step. I want to thank the Obama administration and wish them on to do even better. Let's get those agents hired. I hope the President's budget, when it comes up here, will allow us to hire 1,000 agents at the FBI in order to get this job done, not just in the secondary market, but to go after the originators.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentledady has just a few more minutes, if I may, I would like to pose one more question.

Ms. KAPTUR. Please.

Mr. ELLISON. We've heard that we've had about 23 months of private sector job growth. In January, the job growth numbers were very good, and

we're happy to receive those. Unemployment has ticked down to about 8.3 percent, so it looks like the trajectory of the economy is going in the right direction.

But, until we address this housing problem, will we still have a drag on the economy?

Ms. KAPTUR. I am so happy the gentleman has asked that question.

I have served on the Housing committees for my entire career in Congress. There has been no modern recovery in our country that has not been led by housing development. If you talk to Realtors, if you talk to homebuilders, you'll see how poor that market is right now. We have to fix the housing sector.

On the part of the majority here, there haven't been any serious hearings on this. Have we gone out to the country? We used to go out to the country. When there is a crisis, you go out to the country. If Louisiana loses part of its southern edge, we go down there. We try to help. We try to figure out what's going on. On this housing problem, there has been such timid action, almost no action, by this Congress. We've just let it fester and hemorrhage across the country.

History will show this was one of the most irresponsible periods that damaged our housing stock from coast to coast, and we will be paying for it for years to come—in shattered lives, in shattered communities. If I chaired the committee, we'd be all over the country. We wouldn't be sitting here in Washington doing nothing. We would be going out to these communities.

Mr. ELLISON. Our Republican friends, who are in the majority, they tell us: Let laissez-faire capitalism take over. Let the housing market bottom out. Government shouldn't do anything. Just let all home value go down to nothing, and eventually somebody will buy those houses that are just sitting there, idle, after people have been unemployed and can't afford them and have to be foreclosed on. They tell us we should just be laissez-faire with that. They also tell us that we should not put any regulations in place and that we should cut taxes so that the government doesn't have enough revenue to protect the people.

To me, this crisis seems like the product of a philosophy—that the rich people don't have enough money and that the poor have too much. This seems like a culmination of a philosophy that for the people, through their democratic institutions to hold business accountable, to play fairly and by the rules, has seen its full manifestation. The full manifestation of this Ayn Rand-type philosophy has brought us to financial ruin, and they won't even admit that.

We haven't seen any hearings on how to address the foreclosure crisis, because they believe in just letting the market bottom out. I mean, even though there have been 23 months of private sector job growth, you never

hear them say anything good about that; and while we're adding private sector jobs, they're trying to cut public sector jobs.

What is really going on here? Why isn't our majority addressing the jobs crisis? Their jobs program seems to be to attack the EPA. They're basically making the case that Americans who want to breathe and drink clean water are the problem of our economy. What is this laissez-faire get the government out? no taxes for the rich? What has this philosophy brought us to?

Ms. KAPTUR. I would say to the gentleman that I think what it has brought us to is of only being for the 1 percent because, if you look at what is going on, they have the big banks confiscating private property. In other words, where people had equity, they took it away; right? People walked away from their homes. They didn't get legal advice. They had a leg to stand on, but they were so afraid that ordinary families just walked away from their homes, and many of them could still be in their homes. So they're confiscating private property. Then, at the Federal level, they want to take and cash out public property that belongs to the American people: in our parks—right?—and in our lands. Think about what they're talking about.

□ 1310

So a few want it all. And we're saying, that's not what America's about. America is about everyone—we, the people, all of us. Not just the few, but about the 99 percent, not just the 1 percent.

But when six banks control two-thirds of the wealth of this country, that's something to be worried about because it's too much power in too few hands.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentledady.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BUERKLE). The gentleman from Minnesota has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, let me wrap up.

All I would like to say, Madam Speaker, is that the Progressive Caucus looks at an America where the American Dream was of liberty and justice for all. And when those words were written, we had a society where only part of our society was legally allowed to fully participate. Women couldn't vote. Blacks couldn't vote. But people who believed in the dream of America wanted to make progress and fought to make sure that women and people of color could vote in this country. And people looked at that American Dream and said, You know what, we have a dream of a big middle class, broadly shared prosperity. And even though the society may not have quite been that way at that time, they worked to fulfill that promise, that dream, the American Dream, an idea that good Americans pursued and helped to bring into fruition.

We are trying to make progress on the dream, the progress of full inclusion, full employment, respecting our environment, believing in science. This is what the Progressive Caucus is all about. We're not trying to conserve the old way where only some people had privilege and opportunity. We're trying to make progress. So this is what the Progressive Caucus is all about.

The Progressive Caucus believes, of course, there should be a free market in America; but there also needs to be a public sector that will watch out for the health, safety, and fairness of our country. Yet some people in Congress are hostile to the idea of any government role, but we're not. We believe that government is how we come together in ways that we can't do it alone, for the best benefit of everybody.

And we urge the Republican majority—they've got the power; this is a winner-take-all-type system—to go out across American and do something and hear people about the issue of foreclosure, to get some jobs going. Pass the American Jobs Act. Pass the infrastructure bank bill. Do something to get this country together. Address the foreclosure crisis. Stop whipping up Americans versus Americans, using loaded terms like "food stamp President," which is racial code. Stop blaming the gay community for failures in people's marriages. It's not their fault. Stop heaping hate and scorn on new Americans, and stop trying to relegate women to second-class citizenship.

Let's embrace the fullness of what it means to be an American. Let's make progress on the American Dream. Let's embrace the progressive message.

And I just want to say, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### RECESS APPOINTMENTS

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate the time, and I appreciate being able to follow my colleagues from the Progressive Caucus.

There is not a lot that the Progressive Caucus works for in terms of their techniques that I agree with, but there is so much that the caucus works for in terms of its overall goals for America that I agree with. And I think that that is a story that does not get told as often as it should here in this House. We can very often have common goals but have very different ways that we seek to achieve those goals, Madam Speaker.

I think the way that we achieve those goals is important. It's important. As my colleague said when he was speaking on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, America voted in 2008. America voted in 2010. And in 2008, they elected a President. In 2010, they elected a new

Congress. And powers divided America. Powers divided America. We have Democrats controlling the White House. We have Democrats controlling the Senate. We have Republicans controlling the U.S. House of Representatives. And we have the American people who should be controlling all three of those things.

As we were coming into this new year, Madam Speaker, I was at home with my family back in Georgia, and I heard the news that the President of the United States had decided to appoint members to boards, to positions, to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, to the National Labor Relations Board, to appoint positions that require Senate confirmation, to name people to those positions without getting that Senate confirmation, saying that if I can't do it with the Senate, I'll just skip the Senate.

And I don't mind telling you, Madam Speaker, that really cast a damper on my Christmas season. We were coming into this new year—a new year where, as my friends from the Progressive Caucus have just laid out, we have challenge after challenge after challenge after challenge that we, as Americans, must face together, that we must come together in order to solve.

And we're coming into this new year, an opportunity to make that happen. And I had high hopes. I had high hopes that despite this being an election year—and I think that brings out a lot of what's worst about Washington, DC. Despite this being an election year, despite there being divided government in Washington, I thought, We are going to have an opportunity because the challenges are so great to come together on behalf of all of our constituencies to move this Nation forward.

And I wondered because, even though you are as new, as I am, Madam Speaker, we've seen in years past that the closer you get to election, the crazier things get in Congress. The closer you get to an election, sadly, the more folks stop worrying about doing the right thing and start worrying about getting reelected and doing whatever it takes to do that. And as a freshman, Madam Speaker, I know you likely agree with me.

I happen to think doing the right thing is the best thing for getting reelected. I think if more folks spent more time worrying about doing the right thing instead of getting reelected, their reelection campaigns would take care of themselves. But I had high hopes coming into this year that this would not be a wasted reelection year for the American people but that we would be able to work on serious issues together.

The rule book I use, Madam Speaker, I have up here on the board. This happens to be article II, section 2, clause 3 of the United States Constitution. But the Constitution is the rule book I use. I carry mine with me. I don't want it to be far away because I believe that if we have the same rule book to operate

from, Madam Speaker, then it gives us that context for trying to achieve the goals the American people sent us here to do.

Here we have article II, section 2, clause 3 of the United States Constitution: "The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session." This is the recess appoint authority, Madam Speaker. You've heard it said the President has the power to make recess appointments. The President shall have the power to fill all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate. Undisputed. Undisputed, Madam Speaker: article II, section 2, clause 3.

Article II, section 2, clause 2: The President shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties. And he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided.

The President shall have the power to make appointments if the Senate is in recess. But if the Senate is not, the President only has the power—the President shall, the Constitution says, nominate by and with the advice and consent of the United States Senate. That's the way our system works, Madam Speaker. That's the rule book that was left for us by our Founding Fathers. That's the rule book that has guided this country for 225 years. The President has the power to appoint nonelected leaders, unelected leaders to lead this Nation. But he can do so only with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Now, back in the day, Madam Speaker—I know you are from the northern part of the east coast. I'm from the southern part of the east coast.

□ 1320

It used to take us a long time to get to Washington, DC. I'm 640 miles away from the Capital down in Georgia. If I had to get on my horse and ride to the United States Capital, it would take quite a few days to do it. And understanding that the business of the American people had to continue, our Founding Fathers looked ahead and said if the Senate cannot be reconvened, if the Senate is too far away to consult, and your first duty is to consult, but if you cannot, we want the country to go on.

Well, that's been the way it's been in this country, Madam Speaker, as you know, for hundreds upon hundreds of years. Until now. Until now, when for the very first time, when for the very first time this President of the United States said, I can't get my nominees through the Democratic Senate, so I'm going to go around the Senate. And he made appointments without the advice and consent of the Senate.

I have with me today, Madam Speaker, a page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a speech that was given on the Senate floor, and this is what it says: Mr. President, the Senate will be coming in for pro forma sessions during the Thanksgiving holiday to prevent recess appointments.

My hope is that this will prompt the President to see that it is in our mutual interests to get nominations back on track. With an election year looming, significant progress can still be made. But that progress can't be made if the President seeks controversial recess appointments and fails to make others.

