



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 1, 2012

No. 116

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
August 1, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2012.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I hereby resign from the office of United States Representative for the Fourth District of Kentucky, effective at close of business on July 31, 2012. Enclosed is the letter I have submitted to Governor Steve Beshear.

I thank the people of Kentucky's Fourth District for the honor of serving as their Congressman over the last eight years.

When I was a Cadet at West Point, I internalized the words of the U.S. Military Academy's motto, "Duty, Honor, Country." Next, I learned that success was based on honoring God, Family, and Work, in that order. In December 2011, I decided that in order to honor those values, I needed to retire from Congressional service so I could more effectively serve my family as a husband and father.

Those priorities continue to guide my decisions. Recently, a family health issue has developed that will demand significantly more of my time to assist. As a result, I cannot continue to effectively fulfill my obligations to both my office and my family. Family must and will come first.

I have served with great men and women in the Congress in both parties, and leave knowing that the House is filled with people who love this country and are working to make our future better. I am grateful to have been blessed by being a part of this great institution.

Sincerely,

GEOFF DAVIS,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2012.

Hon. STEVE BESHEAR,
Governor, Commonwealth of Kentucky, Frankfort, Kentucky.

DEAR GOVERNOR BESHEAR: I hereby resign from the office of United States Representative for the Fourth District of Kentucky, effective at close of business on July 31, 2012.

When I was a Cadet at West Point, I internalized the words of the U.S. Military Academy's motto, "Duty, Honor, Country." Next, I learned that success was based on honoring God, Family, and Work, in that order. In December 2011, I decided that in order to honor those values, I needed to retire from Congressional service so I could more effectively serve my family as a husband and father.

Those priorities continue to guide my decisions. Recently, a family health issue has developed that will demand significantly more of my time to assist. As a result, I cannot continue to effectively fulfill my obligations to both my office and my family. Family must and will come first.

I thank the people of Kentucky's Fourth District for the honor of serving as their Congressman over the last eight years.

Sincerely,

GEOFF DAVIS,
Member of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS), the whole number of the House is 431.

REPORT IN THE MATTER OF ALLEGATIONS RELATING TO REPRESENTATIVE LAURA RICHARDSON

Mr. BONNER, from the Committee on Ethics, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-642) in the matter of allegations relating to Representative LAURA RICHARDSON which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

RECOGNIZING STEVE LATOURETTE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is a unique and special place. There are many political offices in America where one can get into office via accident or appointment, but every man and woman on this floor had to be elected by friends and neighbors to deal with the fiscal and economic health of the Nation, for giving voice to people's fears, aspirations, and dreams. I count every day of service in Congress as a gift. Our friend and colleague STEVE LATOURETTE's announcement that he would not seek reelection should give pause to every one of us.

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.

H5527

You often hear a person say they don't always agree with somebody but they respect them. With STEVE LATOURETTE, that's true. Despite being in different political parties, I deeply respect and appreciate STEVE's forthright opinions.

His focus on having the resources to rebuild and renew America is as refreshing as it is important. He's willing to call for increases in fees and taxes for infrastructure at the same time he pushes for responsible budget cutting and right-sizing government in a way that's going to pinch almost everyone. His approach is courageous and consistent and, ultimately, we will follow that balanced path.

He has a sense of justice and regular order, as when he took to the floor as a lonely voice arguing for due process on behalf of a disgraced former Member. He does what he believes in.

Another overused phrase in this body is "wake-up call." But STEVE's decision and announcement should be a wake-up call, a wake-up call to the majority party to think about what this portends for their ability to govern and what will happen when the political winds shift just a little, which they surely will. It's a wake-up call for the people on my side of the aisle that as we fight against what we think are shortsighted and destructive policies, we need to do so in a way that is fair. We all should look for opportunities to make a little progress on second- and third-tier issues that will help do some good while we build the capacity of this institution in bipartisan problem solving.

Most of all, this should be a wake-up call to the American public. Too many of us have allowed our political decisions to be outsourced as the political process increasingly is taken over by smaller and smaller groups of extreme opinion in primaries of both parties.

The Tea Party activists have gotten headlines this weekend in the Texas Senate primary, but the dynamic is known by both parties and potentially distorts the choices of candidates and of issues in the fall.

Some Members of Congress gain a little notoriety by virtue of vision or policy. Usually we get it by being outrageous and stark. Perhaps we are known at home and for groups that have interests that we work with, but the vast majority of us wouldn't register above "margin of error" on the larger stage of American national politics.

STEVE, despite two decades of solid, distinguished service, his wit, good humor, and effectiveness—is like a number of us who may be characterized as an "obscure Member of Congress." Yet I would argue STEVE LATOURETTE should be on the radar screen of every American. His is a powerful message of an institution that needs serious readjustment.

STEVE, his family, especially the younger children, will do just fine. I think he'll have a better job, spend

more time with family and friends, and I think he'll live longer. But make no mistake, everybody should pay attention to his story, his career, and why he's leaving.

After a lifetime of solid, productive public service, if this leads to people's reconsidering how we do business and how the American public assesses whom they reward or punish, then our loss due to his retirement may be the most important contribution in his distinguished career.

OLYMPIAN RACHEL BOOTSMA MAKES MINNESOTA PROUD

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Eden Prairie, Minnesota, native and U.S. Olympian, Rachel Bootsma. The 18-year-old swimmer competed on Sunday in the semifinals of the women's 100-meter backstroke. She has made her home community very proud with her incredible hard work and grace on such a grand stage.

It is no small feat to have made it to her very first Olympics, and in the coming weeks, Rachel will take another important step when she leaves Minnesota for her freshman year of college and also at that opportunity be able to swim for Olympic Coach Teri McKeever.

□ 1010

So I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, this is not the last that we will see of this tenacious swimmer. I'd like to congratulate Rachel and all of the American athletes for carrying our banner in London.

Go, Team USA.

DREAM ACT BECOMING A REALITY

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no greater cause for celebration in America than when we expand rights to more of our people. We are never truer to our American values than when we look at a group of people and demand that they be treated with dignity and respect. We are never more patriotic than when we protect and expand the rights of honest, hardworking people, when we live up to our original promise of liberty and equality and give meaning to those American words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

Right now, we have reasons to celebrate because, shortly, the Department of Homeland Security and the White House are scheduled to announce guidelines on the application process for DREAM Act-eligible immigrants to defer deportation and get work permits so they can take a vital step toward living freely and fully in the only nation that has ever truly been their home.

Today, I want to congratulate the DREAM Act-eligible youth who have fought so hard for this right, the 1 million of them that will be taking a step forward. And I want to remind DREAM Act-eligible youth that because of the intelligent action by President Obama on August 15, they will be able to apply for work permits and protection from deportation.

On August 15, Mr. Speaker, they will take a step out of the shadows and into the light. I encourage them to take this step, and I want them to know that help and resources are available. But first, a warning: any progress on immigration is soon followed by some unscrupulous attempts to make money off the backs of deserving immigrants. So I say to my friends today: Be careful.

There is no reason that applying for relief through President Obama's use of prosecutorial discretion should be expensive or cumbersome. If someone says the only way for a DREAMer to apply is to write a big check, my advice to the DREAMer is they should run in the other direction; they are being lied to. But DREAMers should run toward help because help is on the way.

In Chicago yesterday, the Illinois Coalition for Immigration and Refugee Rights and I announced a workshop that will be held on August 15—the very first day the 1 million young people can apply for work permits and come out of the shadows and get deferred action from deportation.

The event will be held at Navy Pier in Chicago. Mayor Emanuel, myself, and Senator DURBIN—who has played such a leadership role on the DREAM Act for years—will be there. We will have all the resources anyone needs to apply that day. It will be free. We will answer questions and we will provide the resources necessary to thousands of young people that we expect will attend.

And we are not alone in Chicago. All across the country, plans are being made by immigrant advocates and organizations and elected officials for how to help DREAM Act-eligible youth to apply for their work permits and a stay of deportation. Tomorrow, I will be joined by my colleagues to talk about resources available coast to coast.

As one important step, I encourage people to visit this Web site: dreamrelief.org. That's dreamrelief.org to find out more about who is eligible, how to apply, and where people can receive assistance, dreamrelief.org.

On August 15, across America, thousands of honest, hardworking, law-abiding DREAM Act-eligible youth immigrants should be celebrating by lining up and taking that historic step toward equality. It's a day of long-overdue fairness for our young people, and I don't want one eligible young person to miss this opportunity.

I want our young DREAMers to demonstrate to America on August 15 what

they've demonstrated to their communities and their families and their friends their entire lives: they've worked hard and earned this right by excelling in school, by helping their neighborhoods, and by serving our Nation.

I know who you are—you are the next generation of leaders of our great Nation. On August 15, show all of America who you are. We need your example because it's vital to remember that every time we've expanded civil rights in America—every time—someone tried to stand in the way. From women's suffrage, to voting rights for African Americans, to Americans with disabilities, to marriage equality, someone will raise their voice against expanding the rights enjoyed by some Americans to all Americans. There is always someone who says these rights, these liberties, this equality, it's for me, it's not for you.

So I ask my DREAM Act-eligible friends—1 million strong—on August 15, show America who you are and remind America that freedom and equality is for all of us.

HONORING DEPUTY WILLIAM MAST, JR.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy for the family and friends of Watauga County Sheriff's Deputy William Mast, Jr., who gave his life in the line of duty on July 26.

In his 23 short years, Deputy Mast made an imprint on the communities he served and called home. He was a graduate of Watauga High School and a member of Bibleway Baptist Church. He cherished the North Carolina way of life—hunting, fishing, off-roading, and riding horses in our beautiful country.

The thoughts and prayers of thousands remain with his beloved wife, Paige, their unborn child, William, his parents, Angela Wall and William Mast, Sr., his extended family, and the entire Watauga County Sheriff's Office.

May each be comforted and find peace in the midst of this tragedy. And may we be faithful to remember that the safety we experience in our communities is maintained, in part, because people like Deputy Mast volunteer to place themselves in harm's way for our protection. For that caliber of service and sacrifice, we are grateful.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge legislative action on a widespread public health crisis.

I want to thank, first of all, my colleagues, especially my good neighbor and chairman of the House Appropria-

tions Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. HAL ROGERS, Congresswoman MARY BONO MACK, and Congressmen STEVE LYNCH and BILL KEATING—whom you'll hear from in a moment—all tremendous leaders in our fight to stop this epidemic.

The CDC has confirmed what local leaders and professionals across the board have been struggling with daily: prescription drug abuse is a national epidemic—a term the CDC does not use lightly.

It is no longer a silent epidemic. It can be seen at any hour of any day on street corners and in school yards. Every day, there are new stories reporting overdoses, deaths, accidents, and tragedies of families torn apart by the vicious cycle of prescription drug abuse. And the cycle is certainly vicious.

Unlike cocaine or heroin, prescription drugs are legal and frequently prescribed by caring physicians who are led by the principle oath of "first do no harm." Yet, alarming statistics show that children and adults are blind to the harmful consequences of these drugs even as they become addicted, paying upwards of \$150 per pill to buy them on the black market.

Distressingly, my home State of West Virginia has our Nation's highest rate of drug-related deaths. In fact, between 2001 and 2008, more than 9 out of 10 of those deaths involved prescription drugs. Incredibly, drug overdoses now kill more West Virginians each year than do car accidents.

But the alarming use and deaths by prescription drugs is not just in West Virginia. As other distinguished Members will tell you, prescription drug abuse hits everyone, whether you're 9 or 90, whether you're rich or poor, living in big cities or small towns, whether you're Democrat, Independent, Republican, or whatever, anywhere in our great United States.

We know there is no one single answer, no single action, and no silver bullet in the fight against prescription drug abuse. I've met many times with law enforcement, community organizations, educators, physicians, and many other constituents, and I know that fighting back against prescription drug abuse will take the work of an entire village.

We must strengthen drug diversion, educate children and adults on prevention, work with the medical community on addiction and pain treatment, and treat and rehabilitate those affected by vicious addiction before they succumb to the death spiral.

□ 1020

I and my distinguished colleagues have put forth and supported legislation that aims to combat prescription drug abuse. We know that something more must be done from a Federal level, and that's why I've introduced H.R. 1925, the Prescription Drug Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. This bill would implement multiple meas-

ures essential to combating prescription drug abuse, education and training, monitoring, evaluation and enforcement, and it provides a good guideline to coordinate Federal, State, and local efforts to fight this epidemic.

The bill establishes mandatory physician and consumer education and authorizes Federal funding to help our States create and maintain prescription drug monitoring programs that all States can access. It would also set up a uniform system for tracking painkiller-related deaths, helping States and law enforcement professionals manage and report data.

The West Virginia State Police, our State's attorney general, and even physicians have all consistently stressed the need for access to a prescription drug monitoring system that is shared between State lines and updated in real time.

I know my colleagues have authored and supported similar bills, like H.R. 2119, the Ryan Creedon Act, which also seeks to implement targeted physician education on prescription drug abuse and addiction, and H.R. 1065, the Pill Mill Crackdown Act, which would help further eradicate pill mills throughout our Nation. These bills address critical issues that ought to be part of this Congress' effort to craft legislation to assist our States and communities in combating prescription drug abuse.

The toll of destruction and devastation heaped upon America's families and our economy by this epidemic demands that U.S. Congress must act, and act swiftly. So I urge my colleagues to move forward and bring legislation to the floor that will enable our communities to fight back against prescription drug abuse.

Let us act with dispatch and compassion and with an acute understanding of the enormity of the challenge before us. The future of our families and children and the entire health and well-being of local communities and our Nation depend on us.

THE MEDICINE CABINET EPIDEMIC

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my colleague and friend from across the Big Sandy that divides Kentucky and West Virginia and my good friend across the aisle, NICK RAHALL, for organizing these Special Orders by the Congressional Caucus on Prescription Drug Abuse. Congress, the DEA, the medical community, State partners, and particularly the Federal Drug Administration must do more to fight the medicine cabinet epidemic.

The Office of National Drug Control Policy in the White House has identified prescription drugs as our Nation's fastest growing drug problem, easily eclipsing cocaine and heroin abuse. As has been said, the national Centers for

Disease Control has said that prescription drug abuse is now a national epidemic.

In 2010, 254 million prescriptions for opioids were filled in this country. That's enough painkillers to medicate every American adult around the clock for a month.

Our military soldiers are coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan hooked on these pain pills. In the last 2 years, over 150 of our soldiers have died from overdoses.

In my home State, Kentucky's losing roughly 82 people a month to prescription drug deaths, more than car crashes. Our medicine cabinets are more dangerous than our cars.

But these statistics, of course, are just numbers. So many Americans, including members of our caucus who've taken to the House floor today, have been touched by this tragedy in some personal way. In some counties in my district, half of the children are living in a home without their parents in large part because of prescription drug abuse.

I've met single moms struggling to get through drug court and employers who can't string together a clean workforce. We've lost mothers. We've lost grandfathers, police officers, children, brothers and sisters, husbands and wives.

This epidemic does not distinguish between socioeconomic lines or gender lines or geographic lines. It's indiscriminate in its path of destruction, and it has to stop.

FDA has to be part of saying "no" to the abuse of legal drugs. FDA is the primary entity for regulating prescription drugs with its hands on the spigot. For years, I've pleaded with the FDA to take a harder look at how these painkillers are allowed to be prescribed.

Congressman FRANK WOLF of Virginia and I have implored FDA to make these painkillers available only for severe pain. Prescription painkillers such as OxyContin and Opana were originally intended to treat severe pain caused by cancer, but over the years, based in large part on marketing practices, many physicians, dentists, other health care providers began prescribing opioid painkillers for moderate-to-severe pain. A toothache or a stubbed toe has become an excuse for an Oxy prescription.