With the Thanksgiving break looming, the administration informed me that they would make several recess appointments. I indicated I would be willing to confirm various appointments if the administration would agree to move others, but they would not make that commitment. And as a result, I am keeping the Senate in pro forma session to prevent recess appointments until we get this process back on track.

Do you hear those words from the United States Senate, Madam Speaker? Do you hear those words? This was the majority leader in the United States Senate speaking out, telling the President you cannot, you cannot, you cannot make appointments without the advice and consent of the Senate. You're trying to go around us; we will not allow it. We're afraid you're going to do it when we go home for Thanksgiving. So instead of going on recess, instead of recessing the Senate, we're going to stay in pro forma session not just through Thanksgiving, but through the Christmas holidays to make certain that the President seeks our advice and consent.

Sounds like a speech a Republican would have given, Madam Speaker, to make sure the President of the United States followed the Constitution, but it's not. It's not. This is actually a page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD November 16, 2007, Madam Speaker.

These are the words that then-Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID spoke to President Bush, telling President Bush the law of the land is you can't do it without us unless we're in recess. We're not going to go on recess. We're staying here in pro forma session. And, in fact, the majority leader and still now majority leader, HARRY REID in the United States Senate, kept the Senate in session, pro forma session every day until the end of President Bush's term and no recess appointments were ever made. Why, Madam Speaker? Because the Senate never went on recess.

HARRY REID said: Mr. President, the Senate will be coming in for pro forma session during the Thanksgiving holiday to prevent recess appointments. That's how he opened his speech that day. He closed his speech that day by saying: As a result, I'm keeping the Senate in pro forma session to prevent recess appointments until we get this process back on track.

HARRY REID knew, Madam Speaker, that the President could not, could not under the laws that govern our plan, under the rule book that is the United States Constitution, that he could not make appointments if HARRY REID kept the Senate in pro forma session; 2007, then-Majority Leader HARRY REID talking to then-President George Bush.

Fast forward, Madam Speaker, to the holiday season 2011–2012, same majority leader sitting in the United States Senate, HARRY REID, same pro forma session continually through Thanksgiving and Christmas, the same pro forma session that HARRY REID said clearly would prevent constitutionally the President from making any appointments.

And what did this President do? He made four. For the first time in American history, he made four. And he said, you know what, it's been so hard to work with the Senate. This whole going around the Senate and skipping them all together is working so well, I may do it again. If I can't work with you, you, the delegates of the American people, you, the elected representatives to our Republic, if I can't work with you, I'm going to go around you. And it worked out so well this time, I might do it again.

Madam Speaker, while I disagree with my colleagues on the methods that we use, I share a common set of goals with them of what we want for America. When we lose that common fiber, when we lose what I would call that American Dream, that almost tangible spirit that unites us more than it divides us, that sense of who we are as a Nation that you can almost reach out and touch, that makes it clear that we will continue, no matter what our differences, toward a common end. I would tell you the Constitution of the United States, Madam Speaker, contains much of that spirit. The Constitution is clear.

And this President, for the first time, decided it just didn't matter. He had ends that he wanted to achieve, and he said the means, as unconstitutional as they may be, justify those ends.

Same circumstance, same Senate majority leader, same season on the calendar, same pending election year. In 2007, HARRY REID took to the floor of the United States Senate, spoke out on behalf of the American people and said, The Constitution matters, don't you dare.

The silence from the Senate this year is deafening. Deafening.

We only survive as a Republic, Madam Speaker, if the rules apply to everyone consistently. This is not a matter of party; this is a matter of country.

HARRY REID was right when he called out a Republican President and said, don't you dare. It's unconstitutional. And that Republican President, President George Bush, didn't because he knew also that the Constitution forbade it.

Where is the indignation today from the Senate, Madam Speaker, when that

same thing is going on, but the only thing that is different is the President is of a different party? If we are ready to trade away those fundamental truths that unite us as a Nation, Madam Speaker, in the name of party, we have nothing. We have nothing.

This is not a Republican crisis. This is not a Democratic crisis. This is a constitutional crisis and one that every single American has to be on watch for.

□ 1330

Madam Speaker, I'm not proud of everything that happened when Republicans ran the House, Republicans ran the Senate, and Republicans ran the House. I'm certainly not proud of everything that happened when Democrats ran the House, Democrats ran the Senate, and Democrats ran the White House. The temptation to go along with party leaders is strong. But the requirement of the oath that we swear the day we come to this institution, Madam Speaker, is not to follow party leaders. It is to follow the United States Constitution and to defend it against enemies foreign and domestic. We cannot trade away these principles that have guided our Republic and have protected our freedom in the name of party.

When the President was elected, Madam Speaker, I think he believed that. I remember the spirit of the country in those days right after the President was elected. It was magical. I actually happened to be in town, Madam Speaker, when the inauguration was going on there in January of 2009. President Obama being sworn in as President of the United States, and there were men and women weeping in the streets—weeping in the streets because they had joy in their heart that their voice had been heard, their President had been elected and that better days were on the horizon for America. Men and women weeping in the streets.

President Obama was not my choice for President, but I love—I love—that while he and President Bush agreed on virtually nothing, President Bush took the keys to the White House and the suitcase full of nuclear launch codes, and he handed them to President Obama. Not a drop of blood was shed, and not a bullet was fired. The leadership of the most powerful nation on the planet, the most deadly military the Earth has ever known, the beacon of freedom the likes of which this planet has never seen, the keys to that kingdom were handed from one leader to the next, leaders who disagreed on almost everything, handed from one to the next with no blood and no gunshots for one reason and one reason only: because the American people demanded it, because the election required it, because the freedoms that were laid out in the United States Constitution that said the only power in Washington is the power that we, the voters, give to it, lend to it, lease to it for a small period of time. That is the only power in

this town. And when, We the People speak, Washington must listen. All under the rules, the rules of the United States Constitution.

President Obama knew that when he was elected. Here's what he said—this is from his election night victory speech in 2008 when President Obama said this: Resist the temptation to fall back on the same partisanship and pettiness and immaturity that has poisoned our politics for far too long. He was right when he said it. Resist the temptation to fall back on the same partisanship and pettiness and immaturity that has poisoned our politics for far too long. That was his victory night speech, Madam Speaker.

Before this Christmas season, when he decided he can't work with the Senate, he's going to go around the Senate; when he decided if he couldn't pass it with the people's representatives, he'd just skip the people's representatives, he said, I'm going to choose a new path.

But in December of last year, Madam Speaker, after 3 years as our President, when asked about the partisan tone that the rhetoric was taking, he said this: It was going to take more than a year to solve it. It was going to take more than 2 years. It was going to take more than one term, probably takes more than one President.

On victory night, Madam Speaker, he said deliverance is coming to America from the temptation of partisanship, pettiness, and immaturity. In December of 2011, he said that it was just going to be too hard, couldn't do it in a year, couldn't do it in 2 years, couldn't do it in a whole term, probably can't even do it in one presidency.

Madam Speaker, his sights are set too low. He can, if he has the courage to do it. August of 2008, right before the election, Madam Speaker, President Obama says this as he announces his vice presidential candidate: After decades of steady work across the aisle, I know that he'll—talking about Vice President BIDEN—be able to help me turn the page on the ugly partisanship in Washington so we can bring Democrats and Republicans together to pass an agenda that works for the American people.

Madam Speaker, he knows, he knows in his heart what the right thing to do is. He knows. He wants to move past, turn the page, he says, on the ugly partisanship in Washington so that we can bring Democrats and Republicans together to pass an agenda that works for the American people. That was right before the election, Madam Speaker.

This year, he's decided for the first time in American history, if he can't get along with Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, he'll just go around them. It doesn't matter that the constitutional rule book says no. He has somewhere he wants to go. He wants people in power that he can appoint, and the fact that the Senate won't sign off on those folks, the fact that the voice of the American people

as represented in those 100 men and women in the Senate won't sign off on those folks doesn't matter to him. He has an agenda, and he wants to go after it. What happened, Madam Speaker, to trying to turn the page?

November 2010, President Obama recognizes failure. When asked about that bitter partisanship, he said this: I neglected some things that matter to a lot of people, and rightly so that they matter, maintaining a bipartisan tone in Washington. He knew, November 2010, he knew he'd promised it, he knew that we, the American people, were hoping that he would deliver it, and we were praying that he would have the strength and conviction to deliver it. November of 2010, he said, I neglected it. But in November, 2010, he said, I'm going to redouble my efforts to make it happen. I know in my heart it should happen, he said, I'm going to redouble my efforts.

That was November, 2010, Madam Speaker, and here we are having the President go around the Constitution for the first time ever in American history because the Senate does not approve of his nominees. He cannot get Senate approval. Rather than nominating people with whom he could get Senate approval, he said, I want what I want. The will of the people as expressed by the Senate does not matter. If I can't work with them, I'm going to go around them, and it works so well, I'm likely to do it again.

Madam Speaker, I don't want this to sound like a partisan discussion, this that is happening with the Constitution today, this constitutional crisis that we're in with these non-recess "recess" appointments. It is wrong whether a Republican tries to do it or a Democrat tries to do it, and we know that to be true because we remember it from 2007. It wasn't but one President ago that we last confronted this circumstance. And what we concluded was, it's unconstitutional, you can't do it, and we're going to keep the Senate in pro forma session. And that prevented President Bush from making any more appointments for the remainder of his presidency.

This is what President Obama said back when he was Senator Obama—Senator Obama: These are challenges we all want to meet, and problems we all want to solve, even if we don't agree on how to do it. But he says this, Madam Speaker: But if the right of free and open debate is taken away from the minority party and millions of Americans who asked them to be their voice, I fear that the already partisan atmosphere of Washington will be poisoned to the point where no one will be able to agree on anything. That doesn't serve anyone's best interest, he said, and it certainly isn't what the patriots who founded this democracy had in mind.

Madam Speaker, when President Obama was Senator Obama, and he sat in the Senate and the responsibility of representing the men and women of Il-

linois sat on his shoulders, he knew what the truth was.

□ 1340

If the right of free and open debate is taken away from the minority party and the millions of Americans who ask us to be their voice, I fear the already partisan atmosphere will be poisoned to the point where no one will be able to agree on anything.