Now, OxyContin's a wonderful drug, intended for terminally ill cancer patients, people in severe pain that need a time-released capsule over 12 hours. It helped the patient and helped the caregiver. But it's also a very addictive drug and very difficult to kick once addicted. So this is really a dangerous drug when not used in the prescribed way.

This FDA-approved indication for moderate-to-severe pain can create the false assumption that opioids are a safe and effective treatment for chronic, noncancer pain. On the contrary, more than 30 leading clinicians, researchers,

and health officials recently petitioned the FDA to strike the term "moderate" from the indication for non-cancer pain, add a maximum daily dose and a maximum duration of 90 days for continuous daily use.

When we're losing 16,000 people a year to these drugs, the FDA must take this petition seriously.

Second, the FDA shortly will make a vital determination about whether to approve generic versions of the original formulation of the drug OxyContin.

In 2007, the manufacturer of this drug, Purdue Pharma, was found criminally liable for deliberately misbranding their product.

After paying an unprecedented \$630 million penalty, Purdue voluntarily removed the original formulation of OxyContin from the market—and reissued the drug with a formulation which is much more difficult to abuse.

Since this new, more "gummy" drug has come on the market, abuse of OxyContin has steadily declined—while the abuse of other painkillers, like Opana, is on the rise.

Purdue's patent on the original OxyContin formulation expires in 2013, and at least three companies have filed applications with FDA to produce generic versions.

If approved, this stands to be a disaster:

1. As previously seen, original Oxy was incredibly misused and wrought havoc. We could see a new wave of deaths if this drug is available in a cheaper, generic form.

2. This would also be a tremendous setback to companies developing abuse-resistant pain medications. If generic OxyContin is available on the market for a low price, there is no financial incentive for investment in the development of abuse-resistant drugs.

FDA must realize the wide-reaching implications of this pending decision, and I encourage the Agency and Commissioner Hamburg not to put this potent drug back on the market when there are so many alternatives already available and under development.

Mr. Speaker, this epidemic is touching people in every corner of our great nation—and for that reason, I invite all of my colleagues to join us in the fight by becoming a member of the Congressional Caucus on Prescription Drug Abuse and working with us in pressing FDA to make the right decisions.

VERIFYING OFFICIAL TOTALS FOR ELECTIONS ACT

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will introduce today the Verifying Official Totals for Elections Act, also known as the VOTE Act.

Electronic voting machines are vulnerable to poor design and tampering, and there is currently no way to verify the accuracy of an electronic vote count. The VOTE Act will ensure the integrity of our voting machines system by requiring any software used in an electronic voting system for any Federal election to be deposited in the National Software Reference Library. Depositing the software in the National Software Reference Library will allow the software to be available for review in the event of an election contest or recount.

The VOTE Act is definitely needed. We are 97 days away from a crucial election and, according to a recent report, half the States have inadequate post-audit election procedures for electronic voting machines. It also found that a quarter of States have post-audit election procedures that need improvement. Further, the report found that in every national election in the past decade, computerized voting systems have failed, machines did not start or failed in the middle of voting, memory cards could not read, and votes were mistallied.

I'm sure that you all who are computer literate out there have had a computer and you were working on it and suddenly it froze up.

□ 1030

In order to unfreeze it, you had to reboot it, and in the process, you lost all of your data that you were working on; or some of you may have had the misfortune of a computer hard drive just freezing up on you and just crashing, and you had to take it somewhere and try to retrieve your data off of that hard drive, and it cost a whole lot of money. You may have even manipulated your child's computer to prevent access to a dangerous Web site; or somebody may have installed, unbeknownst to you, some software on your laptop computer that you carry around so that one can keep track of your whereabouts.

These are the kinds of things that we must be concerned about as far as our electronic voting machines—their accuracy and the fact that they can be manipulated.

There have been several e-voting inaccuracies since 2006, including prominent controversies in South Carolina, Florida, and Pennsylvania. The VOTE Act provides peace of mind. It does so by requiring that the source code, or the blueprint, of the e-voting system be stored in the National Software Reference Library, which will allow auditors to compare that code with the actual machine to determine if there has been any improper activity.

This is an urgent problem, and the VOTE Act is the solution. The right to vote is fundamental to our democratic process, and it is protected by the Constitution of the United States. The right to vote is protected by more constitutional amendments—the First, 14th, 15th, 19th, 24th, and 26th—than is any other right we enjoy as Americans. Thus, it is vital to ensure the integrity of that vote. We must do everything in our power to ensure that every American who casts a vote in the upcoming election is counted.

I thank Common Cause, Florida Voting, VerifiedVoting.org, and the North Carolina Coalition for Verified Voting for endorsing this bill.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the VOTE Act, and I invite Members from both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, to cosponsor this bill. Protecting the vote and the integrity

of the voting process is not a partisan issue, but an issue that is important to all citizens and vital to the strength of America.

JOE HARTLE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and remember Joe Hartle—a friend and a lifelong farmer of Centre County, Pennsylvania, which is located in the Commonwealth's Fifth Congressional District.

Joe Hartle was a distinguished leader in both the agricultural and fair industries, and was a staple in the Centre County community. Sadly, he passed away in March of 2012.

First elected at the age of 17, Joe served on the Centre County Grange Fair committee for more than 60 years. For the past 25 years, Joe Hartle faithfully served as president of the Grange Encampment and Fair. Joe was instrumental in making the Centre County Grange Fair a showcase for agriculture with events to satisfy all ages. Through his leadership and hard work, the grange fair has become one of the leading fairs in the State. Held annually the week before Labor Day, the Centre County Grange Fair has become the largest encampment east of the Mississippi, and it highlights Pennsylvania's number one industry—agriculture.

In addition to his work, family was always a very important part of Joe Hartle's life. He was married to his wife, Gladys, for 56 years. They had five children—Linda, Jan, Tom, Deb, and Betsy—and 11 grandchildren. I want to thank Joe for a life spent serving others and a legacy for Centre County that will live on for generations.

Rest with the Lord, my friend.

KNOW BEFORE YOU OWE ACT

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ. As August begins, millions of young people across the country are preparing to head off to college. Fall brings not only a return to course selection and roommates and football games but also to high college tuition bills. In my home State of Pennsylvania, the average cost of tuition and fees tops \$12,000 for a public 4-year school and \$32,000 a year for a private university. These high costs force 70 percent of Pennsylvania college students to take out student loans.

One of the biggest decisions facing students and college graduates is not just the amounts they borrow but who their lenders will be and whether they will be private lenders or Federal loans. Federal loans are simply a bet-

ter deal. They offer lower, fixed interest rates, consumer protections and manageable repayment options. Private student loans, on the other hand, typically have uncapped, variable rates, hefty fees and few consumer protections. From 2001 to 2008, the private student loan market exploded, increasing from \$5 billion to \$20 billion. Lenders loosened underwriting standards and often cut school financial aid offices out of the process.

While students may need private loans, they should know the differences between private lenders and Federal loans and be fully informed of the differences in cost and obligation. Unfortunately, right now, a majority of student loan borrowers who are turning to more expensive student loan programs of private options do so without fully exhausting all of the Federal student loan options available to them. This means that student borrowers unnecessarily take on increased costs.

That's why I've joined with my colleagues, Representatives JARED POLIS and TIM BISHOP, to introduce the Know Before You Owe Act in order to make sure that students and their families have access to vital information regarding their student loan programs. The legislation requires schools to counsel students on the financial aid options available to them, and it requires private lenders to adopt commonsense steps to protect student borrowers. The Know Before You Owe Act will empower students and their families to make informed decisions about financing their educations.

Access to higher education is a top priority for middle class families. They know that higher education is one of the keys to being able to succeed in a competitive 21st-century marketplace. They are willing to invest in their futures by taking out student loans in order to afford college. We need to ensure that students have full and complete information about the most affordable student loan options available to them in order to fight back against those who might take unscrupulous advantage of families facing tough financial decisions.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this important legislation and to better ensure that millions of Americans can afford college without taking unnecessary long-term financial hardship and risk.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG ABUSE

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

Mr. KEATING. I would like to thank Congressman RAHALL for organizing this morning-hour on prescription drug abuse. I would also like to thank Chairman ROGERS for his work as well as Congresswoman MARY BONO MACK, Congressman STEVE LYNCH, and all Members with the Prescription Drug Abuse Caucus.

Prescription drug abuse is defined now as an epidemic in this country, and the cost of this epidemic is more than \$70 billion a year. This is by no means just a criminal issue, and that's where the stigma sometimes makes this issue more difficult. It is, indeed, a public health issue, and for this reason Congress needs to step in.

Painkillers account for the country's fastest growing area of drug abuse, which is ahead of cocaine, heroin, and methamphetamine. Throughout my 12-year career as a Norfolk County district attorney in Massachusetts, the susceptibility of new users, particularly of teenagers, to these drugs has been a recurring theme. As district attorney, I have seen in concrete terms that this scourge goes across every social and economic boundary that exists.

I have seen law enforcement officials, while on duty and who were involved in automobile accidents, take these painkillers, become addicted and actually go out with their guns and rob—armed robbery—banks and other institutions in order to just try and feed their habits. I've seen real estate professionals get involved and go to open houses just to search medicine cabinets in order to fulfill their habits. I have also seen young people begin addictions and abuses of prescription drugs from their families' medicine cabinets, finding that later on they cannot afford their habits, and move to a cheaper, purer form of heroin.

□ 1040

I've seen the public health effects of this as well. I've seen the HIV disease spread to people. I've seen 14-year-old girls with hepatitis C as a result of trying to deal with this scourge that is an epidemic around our country.

In Massachusetts alone, 1.7 people every day die of an opiate-derivative overdose. In 2010, the National Institute of Drug Abuse showed that 2.7 percent of eighth-graders, 7.7 percent of 10th-graders, and 8 percent of 12th-graders abused Vicodin. Over 2 percent of eighth-graders, almost 5 percent of 10th-graders, and over 5 percent of 12th-graders abused OxyContin for non-medical purposes at least once in the year prior to that survey. This is why I've introduced the Stop Tampering of Prescription Pills Act, the STOPP Act of 2012, with Chairman ROGERS, Congresswoman BONO MACK, and my other colleagues.

Currently, tamper-resistant mechanisms are in use for some drugs, but this bill is the first of its kind Federal legislation to put a clear pathway for others to come to market. The process outlined in the bill applies both to brand name and generic drugs, both to time-release and to immediate-release pills. Initially, we will incentivize the use of these tamper-resistant processes. Then, in time, they'll be required. This bill is not a silver bullet by any stretch of the imagination, but

it is a very important piece in preventing new users from abusing painkillers and safeguarding against overdose. Just as seatbelts and airbags in cars cannot prevent all car accidents, tamper-resistant formulations will not prevent all instances of drug abuse, but it is a necessary tool in protecting vulnerable populations like the adolescents I have spoken about.

With this bill, we're also preparing for the potential onslaught of pure hydrocodone pills. These are currently being developed, and without proper physical and pharmaceutical barriers in place to prevent the tampering of these painkillers, this potential advent of pure hydrocodone will dramatically increase the already alarming rates of abuse and addiction. The bill would mandate the tamper resistance of these pills, as well as many others.

These pills provide great relief for many Americans in terms of extreme pain, but we must do something about another type of pain, a terminal pain, a pain that family members and loved ones feel when they have lost someone to the disease that results in this type of addiction.

I encourage all my colleagues in the House to cosponsor H.R. 6160, and further encourage the development of these tamper-resistant mechanisms. It's not a silver bullet, but it's an important first step.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG ABUSE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, Mr. KEATING, for his leadership on this issue.

I rise this morning, along with several of my colleagues, Mr. RAHALL and Mr. KEATING, whom you just heard, and also Chairman ROGERS, to talk about the very important issue of prescription drug abuse in America.

Prescription drugs are responsible for the fastest growing area of drug abuse in this country, ahead of cocaine, heroine, methamphetamines, and other drugs. In fact, according to the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, prescription drugs cause most of the more than 26,000 fatal overdoses that we see each year. Despite this alarming number, there exists a lack of knowledge about this particular type of substance abuse that prevents many people from identifying it as the problem that it is, and that in turn makes it more difficult to achieve a real solution.

Prescription drug abuse is an epidemic in this country plain and simple, and it must be dealt with as such. While prescription drug medication can help people suffering from a range of chronic and temporary conditions, for many others, exposure to pain medication, whether prescribed or obtained through other means, can be the begin-

ning of a long and tragic battle with addiction. As you heard from previous speakers, from Massachusetts to West Virginia to Kentucky and to California, many of my constituents also struggle with prescription drug addiction and its consequences. Those people are homemakers, they are professionals, they are students and laborers. Addiction does not discriminate.

Abuse of prescription medicine, especially opioid pain relievers, is a major problem nationally and in Massachusetts, where deaths, emergency room episodes, and admissions for treatment related to non-heroin opioids has skyrocketed in recent years. In fact, 99 percent of individuals entering treatment facilities who report heroin use started with a prescription medication like OxyContin.

OxyContin is a narcotic painkiller which has started too many people on this terrible journey to addiction. It is a drug that by design is inherently so powerfully addictive that it actually changes the brain over long periods of treatment, and it creates customers for life. It creates addicts. OxyContin is a drug that has caused so much grief to individuals, families, and communities, has caused so much pain and suffering, that earlier this year the nation of Canada removed it from the market. I commend them for that. I, in fact, filed a bill in May of 2005 to do exactly the same thing in the United States, but because of the powerful lobbying efforts of the drug companies, that legislation was not successful. That's a big part of the problem.

In the United States, we continue to put corporate profit ahead of personal loss. Reports of the abuse of OxyContin surfaced soon after its introduction in 1996, a year in which Purdue Pharma, the manufacturer of OxyContin, made \$1 billion on the drug. In 2007, Purdue Pharma pled guilty to criminal charges that they intentionally misled doctors, Federal regulators, and patients in regard to the addictive nature of their gold-mine drug in order to boost their profits. Despite its troubled history, OxyContin is still available. In 2011, it earned \$2.8 billion in profits for the company.

In addressing the problem, we need to consider the range of contributing factors. We need to look at the composition of the drugs and the marketing of these addictive drugs and the regulatory approval process. There are two measures that I want to note here: one, there has been a significant effort to reformulate this drug so that it is less susceptible to abuse. I commend the drug-makers on that effort. The second issue is with BlueCross BlueShield, which has instituted a limiting factor. It requires a robust reevaluation of any patient who is being prescribed OxyContin over a period of time. I think that is one of the best decisions by an insurance company in this country in some time.

I commend my colleagues on the Congressional Prescription Drug Abuse

Caucus for their legislative efforts, and I look forward to continuing to work with them on this very important issue.

THE VICTIMS OF COLUMBINE

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Good morning, Mr. Speaker, and to a fellow softball coach.

The columbine is the State flower of Colorado. It's a beautiful flower found in our mountains with whites and blues and yellows. It's just a gorgeous State flower for us to have.

Thirteen years ago, on April 20, 1999, at Columbine High School, we had a terrible tragedy. And I want all of us to remember the names of the kids that were killed at that shooting: Cassie Bernall, Steve Curnow, Corey DePooter, Kelly Flemming, Matt Kechter, Daniel Mauser, Daniel Rohrbough, Rachel Scott, Isaiah Shoels, John Tomlin, Lauren Townsend, Kyle Velasquez, and teacher, Dave Sanders.

□ 1050

Now Columbine, just like this flower, has recovered, sprouted. It's a beautiful school. It has strong academics, strong sports, and good citizens. We're very proud of the kids in that high school. It's near where I live.

We have suffered some scars from Columbine in Colorado, but we've also learned some lessons. We've learned some lessons that were put to good use 10 days ago in Aurora, Colorado.

Aurora, as many of you will remember from your mythology classes, is the goddess of the dawn. And there will be a new day.

We're suffering in Colorado right now. It's a beautiful State. It is a wonderful place. We've had two very difficult, tragic moments. And in these last 10 days, Mr. Speaker, I have had a chance to go to five funerals and visit with some people in the hospital.

I want us to remember the names of the people that were killed 10 days ago:

Jonathan Blunk, Alexander Jonathan (AJ) Boik, Staff Sergeant Jesse Childress, Gordon Cowden, Jessica Ghawi, Petty Officer 3rd Class John Larimer, Matthew McQuinn, Micayla Medek, Veronica Moser, Alex Sullivan, Alex Teves, Rebecca Wingo.

Beautiful people, good people harmed in a very senseless moment in our history.

But in the midst of this tragedy, there were a lot of heroes. And from Columbine, we learned lessons to get in and move quickly to save lives.

So beginning with the Aurora police force and the firefighters from Aurora, there were tremendous acts of courage that saved lives, that saved people from bleeding to death. We saw in our medical teams a coordination of efforts, the likes of which none of us

would ever want to go through again, but tremendous efforts on the part of the medical teams to save lives.

Yesterday I had a chance to meet with some of the people still in the hospital, which gave me so much hope and inspiration. I want to start with the family where the husband and the wife—she's 9 months pregnant—decided that they want to go to a movie before they have their first born. They want to get that one last date out.

He's shot. She suffers shots from the shotgun pellets. He's down on the first floor having surgery on his brain. She is up on the third floor of the hospital having a baby—baby Hugo, who is like the biggest kid I have ever seen at that age. His hands, he's definitely going to be a baseball player. And the Rockies came by to visit him and gave this baby two baseballs.

But she was so positive and so optimistic about her son's future and about the future of her husband, who has had great medical care and will have long-lasting injuries, but he will do well. And this wife was so positive, a young woman who is really optimistic about life.

Another young man who was shot in the side, he was in a coma. He has since come out of it, and he is now planning to start his first year of college at Western State in Gunnison, Colorado.

And finally, one guy who had been in a difficult state, the President of the United States came and visited him. He woke up at that moment—whether it was because of that visit or not, who knows, but he has a huge smile. The Rockies came to visit him, and he said, "I'm sorry, but I'm a Yankees fan." And then, to my chagrin, he also is a fan of the San Diego Chargers and the Oakland Raiders, when he should be a Broncos fan. But he is recovering well, too.

These people are recovering. Our community will recover. We live in a great State.

And I want to just finish with these words, if I could, Mr. Speaker. Ordinarily I speak off the cuff, but one of the staff members in my office, who is a Coloradan, wanted me to say this, and I believe it.

Even after these tragedies, we must remind ourselves and the world what it is to be a Coloradan.

We are the cities and the open spaces. We are the mountains and the prairie. We are the mountains and the trees. We are the snow and the sunshine.

We are loving families and longtime friends. We are the welcoming neighbor and the kind stranger.

We are Coloradans. We live in paradise and surround ourselves with loving, wonderful people who enrich our lives. This is what defines our State.

We will always remember the victims, we will always honor the heroes, and we will grow stronger.

I am proud of my State. I'm sorry for what happened. But we will grow from this.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PROFESSOR THELMA MCWILLIAMS GLASS

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

Ms. SEWELL. I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to a distinguished Alabama educator and civil rights pioneer, Professor Thelma McWilliams Glass. She was known for her exemplary efforts in the field of higher education and her tireless commitment to the struggle for racial equality.

Professor Thelma Glass was the last surviving member of the Women's Political Council, the organization that was instrumental in the planning and organization of the Montgomery Bus Boycott in the 1950s.

She recently passed away in Montgomery, Alabama, on Wednesday, July 25, at the age of 96.

Professor Thelma Glass was born in Mobile, Alabama, on May 16, 1916, and at an early age was instilled with a love of learning that led to her lifelong pursuit of academic excellence. She graduated valedictorian of Dunbar High School in Mobile, Alabama, at the age of 15 and earned a bachelor's degree from Alabama State University and a master's degree from Columbia University, both in geography.

In 1942, Thelma McWilliams married the love of her life, Arthur Glass. They were both professors at Alabama State University for over 40 years. Their love for each other was as strong as their dedication and commitment to the students they taught at Alabama State University. After 41 years of marriage, her husband, Professor Arthur Glass, passed away in 1983.

Professor Thelma Glass was an accomplished educator who taught geography at Alabama State University for 40 years. She led by example, displaying the same exceptionalism, tenacity, and commitment to public service that she demanded of her students. After four decades of dedication to Alabama State University and her community activism, in 1981, the Thelma M. Glass auditorium in Trenholm Hall was dedicated on the campus of Alabama State University in her honor.

Professor Glass was at the forefront of the civil rights movement, showing great courage as she stood up to social injustices of segregated Montgomery, Alabama, in the 1950s. She was a core member and secretary of the Women's Political Council that formed at Alabama State University to campaign against the abuses and the indignities of segregation.

The activism of the Women's Political Council laid the groundwork for the successful Montgomery Bus Boycott. When Rosa Parks set the protest into motion with her arrest in 1955 after refusing to give up her seat on the bus, women like Professor Thelma Glass were ready and willing to fight against such racial injustice.

The Women's Political Council was soon absorbed into the newly formed

Montgomery Improvement Association with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., at its helm. Professor Glass continued to play an integral role by copying thousands of flyers and recruiting her students to help spread the word of the bus boycott. She risked her life driving in carpools and organizing transportation for those participating in the boycott.

The success of the Montgomery boycott pushed the civil rights movement into full force, as African Americans across the South fought against racial inequality and ultimately led to the signing of the Voting Rights Act in 1965 by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

It was women like Professor Glass who refused to sit on the sidelines and be a footnote in history that made it possible for all of us to enjoy the rights that we do today. I know I would not be standing here today as the first African American Congresswoman from Alabama if not for activists like Professor Thelma Glass.

The remarkable career of Professor Thelma Glass as an educator and civil rights activist has been recognized by numerous awards. In 2011, Professor Glass received the Black and Gold Standard Award, one of the highest honors awarded to an alumna by Alabama State University. Professor Glass was an active member of Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority, the Montgomery chapter of the Links Incorporated, and St. John A.M.E. Church.

Thelma Glass was, indeed, an inspiration to all. I know on a personal note, Professor Glass served as a role model and mentor to my mother Nancy Gardner Sewell, whom she encouraged as a student at Alabama State University to pledge Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority. She was the epitome of a woman of grace and style who lifted as she climbed.

I stand on the shoulders of these trailblazing activists such as Professor Glass, this remarkable woman who paved the way for the advancement of African Americans.

Our Nation is eternally grateful to Professor Thelma Glass' commitment to racial equality and social justice that is a great example to all of us. She left an indelible mark on the State of Alabama and on this Nation, and today I proudly stand to acknowledge her legacy and hope that we all remember it for generations to come.

□ 1100

REPUBLICAN INTRANSIGENCE AND OBSTRUCTION

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week's middle class tax cut debate is unfortunately an unnecessary sequel to December's fight over extending payroll tax cuts. Republicans campaigned on a pledge to seek bipartisan solutions to our pressing challenges, but when faced

with a bipartisan agreement in December of last year, they chose to walk away. Unfortunately, they appear ready to do so again. When it comes to extending tax cuts to the middle class, Democrats and Republicans agree; both believe we ought to do so. So we have agreement. That agreement has been reflected in a Senate-passed bill, Mr. Speaker, as you know.

So with millions faced with the uncertainty of whether their taxes will go up next year, why haven't we acted? This should be an easy vote for an overwhelming majority of Members to say, Let's extend these tax cuts we agree on, and then debate what we don't agree on. It should be easy. But the Republicans, Mr. Speaker, are continuing to do what they do so often, have done best this Congress—obstruct, delay, and walk away.

In December, by holding hostage an extension of the payroll tax cuts for 98 percent of our taxpayers, Republicans walked away from the middle class. They walked away from their responsibility to seek compromise on job creation and economic recovery. They walked away from negotiations over deficit reduction, setting up the dangerous sequester that now looms at the end of the year. The sequester exists because Republicans pursued a policy of placing the Nation's debt at risk.

Today, sadly, they are walking away from the middle class and working families once more, demanding their way or nothing on tax cuts. No tax cuts for the middle class, they insist, without an additional tax break for the upper 2 percent of income earners. In other words, we agree on 98 percent. We don't agree on 2 percent. Rather than doing that which we agree upon for 98 percent of the American taxpayers, we will hold them hostage until we get agreement on the 2 percent. Of course if we agree on the 2 percent, it will add a trillion dollars over 10 years, if followed for 10 years, to our deficit and debt.

Republicans' plan of tax cuts for the wealthy hasn't worked before, and it won't work now. Under President Reagan and both Presidents Bush, deficits climbed. Democrats want to return to the successful policies we had under President Clinton, when we had the most successful economy, 4 years of balanced budgets, and 4 years in which we did not increase the national debt.

I say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, we've had many opportunities to work together this year to address our challenges, but each time our Republican colleagues have walked away. In doing so, they broke a central promise in their pledge to America—that is, the promise to let the majority work its will.

We could have extended the payroll tax cuts without a fight. We could have found a big and balanced solution to deficits. And we could be voting today on a tax cut extension for 100 percent of Americans who make up to \$200,000.

Or, if they're a couple, \$250,000. But in each case, Mr. Speaker, Republicans moved not towards the center but to the right to placate the extreme wing within their party.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, Representative RICHARD HANNA of New York, a Republican, said this about his party in Congress:

I have to say that I am frustrated by how much we—I mean the Republican Party—are willing to give deferential treatment to our extremes in this moment of history.

The gentleman from New York went on to say:

We render ourselves incapable of governing when all we do is take severe sides. If all people do is go down there and join a team, and the team is invested in winning and you have something similar to the shirts and the skins, there's not a lot of value there.

Congressman HANNA in this instance is right. Republicans have been unable to govern. Again and again, this Republican House has received compromise bills from the Senate but has been incapable of agreeing to legislation or passing a version that could become law.

That was true on transportation. It's true on the farm bill, and it's true on Violence Against Women. And it's true on this tax bill. Examples include, as I've said, Violence Against Women and the farm bill, postal reform, the highway bill, FAA reauthorization, and many others. Instead of focusing on winning politically, they ought to be concerned about governing effectively.

They could learn much from our outstanding Olympic athletes. In team sports like soccer and basketball, athletes who normally compete against each other at home have come together as one team, Team USA. They've won gold; they've been successful. We could be as well if we came together as Team USA.

Those athletes may harbor rivalries most of the time. They may not be used to working together. And they all know that when the cauldron is extinguished, they'll once again wear different colors. But right now in London, they're all wearing red, white, and blue, and they've set their differences aside to achieve victory together. We ought to follow their example. Republicans ought to follow their example.

We have a chance today to be one team and make possible what we agree ought to happen. Again, we agree on 98 percent of the proposal. Let's agree on that, and agree to debate that on which we don't agree. So I say to my Republican friends, stop walking away from the middle class and start working with us to get things done on their behalf.

Let me quote someone I don't usually quote, Newt Gingrich, when he was Speaker of this House when we were considering a compromise that he and President Clinton had agreed to, and so many of his Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker, as you may remember, opposed Newt Gingrich's efforts. He said:

I would say for just a minute, if I might, to my friends who were asking for a 'no' vote, the 'perfectionist caucus.'

He concluded his remarks in urging them to vote for a compromise agreement:

So the question is: Can we craft a bill which is a win for the American people because it is a win for the President and a win for the Congress? Because if we cannot find a way to have all three winning, we do not have a bill worthy of being passed.

The President has indicated he will not sign the Republican bill, and the Senate won't pass the Republican bill. But again, my friends, Mr. Speaker, as you know, we have agreement on 98 percent, and we are hung up because we don't have agreement on the other 2 percent.

Speaker Gingrich went on:

Now, my fine friends who are perfectionists, each in their own world where they are petty dictators, could write a perfect bill.

And he concluded:

In a free society, we have to have give and take. We have to be able to work.

Mr. Speaker, Americans must lament the fact that they see their Representatives agreeing on 98 percent of a proposition and will not pass it. They will not pass it because the perfectionist caucus has promised in many respects to one individual American we will not raise taxes ever. We won't pay for what we buy, even if we think it's important.

Mr. Speaker, both parties have an opportunity today to stand up and reflect agreement and do something positive for the American people, do something positive for the American economy, do something positive to grow jobs in America. Do something that will give certainty and confidence to the overwhelming majority of Americans, who will say that Congress can work.

□ 1110

It can, as families understand they must do every day, reach compromise, come together, reason with one another and give and take, as Speaker Gingrich said.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that we reflect the best in us today, not the worst, not the confrontational inclination, but the inclination to come together, to make America better and to make sure that the American people, who are working hard every day, don't see a tax increase on January 1 as a result of a "perfectionist caucus" unwilling to compromise, unwilling to pass an already-passed Senate bill that will give 98 percent of Americans confidence that they will not receive any tax increase on January 1.

What a good thing that would be for America, for the American people, and for the American economy. Let's work together. America expects us to do that, and that's what we ought to do.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

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

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Michael Catt, Sherwood Baptist Church, Albany, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, I give thanks to live in a free land, blessed by You. Since the days of the Pilgrims who sought freedom from religious and political tyranny, You have blessed this land. You have guided us through wars, recession, and prosperity. We owe our existence to Your sovereign hand.

May those elected to represent the people follow the teachings of Your Word. We pray for all in authority that we may live in peace. Please guide the Congress, regardless of political persuasion, to follow the words of Micah 6:

He has told you, O man, what is good. What does the Lord require of you but to do justice, to love kindness, and to walk humbly before your God? The voice of the Lord will call to the city. It is sound wisdom to fear Your name.

In the name of my Lord Jesus, I pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND MICHAEL CATT

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

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize today's guest chaplain, Dr. Michael Catt. Dr. Catt is the senior pastor at Sherwood Baptist Church in Albany, Georgia. I'm honored to welcome Dr. Catt, his wife, Terri, and his daughter, Hayley, to the U.S. House of Representatives today.

Dr. Catt has served as senior pastor at Sherwood Baptist Church since 1989. The church has 3,000 members and has averaged 100 baptisms each year. Thousands have joined the church from Albany and 29 surrounding communities. The church has evolved from a neighborhood church to a regional, multi-ethnic congregation with members from 11 nations.

Most notably, under Dr. Catt's leadership, Sherwood Baptist developed an out-of-the-box church outreach. Dr. Catt's goal is to change the world from Albany, Georgia. While this may sound and seem like a radical or even ridiculous statement from a pastor in southwest Georgia, it has, in fact, become a reality through Sherwood Pictures. Dr. Catt has served as executive producer of "Flywheel," "Facing the Giants," "Fireproof," and "Courageous." Each of these major motion pictures serves to influence the world for Christ.

I am honored to call Dr. Catt a friend, and I look forward to how God continues to use Dr. Catt in the future. I ask my colleagues to welcome Dr. Catt and his family as he leads us today in opening prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches from both sides of the aisle.

THE POWER TO TAX IS THE POWER TO DESTROY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, "The last thing you want to do is to raise taxes in the middle of a recession because that would take more demand out of the economy and put business in a further hole."

That's what the President said in 2009, but that was then and this is now. If Congress doesn't act, Americans will face higher taxes when the clock strikes midnight on December 31 of this year. The President's solution is to raise taxes on some. That would eliminate 700,000 jobs in our country; 60,000 of those would be lost in my home State of Texas. The tax increase will cost the average American a year's worth of groceries—\$4,000.