He was right, Madam Speaker. He was right before the election, when he said he was going to fight partisanship. He was right after the election, when he said he wanted to bring openness back to Washington. He was right when he was a United States Senator and he said the people's voice needed to be heard. He was wrong when he ignored the United States Constitution less than 45 days ago and said, I can't work with the Senate. The people's Representatives have it all wrong. And if I can't work with them, I'm going to go around them. You can't make that choice, Madam Speaker. The rule book is right here. It's the United States Constitution.

Again, Senator Barack Obama: We need to rise above an ends-justify-the-means mentality because we are here to answer to the people—all of the people, not just the ones wearing our party label. This was April 13, 2005.

As a United States Senator, President Obama knew. He knew, when he had the burden of responsibility—the pleasure of responsibility—of representing the men and women of Illinois, he knew ends-justify-the-means mentality. We must rise above it, he said. We must answer to the American people, not just the ones wearing our party label.

He was right, Madam Speaker. He was right then. He was right before the election. He was right after the election. He is wrong today. What has happened? What has happened in 3 years of his Presidency that he knew where we could go as a Nation, he knew where we should go as a Nation. He knew that the rule book that has been guiding us for over 200 years would get us through to better days tomorrow. He knew it, and he's forgotten it. And we're on the brink of a constitutional crisis.

Madam Speaker, I have here a quote from Senator CHUCK SCHUMER: You don't change the rules in the middle of the game just because you can't get your way. Our Constitution, our system of laws, is too hallowed, is too important to do that. Democratic Senator from New York, CHUCK SCHUMER.

Madam Speaker, I've said it as long as I've been here—and you and I have been here just over 1 year—truth does not have a Republican or Democratic label after it. Truth is truth, right is right, and wrong is wrong. The President knows what's wrong. He knew it as a Senator. He knows it as a President. His colleagues in the Senate know what's wrong. You don't change the rules in the middle of the game just because you can't get your way. Our

Constitution, our system of laws, is too hallowed, is too important to do that.

CHUCK SCHUMER was right, Madam Speaker. There's no process in this Constitution for reining in that Executive that just throws the Constitution aside—short of impeachment. It's the only one. We can't sue him. We can't go down there. We can have a picket, but that doesn't make any difference.

He knew it. He knew it was wrong. He knew it as a candidate. He knew it once he was elected. He knew it when he was a Senator. And he did it anyway, because the ends justified his means.

Madam Speaker, all we are as a Nation comes from the very few words that make up this United States Constitution—Constitution on your bedside, Bible on your bedside, those important works of American history by your bedside, Madam Speaker. We have a national identity, and that national identity is defined by having one set of rules that apply to everybody equally.

Madam Speaker, I'm grateful to you for making this time available to me today. I encourage every American to look at these facts and judge for themselves what the next step is on our constitutional journey.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### OIL CRISIS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam Speaker, I want to begin today with a chart that I usually use near the end of this presentation when I'm talking to an audience. I frequently don't have time to develop the chart as fully as one might, so I thought that today I would begin with this chart.

As I've said before, if you had only one chart that you could look at to get some idea as to where we are relative to the liquid fuel situation in the world, this would be the chart.

Let me first make a comment or two about energy in general. There's a lot of discussion of energy. Sometimes we talk about the various kinds of energy as if they were interchangeable. We will talk about electricity. We will talk about natural gas, and we will talk about oil. When we have a sudden increase supply of one—natural gas today—the assumption is made by some that, gee, we then don't have a problem with oil, do we, because we've had a problem with oil.

Now, for some uses these energy sources are fungible, they're exchangeable, and you can use one or the other. For instance, if you want to ride in a bus, we used to have buses that had a trolley on top and wires up there, and they were run with electricity. You see them run with natural gas, and most of them are run with a petroleum product that comes from oil. So with proper engineering, you can use any of these en-

ergy sources to run a bus. And streetcars, of course, were a bus on rails, and we've taken those out of most of our cities now.

But you will never run an airplane on anything but some product from oil. You cannot possibly get enough energy stored in a battery to do that. And natural gas, those molecules are very small and they don't like each other at all. They try to get as far apart as possible, so we squeeze on them to put them close together and under some considerable pressure, but we just can't get them to liquify so that we can get any concentrated energy source there. So for our airplanes, for instance, we're stuck with some product from oil.

For automobiles, we could certainly run them on electricity. We can certainly run them on natural gas. We now run most of them—about 97 percent of our transportation comes from oil. But to do that, we have to make a lot of changes in engineering and manufacturing, and it takes a long while to do that. The fleet out there runs about 16 to 18 years before you turn the fleet over, so it would be a long while before we could introduce a meaningful number of cars running on something other than some product of oil. Then we have to develop the infrastructure to support that.

We have been, now, 100 years in this country developing our current infrastructure. In this country, in the world, we are finding the oil. We are developing the fields for pumping the oil. We are transporting the oil. We're refining it. We're hauling it to the service stations. And there are millions of them around the country, wherever it's convenient and customers will come there and the owner can make a profit. One might note that government was hardly involved at all in any of these activities. It was the marketplace that drove this. But today we're going to be talking about oil.

We face a special crisis in oil; and it's not there in natural gas, and it's not there in electricity. For those who would have you believe that, because we can put in more nuclear power plants and wind and solar and micro hydro and true geothermal for electricity, we don't need to worry about oil because we can do it with electricity or natural gas, we can do it with natural gas; but we cannot change that quickly to avoid a crisis with oil if, indeed, we can't find enough oil to meet our demands.

□ 1350

Well, this is the one chart that I told you that if we had only one chart this would be the one that would tell you the most about where we've come from and where we're going with oil. This is billions of barrels per year that have been discovered here. These are the years in which they have been discovered on the bottom, and the bars here indicate the volume of that discovery.

You can see that we started discovering it way back in the thirties a lit-

tle bit, and then a bunch in the forties; and, wow, the fifties, the sixties, the seventies and even into the eighties we were discovering oil.

If you add up all of these bars here, you get the total amount of oil that the world has found, and the amount that we have used is represented by this heavy dark line here. The amount that we've used is the same as the amount that we've produced because we're not storing anywhere any meaningful quantities of oil. So the production rate and the consumption rate are essentially the same thing.

There are several interesting things about this chart. Notice that from about the 1970s on, we have found less and less and less oil. And that was while we had a greater and greater interest in finding oil because we had a greater and greater use for oil.

The dark line here shows our use rate, and you notice that it was increasing exponentially up through the early seventies. Had this curve continued, and you can extrapolate it, it would have come out through the top of this graph. But a very fortuitous thing happened. We didn't think it was fortuitous at the time. It was anything but that at the time, but it was the Arab oil embargo. And I can remember that you went on even, odd days, the last number on your license plate, and there were long lines at the service stations, and some disagreements occurred in those lines. It was a difficult time for America. But that woke us up.

By the way, this was only a temporary disruption of the supply of oil because they just decided because they did not like our friendship for Israel that they weren't going to ship us the oil. There was plenty of oil to ship us, and we knew it would be there after this temporary crisis.

But it did wake us up. It reminded us that, gee, we had better be somewhat more provident in our use of oil. And so we set about being more efficient in the way we use this energy. A lot of things are more efficient today than they were then, in both the use of oil and electricity. For instance, your air conditioner is probably three times as efficient today as it was then, so you're using less electricity, relatively, now than you were then.

We became more efficient in our use of oil. You notice there was a little recession produced by this Arab oil embargo in the eighties there, and now the growth rate is slower. That's very fortunate because now the reserves that we have will last longer.

Notice that at about 1980, we, for the first time, started using more oil than we found. But no matter, because we have a lot of reserves. You see, everything above this curve represents reserves. All that we have used is what is under the curve, so above the curve represents reserves that we can use. And we cannot find enough to meet today's use, and that's been the situation since these curves crossed back here in about the eighties.



And so now we have been dipping into these reserves back here to find the oil that is above the oil that we've found to meet our demands for it. And by and by, these reserves, of course, will be exhausted. And so this was a prognostication made—when was it made? In about 2004, this prognostication was made that we were going to reach our maximum oil production here in just about this time, isn't it? Just about this time we were going to reach the maximum oil production, and then production of oil would fall off after that.

Now, it's anybody's guess as to how much oil we will find, and we're finding some meaningful fields of oil. If you find a 1 billion field of oil, that's a pretty big field of oil. So where is that on this chart? Well, this is 10 billion here, so 1 billion is way down here, just barely gets off the baseline here.

A really, really big find of oil is 10 billion barrels of oil. That's here.

Well, you can see that the big discoveries that we're finding today are dwarfed by the discoveries that we found a number of years ago. One of these discoveries was the great Ghawar oil field, the granddaddy of all oil fields in Saudi Arabia. It's been pumping oil now for 50 years, and we don't know how many years yet before exhaustion in that field.

By the way, that 10 billion barrels of oil that you find will last our world just exactly 120 days because every 12 days we use a billion barrels of oil. This is about sixth grade arithmetic. We're using about 84 million barrels of oil a day, and if you multiply that by 12, it's about 1,000, and 1,000 million is a billion. So about every 12 days we use a billion barrels of oil. That means that a huge oil discovery today will last the world 120 days.

Now, what happens in the future, you can draw that curve anyway you wish by what you postulate as to what we're going to find. You can actually have that curve going up, and some do, if you think that we're going to find enough oil to make that happen.

But this is the rate at which we've been finding—and remember that these ever-decreasing discoveries have occurred while we've had better and better technologies for finding oil. We had pretty poor technologies back here, but it was near the surface and readily available, so we found an awful lot of it. Now what we find is deep and hard to get at, and we have much better technologies for finding. So in spite of these improved technologies for finding oil, we have been finding less and less and less oil.

The next chart shows us what happened in our country and what is happening today in our country. I need to get a more recent one of these charts because it will show a little bit of a pick-up here at the end due to the Bakken oil. But this is the production of oil in our country.

Whenever I present this chart, I generally talk about the prognostications

of the person I think gave the most important speech of the last century. It wasn't recognized then, and I think shortly now it will be recognized that the speech given by M. King Hubbert on the 8th day of March, 1956, was the most important speech in the last century. It was given to a group of oil people in San Antonio, Texas; and he made what was then an absolutely audacious prediction.

The speech was given in 1956, and here we are in 1956, and this is the amount of oil that we're producing. Oh, the orange on top here is natural gas liquids—that won't be in your gas tank; it is propane and butane and things like that—and oil from Texas and oil from the rest of the United States. But the total here is the line that we're interested in, and this is where we were in 1956.