Madam Speaker, almost half of Americans pay no Federal income tax at all. What we need are more taxpayers, not more taxes. We need to renew the so-called "Kennedy-Reagan-Bush tax cuts." No tax increases on Americans. Because the power to tax is the power to destroy, and the last thing we should do is raise taxes in a recession.

And that's just the way it is.

DON'T FORGET THE LITTLE PEOPLE

(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, "Don't forget the little people." That's what a gentleman said as he grabbed my hand and looked into my eyes at the Sanborn Farm Museum French toast breakfast on Saturday morning. "Don't forget the little people."

Who are these little people? I'll tell you right now, these are millions of moms and dads sitting at their dinner table tonight trying to cover their worried expression from their kids as they look over their family finances, wondering whether Congress is going to step up to the plate and give them the tax break they so desperately deserve.

Only in Washington will people tell you you need to address our growing out-of-control deficit by spending a trillion dollars on tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires. And not just that. That puts us into further debt with the Chinese. I've got a problem with that.

It seems simple to me. If we want to cut our deficit, we cut spending, and we also ask those who benefited from tax breaks for the last decade to pay their fair share.

Like many of us, I'm with the little people and I'm with the middle people. Let's vote for a middle class tax cut today.

STOP THE TAX HIKES

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, let the countdown begin. Come January 1, the President and the Democrats plan to raise taxes on hard-working families and small business.

That's right. Instead of reining in their out-of-control spending, the President wants all Americans to hand over even more of their hard-earned money to the Federal Government. It's not smart to raise taxes ever, and certainly not in a struggling economy.

With 3 years of sky-high unemployment across the country, record-breaking deficits, and countless new rules and mandates coming from the White House, the solution is simple: Stop these job-killing tax hikes.

It's time to rewrite the Tax Code, work on pro-growth tax reform, and get this economy working again. Stop the Democrats' massive tax hikes to pay for their Big Government agenda. The American people want, need, and deserve better.

□ 1210

DISESTABLISHMENT OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Article I, section 8, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the responsibility to establish and ensure operations of the postal service. Today, August 1, 2012, 234 years after the Constitution was ratified, Congress is presiding over the disestablishment of the postal service.

Today, a manufactured default created by congressional legislation is pushing the postal service to the brink. Today, the postal service will not make a payment that it should have never had to make in the first place to pay for prefunding 75 years of retiree health benefits in 10 years. A manufactured default, encouraged by banks and other interest groups, a move towards privatization of one of America's most vital services. The Congress has a responsibility to stand up. But here in the USA under Citizens United, everything is up for auction, including the postal service.

Wake up, America. Universal service is on the line. Wake up, America, and stand up for the Constitution, the 575,000 postal service workers, and our obligation to the American people to see to it that the postal service is rescued from those who want to push it into default or privatize it for their own profit.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF ADAM ROSS

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

Mr. GOWDY. Madam Speaker, I rise to say thank you to Adam Ross and his parents, Dudley and Amanda Ross, from the Boiling Springs community in Spartanburg, South Carolina. Adam Ross has been described as a "well-mannered, good-spirited, and all-around good American boy." When he left Spartanburg to follow in his father's and his brother's footsteps to go fight for this country he loved so much, he told his family, Madam Speaker, I know where I am going, I know why I am going and what the purpose is.

Madam Speaker, Adam Ross' body was returned to this country he loved and believed in last week in a flag-draped coffin. His parents buried him at the tender age of 19. He died defending this country and fighting for the qualities that make this the last best hope for mankind.

So, Madam Speaker, I rise to honor his service, to honor the sacrifice his parents made, to pray for their peace and their wisdom, and to pray that when Adam Ross looks down from heaven and sees the America of years to come, he may believe his sacrifice and service were worth it.

MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUT

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, now is the time for Congress to stand

up for middle class families. I urge my Republican colleagues to abandon their plans to hold middle class tax cuts hostage to their demands for another tax cut for millionaires and billionaires and to pass a balanced tax plan, such as that contained in H.R. 15 that extends tax cuts for 98 percent of all Americans and 97 percent of small businesses.

If Congress fails to act, an estimated 400,000 families in Rhode Island could face an average tax increase of \$1,600. The Republican tax proposal will end the expanded earned income tax credit and expanded child tax credit and eliminate the American opportunity tax credit. In my State of Rhode Island, it's estimated that more than 100,000 families would lose an average of \$1,000 in 2013 if the child tax credit expansion is allowed to expire.

The Republicans' misguided plan would protect tax cuts for the wealthiest, while effectively raising taxes on 25 million lower- and middle-income Americans. I urge my colleagues to support a balanced plan that protects the middle class, strengthens our small businesses, and strengthens our economy.

BUFFALO-NIAGARA AND THE URBAN AREA SECURITY INITIATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, on Monday, I hosted a field hearing of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, on which I serve as ranking member. This was an opportunity for the committee to hear from local officials on the decision to eliminate Buffalo-Niagara from the Urban Area Security Initiative program.

Niagara County Sheriff Voutour and Erie County Commissioner of Emergency Services Daniel Neaverth testified that the capability gains made under this program cannot be sustained without fully funding this program. The Federal investment that supported the security gains achieved over the past 8 years in this program will be lost unless we fully fund this program.

Madam Speaker, the witness testimony made clear that the decision to eliminate Buffalo-Niagara from the Urban Areas Security Initiative program was ill-advised, shortsighted, and counterproductive. Congress and the Department of Homeland Security must reverse this course and restore Buffalo-Niagara's eligibility for this all-important program.

NEW PREVENTIVE SERVICES FOR WOMEN

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mark a key milestone in women's access to affordable health care services. Starting today, and thanks to the health care reform law, women will have guaranteed access to a host of preventive services in new health care plans, without additional costs. These benefits—including annual well-women physicals, birth control coverage, and screenings for domestic violence among them—are a critical step to ensuring that all women get the care they need to stay healthy and treat disease early.

Far too often, women put off needed care because of the cost; but this new coverage benefit makes some of these tough decisions a thing of the past, decisions like whether to pay for treatment or to pay for groceries.

As we celebrate this day, we must also remember that these health care services continue to be politicized and face many attacks. These attacks are not only divisive but an intrusion into women's private health decisions. We must stand up to such partisan attacks and support these important health care benefits and thus ensure that all women and their families have access to affordable preventive care services.

BRIGHT SPOTS IN COLORADO

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, it's been a hard summer in Colorado, but we have a lot of bright spots. And I want to focus on three today—one thing and two people.

The "thing" is the patent office. In this country, we've had one patent office. It's been here in Washington, D.C. And now we're going to have three patent offices across the country, and Colorado got one of those. We're going to have a satellite patent office in Colorado, and that will help us continue our innovative and entrepreneurial spirit.

Now, of the two people I would like to highlight, one is Chief Dan Oates. We had tremendous heroes in this recent tragedy that we had in Colorado. But Chief Dan Oates and his leadership of the Aurora Police Department were fantastic, and I want to compliment him on that.

Now, the last person I want to highlight, who is a bright spot and will keep getting brighter, is Missy Franklin who has won a bronze medal and a gold medal in swimming. And she is going to win a lot more.

So even though we've had a tough summer, there are a lot of bright things and a lot of bright people in Colorado, and it's going to be better from here on out.

JOE BACA MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, this Monday, Colton Joint Unified School District held a dedication ceremony for the new Joe Baca Middle School in Bloomington, California. Next week, 800 students from the surrounding communities in Bloomington and Rialto will begin to attend classes there.

I am truly humbled to receive this distinguished honor, and I thank the Colton Joint Unified School District. I want to especially recognize Superintendent Jerry Almendarez; all of the school board members of the Colton Joint Unified School District; Ignacio Gomez, whose beautiful artwork will be displayed at the school; and Congressman GARY MILLER for his bipartisan support.

Growing up the youngest of 15 children in a poor household, I never would imagine that one day I would have a school named in my honor. I never thought I would live to see this day. Again, I want to thank everyone involved and give a special thank you to my family for their continued love and support.

LET PEOPLE VOTE ALREADY

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, our democracy flourishes when every citizen who wants to, votes—but just once. And luckily, there's just not much evidence that anyone's voting more than once. Look at Pennsylvania, where one of the Nation's strictest voter ID laws is on trial. The State can offer zero evidence that fraud has been committed. They can offer zero evidence that future fraud is likely.

So why would we require a voter ID when we know one in 10 voters doesn't have ID? Why would we close early voting sites or deny voters an absentee ballot when they can't make it to the polls on election day?

Madam Speaker, the number of people hurt by barriers to voting is clearly higher than the number of illegal votes these methods purport to stop. So let's quit fooling ourselves and let people vote already.

□ 1220

WOMEN'S HEALTH

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, this is an important day for women across this great country. Starting today, all new health insurance plans will include coverage for important preventive health care for women. Many have looked forward to this date since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, and I'm thrilled that it's finally here.

Starting today, women across the country will have access to essential preventive health care without copay-

ments or deductibles. Women who were effectively barred from these services because of the cost will now be able to receive annual visits, testing for diseases like HPV and HIV, breast feeding support and education, domestic violence counseling, and contraceptives.

This is an important step in lowering our country's health care costs and making sure that women have sufficient access to preventive health care.

In my home State of Oregon, there are more than 633,000—and 47 million across the country—who are going to benefit from this change. These are women who had unintended pregnancies because they couldn't access contraceptives. These are women who avoided going to the doctor because they didn't have the money, only to end up in the emergency room. And these are women whose pregnancies were endangered because of lack of prenatal care. Today this changes. Now all women can take control of their health.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, sequestration—that's the bogeyman Republicans created last year when they refused, for the first time in American history, to allow a clean debt ceiling vote. So they formed a supercommittee which they doomed to failure when they refused to consider a balanced approach that included revenue and spending cuts. And now they decry the impending \$1.2 trillion cuts they fashioned and voted for as a crisis for national defense. This gives chutzpah a bad name.

If Senators MCCAIN, GRAHAM, and AYOTTE want to resolve this crisis in their town hall meetings—that they helped create—join me in calling our House Republican leadership to cancel the 5-week August recess and solve this solvable problem.

AMERICA NEEDS A FARM BILL

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

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, America needs a farm bill. America needs a farm bill. Our ranchers, our agricultural conservation districts, our dairy farmers, our commodity farmers need and deserve a farm bill. It was passed by the Senate. It was passed by the House Agriculture Committee in a strong bipartisan vote. But for the first time, literally the first time in the history of this country, a farm bill passed by the Agriculture Committee is not being allowed to come to the floor. There's no excuse for that.

Is it a hard job? Yes. But is that an excuse for Congress to duck its responsibility? No. Are there contentious issues? Yes.

Some on the other side want to cut commodity programs. Give them a shot. Let them bring an amendment. My colleague, ROSA DELAURO, thinks we ought to restore all funding for nutrition. I agree. Give her a shot.

Congress must do its job. It must bring a farm bill to the floor for a vote so that each and every one of us is held to account to our constituents.

WOMEN'S PREVENTIVE HEALTH

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, 26 years ago, I was diagnosed with ovarian cancer. I was lucky. I had excellent doctors. They detected the cancer by chance in stage I. If my cancer had not been caught early, I might not be speaking to you today. Many women are not so lucky because they have never had access to preventive health care.

That is why I am so pleased to see that today, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, more lifesaving preventive services will begin to be covered for women all over the country. Last year, 54 million Americans with private health insurance gained access to preventive services without cost sharing, including over 700,000 in my State of Connecticut.

Starting today, 47 million American women, including over 600,000 Connecticut women, will now have access to well-women visits, screenings for gestational diabetes, HPV and HIV, contraception, and counseling and support for STIs, breast feeding, and for domestic violence.

A report in 2009 found that more than half of American women delayed or avoided necessary care because they could not afford it. This is why we passed the Affordable Care Act.

Let's help Americans get quality care. Let's save lives.

MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUTS

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, House Democrats and President Obama are fighting for families by working to extend middle class tax cuts that will benefit 98 percent of Americans. Our plan will put \$2,200 in the pockets of an average family next year. That's money that can be spent by your family on your family's needs. That money will help Minnesota businesses grow and hire employees in St. Paul, Roseville, and Oakdale.

But House Republicans refuse to extend tax cuts for the middle class unless millionaires and billionaires get an extra tax cut. It's wrong to borrow \$50 billion from China so millionaires and billionaires can get an extra tax cut of \$160,000.

The Bush tax cuts for the super-wealthy built a mountain of debt and

failed to strengthen the economy. The Bush years proved that the Republican love affair with tax cuts for the super-wealthy are a wasteful handout. They failed to create jobs.

The American economy is strong when the American middle class is strong. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Democrats' middle class tax cuts.

AMERICAN WOMEN WIN

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, today American women win. Congress has finally done something right. No more copays for contraception. No more copays for mammograms. No more copays for well-women visits. No more copays for diabetes screening, DV counseling, HPV DNA testing, or HIV screening.

So what does that mean to women in America?

Women in America today are saving money. For contraception alone, they'll save \$400 to \$600 a year. For all women in this country, it's a billion dollars worth of savings because the Affordable Care Act was passed by Congress and signed by the President of the United States.

Yes, President Obama does care. And yes, American women win.

MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUTS

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, today the House will take up a bill on the Bush tax cuts. The Republicans want to extend the Bush tax cuts to everybody, but tax 25 million Americans by not extending certain credits that they get right now. The Democratic proposal, which I will support and which I'm here for today, despite the fact that my election is tomorrow, will extend tax cuts to everybody and raise taxes somewhat on people who make over \$200,000 individual and \$250,000 married. Those people still get a tax cut, but just not as much.

Madam Speaker, 93 percent of the income growth in the last decade went to the top 1 percent. That's the people who can afford to pay more taxes. And the fact is, to deal with the deficit, we've got to have both income and cuts to wasteful spending.

Republicans and Democrats have agreed. Economists Paul Krugman and Joseph Stiglitz have called on both revenue and cuts. And so have Martin Feldstein, an adviser to President Reagan, and Hank Paulson, Treasury Secretary to President Bush. So did Simpson-Bowles. They've all said you need both revenue and cuts. That's what President Clinton recommended in 1993, the Democrats supported, and we had a surplus—wasted on Bush tax cuts.

I urge support for middle class tax cuts.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, AND COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Committee on the Budget, and Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2012.

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

MR. SPEAKER, I hereby announce my resignation, effective immediately, from the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Should you have any questions please contact my Chief of Staff.

Sincerely,

FRANK GUINTA,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2012.

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

MR. SPEAKER, I hereby announce my resignation, effective immediately, from the House Committee on Budget. Should you have any questions please contact my Chief of Staff.

Sincerely,

FRANK GUINTA,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2012.

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

MR. SPEAKER, I hereby announce my resignation, effective immediately, from the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Should you have any questions please contact my Chief of Staff.

Sincerely,

FRANK GUINTA,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

□ 1220

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 751

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—Mr. Guinta.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6169, PATHWAY TO JOB CREATION THROUGH A SIMPLER, FAIRER TAX CODE ACT OF 2012; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, JOB PROTECTION AND RECESSION PREVENTION ACT OF 2012; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS FROM AUGUST 3, 2012, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 7, 2012; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 747 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 747

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6169) to provide for expedited consideration of a bill providing for comprehensive tax reform. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; (2) two hours of debate on the subject of reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (3) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Slaughter of New York or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8) to extend certain tax relief provisions enacted in 2001 and 2003, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of

the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Levin of Michigan or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from August 3, 2012, through September 7, 2012,—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved;

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment; and

(c) bills and resolutions introduced during the period addressed by this section shall be numbered, listed in the Congressional Record, and when printed shall bear the date of introduction, but may be referred by the Speaker at a later time.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 5. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 6. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 7. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar or legislative day for purposes of clause 7(c)(1) of rule XXII.