You have to put this in context as to where we were as a country. The United States was king of oil. We were producing more oil, we were using more oil, we were exporting more oil than any other country in the world.

M. King Hubbert said that, in just about 14 years, right around 1970, the United States will reach its maximum oil production. From then on, no matter what you do, the production of oil will fall off. We don't have time today, but we may, at another time, go into how he made those predictions and why he was relatively certain that he was correct in making those predictions.

No one else had done that. And because we had always found huge amounts of oil, more than we were using, he was relegated to the lunatic fringe. And when in 1970 it happened, and when you were at 1980 and looked back, you really knew that it happened, didn't you, because you could look back and say, wow, 1970 was the peak, wasn't it? We're falling off the peak now, so M. King Hubbert was right.

Now, he did not include in his predictions oil from Alaska or the Gulf of Mexico because he looked at only the lower 48. You notice that that huge find in Alaska, we have a 4-foot pipeline up there, I've been up there where the pipeline begins, and we are producing about a fourth of all the oil in our country that flowed through that pipeline.

□ 1400

So it made a little blip here in the downhill slide. Then you remember not all that many years ago those fabled discoveries and production of oil in the Gulf of Mexico. You see it here. It's the little yellow here that made barely a ripple in the top line.

Well, this is the experience of the United States. Today we have drilled more oil wells than all the rest of the world put together. We're the most creative, innovative society in the world. We could not reverse this decline that M. King Hubbert said was going to happen.

He also predicted that at just about this time, the world would be reaching its maximum oil production.

Now, if the United States, if we, with all of our creativity and innovation, could not reverse this decline, when the world reaches this top point, which is called by most people peak oil, from which point you go down the other side, if we could not reverse that, what chances do you think there are that the world will do what we could not do? I think most people believe that we probably can do more, better than the rest of the world.

This is a chart of a couple or so years ago. These are the data from two entities that do the world's best job of tracking the production and consumption, which are essentially the same thing, of oil. This is the International Energy Association, a creature of the OECD in Europe, and the Energy Information Administration, a part of our own Department of Energy. These are their two curves here. You can see that they are very similar.

The caption up here says "Peak Oil: Are We There Yet?" Because they appeared to be leveling out. Now, this chart was drawn when oil was a bit under \$100 a barrel. You remember if we extended this out a little, it went to \$147 a barrel. These curves did not go up. We're roughly here at 84, 85 or so million barrels of oil a day or so. That's where we've been for 5 years now.

With increasing demand and no more supply, the price finally went up to \$147 a barrel, and the economy with some help by the housing crisis in our country, came crashing down and oil dropped down to I think a bit below \$40 a barrel. This has been a steady climb as the economy picked up from that time on, and oil, as you know now, is about \$100 a barrel.

The next chart here, and I want you to remember this one because you're not going to find it on the Internet when you go there. These both appeared on the Internet. It's where we got them. These are charts produced by the IEA, the International Energy Association. This was called the World Energy Outlook. This top one here they did in 2008. I want you to note some interesting things about this chart.

The dark blue here is the production of oil, what we call conventional oil. If we went back to the other side of the Chamber here and started 100 years ago, you'd start at zero and then it would come up and up and up, slowly up, always producing just the amount of oil that the world wanted to use because it was the era and we could produce it.

So, we always met the demands for the use of oil in the world. It was 10 cents a barrel when it started, and within fairly recent memory it was \$10 a barrel, really pretty cheap compared to \$100 a barrel, isn't it?

So, they're saying that now this conventional oil that we've been pumping is going to reach a peak here. We reached that peak in our country in 1970, remember. After we reach that

peak, it's now going to fall off. It's now going to go down the other side.

We're now producing total liquid—we say it's oil but some of it is natural gas liquids—about 84 million barrels a day. The top orange here is natural gas liquids. The green here is unconventional oil. That's oil like the tar sands of Alberta, Canada. That is really sticky stuff. They have a shovel that lifts 100 tons, dumps it in a truck that holds 400 tons, and then they cook it with some what we call stranded natural gas. That's natural gas where there's not a lot of people so there's not a big demand for it. We say it's stranded so it's quite cheap. They use that for heating and softening this oil. Then they put some solvents in it so that it will remain a liquid so that they can pump it.

The dark little red one up here, now it really should be a part of the blue one down here because it's simply enhanced oil recovery. It's squeezing a little bit more out of conventional oil by pumping live steam down there or seawater, as they do in Saudi Arabia, or CO<sub>2</sub> to get some more oil out of it.

They're prognosticating that by 2030 that we're going to be producing 106 million barrels of oil a day, and that's going to be possible in spite of this fall-off in the production from our conventional sources because there's going to be huge productions that come from the fields that we have now discovered, the light blue here, but too tough to develop, and the red ones, fields yet to be discovered.

These represent pretty big wedges, and I want you to look at the relative magnitude of these wedges to the amount of oil that they said we would be producing from our conventional wells by 2030.

Now, 2 years later in 2010, they produced the chart on the bottom. There are several interesting things about this. They reversed the two things on top. They're exactly the same things. They have different colors and they've reversed them. This is unconventional oil, and this is natural gas liquids. They've now incorporated the enhanced oil recovery up here where it should have been, and the conventional oil. Notice now they're showing even a more precipitous dropoff, and now they go out to 2035.

Reality is setting in because now 5 years later, 5 years beyond this, they are not producing 106 million barrels a day. They say now the production will only be 96 million barrels a day.

But to get to that 96 million barrels a day, you have to postulate huge wedges in here from developing fields that we've discovered now but are hard to develop, like one in the Gulf of Mexico under 7,000 feet of water and 30,000 feet of rock, and the darker blue here, fields yet to be discovered.

Now, we were at this tipping point in 1970, and there is nothing we did in our country that kept this top curve going up. I have a lot of trouble understanding why people believe that the world will be able to do what we could

not do. Notice these huge wedges that are supposed to be produced by just 2035. That's not very long from now, is it? I think that there is little probability that these wedges will be produced.

I think what's going to happen is that the world will do what the United States did. That this will tip over and the total production of oil worldwide will decrease.

The next chart is a very recent chart from the Deutsche Bank, and this shows the growth in oil production capacity versus demand. This is not how much we're producing. This is the growth in how much we're producing.

They think this chart tells a grim story. I think it tells an even grimmer story because I don't think we're going to have any increase in production. I hope we do. But we have not for 5 years now. I think we're stuck at where we are. Even if we have this increase in production, this is the increase in demand, and they say that an increase in demand is going to fall 20 percent short of the production.

Notice where most of that demand is. Red. Red China. That's where most of the increase in demand is.

China last year used 6 percent more oil than it did the year before. Worldwide, there was no more oil than there was the year before. So where did China get that oil? Well, we use less. We used to use, what, 21 million barrels a day? Now we're at 18½ million barrels a day. We are driving less. We're driving more efficient cars. There are more people in the HOV lane.

Our military really has had a very aggressive and very successful program to be more energy efficient because energy is a huge part of their cost. If it goes up just a dollar a barrel, they have millions of dollars more cost in the military.

So for a lot of reasons, we've been more efficient in our country. Good news, because that meant that China could have more oil to use and the price didn't go above \$100 a barrel.

Let me show you the next chart here, and this one I think, is a very interesting chart that kind of puts this in a worldwide perspective. The world is going to seem to be turned upside down with this.

□ 1410

This is what the world would look like if the size of the country were relative to how much oil it had. We see some very interesting things here.

Wow, Saudi Arabia dominates the planet in oil, doesn't it?—and it does. About 22 percent of all of the known reserves of oil in the world are in Saudi Arabia.

Look at little Kuwait, a tiny, little thing that looked to Saddam Hussein like a province that ought to belong to Iraq, and he went down there to take it. You remember that war. Look at Iraq and how much oil is there. Then Iran. Iran is pretty big.

In our hemisphere, Venezuela dwarfs everything else. They have more oil

than everybody else put together in our hemisphere.

Here we are, the United States. We have only 2 percent of the reserves of oil in the world, and we use 25 percent of the oil in the world. Guess who our No. 1 importer is. It's Canada.

Look at Canada. Canada has even less oil than we do, but they don't have very many people, so they can export the oil.

Until fairly recently, Mexico was our No. 2 importer. They also have less oil than we do. They have a lot of people, but they're too poor to use the oil, so they can export it to us. The second largest oil field in the world, the Cantarell oil field, was in Mexico. It is now in rapid decline by something like 20 percent a year, so now Mexico is our No. 3 importer, and Saudi Arabia is our No. 2 importer of oil.

I want you to look at Europe. Boy, you need a magnifying glass to find it over here, don't you? This is Europe. It's bigger than we are in terms of an economy but with very little oil. It's really dependent on these huge supplies of oil from the Middle East.

Russia, spanning 11 time zones up there, is not all that big. They're the world's, I think, No. 1 producer of oil now because they're pumping really hard in their oil fields. They have a lot of oil, and it will last for a while but nowhere near as long as that of Saudi Arabia and Iraq and Iran.

By the way, as to Iran, if the current increase in use rate and if the current production rates remain the same, those curves will cross within less than a decade, and Iran will be an oil importer. That is also true of Mexico, by the way. They're going to be an oil importer within a decade. If you look at the rate of increase in the use of oil and in the production of oil, those curves will cross in less than a decade.

The real alarming picture occurs when you look at China and India over there. They're tiny, little countries in this world according to oil—China with 1.3 billion people, India with over 1 billion people and with very little oil. What is China doing about this? China is buying up oil all over the world. We use 25 percent of the world's oil. It's a bit less now since we slowed down a little, but it has been 25 percent of the world's oil, two-thirds or more of which we import, and we're not buying oil anywhere.

Why wouldn't the nation that uses the most oil and has, relative to its use, the least be buying oil somewhere else? Well, there is no need to buy the oil. It doesn't matter who owns it, because the person who gets it is the person who comes with the dollars and buys the oil—and let's hope it stays dollars at the global petroleum auction.

So why isn't China content to just take their money—and they've got a lot of it. Why don't they just take their money and buy the oil? I think that they understand that there will be a shortage of oil in the future—and I

hope I'm wrong in this prediction—and that China may one day say that they can't share that oil. This is going to create some huge geopolitical tensions in the world.

What does all of this mean?