SEC. 8. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of August 2, 2012, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV.

SEC. 9. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of August 2, 2012.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. House Resolution 747 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 8, a bill to extend the current tax rates for all Americans for 1 year; a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 6169,

which provides a legislative path for true tax reform; and for other tools allowing the House to finish its business and continue to operate during the August district work period.

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

Madam Speaker, why are we here today? My friends on the left will tell you that we are here today to discuss the issue of fairness in our Tax Code. I would agree. America is the land of opportunity. We believe that the worst possible thing you can do during a fragile recovery—that feels like a recession to me—is to increase taxes. Why? Because by increasing taxes, we jeopardize another 710,000 jobs, according to the experts, 710,000 jobs.

One of those jobs could be held by one of my constituents, a friend of mine named Joe Stringer. Joe Stringer is a middle class American, 62 years old. His wife is 67 years old and on Medicare. Joe doesn't make \$250,000, Joe doesn't make \$200,000, not even \$150,000 or \$100,000, but Joe does have dividend income, like 9 million seniors around this Nation who have dividend income.

And here is the interesting fact, Madam Speaker, when we hear the left talk about taxing the millionaires and the billionaires, here is the new definition: of those 9 million seniors who have dividend income, 68 percent of them have an income of less than \$100,000, 40 percent have an income of less than \$50,000. But my friends on the left would categorize these folks as a member of the rich, with their tax cuts being expired at the end of this year.

We are looking at an increase in the dividend tax rate of 185 percent for millions of Americans who are on fixed incomes. These folks aren't rich. They depend on their dividend income, and yes, with the actions of the left, we would see their dividend income tax responsibility and burden go up by 185 percent. This is definitely not right. It is definitely wrong.

Now this is on top of all the new taxes that we find as a part of the Affordable Care Act, another \$804 billion of new taxes on Americans throughout this Nation. And in addition to that, Madam Speaker, under their proposal, we see the death tax going from 35 percent with a \$5 million elimination to 55 percent. And for farmers, folks in agriculture, and for small businessowners, their wealth is not liquid. You would have to sell your land to pay these taxes. It's what we call a "fire sale."

So my friends on the left would punish people who work all their lives and come up with wealth to pass on to the next generation. But in this instance the taxes would go up significantly. And that's wrong.

□ 1240

In spite of the results of all the surveys—yesterday we had a survey done in my district that said that 61 percent of folks would like to see the 2001 and

2003—and, oh, by the way, 85 Members of the Democrats voted for these exact same tax cuts to stay in place in 2010. It was good in 2010; it's still good right now. Sixty-one percent of folks say let's extend these tax cuts for all Americans, and let's keep those 710,000 Americans who would lose their jobs employed.

But in addition to that, the environment that we're working in right now matters; it matters significantly. Because we have over 41 months—over 41 months, Madam Speaker—of unemployment over 8 percent. It's devastating. It's devastating, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues will come together here today and realize that the time for political points should be over; that my colleagues would come together today and realize that the time for trying to divide Americans is over; that we would come together today, Madam Speaker, and realize that the time for punishing success is over.

In many ways, Madam Speaker, in many ways this debate today is about the very soul of who we are as Americans: Are we going to lift everyone up as one Nation, or are we going to push some down to bring everyone somewhere in the fuzzy middle in some misguided attempt to redefine fairness? Are we going to let the foundation of this Nation continue to crack, or are we going to strengthen it for another 200 years?

We encourage—I encourage—success in this Nation. We have to ensure our children can learn about America the same way all of us learned about the land of opportunity. That's fairness that I believe in.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, under the rule before us today, we will choose between two starkly different visions for America. My Democratic colleagues and I are proposing a simple and fair tax cut for the middle class. This proposal has already passed the Senate. If passed by the House, the legislation could quickly become law. Our tax cut is based upon a simple premise—that it is time for the wealthy and corporations to pay their fair share—no more. Their fair share.

Unfortunately, despite agreeing with the tax cuts proposed in our bill, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are standing in the way of the tax cut becoming law. Instead of passing a commonsense tax cut, the majority is demanding that any tax cut for the middle class be accompanied by an additional tax cut for the richest 2 percent. Their proposal is based upon the

disproved theory of trickle-down economics—a failed economic theory that has led to record inequality and a broken Tax Code that is riddled with loopholes and giveaways to the wealthy.

For decades, our tax system has been tilted in favor of the wealthy and big corporations—a rigged system that isn't working for most Americans. As just one example, between 2008 and 2010, 30 profitable Fortune 500 companies paid absolutely nothing in Federal taxes, and many more companies and wealthy individuals avoid paying taxes by sheltering the money in bank accounts overseas.

This stands in sharp contrast to other moments in American history. In the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s—a 30-year period that saw the creation of the middle class and the realization of the American Dream—top income tax rates often reached levels we wouldn't even dream of today. But despite these tax rates, we saw incredible economic growth and the creation of the strongest middle class on Earth.

The middle class grew, in part, because we did not allow the most successful members of our society to dodge their responsibility as American taxpayers. In years since, we've witnessed a purposeful and concerted effort by some to undermine the notion of shared responsibility, which this government was based on. In years since, we've witnessed a purposeful and concerted effort to undermine that. Starting with Reaganomics in the 1980s, a new theory pervaded American politics—a belief that our focus should really be on helping corporations and the wealthy in hopes that they might in return help some of us.

Many on the other side of the aisle subscribed to this idea and believed that by providing for the powerful interests first, success would trickle down onto the middle class. What we now know is the theory is simply not true. Today, America is increasingly unequal, millions of jobs have been shipped overseas, and the middle class has been gutted. These results are strong evidence that trickle-down economics have completely and utterly failed.

In 2001, President Bush proposed a series of unpaid-for tax cuts that exploded our deficit and put millions of dollars directly into the pockets of the richest families in America, and that's where we are today. At the same time, President Bush claimed that these tax cuts would create jobs. And Vice President Cheney told us not to worry about the cost to our Nation because "deficits don't matter." A decade later, we can see that President Bush and Vice President Cheney couldn't have been more wrong.

Under President Bush, our deficit exploded to record levels; and according to FactCheck.org, he created only 1.1 million jobs. In contrast, President Clinton erased our deficit through a balanced tax plan and created 23 million jobs—quite a difference—which

brings us back to the legislation that we are considering today.

Today, the majority proposes that we continue failed policies by extending the Bush tax cuts for the richest 2 percent. Doing so, Madam Speaker, would cost us nearly \$1 trillion over the next 10 years, it would force us to continue borrowing billions of dollars from China, and would force us to make cuts in vital programs like Medicare and student loans.

To continue the failed status quo is a disservice to the American people that we represent. It is high time that we start making our Tax Code fair for those who work hard and play by the rules—not just the wealthy who lobby hard and rewrite the rules. We can do that by passing a simple and fair tax cut for the middle class today.

Unlike the proposal from the majority, the Democratic proposal to cut taxes for the middle class is something that both sides already agree on. The majority's strategy of holding middle class tax cuts hostage in exchange for tax cuts for the top 2 percent is outrageous, and it must end.

Far too often, the majority has pursued a partisan and zero-sum ideology that has led this Congress down dead-end roads. We've seen it over and over again, whether it's the majority's proposal to end Medicare as we know it, or their inability to avoid a downgrade—the first in our Nation's history—in our credit. Unfortunately, their proposal today is yet another partisan piece of legislation that will never become law. Indeed, the President has already said that he will veto the majority's proposal if it ever reaches his desk.

When faced with these two starkly different proposals—one, a non-controversial and commonsense tax cut for the middle class; the other, a partisan tax cut to benefit the richest 2 percent—it's clear what we should do.

I urge my colleagues to provide a fair and simple tax cut to all Americans—because the rich will benefit too—while standing up for the financial security and prosperity of the middle class. Why would we continue a program we know has failed?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I just want to make sure that I note once again, reinforce the fact, that this 1-year extension that we are suggesting on the right is in fact an extension of not only the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, but also the tax cuts that passed this House in 2010 in a bipartisan fashion.

There is no doubt that an action not to extend these tax cuts is actually increasing taxes on many people in this Nation.

□ 1250

And, in fact, if we do extend these tax cuts, what we are actually doing is allowing current tax law to stay in place. But if we don't do that we are talking about 9 million seniors, 68 percent of whom make less than \$100,000,

seeing their dividend income go up in taxation by 185 percent. That's the middle class.

We're talking about how the marriage penalty will place a \$591 higher tax on over 88 million families. That's the middle class. We're talking about a reduction in the child tax credit that will pose a \$1,028 tax hike on 31 million families. This looks like to me that my friends on the left are willing to tax the middle class and the poor.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. TREY GOWDY.

Mr. GOWDY. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and colleague, TIM SCOTT. And I was in rapt attention when he was talking. It was almost as if he stole my thoughts. But I don't mind because he's a member of the freshman class.

And many of us in the freshman class, Madam Speaker, we weren't here in December of 2010 when this body last decided to extend the tax cuts for all Americans, not some of them, but all Americans, 18 months ago. So you can imagine, Madam Speaker, how intrigued we are by the debate on the other side.

We're also intrigued at the number of our colleagues who, not 18 months ago, decided it would be bad economics to raise taxes on any American, which leads me to wonder, were the rules not fair 18 months ago? I know that's the campaign slogan, that everybody has to play by the rules and everybody should pay their fair share.

Were the rules not fair 18 months ago? Was everybody not paying their fair share 18 months ago? Because heaven knows they voted for it 18 months ago. Which got me wondering, Madam Speaker, what's different today than it was 18 months ago?

Well, maybe the economy's better off. Maybe that's the explanation. And then I saw, well, gas prices are higher and milk prices are higher and bread prices are higher and inflation is higher, which is the most insidious of all taxes, and people's purchasing power is down. So, no, that couldn't be why they changed their minds. It can't be because people are better off, because they're not.

So then I thought, Madam Speaker, well, maybe it's because government has become a better steward of the tax dollars that we do give them. Maybe government's spending the money better. And then I thought, well, no, we've had Solyndra and we've had Abound, and we've had a failed stimulus plan, and we've had a GSA scandal, so no, it couldn't possibly be that we're spending the money wiser.

So why in the world, Madam Speaker, would so many of our colleagues who just 18 months ago thought the rules were just fine and that 35 percent was enough to pay, why in the world would they change their mind in the course of just 18 months?

And then it dawned on me, Madam Speaker. It dawned on me while I was

listening to the President tell our fellow Americans you didn't build that, and promising more flexibility in a second term, that we're in the middle of a reelection campaign. It dawned on me, no, the economy's not better, and no, government's not spending its money better, but I have to have something to run on, so I'm going to pit one group of Americans against another group of Americans, because God knows I can't run on my record.

So let's try the politics of bringing people down and perpetuating this myth that somehow pulling other people down makes me taller. Let's pit one group of Americans against another group.

Madam Speaker, the economy is still struggling. Heavens knows it is. People are suffering.

If you want economic growth, why in the world are you talking about taking more money from people, even if you don't think they built it?

What has changed in the last 18 months other than the vicissitudes of a political cycle, Madam Speaker?

And then I got to thinking, while Congressman SCOTT was talking, let's assume for the sake of argument, Madam Speaker, that we do what they want us to do. Go ahead and raise it to 39 percent. It may be 39 this time. How about 50? If you didn't build it, how about take half of it?

What about 60 percent, Madam Speaker? If you didn't build it, take 60 percent of it. Where does it stop?

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GOWDY. What the Democrats want to do, Madam Speaker, is bad citizenship. It is bad economics. It is bad for our fellow Americans. It remains to be seen if it's good electioneering or not. That remains to be seen.

But duplicity is duplicity, no matter what the calendar says.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I would just like to remind the previous speaker that 18 months ago there was a Republican majority in this House that made a determination to bring this Nation to its knees and to shut down the government because they would not raise a debt ceiling and were holding the government hostage and the Nation hostage.

And quite frankly, that's what they're doing again today. And this time, it is about tax relief for working families and for middle class families. The duplicity is on the other side of the aisle, which always is trying to bring this body and this country to the precipice.

I rise in opposition to the House majority's tax plan. What it would do is raise taxes on 25 million middle class and working families, people with incomes below \$250,000. Their taxes would go up by \$1,000 each.

Why? In order to give another tax break to the rich.

The New York Times article just a few days ago said the Republicans will press to extend tax cuts for affluent families scheduled to expire on January 1. But the same Republican tax plan would allow a series of tax cuts for the working poor and for the middle class to end next year.

The Washington Post said, and I quote, "Republicans want to raise taxes on the poor. Why?"

Why indeed. In order to pay for an over \$160,000 tax break for millionaires. The plan would slash the Child Tax Credit, taking an average of \$854 away from nearly 9 million families, pushing 2 million children back into poverty.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman another minute.

Ms. DELAURO. It weakens the Earned Income Tax Credit, which kept 8.3 million people out of poverty last year—this as poverty rates head towards the highest levels in nearly half a century.

We all know there's a better way forward. The Senate has passed a plan, supported by the President, which cuts taxes for 98 percent of Americans, 97 percent of small businesses in the country. Rather than holding tax relief for the vast majority of American families and small businesses hostage to more tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent, let us take up that Senate bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and this Republican Reverse Robin Hood tax plan, and support tax relief for the middle class.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I just want to make sure that we remember the facts as they are. There's no reason for us to so quickly revise history to meet our political objectives.

In 2010, this House, controlled by the Democrats, the Senate, controlled by the Democrats, and the White House, controlled by the Democrats, passed the 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts. So what we're talking about is a bipartisan piece of legislation that would continue the current tax law because the previous Congress, in a bipartisan fashion, decided that tax cuts were good for all Americans. And now we find ourselves, as Mr. GOWDY said, in the midst of a political season.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. RICH NUGENT, the sheriff.

□ 1300

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and fellow Rules Committee member TIM SCOTT for allowing me to speak on this very important issue.

This rule does something that is decades overdue. It puts the Nation on a path to comprehensive tax reform. Achieving a fairer, simpler Tax Code isn't an easy goal, which is why we are considering today and tomorrow a

multi-step process. First, we need to extend the current tax rate. This extension gives us a bridge, the time we need, to dig into the Tax Code and find a way to make it work for all Americans, not just some. Perhaps even more importantly, it stops the largest tax hike in history. It's worth repeating: the largest tax hike in history.

Madam Speaker, this tax increase would threaten more than 700,000 American jobs, and for those folks lucky enough not to lose their jobs, it could very well lead to lower wages for them. If we don't act, the Democrats' tax increase will hit 53 percent—more than half—of all American small business income.

When I brought these small businesses up at the Rules Committee last night, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle responded to me and my questions by coming back with statistics, things that don't really matter much to anybody. Yet, when I talked about small businesses in my district—those folks making over \$200,000 who are going to be impacted by this increase on taxes—it related to actual jobs, what they can create and what they may have to cut back on. These are real people, not some statistics that somebody in some Washington think tank came up with. These are real people, real job creators in America. We are talking now about stifling that at a time when job growth in America is anemic at best.

My fellow speakers earlier talked about just that issue in regards to what has changed.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NUGENT. What has changed in America since that increase, or the 2001–2003 tax decrease, was passed by the democratically-controlled Congress in 2010? What has changed?

You heard from my good friend Mr. GOWDY that nothing has changed. Now we are going to look at those job creators—and let's slap them again. Let's take away the certainty for the people. We have almost 11 percent unemployment in my district, so now we are going to crush them again by taxing those job creators and by putting jobs out of the reach of real Americans.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. NUGENT. I thank my friend.