This means that we have a huge challenge in our country. This is good news to me because I think that we can, once again, become an exporting country and that we can create millions of jobs with the green technology that produces the alternatives that inevitably will occur. One day, we will produce as much energy as we use in this country. Geology will assure that that happens.

I hope that we get there through a really winning economy when we recognize that we have to rise to this challenge. I think America with its creativity and innovation can create the technologies and the products it will sell worldwide to help us in this huge challenge that we face with a limited supply of oil and the ever-increasing growth in the need for oil.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDWARDS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. MICHAUD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a funeral of a family member.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of medical reasons.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 13, 2012, at 1 p.m.

#### OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Gary L. Ackerman, Sandy Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Jason Altmire, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Robert E. Andrews, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Tammy Baldwin, Lou Barletta, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Karen Bass, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Rick Berg, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne

Bonamici, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Mo Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Ann Marie Buerkle, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Francisco "Quico" Canseco, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Hansen Clarke, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. "Gerry" Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Chip Cravaack, Eric A. "Rick" Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Mark S. Critz, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Geoff Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Joe Donnelly, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Jeff Flake, Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Elton Gallegly, John Garamendi, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Gabrielle Giffords\*, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. Gonzalez, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, Janice Hahn, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Jane Harman\*, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Nan A. S. Hayworth, Joseph J. Heck, Martin Heinrich, Dean Heller\*, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubén Hinojosa, Mazie Hirono, Kathleen C. Hochul, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Tim Huelskamp, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson Lee, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Dale E. Kildee, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Larry Kissell, John Kline, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, Jeffrey M. Landry, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Christopher J. Lee\*, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe

Lofgren, Billy Long, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Cynthia M. Lummis, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Connie Mack, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Carolyn McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNERney, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Mick Mulvaney, Christopher S. Murphy, Tim Murphy, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, John W. Olver, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Gary C. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Benjamin Quayle, Mike Quigley, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, Denny Rehberg, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Silvestre Reyes, Reid J. Ribble, Laura Richardson, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, David Rivera, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Peter J. Roskam, Dennis Ross, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Jon Runyan, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Robert T. Schilling, Jean Schmidt, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Tim Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland, Jackie Speier, Cliff Stearns, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott Tipton, Paul Tonko, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Robert L. Turner, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Joe Walsh, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Daniel Webster, Anthony D. Weiner\*, Peter Welch, Allen B. West, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Frederica Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu\*, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Young, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young, Todd C. Yoder.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2011 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Betty McCollum	10/19	10/25	Tunisia		2,799.71						2,799.71
Misc. Transportation Costs							4,200.00				200.00
Commercial airfare							3,055.00				3,055.00
Susan Avcin	10/22	10/26	Republic of Singapore		1,960.00						1,960.00
Commercial airfare							12,041.90				12,041.90
Lisa Molyneux	10/22	10/26	Republic of Singapore		1,960.00						1,960.00
Commercial airfare	10/26	10/29	People's Republic of China		930.00						930.00
Commercial airfare							14,712.70				14,712.70
Hon. Jack Kingston	10/21	10/22	Qatar		225.76						225.76
Misc. Transportation Costs							83.77				83.77
Commercial airfare <sup>3</sup>											
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	11/5	11/7	Oman		731.82						731.82
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/9	11/10	Egypt		302.00						302.00
	11/10	11/12	Great Britain		1,053.60						1,053.60
Return of Unused Per Diem					(-150.00)						(-150.00)
Misc. Delegation Costs							( <sup>4</sup> )	540.94			540.94
Hon. Kent Calvert	11/5	11/7	Oman		731.82						731.82
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/9	11/10	Egypt		302.00						302.00
	11/10	11/12	Great Britain		1,053.60						1,053.60
Return of Unused Per Diem					(-100.00)						(-100.00)
Misc. Delegation Costs							( <sup>4</sup> )	540.94			540.94
Hon. Jo Bonner	11/5	11/7	Oman		731.82						731.82
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/9	11/10	Egypt		302.00						302.00
	11/10	11/12	Great Britain		1,053.60						1,053.60
Misc. Delegation Costs							( <sup>4</sup> )	540.94			540.94
Hon. Adam Schiff	11/6	11/7	Oman		226.91						226.91
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/9	11/10	Egypt		302.00						302.00
	11/10	11/12	Great Britain		1,053.60						1,053.60
Misc. Delegation Costs							( <sup>4</sup> )	540.94			540.94
Commercial airfare							8,810.00				8,810.00
Tom McLemore	11/5	11/7	Oman		731.82						731.82
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/9	11/10	Egypt		302.00						302.00
	11/10	11/12	Great Britain		1,053.60						1,053.60
Return of Unused Per Diem					(-48.00)						(-48.00)
Misc. Delegation Costs							( <sup>4</sup> )	540.94			540.94
Paul Juola	11/5	11/7	Oman		731.82						731.82
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/9	11/10	Egypt		302.00						302.00
	11/10	11/12	Great Britain		1,053.60						1,053.60
Misc. Delegation Costs							( <sup>4</sup> )	540.94			540.94
Adrienne Ramsay	11/5	11/7	Oman		731.82						731.82
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/9	11/10	Egypt		302.00						302.00
	11/10	11/12	Great Britain		1,053.60						1,053.60
Return of Unused Per Diem					(-60.75)						(-60.75)
Misc. Delegation Costs							( <sup>4</sup> )	540.94			540.94
Elizabeth H. Bina	11/19	11/20	Thailand		218.00						218.00
	11/20	11/26	Indonesia		138.00						138.00
Misc. Staff Delegation Expenses									181.60		181.60
Return of Unused Per Diem					(-270.00)						(-270.00)
Commercial airfare							16,470.20				16,470.20
Hon. Barbara Lee	12/10	12/12	Switzerland		1,217.65						1,217.65
Commercial airfare							1,890.20				1,890.20
Committee total					23,123.40		57,263.77		3,968.18		84,355.35

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.  
<sup>4</sup> Out of pocket not reimbursed.  
<sup>5</sup> None—layover privately-sponsored travel.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
VISIT TO GERMANY, UNITED KINGDOM, PORTUGAL, AZORES, SPAIN, September 26–October 4, 2011:											
Cathy Garman	9/26	9/30	Italy		1,202.48						1,202.48
	9/30	10/1	Spain		183.00						183.00
	10/1	10/2	Portugal		269.28						269.28
	10/2	10/3	Azores		84.00						84.00
	10/3	10/4	Portugal		165.25						165.25
Commercial Transportation							4,562.60				4,562.60
Vickie Plunkett	9/26	9/30	Italy		1,052.48						1,052.48
	9/30	10/1	Spain		153.00						153.00
	10/1	10/2	Portugal		261.28						261.28
	10/2	10/3	Azores		84.00						84.00
	10/3	10/4	Portugal		157.25						157.25
Commercial Transportation							4,562.60				4,562.60
Jamie Lynch	9/26	9/27	Germany		275.00						275.00
	9/27	9/30	United Kingdom		873.35						873.35
	9/30	10/1	Spain		169.00						169.00
	10/1	10/2	Portugal		254.28						254.28
	10/2	10/3	Azores		74.00						74.00
	10/3	10/4	Portugal		153.25						153.25
Commercial Transportation							4,562.60				4,562.60
Ryan Crumpler	9/26	9/30	Italy		1,202.48						1,202.48
	9/30	10/1	Spain		183.00						183.00
	10/1	10/2	Portugal		269.28						269.28
	10/2	10/3	Azores		84.00						84.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Commercial Transportation	10/3	10/4	Portugal		165.25						165.25
Debra Wada		9/27	Germany		289.00		9,800.90				9,800.90
	9/26	9/27	Germany		289.00						289.00
	9/27	9/30	United Kingdom		1,651.05						1,651.05
	9/30	10/1	Spain		183.00						183.00
	10/1	10/2	Portugal		263.28						263.28
	10/2	10/3	Azores		84.00						84.00
	10/3	10/4	Portugal		165.25						165.25
Commercial Transportation							5,279.50				5,279.50
Visit to Afghanistan, Kyrgyzstan, United Arab Emirates, October 14–19, 2011:											
Hon. K. Michael Conaway	10/15	10/15	United Arab Emirates								
	10/16	10/18	Afghanistan		5.00						5.00
	10/18	10/19	Kyrgyzstan				3,936.30				3,936.30
Commercial Transportation											
Hon. Joe Courtney	10/15	10/15	United Arab Emirates								
	10/16	10/18	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	10/18	10/19	Kyrgyzstan			182.00					182.00
Commercial Transportation							3,936.30				3,936.30
Ryan Crumpler	10/15	10/15	United Arab Emirates								
	10/16	10/18	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	10/18	10/19	Kyrgyzstan		182.00						182.00
Commercial Transportation							3,936.30				3,936.30
Douglas Bush	10/15	10/15	United Arab Emirates								
	10/16	10/18	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	10/18	10/19	Kyrgyzstan		182.00						182.00
Commercial Transportation							3,941.30				3,941.30
John Noonan	10/15	10/15	United Arab Emirates								
	10/16	10/18	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	10/18	10/19	Kyrgyzstan		182.00						182.00
Commercial Transportation							3,941.30				3,941.30
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq, November 5–11, 2011:											
Catherine McElroy	11/6	11/7	Kuwait								
	11/7	11/8	Iraq								
	11/8	11/10	Kuwait		1,168.41						1,168.41
Commercial Transportation							8,840.10				8,840.10
Paul Lewis	11/6	11/7	Kuwait								
	11/7	11/8	Iraq								
	11/8	11/10	Kuwait		1,298.41						1,298.41
Commercial Transportation							8,840.10				8,840.10
Lynn Williams	11/6	11/7	Kuwait								
	11/7	11/8	Iraq								
	11/8	11/10	Kuwait		1,168.41						1,168.41
Commercial Transportation							8,840.10				8,840.10
Michael Casey	11/6	11/7	Kuwait								
	11/7	11/8	Iraq								
	11/8	11/10	Kuwait		1,298.41						1,298.41
Commercial Transportation							8,840.10				8,840.10
Visit to Qatar, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Djibouti, November 6–13, 2012:											
David Sienicki	11/7	11/9	Qatar		114.00						114.00
	11/9	11/10	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
	11/10	11/11	United Arab Emirates		186.00						186.00
	11/11	11/12	Djibouti		107.00						107.00
Commercial Transportation							6,576.42				6,576.42
Jamie Lynch	11/7	11/9	Qatar		97.00						97.00
	11/9	11/10	Bahrain		102.00						102.00
	11/10	11/11	United Arab Emirates		158.00						158.00
	11/11	11/12	Djibouti		89.00						89.00
Commercial Transportation							6,327.92				6,327.92
Debra Wada	11/7	11/9	Qatar		114.00						114.00
	11/9	11/10	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
	11/10	11/11	United Arab Emirates		186.00						186.00
	11/11	11/12	Djibouti		107.00						107.00
Commercial Transportation							6,576.42				6,576.42
Brian Garrett	11/7	11/9	Qatar		43.37						43.37
	11/9	11/10	Bahrain		25.81						25.81
	11/10	11/11	United Arab Emirates		9.80						9.80
	11/11	11/12	Djibouti		50.00						50.00
Commercial Transportation							6,749.42				6,749.42
Visit to China, Vietnam, November 17–23, 2012:											
Craig Greene	11/18	11/20	China		126.67						126.67
	11/20	11/22	Vietnam		406.00						406.00
Commercial Transportation							15,179.90				15,179.90
Debra Wada	11/18	11/20	China		126.67						126.67
	11/20	11/22	Vietnam		406.00						406.00
Commercial Transportation							15,179.90				15,179.90
Nancy Warner	11/18	11/20	China		126.67						126.67
	11/20	11/22	Vietnam		406.00						406.00
Commercial Transportation							15,179.90				15,179.90
Delegation Expenses									120.14		120.14
Visit to Afghanistan, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, November 18–23, 2011:											
Hon. Rob Wittman	11/19	11/20	United Arab Emirates		141.00						141.00
	11/20	11/21	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/22	11/23	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial Transportation							2,323.40				2,323.40
Hon. Mike Coffman	11/19	11/20	United Arab Emirates								
	11/20	11/21	Afghanistan								
	11/22	11/23	Bahrain		12.10						12.10
Commercial Transportation							2,323.40				2,323.40
Hon. Larry Kissell	11/19	11/20	United Arab Emirates								
	11/20	11/21	Afghanistan								
	11/22	11/23	Bahrain		12.10						12.10
Commercial Transportation							2,323.40				2,323.40
Michele Pearce	11/19	11/20	United Arab Emirates		141.00						141.00
	11/20	11/21	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/22	11/23	Bahrain		100.00						100.00
Commercial Transportation							2,323.40				2,323.40
Mark Lewis	11/19	11/20	United Arab Emirates		141.00						141.00
	11/20	11/21	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/22	11/23	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial Transportation							2,323.40				2,323.40
Michael Amato	11/19	11/20	United Arab Emirates		141.00						141.00
	11/20	11/21	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Commercial Transportation	11/22	11/23	Bahrain		124.00		2,323.40				124.00 2,323.40
Visit to United Kingdom, November 19–23, 2011: Hon. Michael Turner	11/19	11/23	United Kingdom		1,276.00						1,276.00
Committee total					21,406.22		169,530.38		120.14		191,056.74