H.R. 8 will prevent real hardworking Americans from getting hit with history's largest tax increase. We have an obligation to make sure that we do this. If we extend it for a year, it gives us the opportunity. It has been decades since we have had real tax reform. The Ways and Means Committee, through regular order, has the opportunity to have input from both Democrats and Republicans alike—experts in the

field—to talk about how we craft tax policies that are going to carry us through the next decade.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. NUGENT. This is such an important issue, Madam Speaker. This is about the future of America. This is about how we move forward.

Ways and Means has had 20 committee hearings already on this issue. One of my favorites was on the Fair Tax, which is what we are talking about as we move forward—the ability of the American people to hear debate on this floor and in committee sessions through an open process in which we can amend laws or legislation that is going to come forward to this House. It is also the ability to get input from all of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—because it really is about where we are heading as a Nation.

We talk about job creation. This is about job creation. This is about sustaining the current jobs that we have and about allowing American businesses and entrepreneurs to create more jobs. It's not some crazy idea. This is real America. These are businesses in my district.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The real issue here today is: Are we going to continue something that we know utterly failed? More than 10 years ago, this deal was made with corporations that we would cut the tax rate and that they would produce jobs. We didn't get the jobs. Half of it didn't work. Why would a country as intelligent as ours want to continue that failed policy? We are at a critical crossroads here, and we had better this time get it right.

In that regard, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy.

She had it exactly right. We've gone down this path. We had an opportunity for us to see how effective the Bush tax cuts were in creating employment in America versus those high rates in the Clinton era, a couple of percentage points higher. Look at the job creation: 22 million jobs in the Clinton years when we were actually balancing the budget for 4 years in a row, reducing the deficit, versus anemic job creation in the Bush administration that was less than 5 percent of that.

We've tried it their way.

With all due respect, it's really hard to characterize what happened in 2010 as bipartisan legislation. The Republicans in the Senate refused to legislate. It was going to be that all the tax relief expired. A consensus was reached. A compromise was made to extend it. Hopefully, we could have worked things out, but we didn't. We're now right back in the same spot.

I would respectfully suggest that what we are looking at now with my

Republican colleagues, when they talk about the largest tax increase in American history, is when you put the Republican-Romney bill in effect. If you are going to have that massive cut for the wealthiest of Americans, the only way you can make that deficit-neutral is by raising taxes on the other 95 percent. And you can quibble with some of the assumptions of the various independent experts, but they all agree: if you're going to give people who make over \$1 million an average of more than \$100,000 in annual relief, you are going to be raising taxes on the 95 percent of the rest of America.

That's not right. It's not necessary. There are better alternatives, and you're going to hear it in the form of the Democratic alternative that's going to come forth later this afternoon.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia and my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. ROB WOODALL.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my colleague from South Carolina for yielding me the time.

I don't actually have the words for this debate, so I had to bring something with me, Madam Speaker. What I brought are the very words that President Obama spoke from right here behind me in his State of the Union address in 2011. As you'll remember, we had just done this thing that we had all agreed on. I say "we." My colleague from South Carolina and I were not in Congress at the time. "You." This thing that you agreed on with the President and with the Senate to not raise taxes on job creators, why did you agree on that? Let's look and see what the President said.

He said:

We measure progress by the success of our people—by the jobs they can find and the quality of the jobs they can find. Opportunities for a better life that we pass on to our children, that's a project the American people want us to work on together. We did that in December.

He was talking about when we came together to prevent the largest tax increase in American history from impacting Americans and the jobs they were seeking.

Here is what he said:

We did that in December. Thanks to the tax cuts that we passed, Americans' paychecks are bigger today. Businesses can write off the full cost of investments, and these steps taken by Democrats and Republicans will grow the economy and add more than 1 million private sector jobs.

That's why Ernst & Young says doing what the Democrats propose to do is going to kill 700,000 jobs. It's because, as the President said, doing what we all agreed on—doing what we are proposing to do here today—added 1 million jobs. That was from the President's address in 2011.

He went on. He talked about the parade of lobbyists who have rigged the Tax Code to benefit particular companies and industries.

He says:

Those with accountants and lawyers can work the system and pay no taxes at all, but the rest are hit with one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world. It makes no sense, and it has to change.

He's right, but the proposal that my friends on the Democratic side are bringing to the floor raises taxes on these small businesses that create jobs. The President knows that's not fair. He goes on.

□ 1310

He says, "Tonight, I'm asking Democrats and Republicans to simplify the system. Get rid of the loopholes," he says, "level the playing field," he says, "and use the savings to lower the corporate tax rate for the first time in 25 years without adding to the deficit."

That's what the President called on us all to do. That's what this rule that my friend from South Carolina allows us to do. That's what, if we're willing to put politics aside in this election year, we can do together as you did in 2010.

Madam Speaker, I will close with this. That was his 2011 address, and maybe you think that was just the enthusiasm of our cooperation there at the end of 2010, but it wasn't.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Standing right here in this Chamber 10 feet behind me this year, the President said this:

We have an opportunity at this moment to bring manufacturing back, but we have to seize it. We should start with our Tax Code. Right now, companies get tax breaks for moving jobs and profits overseas; meanwhile, companies that choose to stay in America get hit with one of the highest tax rates in the world. It makes no sense and everyone knows it. So let's change it.

What you do does not change it. What you do dooms our small business owners to continue to operate at one of the highest tax rates in the world. We can do better. We have the bill to do better. Together we will do better.

With that, I thank my friend from South Carolina.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I think I must say that 97 percent of small businesses in America will not be affected at all.

With that, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Americans who served on the school board or a parents council or the board of trustees, their fire company, that have ever had a dispute about what to do know that one of the ways to resolve the dispute is to say, Listen, let's take the things that we agree on and do them, and set aside the things in which we disagree and argue about them later. But let's agree

on the things we can do and get them done.

I think virtually every Member of this Chamber agrees that if a family makes less than a quarter of a million dollars a year, their taxes should not go up. Let's pass a bill that says that and then move on to the things on which we disagree.

Here is one of the things that we disagree on: The majority's bill that's on the floor raises taxes on 25 million Americans, and they are some of the Americans who least merit and deserve a tax increase. For example, an E4 corporal in the Marine Corps with 4 years of service, married and with two children sees his taxes go up by \$448 a year under the Republican bill. Under the Democratic bill, that Marine's taxes do not go up. A military police sergeant, an E5 in the Air Force, who has 8 years of service, with a spouse and three young children would see a tax increase of \$1,118 a year.

How could this be?

In 2009, President Obama increased the earned income tax credit, which helps low-income people who work for a living, and he increased the child care credit, which is working people with children. We pay our marines, our Air Force, our Army, and our sailors a lot less than we should. They're very underpaid, and they take advantage of these tax breaks.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I will be happy to yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. The Democratic bill preserves these tax rules for working families, including members of the military; the Republican bill does not.

So I would urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to do the following: Let's oppose the rule that's on the floor, which gives us a chance to amend the bill. When we amend the bill, let's cancel out the tax increase on the Air Force sergeant of \$1,118 and let's cancel out the tax increase on the Marine corporal of \$448.

Vote "no."

[From the Center for American Progress, Aug. 1, 2012]

HOUSE REPUBLICAN TAX BILL LEAVES SOME MILITARY FAMILIES BEHIND
MILITARY FAMILIES WITH MODEST INCOMES COULD LOSE IMPORTANT TAX CREDITS
(By Seth Hanlon)

The House of Representatives today is scheduled to vote on a House Republican proposal (H.R. 8) that purportedly extends all tax cuts but actually raises taxes on about 25 million families by reducing certain tax credits. The 25 million families include middle-class families and students who currently benefit from a tax credit for college expenses. Others are parents raising children on modest incomes who are helped by the child tax credit and earned income tax credit. Some, as illustrated below, are members of the U.S. military and their families.

The competing Democratic proposal, which has already passed the Senate (S. 3412/H.R. 15), extends all income tax cuts for the 98 percent of families with incomes under \$250,000 (\$200,000 for singles), including these tax credits in their current forms.

Below are three illustrative examples of military families whose tax bill would rise next year under H.R. 8, the House Republican tax bill.

A corporal (E4) in the Marines with four years of service, who is married and has two children would see a tax increase of \$448 under H.R. 8.

In 2009, President Barack Obama signed into law improvements to the earned income tax credit—an important tax credit that boosts the earnings of low- and moderate-income workers. In 2009, 211,000 military families benefitted from the earned income tax credit.[1] One of the 2009 improvements reduced the tax credit's so-called marriage penalty (phasing out the credit at higher income levels for families that file joint tax returns). H.R. 8 would let that provision expire, increasing the marriage penalty and thus reducing the EITC for married couples in the phaseout range.

With military basic pay of \$27,660[2] (and assuming no other household income), this Marine Corporal's family is affected by the worsened marriage penalty under H.R. 8. As a result, the family's tax credit would be reduced by \$448 under H.R. 8 compared to the current tax rules, the Senate-passed bill, and the House Democratic alternative. Here are the details:

Marine corporal (E4), four years' service, married with two children;

Military basic pay: \$27,660

Earned income tax credit under current tax policy and Democratic plan: \$4,326

Earned income tax credit under H.R. 8: \$3,878

Tax increase under H.R. 8: \$448

A military police sergeant (E5) in the Air Force with eight years' service, with a spouse and three young children at home, would see a tax increase of \$1,118 under H.R. 8.

Another provision enacted in 2009 boosted the value of the earned income tax credit for families with three or more children, reflecting the fact that these families have a higher cost of living. H.R. 8 would let this provision expire, so that families with three or more children get the same-sized tax credit as families with two children.

With basic pay of \$34,723, this sergeant's family would be affected by both the earned income tax credit's worsened marriage penalty under H.R. 8 and the reduced credit for families with three or more children. In total, the family's earned income tax credit would be reduced by \$1,118 under H.R. 8. Under the Senate-passed bill and the House Democratic alternative, it would not be cut. Here are the details:

Air Force sergeant (E5), eight years' service, married with three children:

Basic pay: \$34,723

Earned income tax credit under current tax policy and Democratic plan: \$3,508

Earned income tax credit under H.R. 8: \$2,390

Tax increase under H.R. 8: \$1,118

A private in the U.S. Army (E1) in his first year of service, who is married with an infant child, would see a \$273 tax increase under the Republican plan.

The child tax credit generally provides a \$1,000 credit per child. But the credit is only partially "refundable" for families who do not have federal income tax liability in a given year. H.R. 8 would reduce the ability of some low-income families to claim the credit. That is because the credit's refundability is based on the level of a family's earnings above a certain threshold—and H.R. 8 would raise that threshold.

With basic pay of an estimated \$18,196 in 2013, the Army private's family's income is too low to owe federal income tax because of the standard deduction and personal exemp-

tions. Under H.R. 8, the family would only be able to claim a partial child tax credit, limited to \$727. In contrast, under the Senate-passed bill and the House Democratic alternative, the family could claim the full \$1,000 credit for its child. Here are the details:

U.S. Army private (E1), first year of service, married with one child:

Basic pay: \$18,196

Child tax credit under current tax policy and Democratic plan: \$1,000

Child tax credit under H.R. 8: \$727

Tax increase: \$273

These are just three typical military families who face a tax increase from H.R. 8's failure to extend important tax benefits for working families. Many families with similar incomes, military and nonmilitary, would face similar tax increases because of H.R. 8's failure to extend the child tax credit and earned income tax credit improvements. H.R. 8 also fails to extend the American opportunity tax credit for families and students paying for college.

In all, the House Republican plan raises taxes on about 25 million families, including 18 million families with children (constituting 37 percent of all families with children).[3] By contrast, all 98 percent of families with incomes under \$250,000 (\$200,000 for singles) would see no tax increase under the Democratic bill, and the 2 percent of Americans with higher incomes will keep tax cuts on their income up to those amounts.

Seth Hanlon is Director of Fiscal Reform at the Center for American Progress.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady.

Madam Speaker, let's first of all define what these two bills are.

Number one, the Democratic bill would provide tax relief to 100 percent of Americans: 98 percent would get tax relief on every dollar of income; 2 percent would get tax relief on up to \$250,000 of income. Above that, they would be going back to the Clinton rates.

The Republican bill would provide 100 percent of Americans tax relief, including those top 2 percent. At what cost? A trillion dollars added to the debt, number one. Number two, higher taxes on military folks and low-income folks who would be hammered by the tax increases in the Republican bill.

Why is that? There's two reasons:

One, the underlying philosophy behind the Republican bill is that trickle-down economics works. It is a proposition that says that the tax cuts that go to the 2 percent, the highest-income Americans—who don't need them—will benefit 98 percent of Americans who don't get them. There's absolutely no evidence to back that up. Secondly, there's a total doubling down on supply-side economics, trickle-down economics.

Our bill basically has two propositions:

Number one, if we're going to work ourselves out of the biggest recession that we've had since the Great Depression, we have to increase employment and we have to increase demand. That's why we've got to give purchasing power to the vast majority of

low-income and middle Americans. That's why we sustain the tax breaks that we've had in place since the Bush tax cuts were passed.

Number two, we have to pay down on the debt and have money to invest in things like infrastructure, science, and education. That's a trillion dollars that would be made available by going with the Democratic approach.

We've been here before, trickle-down economics versus middle class commitment.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina, Mrs. RENEE ELLMERS.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for allowing me to speak on this very important issue today.

I rise today in support of H.R. 8, which will ensure that we will not raise taxes on our Nation's job creators and harm our recovery.

Madam Speaker, I would like to speak about one sector of the economy that will be the greatest harmed, and that is our farmers. Our farmers provide for our Nation and deserve our gratitude and protection from unnecessary harm. In my district, thousands of farmers and their families wait in fear that their homes and businesses will be destroyed by the devastating tax increases on the horizon. And yes, I am including the inheritance tax, or the estate tax, or, which I like to refer to as, the "death tax," which I think, all in all, needs to be repealed in full.

Let's just talk today about what will happen if we do not pass H.R. 8.

Our farmers will be forced to lay off workers, and they will be forced to sell off equipment and land because that is where their investment is.

They will not be able to pass along to their families the accomplishments that they and their ancestors put forward because most farms are family-owned businesses. What I am speaking of is the inheritance tax going up. It will increase to—total asset income of \$1 million, increase to 55 percent, currently at \$5 million at 35 percent. You can see that that would be devastating.

As Steve Mitchell of Mitchell Farms in my district noted:

It will be very hard for our son to carry on. We have paid taxes all our lives, and now they want to tax us when we die. With the value of our farm equipment these days, it wouldn't take long for a family farm to run up against this limit.

We are here today because our economy and job creators continue to wait anxiously for real solutions. H.R. 8 will ensure that our family farmers, job creators will be protected.

□ 1320

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my New York colleague and friend.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 8, which

should be more appropriately named the Job Prevention and Recession Protection Act.

We always hear talk about tax reform, but the only solution my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have to offer is an extension of the failed policies that skyrocketed the debt and contributed to the current state of the economy. My Republican colleagues say their plan will create jobs. If that's true, why didn't it work during the Bush administration when we lost millions of jobs? The Republican philosophy always seems to be to help the wealthy and give the back hand to the middle class.

So let's put this in perspective: at the same time the majority demands we give the wealthiest a break, they cut Medicaid and Medicare, early education programs, title X family planning, and food stamps. The list goes on and on. Madam Speaker, I would laugh if this weren't so tragic.

Our government should be about giving everyone a fair chance and making sure that we help the middle class and working people. Unfortunately, the current Republican philosophy seems to make it easier for those who are already ahead and more difficult for everyone else. The Republican proposal would give our military soldiers a tax increase while giving millionaires and billionaires a huge tax break.