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> 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, Jan. 31, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Paul Ryan	12/09	12/09	United Arab Emirates								
	12/10	12/11	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	12/12	12/12	United Arab Emirates				12,828.40				12,828.40
Hon. John Carney	12/09	12/09	United Arab Emirates								
	12/10	12/11	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	12/12	12/12	United Arab Emirates				12,828.40				12,828.40
Hon. Jason Chaffetz	12/09	12/09	United Arab Emirates								
	12/10	12/11	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	12/12	12/12	United Arab Emirates				12,828.40				12,828.40
Hon. Frank Guinta	12/09	12/09	United Arab Emirates								
	12/10	12/11	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	12/12	12/12	United Arab Emirates				12,828.40				12,828.40
Hon. James Lankford	12/09	12/09	United Arab Emirates								
	12/10	12/11	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	12/12	12/12	United Arab Emirates				12,828.40				12,828.40
Hon. Marlin Stutzman	12/09	12/09	United Arab Emirates								
	12/10	12/11	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	12/12	12/12	United Arab Emirates				12,828.40				12,828.40
Jonathan Burks	12/09	12/09	United Arab Emirates								
	12/10	12/11	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	12/12	12/12	United Arab Emirates				13,657.40				13,657.40
Committee total					196.00		90,627.80				90,823.80

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

PAUL RYAN, Chairman, Jan. 27, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Felipe Mendoza	10/31	11/07	Mexico		<sup>4</sup> 1,086.26		778.18				1,864.44
Shannon Weinberg	10/31	11/4	Mexico		<sup>5</sup> 1,086.26		776.68				1,862.94
Brian McCollough	11/1	11/4	Mexico		<sup>6</sup> 814.70		776.68				1,591.38
Hon. Gene Green	11/5	11/6	Turkey		406.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				
	11/6	11/6	Afghanistan				( <sup>3</sup> )				406.00
	11/7	11/9	Pakistan		758.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				758.00
	11/8	11/10	Dubai, UAE		502.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				502.00
	11/10	11/10	Iraq				( <sup>3</sup> )				
	11/11	11/11	Germany		<sup>7</sup> 106.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				106.00
Mary Neumayr	11/18	11/27	Indonesia		<sup>8</sup> 2,358.00		12,892.30				15,250.30
Rep. Ed Whitfield	11/20	11/22	Poland		598.60		( <sup>3</sup> )				598.60
	11/22	11/24	Georgia		587.22		( <sup>3</sup> )				587.22
	11/24	11/25	Lithuania		243.30		( <sup>3</sup> )				243.30
	11/25	11/29	Egypt		1,283.23		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,283.23
Kelley Greenman	12/5	12/11	South Africa		<sup>9</sup> 588.00		5,245.40				5,833.40
Committee total					10,417.57		20,469.24				30,886.81

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.  
<sup>4</sup> Returned \$183.99 unused per diem.  
<sup>5</sup> Returned \$100.30 unused per diem.  
<sup>6</sup> Returned \$100.30 unused per diem.  
<sup>7</sup> Returned \$76.00 unused per diem.  
<sup>8</sup> Returned \$528.00 unused per diem.  
<sup>9</sup> Returned \$135.00 unused per diem.

HON. FRED UPTON, Chairman, Jan. 1, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Randy Neugebauer	9/27	9/28	Senegal		258.46		( <sup>3</sup> )				258.46
	9/28	9/29	Ethiopia		319		( <sup>3</sup> )				319.00
	9/29	9/30	United Arab Emirates		400.61		( <sup>3</sup> )				400.61



REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Michael Fitzpatrick	9/30	10/2	United Kingdom		718.91		( <sup>3</sup> )				718.91
	11/5	11/6	Turkey		61.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				61.00
	11/6	11/6	Afghanistan		0.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				
	11/7	11/9	Pakistan		120.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				120.00
	11/9	11/10	United Arab Emirates		1,415.26		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,415.26
	11/10	11/10	Iraq		0.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				
	11/11	11/11	Germany		41.43		( <sup>3</sup> )				41.43
Hon. Carolyn McCarthy	11/19	11/23	United Kingdom		1,675.24			1,250.30			2,925.54
Hon. John Carney	12/9	12/11	Afghanistan		28.00			12,828.40			12,856.40
Committee total					5,037.91			14,078.70			19,116.61

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. SPENCER BACHUS, Chairman, Jan. 27, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Harold Rees	10/16	10/18	Philippines		456.53						456.53
	10/18	10/20	Singapore		732.47						732.47
	10/20	10/23	India		1,089.00						1,089.00
								4,128.18			12,818.80
William Hawkin	10/16	10/18	Philippines		399.00						399.00
	10/18	10/20	Singapore		909.14						909.14
	10/20	10/23	India		1,117.00						1,117.00
								4,128.47			12,847.00
Sarah Leiby	10/16	10/18	Philippines		399.00						399.00
	10/18	10/20	Singapore		704.00						704.00
	10/20	10/23	India		1,150.00						1,150.00
								4,128.18			12,818.80
Janice Kaguyutan	10/16	10/18	Philippines		399.00						399.00
	10/18	10/20	Singapore		704.00						704.00
	10/20	10/23	India		1,130.00						1,130.00
								4,128.18			12,818.80
Hon. Robert Turner	10/15	10/15	UAE								
	10/16	10/17	Afghanistan		5.00			( <sup>3</sup> )			5.00
	10/17	10/19	Kyrgyzstan								
								4,394.13			3,941.30
Hon. Dan Burton	10/5	10/6	Croatia		350.67		( <sup>3</sup> )		5,139.10		14,260.67
	10/6	10/8	Serbia		706.00		( <sup>3</sup> )		5,10,442.00		11,148.00
	10/8	10/9	Kosovo		183.66		( <sup>3</sup> )				183.66
	10/9	10/10	Bosnia		145.82		( <sup>3</sup> )				145.82
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	10/5	10/6	Croatia		350.67		( <sup>3</sup> )				350.67
	10/6	10/8	Serbia		706.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				706.00
	10/8	10/9	Kosovo		183.66		( <sup>3</sup> )				183.66
	10/9	10/10	Bosnia		145.82		( <sup>3</sup> )				145.82
Hon. Ted Poe	10/5	10/6	Croatia		302.36		( <sup>3</sup> )				302.36
	10/6	10/8	Serbia		665.43		( <sup>3</sup> )				665.43
	10/8	10/9	Kosovo		152.89		( <sup>3</sup> )				152.89
	10/9	10/10	Bosnia		166.50		( <sup>3</sup> )				166.50
Brian Wanko	10/5	10/6	Croatia		350.67		( <sup>3</sup> )				350.67
	10/6	10/8	Serbia		706.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				706.00
	10/8	10/9	Kosovo		163.37		( <sup>3</sup> )				163.37
	10/9	10/10	Bosnia		194.62		( <sup>3</sup> )				194.62
J. Brandy Howell	10/5	10/6	Croatia		350.67		( <sup>3</sup> )				350.67
	10/6	10/8	Serbia		706.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				706.00
	10/8	10/9	Kosovo		163.37		( <sup>3</sup> )				163.37
	10/9	10/10	Bosnia		194.62		( <sup>3</sup> )				194.62
Jesper Pederson	10/5	10/6	Croatia		350.67		( <sup>3</sup> )				350.67
	10/6	10/8	Serbia		706.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				706.00
	10/8	10/9	Kosovo		163.37		( <sup>3</sup> )				163.37
	10/9	10/10	Bosnia		194.62		( <sup>3</sup> )				194.62
Hon. Gus Bilirakis	11/19	11/23	United Kingdom		1,197.79						1,197.79
								1,521.30			1,521.30
Hon. Donald Payne	11/20	11/22	Poland		570.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				570.00
	11/22	11/24	Georgia		594.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				594.00
	11/24	11/25	Lithuania		243.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				243.00
	11/25	11/29	Egypt		1,238.23		( <sup>3</sup> )				2,238.23
	11/29	11/29	Ireland				( <sup>3</sup> )				
Gregory McCarthy	12/5	12/8	Iraq								
	12/8	12/9	Kuwait						5,476.74		4,767.74
								3,066.60			3,066.60
Committee total					21,373.62			59,832.60	24,828.74		106,034.96

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

<sup>4</sup> Round trip airfare.