That's why I strongly support the Democratic substitute introduced by Congressman LEVIN. Our substitute is in stark contrast to the billion-dollar boondoggle proposed by the majority. Our proposal continues the tax cuts for the middle class and requires the wealthiest to pay their fair share, as well they should. Until we can have a meaningful debate about actual tax reform, the Democratic proposal is the only one worth supporting.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 8 and to support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, this week there was some disturbing news about Members of the House. One of our finest, longest-serving Members, Mr. LATOURETTE of Ohio, a Republican, announced he wasn't going to run for reelection. He said he couldn't run for reelection because of the gridlock and the difficulty getting things done.

He was for income, revenue—not for Grover Norquist's pledge that most of the Republicans have signed. And because he was for revenue, which is what the Democrat plan is, in taxing the wealthiest and most financially blessed in this country, he gave up because he said, you couldn't get things done. That's a shame.

People ask, why is there partisan gridlock? This is a perfect example. The two sides agree that people making \$200,000 a year or married couples

making \$250,000 a year should get continued tax breaks. We should pass that, as the Senate did. We know that can become law and guarantee those tax breaks. The difference that we have is whether people making over \$200,000 single and \$250,000 married get tax breaks. They will get tax breaks on that amount of income but not on the income over that.

I have been blessed in my life, and I have had sufficient monies to do the things I want. But I have never made \$250,000 a year. I consider that a lot of money.

On the Democratic side, we call that middle class tax cuts. The reality is, in my perspective, it's upper-middle class tax cuts and middle class tax cuts. The only people at the top who are having to pay a little more are the very wealthy and predominantly millionaires.

When I grew up, a millionaire was somebody who had a net worth of \$1 million. Today it's somebody who makes \$1 million—rock stars, business tycoons, bankers. They can afford to pay it. They're not spending that money. We need Americans who spend their money to stimulate our economy. We need purchasers.

So that's why I am against the Republican plan and for the Democratic plan. It will activate our economy.

I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman from South Carolina that he has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Kansas, Ms. LYNN JENKINS.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, stopping the tax hike is not just about taxes; it's about jobs. Small businesses have been responsible for about two-thirds of the new jobs created. Raising taxes on the so-called "rich" will hit nearly 1 million of these businesses and in this weak economy will risk destroying 700,000 jobs.

Is it worth it? Raising taxes simply allows Washington to spend more. If we want to have a serious discussion about reining in our out-of-control spending, I welcome that debate. But first we should do no harm to our fragile economy.

Extending current rates gives us time to pass our plan for comprehensive tax reform without risking thousands of jobs and another recession. CBO estimates that action will produce 2 million jobs next year alone.

The choice is clear. Let's stop the tax hikes and create jobs.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, although I have great affection for the gentleman from South Carolina, I am so enthusiastic that

Ranking Member SLAUGHTER is managing this bill.

I rise in great opposition to H.R. 8, but in enthusiastic support for H.R. 15. This is a gift to America's women, working women, mothers.

And let me give you the role: every taxpayer will get tax relief on \$250,000. That, by the evidence of this letter from small businesses, will be 97, 98 percent of small businesses. And they are women—most of them, many of them—women who are in their homes having a one-person small business, women who have hired people in a five-person small business, women who are thinking of getting ready to start their small businesses.

Then, of course, the child tax credit. What a boon for working mothers and others who need that desperate relief. And then, of course, the marriage tax relief. EITC, if you come from the gulf region, we were saved by the earned income tax credit for Hurricane Katrina victims. They were able to get some minimal relief to carry them through. The higher education tax credit. The adoption tax credit. And as I indicated, the child care tax credit. A tax credit, as well, for expensing in small businesses.

What are my colleagues and my friends on the other side talking about? A job-killing, economy-killing, deficit-busting H.R. 8 is not the way to go.

So I am enthusiastically here to tell the women of America that this is a vote for you today. Those women who get up every day, who design a way to make a living when there is no job—these women, along with men, who have come into understanding what small business can do for America.

I'm excited because I consider the 18th Congressional District to be a host of small businesses. Everywhere I go, individuals are talking about their small businesses.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I will submit into the RECORD, Madam Speaker, a letter from small businesses of the Main Street Alliance opposing H.R. 8 and supporting this legislation the Democrats are offering.

This is a celebration for women. This vote today will enhance opportunities for women, small businesses, and families across America.

Madam Speaker. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8 and H.R. 6169, and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together in support of regular order for any proposed tax legislation, whether it comes to the House Floor today, tomorrow, or next year. The Rule before us is structured and I note that it is titled H. Res. 747, but unlike the jetliners that we Americans use every day, this bill and the Rule are not yet ready for take-off.

House Republicans released a proposal, H.R. 6169, that would relax some of Congress's normal procedural rules in order to enact an overhaul of the tax code—so long as the tax overhaul meets the objectives laid out

in the House budget plan authored by House Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN.

Their proposal states:

"The United States tax code is far too complex and bloated. It forces American citizens and small business owners to focus on filling out tax forms instead of tending to their families and businesses. It is clear to lawmakers on both sides of the aisle that real, fundamental reforms to our tax code are long overdue. In fact, our revenue laws have not been substantially reformed in 50 years," Chairman DREIER said.

I couldn't agree more with Chairman DREIER but by putting a stranglehold on the tax reform process before we even begin is tantamount to forcing debate on any tax reform bill while potentially limiting input.

H.R. 6169 lays out several components that the tax overhaul legislation must have in order to be passed through the easier legislative procedure.

All of these components seem identical to those laid out in the Ryan Plan that we witnessed in the Spring—it's like a bad B movie rerun.

The required components of the tax overhaul include:

replacing the personal income tax rates with just two rates, 10 percent and 25 percent (or less)

repeal of the Alternative Minimum Tax, AMT reducing the statutory corporate income tax rate to 25 percent (or less)

adoption of a "territorial" tax system (empting offshore profits of corporations from U.S. taxes)

collecting revenue equal to between 18 and 19 percent of GDP

The "findings" section of the bill states that revenue will "rise to 21.2 percent of GDP under current law," meaning its proposed revenue target of between 18 and 19 percent of GDP is an explicit cut in revenue.

Like the Republican Plan, the bill introduced by my colleagues Ways and Means Chairman CAMP and Rules Committee Chair DREIER, does not say which tax loopholes and tax subsidies should be closed to ensure that the tax system still collects revenue equaling between 18 and 19 percent of GDP even after the plan's steep rate reductions and the repeal of the AMT are in effect.

My sense is that even if those with incomes exceeding \$1 million were forced to give up all the tax expenditures RYAN could possibly want to take away from them—all their itemized deductions, tax credits, the exclusion for employer-provided health insurance and the deduction for health insurance for the self-employed—even then the net result for these taxpayers would be an average income tax cut of \$187,000 in 2014.

That's because the income tax rate reductions RYAN proposed are so deep that they would far outweigh the loss of all these tax loopholes and tax subsidies.

I have consistently supported and voted for middle class tax cuts, as I did two years ago when I voted for the Middle Class Tax Relief Act of 2010, and the extension of unemployment benefits.

I am deeply saddened that the fate of unemployed, low and middle income Americans has been held hostage by the insistence by Republicans that this legislation include a giveaway to the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans that is going to irresponsibly expand the already large deficit.

I have spoken to and heard from many fine, patriotic, hardworking middle income Americans from Houston, from the great state of Texas, and all across the nation. Middle class American families and small businesses are deeply concerned about our troubled economy, the skyrocketing national deficit, high unemployment rates, job creation, and sorely needed extension of the tax relief and unemployment benefits set to expire at the end of this month.

The Republican bill temporarily extends for one year, through 2013, all the reduced tax rates and other tax benefits enacted in 2001 and 2003 that are scheduled to expire on Dec. 31. The measure maintains the maximum estate tax rate of 35 percent while retaining the exemption amount of \$5 million, provides a two-year "patch" to prevent the alternative minimum tax, AMT, from hitting over 27 million taxpayers and allows small businesses to deduct an increased amount of their capital expenditures for another year.

I feel like we have been down this path before and I recall many of my colleagues staking a claim to fiscal responsibility. Well, I ask in all sincerity, which bill is more fiscally responsible: H.R. 8, which blows a hole in the deficit, or H.R. 15, the Democratic alternative which keeps the Bush Tax rates in place for the people who truly need tax relief.

This is the same Republican Congress which has asked for a balanced budget amendment. It has codified the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, which is possibly unconstitutional, and has had no impact on jobs and the unemployment problem. Yet today they want us to vote on a tax increase for the top 2 percent. This illustrates what happens when Congress does not work together in a bipartisan manner, laboring for the American people. We must work together and compromise.

The Senate gave us a layup by producing a bill last week which is virtually identical to the Democratic Substitute. All we have to do is act like Olympians and pass it.

The American people are asking the President and Members of Congress to move swiftly and take decisive action to help restore our economy in a fiscally responsible manner. I am disappointed that Republicans have insisted on holding tax cuts for working and middle class families' hostage in order to benefit the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans.

I would like to thank President Obama for his determined leadership, support and commitment to protecting important tax relief issues for middle-income Americans and the nation's small businesses and farmers during these challenging economic times. I would also like to thank all the Members and their staff who worked diligently to bring this essential legislation to the House floor today in an attempt to do all that we can to protect the American people and move this nation toward fiscally responsible economic recovery.

I support those provisions of H.R. 8 which provide relief for middle-class families and small businesses who will see their taxes go down and get much needed certainty. But I cannot in good conscience support tax relief for millionaires and billionaires at a time when others need help just to make ends meet.

Unlike those provisions of H.R. 8 which benefit America's struggling middle class, I do not support the provisions of this legislation which condition that desperately needed relief upon

the unconscionably high cost of providing an unnecessary, expensive giveaway to the wealthiest Americans by providing a 2-year extension of Bush-era tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans while keeping their estate tax rate at 35 percent on estates valued at more than \$5 Million for individuals and more than \$10 Million for couples.

These giveaways to the wealthiest Americans during these dire economic times needlessly add billions of dollars to our skyrocketing deficit yet create no value for our ailing economy since these tax cuts are not tied to job creation and preservation.

ESTATE TAX AMENDMENT

I offered an amendment that would have set the Estate Tax at reasonable levels. My amendment would have allowed estates valued at \$3.5 million or less to pay 35 percent, estates valued between \$3.5 million and \$10 million to pay a 45 percent rate, and estates over \$10 million to pay a 55 percent rate. This commonsense amendment would have restored a sense of fairness to H.R. 8.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the 2009 estate tax rules already are extremely generous, tilting in favor of the wealthy. The Tax Policy Center estimates that if policymakers reinstated the 2009 rules:

The estates of 99.7 percent of Americans who die would owe no estate tax at all in 2013. Only the estates of the wealthiest 0.29 percent of Americans who die—about 7,450 people nationwide in 2013—would owe any tax.

Moreover, under the 2009 rules, the small number of estates that were taxable would face an average effective tax rate of 19.1 percent, far below the statutory estate-tax rate of 45 percent. In other words, 81 percent of the value of these estates would remain after the tax, on average. An estate tax that exempts the estates of 997 of every 1,000 people who die and leaves in place an average of 81 percent of the very wealthiest estates is hardly a confiscatory or oppressive tax.

Moreover, only 60 small farm and business estates in the entire country would owe any estate tax in 2013, under a reinstatement of the 2009 rules, and these estates would face an average effective tax rate of just 11.6 percent. Failing to tie tax cuts to job creation is irresponsible since it exacerbates our growing deficit without bolstering job creation.

My amendment does not address the step-up in basis. The exemption level and rate are consistent with parts of the estate tax proposal included in the President's FY2010 and FY2011 Budgets and H.R. 16, the intelligent estate tax proposal being put forth by my colleague Mr. LEVIN of the Ways and Means Committee.

CLASSROOM EXPENSE DEDUCTION AMENDMENT

My second amendment would have provided tax relief to school teachers by providing them a deduction for qualified out-of-pocket classroom expenses of \$250 dollars, whether or not they itemize their deductions. You may recall Mr. Speaker that the President included this proposal in his Budget for Fiscal Year 2013.

I understand the tremendous personal costs incurred by educators with little or no classroom budget. According to a 2006 National School Supply and Equipment Association Retail Awareness Study, teachers spend an average of \$493 out of pocket on school supplies for their own classrooms.

Seven percent of teachers surveyed said they plan to spend more than \$1,000 of their personal finances on supplies. As education budgets face major shortfalls in the recession, that amount is expected to increase significantly.

Beginning in 2002 the IRS allowed for an above-the-line deduction for classroom expenses of up to \$250. The educator expense deduction allows teachers to write off some expenses that they incur to provide books, supplies, and other equipment and materials for their classrooms. I introduced this amendment and would like to acknowledge the work of my colleagues who have put forth legislation advocating this deduction. America's teachers from Texas to Maine to Florida to Washington deserve our renewed appreciation for their commitment to educating future generations.

Our children should not have to suffer because our teachers are given a Hobson's Choice, forced to choose between using their own finances to effectively teach a class or forced to cut corners due to budgetary restrictions. We promote an increased quality of education by lessening the financial burden on them when they are trying to go above and beyond their responsibilities is certainly warranted.

While I am opposed to the portions of H.R. 8 that amount to an expensive giveaway to the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans, I want to emphasize that I fully support job-creation and job creators. I also support President Obama's vision for change. I share his commitment to fighting for low- and middle-income Americans who are the backbone of this country and our economy.

However, this legislation, H.R. 8, especially as it pertains to tax cuts for the top 2 percent of Americans and estate tax provisions that are regressive and inflate the deficit, does not comport with this vision. I have serious misgivings about extending tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans at the expense of our deficit, especially if these tax cuts are not targeted towards job creation.

DEFICIT AND TAXATION

You may recall that in the Budget, the Administration calls for individual tax reform that: cuts the deficit by \$1.5 trillion, including the expiration of the high-income 2001 and 2003 tax cuts. As a matter of sound fiscal policy, I am supportive of this effort. I recognize the putative economic benefits that many attribute to the Bush Tax Cuts, but we must ask ourselves are they affordable? There is no amount of dynamic scoring that will help penetrate the deficit.

The President's budget also eliminated inefficient and unfair tax breaks for millionaires while making all tax breaks at least as good for the middle class as for the wealthy; and observes the Buffett Rule that no household making more than \$1 million a year pays less than 30 percent of their income in taxes.

The individual income tax is a hodgepodge of deductions, exemptions, and credits that provide special benefits to selected groups of taxpayers and favored forms of consumption and investment. These tax preferences make the income tax unfair because they can impose radically different burdens on two different taxpayers with the same income. In essence, Congress has been picking winners and losers.

There is absolutely no justification for huge tax cuts. The wealthiest tax brackets should

not profit at the expense of programs keeping struggling families from poverty.

Bear in mind, the Republican's 2012 budget cut \$2 trillion dollars more than President Obama's Debt Commission advised, and those cuts come from vital social services and safety nets for low-income families, children and seniors.

Tax expenditures also reduce the economy's productivity because decisions on earning, spending, and investment are driven by tax considerations rather than the price signals that a well-balanced, and fair free market economy produces. These expenditures, whether for individuals or corporations, are really no different than the much ballyhooed entitlement programs, but they have cute names and fancy lobbyists.

Moreover, tax expenditures make the tax system excessively complex for honest taxpayers who are trying to comply with the law while seeking the benefits to which they are legally entitled.

The system is so complex that most taxpayers—even those with low incomes—now use either a professional tax preparer or tax software. A one-page form shouldn't require a tax preparer who earns a percentage of the return, or a fee.