<sup>5</sup> Indicates delegation costs.

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

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.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Chairman, Dec. 21, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. James Sensenbrenner	10/16	10/18	Thailand		627.19						
	10/18	10/20	Nepal		426.00						
	10/20	10/23	Bhutan		828.00		14,792.89				16,674.08
Bart Forsyth	10/16	10/18	Thailand		627.19						
	10/18	10/20	Nepal		426.00						
	10/20	10/23	Bhutan		828.00		14,792.89				16,674.08
CODEL Expenses											3,205.21
Gifts									299.45		
Thailand-State Dept.									198.29		
Bhutan-State Dept.									2,707.47		
Committee total											36,553.37

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, Jan. 26, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

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.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOC HASTINGS, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Scott DesJarlais	10/7	10/8	Turkey		121.47						121.47
	10/8	10/9	Afghanistan		21.51						21.52
	10/9	10/11	Germany		277.24						277.24
Hon. Peter Welch	11/5	11/7	Oman		731.82						731.82
	11/7	11/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/9	11/10	Egypt		302.00						302.00
	11/10	11/12	U.K.		706.80						706.80
Hon. Mike Quigley	11/19	11/20	UAE		141.00						141.00
	11/20	11/21	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/22	11/23	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Comm. transportation							5963.00				5963.40
Committee total					2481.85		5963.40				8445.25

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DARRELL E. ISSA, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	11/19	11/22	Belgium		322.65		10,828.90				11,151.55
Bess Caughran	11/19	11/22	Belgium		322.65		12,227.20				12,549.85
Harlan Watson	11/30	12/12	South Africa		452.94		9,033.90				9,486.84
Jetta Wong	12/2	12/11	South Africa		672.00		13,990.90				14,662.90
Committee totals					1,770.24		46,080.90				47,851.14

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RALPH M. HALL, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

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.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

SAM GRAVES, Chairman, Feb. 1, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Dolores Dunn	10/4	10/5	Turkey		15.00						15.00
Cathy Wiblemo	10/4	10/5	Turkey		15.00						15.00
Hon. Phil Roe	10/4	10/5	Turkey		15.00						15.00
Hon. Tim Walz	10/4	10/5	Turkey		15.00						15.00
Hon. Jeff Denham	10/4	10/5	Turkey		15.00						15.00
Hon. Dan Benishek	10/4	10/5	Turkey		15.00						15.00
Dolores Dunn	10/8	10/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Cathy Wiblemo	10/8	10/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Hon. Phil Roe	10/8	10/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Hon. Tim Walz	10/8	10/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Hon. Jeff Denham	10/8	10/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Hon. Dan Benishek	10/8	10/9	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Dolores Dunn	10/9	10/11	Germany		264.00						264.00
Cathy Wiblemo	10/9	10/11	Germany		264.00						264.00
Hon. Phil Roe	10/9	10/11	Germany		264.00						264.00
Hon. Tim Walz	10/9	10/11	Germany		264.00						264.00
Hon. Jeff Denham	10/9	10/11	Germany		264.00						264.00
Hon. Dan Benishek	10/9	10/11	Germany		264.00						264.00
Committee total					1,842.00						1,842.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JEFF MILLER, Chairman, Jan. 19, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Ellard, Angela	12/14	12/18	Switzerland		1285.00		1951.00		2571.07 <sup>3</sup>		5807.07
Antell, Geoffery	12/14	12/18	Switzerland		1331.12		1951.00				3282.12
Kibria, Behnaz	12/14	12/18	Switzerland		1375.00		1932.00				3307.00
Kearns, Jason	12/14	12/18	Switzerland		1538.32		1932.00				3470.32
Committee total					5529.44		7766.00		2571.07		15,866.51

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> For Local Transportation Vehicle.

DAVE CAMP, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Frank LoBiondo	10/18	10/20	Africa		576.00						576.00
	10/20	10/21	Africa		707.50						707.50
Commercial Aircraft							14,882.42				14,882.42
Hon. Devin Nunes	10/14	10/15	Europe		234.74						234.74
	10/16	10/18	Europe		193.91						193.91
Commercial Aircraft							8,307.30				8,307.30
George Pappas	10/14	10/15	Europe		234.74						234.74
	10/16	10/18	Europe		193.91						193.91
	10/18	10/20	Africa		876.00						876.00
	10/20	10/21	Africa		707.50						707.50
Commercial Aircraft							16,001.61				16,001.61
Brooke Eisele	10/18	10/21	Africa		954.00						954.00
	10/21	10/23	Africa		322.00						322.00
Commercial Aircraft							7,624.02				7,624.02
Darren Dick	10/16	10/18	S. America		300.00						300.00
	10/18	10/20	S. America		764.00						764.00
	10/20	10/21	S. America		234.00						234.00
Commercial Aircraft							2,824.34				2,824.34
Chelsey Campbell	10/16	10/18	S. America		300.00						300.00
	10/18	10/20	S. America		764.00						764.00
	10/20	10/21	S. America		234.00						234.00
Commercial Aircraft							2,824.34				2,824.34
Katie Wheelbarger	10/16	10/18	S. America		300.00						300.00
	10/18	10/20	S. America		764.00						764.00
	10/20	10/21	S. America		234.00						234.00
Commercial Aircraft							2,824.34				2,824.34
Hon. Mac Thornberry	11/5	11/6	Asia		515.00						515.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Commercial Air	11/6	11/8	Asia		827.72						
	11/8	11/10	Asia		829.72						
	11/10	11/11	Asia		271.72						
	11/11	11/12	Asia		413.86						
Hon. Devin Nunes	11/5	11/6	Asia		515.00						
	11/6	11/8	Asia		827.71						
	11/8	11/10	Asia		829.71						
	11/10	11/11	Asia		271.71						
	11/11	11/12	Asia		413.86						
Commercial Aircraft											
George Pappas	11/5	11/6	Asia		515.00						
	11/6	11/8	Asia		827.71						
	11/8	11/10	Asia		829.71						
	11/10	11/11	Asia		271.71						
	11/11	11/12	Asia		413.86						
Commercial Air											
Linda Cohen	11/5	11/6	Asia		515.00						
	11/6	11/8	Asia		827.72						
	11/8	11/10	Asia		829.72						
	11/10	11/11	Asia		265.72						
	11/11	11/12	Asia		413.86						
Commercial Air											
Committee total					20,320.32					102,217.70	122,538.02

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MIKE ROGERS, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Christopher H. Smith	10/07	10/10	Croatia	Kuna	1,104.97						1,104.97
Hon. Robert Aderholt	10/07	10/10	Croatia	Kuna	1,420.50						1,420.50
Hon. Mike McIntyre	10/07	10/10	Croatia	Kuna	1,420.50						1,420.50
Robert Hand	10/06	10/10	Croatia	Kuna	1,155.50		2,528.30				3,683.80
Mark Milosch	10/07	10/10	Croatia	Kuna	1,164.96						1,164.96
Marlene Kaufmann	10/20	10/25	Tunisia	Dinar	975.62		2,713.20				3,688.82
Mischa Thompson	10/02	10/08	Poland	Zloty	1,757.80		2,719.70				4,477.50
	11/09	11/12	Austria	Euro	1,009.19		3,837.00				4,846.19
Shelly Han	10/16	10/20	Austria	Euro	1,303.26		1,508.60				2,811.86
	10/25	11/01	Kyrgyzstan	Som	1,413.00		9,370.94				10,783.94
	11/01	11/06	Turkmenistan	Manat	226.00						226.00
Janice Helwig	09/25	10/08	Poland	Zloty	3,577.60		2,445.30				6,022.90
	10/08	10/13	Austria	Euro	1,686.58						1,686.58
	10/25	11/01	Kyrgyzstan	Som	1,653.00		8,309.53				9,962.53
	12/02	12/08	Lithuania	Litas	1,567.72		5,830.90				7,398.62
Alex T. Johnson	10/01	12/16	Austria	Euro	20,764.01						20,764.01
	10/20	10/25	Tunisia	Dinar	1,155.00		323.54				1,478.54
	10/03	10/07	Poland	Zloty	1,100.80		1,466.65				2,567.45
	10/07	10/09	Croatia	Kuna	1,253.50						1,253.50
	10/09	10/12	Montenegro	Euro	1,143.00						1,143.00
	12/03	12/08	Lithuania	Litas	1,306.62		996.10				2,302.72
Erika Schlager	09/26	10/06	Poland	Zloty	2,713.40		2,717.20				5,430.60
Kyle Parker	09/25	10/01	Poland	Zloty	1,609.20		1,443.20				3,052.40
Amb. Cynthia Efirid	09/26	10/07	Poland	Zloty	2,787.46		2,825.20				5,612.66
	11/30	12/05	Russia	Ruble	1,612.00		4,609.00				6,221.00
	12/05	12/08	Lithuania	Litas	785.23						785.23
Committee total					57,666.42		53,644.36				111,310.78

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2012.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4935. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Registration of Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants (RIN: 3038-AC95) received January 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4936. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Definitions and Abbreviations (RIN: 0570-AA87) received January 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4937. A letter from the Director, Credit, Travel and Grants Policy Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Implementation of Office of Management and Budget Guidance on Drug-Free Workplace Requirements (RIN: 0505-AA14) received January 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4938. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization; Standards of Conduct and Referral of Known or Suspected Criminal Violations; Definitions; Disclosure to Shareholders; and Disclosure to Investors in System-wide and Consolidated Bank Debt Obligations of the Farm Credit System; Compensation, Retirement Programs, and Related Benefits (RIN: 3052-AC41) received January 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4939. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Benjamin C. Freakley, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4940. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's FY 2011 report on Foreign Language Skill Proficiency Bonus; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4941. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement; Independent Research and Development Technical Descriptions (DFARS Case 2010-D011)

(RIN: Number 0750-AG96) received January 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4942. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064-AD90) received January 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4943. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Communications and Government Affairs, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the Corporation's 2009 annual report on the provision of services to minority and diverse audiences by public broadcasting entities and public telecommunication entities, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 396(m)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4944. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the Agency's reports containing the September 30, 2011, status of loans and guarantees issued under Section 25(a)(11) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4945. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's report on Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls for 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4946. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on Export and Reexport License Requirements for Certain Microwave and Millimeter Wave Electronic Components; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4947. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Interagency Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training FY 2011 Annual Report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4948. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report in accordance with Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4949. A letter from the Acting Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4950. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4951. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the FY 2011 annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) of 1982, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4952. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report on Elderly and Family Reunification for Certain Non-Violent Offenders Pilot Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4953. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2010 Annual Report of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4954. A letter from the Immediate Past National President, Women's Army Corps Veterans' Association, transmitting the annual audit of the Association as of June 30, 2010, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1103 and 1101(64); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4955. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the

Department's report entitled, "Fundamental Properties of Asphalts and Modified Asphalts — III"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4956. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2012-8) received January 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4957. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2012-10] received January 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4958. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Interim Guidance on Informational Reporting to Employees of the Cost of Their Group Health Insurance Coverage [Notice 2012-9] received January 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4959. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2012-4) received January 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4960. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Allocation and Apportionment of Interest Expense [TD 9571] (RIN: 1545-BJ84) received January 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4961. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2012-4) received January 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4962. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Advantage and Prescription Drug Benefit Programs: Negotiated Pricing and Remaining Revisions; Prescription Drug Benefit Program: Payments to Sponsors of Retiree Prescription Drug Plans [CMS-4131-F2] (RIN: 0938-AP64) received January 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

4963. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of the Methamphetamine Production Prevention Act of 2008 [Docket No.: DEA-328] (RIN: 1117-AB25) received February 9, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

4964. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Amendments to Regulations Regarding Eligibility for a Medicare Prescription Drug Subsidy [Docket No.: SSA-2010-0033] (RIN: 0960-AH24) received February 9, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3408. A bill to set clear rules for the development of United States oil shale resources, to promote shale technology research and development, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3407. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish and implement a competitive oil and gas leasing program for the exploration, development, and production of the oil and gas resources of the Coastal Plain of Alaska, to ensure secure energy supplies for the continental Pacific Coast of the United States, lower prices, and reduce imports, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 3813. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to secure the annuities of Federal civilian employees, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-394, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committee on Natural Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2484 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

#### 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. KLINE (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 3989. A bill to support State and local accountability for public education, inform parents of their schools' performance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 3990. A bill to encourage effective teachers in the classrooms of the United States and innovative education programs in our Nation's schools; referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ADAMS (for herself, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. YODER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr.

PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 3991. A bill to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from requiring that employers provide to the Board or to a labor organization the telephone number or email address of any employee; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 3992. A bill to allow otherwise eligible Israeli nationals to receive E-2 non-immigrant visas if similarly situated United States nationals are eligible for similar non-immigrant status in Israel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 3993. A bill to clarify the National Credit Union Administration authority to improve credit union safety and soundness; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POMPEO (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 3994. A bill to give States and localities the option to return unused Federal grant funds to the general fund of the Treasury for the purpose of deficit reduction; referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 3995. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HECK, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 3996. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Nevada System of Higher Education certain Federal land located in Clark and Nye Counties, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 3997. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for expensing of environmental remediation costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 3998. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 3999. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for mortgage insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. REBERG, Mr. BOREN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. BERG, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCCLIN-

TOCK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WEST, Mr. COLE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CANSECO, Ms. BUERKLE, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 4000. A bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline project, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 4001. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow partnerships invested in infrastructure property to be treated as publicly traded partnerships, to reduce the depreciation recovery periods for such property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WEST, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 4002. A bill to amend the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 to provide one-time payments from the SIPF Fund for customers during a pending lawsuit by the Securities and Exchange Commission against the Securities Investor Protection Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 4003. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the payment of a bill, invoice, or statement of account due, if made by mail, shall be considered to have been made on the date as of which the envelope which is used to transmit such payment is postmarked; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. YODER, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 4004. A bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4005. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a study and report to Congress on gaps in port security in the United States and a plan to address them; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4006. A bill to require the submission of a plan to ensure the placement of sufficient U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers at each of the ten international airports in the United States with the largest volume of international travelers to effectively combat security threats and vulnerabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 4007. A bill to establish the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 4008. A bill to establish the Cavernous Angioma CARE Center (Clinical Care, Awareness, Research and Education) of Excellence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4009. A bill to prohibit Members of Congress, senior congressional staffers, and administration executives from making certain purchases or sales of registered securities, futures, swaps, security futures products, security-based swaps, and options, to prohibit bonus payments to executives at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, 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. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOYER,

Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FARR, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. STARK, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SPIER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DICKS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. BASS of California):

H.R. 4010. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, and other entities, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER,



Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4011. A bill to modify certain provisions of law relating to torture; referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 4012. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to establish a community-supported agriculture promotion program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 99. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to unveil the marker which acknowledges the role that slave labor played in the construction of the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration; considered and agreed to.

#### 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.

Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 3989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 3990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

Mrs. ADAMS:

H.R. 3991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power to . . . regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States. . .

Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 3992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 3994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States

(the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . ."

Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 3996.

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 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 3997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 3998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 3999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MACK:

H.R. 4000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 4001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 4002.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States, which authorizes Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 under the United States Constitution

Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 4004.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 6—Clause 2

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Con-

stitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4005.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4006.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress. Also this legislation can be enacted under the authority granted in Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 4008.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 3, Section 2 of the United States Constitution.

Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4009.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I, and Clause 2 of Section 5 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 4010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art 1, Section 4.

Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 4011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clauses 11 and 18.

Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 4012.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18. The Congress shall have Power \* \* \* To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 104: Ms. CHU.  
 H.R. 157: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.  
 H.R. 505: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 592: Mr. DEUTCH.  
 H.R. 615: Mr. POSEY.  
 H.R. 1148: Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
 H.R. 1179: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. CAMPBELL.  
 H.R. 1236: Mr. LONG.  
 H.R. 1265: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. FINCHER.  
 H.R. 1327: Mr. WOMACK.  
 H.R. 1418: Mr. ACKERMAN.  
 H.R. 1426: Mr. HIGGINS.  
 H.R. 1511: Mr. HINOJOSA.  
 H.R. 1515: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
 H.R. 1533: Mr. STIVERS.  
 H.R. 1546: Mr. MEEHAN.  
 H.R. 1564: Ms. HIRONO.  
 H.R. 1578: Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 1648: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
 H.R. 1697: Mr. CARTER.  
 H.R. 1744: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.  
 H.R. 1777: Mrs. HARTZLER.  
 H.R. 1897: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 1955: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. MORAN.  
 H.R. 1964: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 2019: Mr. CARNAHAN.  
 H.R. 2085: Mr. RUSH and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 2139: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MARINO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. COURTNEY.  
 H.R. 2187: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. BACA.  
 H.R. 2288: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota and Ms. LEE of California.  
 H.R. 2299: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H.R. 2311: Ms. SPEIER.  
 H.R. 2412: Mr. KEATING.  
 H.R. 2418: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 2505: Mr. CRENSHAW.  
 H.R. 2569: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.  
 H.R. 2595: Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 2643: Mr. MORAN.  
 H.R. 2689: Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 2925: Mr. STEARNS.  
 H.R. 2969: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. FARR, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 3003: Mr. HANABUSA and Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
 H.R. 3015: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. CARNAHAN.  
 H.R. 3059: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 3072: Mr. BURGESS.  
 H.R. 3086: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 3147: Mr. ACKERMAN.  
 H.R. 3200: Mr. HONDA and Mr. PIERLUISI.  
 H.R. 3266: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
 H.R. 3274: Mr. ROYCE.  
 H.R. 3306: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mrs. BLACKBURN.  
 H.R. 3307: Mr. DENT, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
 H.R. 3308: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 3395: Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 3425: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.  
 H.R. 3510: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. ANDREWS.  
 H.R. 3548: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mrs. BACHMANN.  
 H.R. 3576: Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
 H.R. 3585: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 3606: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
 H.R. 3625: Mr. SCHILLING.  
 H.R. 3643: Mr. CRAWFORD.  
 H.R. 3656: Mr. TIBERI.  
 H.R. 3662: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ADAMS, and Mr. RIVERA.  
 H.R. 3695: Ms. HAHN.  
 H.R. 3698: Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
 H.R. 3702: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. TSONGAS.  
 H.R. 3712: Mr. FILNER and Mr. CRITZ.  
 H.R. 3713: Mr. POSEY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. BILBRAY.  
 H.R. 3737: Mr. ROSKAM.  
 H.R. 3786: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 3814: Mr. LABRADOR.  
 H.R. 3825: Mr. ANDREWS.  
 H.R. 3828: Mr. NUGENT.  
 H.R. 3829: Mr. CLAY.  
 H.R. 3831: Ms. JENKINS.  
 H.R. 3839: Mr. HANNA.  
 H.R. 3840: Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 3855: Mr. HECK and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.  
 H.R. 3860: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. TOWNS.  
 H.R. 3877: Mr. ROSKAM.  
 H.R. 3897: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 3981: Mr. NUGENT.  
 H. Res. 111: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. RENACCI.  
 H. Res. 134: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
 H. Res. 220: Mr. CLAY.  
 H. Res. 298: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. HANNA.  
 H. Res. 525: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. RANGEL.  
 H. Res. 532: Mr. GOODLATTE.

---

 CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 or rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative RYAN to H.R. 3152, the Expedited Line-Item Veto and Rescissions Act of 2011, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

---

 DISCHARGE PETITIONS—  
 ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 3 by Mr. WALZ on H.R. 1148: Nydia M. Velázquez, Suzanne Bonamici, and Bob Filner.