It is not justifiable, especially when some commentators like to point out that a number of taxpayers pay no tax—well they somehow conveniently forget to mention that these tax scofflaws making \$30,000 dollars a year more than make up for it with a long list of regressive taxes at the state and local level.

The alternative minimum tax, or AMT, was initially designed to ensure that all high-income taxpayers paid some income tax, has become the poster child for the tax system's failure, requiring Congress to enact increasingly expensive temporary patches to prevent the AMT from encroaching on millions of middle class households particularly those with children, in a web of pointless high tax rates, complexity, and unfairness.

On the deficit reduction front it is important to remember the economic crisis that the President inherited. I remember back in 2008 and 2009, when we experienced the worst recession since the Great Depression. The economy actually contracted, it shrunk, at a rate of almost 9 percent in the fourth quarter of 2008.

We lost 800,000 private-sector jobs in January of 2009 alone, and unemployment was surging. Those are the conditions the President inherited—the car was swerving into the ditch. He was not the driver, but he was asked to come in on literally his first day of office, roll-up his sleeves and figure out how to prevent the car from rolling farther down the hill. If you'll recall we also faced a housing market that was in crisis, and we faced a financial market crisis as well that threatened to set off a global financial collapse. We have come a long way since then yet there is more work to be done.

The cloud looming over this Congress is an unintended "triple-witching hour" of tax increases that will take effect at the beginning of 2013.

The expiration of the Bush Tax Cuts, the end of the recently extended Payroll Tax Cut, and increases in capital gains and dividends taxation will shock the conscience and wallets of the American people. That is why Congress needs to enact bi-partisan legislation that

helps lower the deficit but does not wreck havoc on the financial soul of the middle class.

But again, tax reform that lowers the rate, reduces the deficit, and does not pick winners and losers is not easy, but let's not forget, if President Reagan and then-Speaker Tip O'Neill could do it in 1986, anything is possible.

The so-called "99ers have been sincerely looking for work for a very long time and have run out of resources to provide for their families and pay their mortgages, pay their bills and buy food. They simply want and need a job to pay for these obligations. H.R. 8 proposes to give tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans, yet fails to provide for the so-called "99ers."

H.R. 8 unfortunately is not ready for prime-time.

THE MAIN STREET ALLIANCE,
Seattle, WA, August 1, 2012.

To: Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Re Small business support for ending the extra Bush tax cuts for the top 2 percent.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As small business owners, we urge you to end the special Bush-era tax cuts for the top 2 percent of income earners, or household income over \$250,000 a year. This is the right thing to do for small businesses, our local economies, and America.

The debate over the Bush tax cuts has been clouded by claims that ending special breaks for the top 2 percent of income earners would impact many small businesses. As small business owners, we know these claims don't square with the facts.

In reality, only a tiny fraction—roughly 3 percent—of all American taxpayers who report any form of business income on their personal tax returns would be impacted by a change in tax rates for income over \$250,000. Even this small fraction includes hedge fund managers, high-powered corporate lawyers, and K Street lobbyists, so the number of real small businesses affected is even fewer.

Furthermore, the "trickle down" theory used to justify extra tax cuts at the top simply doesn't work. When the Congressional Budget Office examined close to a dozen options to jumpstart economic activity and job creation in early 2010, it found that extending special tax breaks for the richest Americans was the least effective of all 11 options for creating jobs and boosting the economy.

Finally, claims about how ending these special tax cuts will impact job creation ignore the most basic fact about what drives small business hiring. Customers drive small business hiring, not tax cuts. We hire when we see opportunities, when demand exceeds the capacity of our current workforce, not because of a tax cut on our take-home income.

Small businesses need more customers. How do we get there? Build roads and bridges, invest in education, hire teachers and first responders—this will create local jobs, inject money into local economies, and bring more customers into our businesses. But we won't have the resources to do these things if we take the nearly \$1 trillion we would raise from ending the extra tax cuts for income over \$250,000 and hand it right back in another giveaway to the top.

We urge you to stand with real small businesses and end the special Bush tax cuts for the top 2 percent.

Sincerely,

Charles Carter, Boy Genius World Productions, Eureka Springs, AR; William Wallin, Wallin Mental Medical, Richmond, CA; Penny Shaw, Financial Af-

fairs, Cooper City, FL; Ron Dinsdale, Midvale Pinacotheca, Huxley, IA; Laura Schlegel, Mario's Mondo Cafe, Chicago, IL; Iris Marreck, Iris B. Branding & Communications, Northfield, IL; Maude Varela, Kidutopia, New Orleans, LA; Thomas Dougherty, Panero Cinema Products, Grass Valley, CA; Marian Gallagher, Nube de Helado Software, Inc., San Diego, CA; Jena Schill, Hair stylist, Ames, IA; James Berge, Berge Farms, Kensett, IA; Kristin Aufmann, Aufmann Associates, Ltd., Mount Prospect, IL; Kyle Schulz, Kar-Fre Flowers, Sycamore, IL; Brian England, British American Auto Care Inc., Columbia, MD; Timothy Larive, Larive Appraisal Services, Mount Shasta, CA; Laurie Chadwick, Bed and Biscuits, Santa Cruz, CA; Natalie Dinsdale, TaDah Salon, Ames, IA; ReShonda Young, Alpha Express Inc, Waterloo, IA; David Borris, Hel's Kitchen Catering, Northbrook, IL; Mary Noel Black, The UPS Store @ Citiplace, Baton Rouge, LA; Catherine Cretu, Anaconda Press, Inc., Forestville, MD.

Jerry Alexandratos, Alexandratos Rental Properties, Frederick, MD; Timothy Floyd, Floyd Consulting, Augusta, ME; Halcyon Blake, Halcyon Yarn, Inc., Bath, ME; Jerry Provencher, MRPS, Bath, ME; Beverly Evans Messer, Electrolysis by Bev, Belfast, ME; Jim Riley, Black Dog Services, Berwick, ME; Alexander Jackimovicz, Jackimovicz Electric, Boothbay, ME; Gloria Coomer, Solarmarine LLC, Brooksville, ME; Steven Klockow, Healing Relationships, Brunswick, ME; Amy Smith, Social Insight, Arrowsic, ME; Gary Friedmann, Bar Harbor Community Farm, Bar Harbor, ME; George Waldman, MainePhotoJournalism.com, Bath, ME; William Savedoff, Social Insight, Bath, ME; Dr Rebekka Freeman, Partners for Change, Belfast, ME; Patricia Vigue, Music Plus, Biddeford, ME; Joan Lee Hunter, Fifth House Lodge Writers' Retreat, Bridgton, ME; Harold Roberts, Coryell Clayworks, Brunswick, ME; Moreen Halmo, Psychologist, Brunswick, ME; Bill Tibbetts, Brookside Auto Repair, Augusta, ME; Emily Henry, Chickadee Hill Flowers, Bar Harbor, ME; Michael Kelly, Michael Thorne Kelly, Inc., Bath, ME; Susan Lubner, Yoga in Bath, Bath, ME; Carol P. Gater, Wealthy Poor House B&B, Belfast, ME; Frank Svatek, Photographer, Biddeford, ME; Ken Converse, Quality Images, Bridgton, ME; Daniel Atkins, Fine Blade Carpentry, Brunswick, ME; Robert Theberge, RC Theberge GC, Inc., Brunswick, ME.

Laurie Garrec, Westcon Mfg Inc, Brunswick, ME; Anna Dembska, Publishing, Camden, ME; Mark Braun, Mark Braun, MD, Cape Elizabeth, ME; David A. Woolsey, David Woolsey Violinmaker, Ellsworth, ME; Melanie A. Collins, Melanie's Home Childcare, Falmouth, ME; William Berlinghoff, Oxtan House Publishers, LLC, Farmington, ME; Nancy Glista, Glista Jewelry, Franklin, ME; Carson Lynch, The Gorham Grind, Gorham, ME; Steve Workman, Workman Management Consulting, Kittery, ME; Jennifer Porter, Honey Tree Films, Buxton, ME; Constance Jordan, Behavioral Health Resources, Cape Elizabeth, ME; Mary Ellen Serina, Paradise Studio, East Boothbay, ME; Edward Grohoski, Ed's Electric Inc., Ellsworth, ME; Ned Kitchel, Quaker Marine Supply Co,

Falmouth, ME; Emery Goff, The Old Barn Annex Antiques, Farmington, ME; David Hutchinson, Checkout Convenience Stores, Glenburn, ME; Doris Luther, Mediation & Conflict Resolution Services, Hollis, ME; Edward Walworth, MD, Retired Surgeon, Lewiston, ME; Mallory Hattie, Raising Canine Maine Dog Training, Buxton, ME; Scott Cronenweth, Freelance writer, Cape Elizabeth, ME; Sandra Fayle, Faraway Antique Shop, East Millinocket, ME; Kathryn Gannon, Gannon-Janelle Interiors, Falmouth, ME; Sandra Stanton, Artist, Farmington, ME; Beth Labaugh, Kennebec Therapeutics, Fayette, ME; Elizabeth Beane, Clinical Social Worker, Private Practice, Gorham, ME; Gary McGrane, GT McGrane Builders, Jay, ME; Craig Saddlemlire, Round Point Movies, Lewiston, ME.

Mike Relac, Fox Hill Associates, Inc., Limington, ME; Cheryl L. Wilder, Pine Street Redemption Center, Madison, ME; John Sweet, Sweet Timber Frames, Mount Desert, ME; Marla Bottesch, Snowbound Books, Norridgewock, ME; Dotty Caldwell, Dorothy Caldwell, LCPC, Penobscot, ME; Elizabeth Della Valle, Elizabeth A Della Valle, AICP, Portland, ME; Joel Bolton, Internet Island Web Development, Portland, ME; Jennifer Lunden, The Center for Creative Healing, Portland, ME; Abi Morrison, Red Bird Acupuncture, Rockland, ME; Scott Gaiason, Bear Wood, Lisbon Falls, ME; Susan D'Alessandro, Maine Nature & Nostalgia, Millinocket, ME; Jessie Greenbaum, Therapeutic Massage, Mount Desert, ME; Irja Frank, Frank Translations, Orono, ME; Cynthia L. Cochran, Cynthia L Cochran, CPA, Portland, ME; Martha Fenton, Freelance writer, Portland, ME; Cecile Deroche-Cain, Musician, Portland, ME; Mary Zarate, Z Fabrics, Portland, ME; Ginger Woods, Self-employed, Rumford, ME; Elizabeth Como, Winter Journeys, Lovell, ME; John Ackerman, Residence, Mount Desert, ME; Winston Mctague, Jr, Mctague Logging, Newport, ME; Geno Scalzo, Shipwright, Owls Head, ME; Gary Ameika, Dune Marketing, Portland, ME; Dr. Wendy Pollock, Inner Shores, Portland, ME; Barbara McKim, Psychologist—Private Practice, Portland, ME; Joanne Dunlap, Mo's Variety, Rangeley, ME; Susan Littlefield, Echo Farm Pottery, Saco, ME.

Matthew B. Westerlund, Matt Westerlund Financial Services, Sanford, ME; Shahzad Kirmani, VisionMaster, Inc., Scarborough, ME; Frank Ridley, Different Drummer Workshop, Solon, ME; Priscilla Skerry, Healing Routes, South Portland, ME; Ann Breeden, Spring Woods Gallery, Sullivan, ME; John H. Noyes, The Picture Framer, Inc., Topsham, ME; Earl Morse, Waterford Design, Waterford, ME; Bill Nave, Bill Nave Consulting, Winthrop, ME; Mary Campbell, Everyday Wines, Ann Arbor, MI; Edwin Farrar AE Profit Solutions, Scarborough, ME; Joe Thompson, Salt Pond Rowing, Sedgwick, ME; Bonnie Jackson, Bonnie Jackson Remodeling, South Portland, ME; Artis Bernard, Inleaf Press, South Portland, ME; Eileen Mielenhausen, Healing & Expressive Arts Retreats of Maine, Surry, ME; Seth Hall, S & J Llama LLC, Waldoboro, ME; John O'Donnell, Tilton & O'Donnell Law Offices, Waterville,

ME; David Mercer, Mercer & Sons, Yarmouth, ME; Steve Koch, Midnight Security & Communications Inc, Flint, MI; Allegra Kirmani, Heart Art Studios, Inc, Scarborough, ME; Pat Berger, The Pond, Sidney, ME; Georgia Williamson, Georgia Deveres Studio, South Portland, ME; William Clarke, CIMPAC INC, St George, ME; David Hynd, Carpentry, Thomaston, ME; Mitch Kihn, Mid-Maine Forestry, Warren, ME; Tori Stenbak, Stenbak Law Offices, PA, Westbrook, ME; Chris Barbour, Barbour Computing, York, ME; Mary Bridge, Hip Hoopla LLC, Chesterfield, MO.

James Hoffmann, Hoffmann/Morgan Architects, Missoula, MT; Elizabeth Wood, Crossroads Veterinary Clinic, Cortland, NY; Ann Stanley, Radiant Health Acupuncture and Massage, LTD, Bend, OR; Michael O'Shea, Tiffany and O'Shea, Inc, Happy Valley, OR; Karen Mccarthy, Madras Garden Depot, Madras, OR; Vincent Alvarez, Peanuts on the Half Shell, Milwaukie, OR; Thomas Karwaki, CAI, Portland, OR; Michael Schulte, Joe's Garage, Portland, OR; Steve Hanrahan, Mirador Community Store, Portland, OR; Kent Watson, Kent Watson & Associates, Missoula, MT; Freddy Castiblanco, Terraza 7, Elmhurst, NY; Kate Lindburg, Animal Crackers Pet Supply, Corvallis, OR; Peter Bluett, Pete Bluett Sculpture, Lake Oswego, OR; Barbara Byram, Barbara Byram Consulting, Medford, OR; Jim Gilbert, Northwoods Nursery, Molalla, OR; Sherry Dirks, Gray Bear Construction Co., Portland, OR; Samuel Pardue, Lensbaby, Portland, OR; Peter Rossing, Muse Art and Design, Portland, OR; J. Kelly Conklin, Foley-Waite Associates Inc, Bloomfield, NJ; Greg Nickle, Nickle & Associates, Tulsa, OK; Brian McDonald, Gresham Music, Gresham, OR; Karen Alexander-Brown, Wind Song at the Sea Gypsy, Lincoln City, OR; Mark Kellenbeck, BrainJoy LLC, Medford, OR; John Mullin, Amallegory Productions, Oregon City, OR; Bruce Chaser, Hawthorne Wellness Center, Portland, OR; Moses Ross, M. J. Ross Group, Inc., Portland, OR; Deborah and John Field, Paperjam Press, Portland, OR.

Judith Wallace, Serenity Shop, Portland, OR; Brian Setzler, CPA, TriLibrium, Portland, OR; Hank Keeton, Keeton Corporation, Scotts Mills, OR; Aylene Geringer, The Chocolate Box, Silverton, OR; Gary Mazzilli, Outsource Estimating Inc., Hayes, VA; Chuck Robinson, Village Books, Bellingham, WA; Robert Jekel, Parkade Hobbies, Kennewick, WA; Diana Thompson, Harmony SoapWorks, Ocean Park, WA; Dan Emerson, Summit View Pet Clinic, Puyallup, WA; Tamara Maher, Tamara B Maher PC, Portland, OR; Jack Coelho, Vital Body Studio, Portland, OR; Victor Madge, Architecture, Silverton, OR; Terrell McDaniel, Hughes McDaniel and Associates, Hendersonville, TN; Diane Middaugh, Quik Tan, Bellevue, WA; Dante Montoya, Dante Lee Montoya CPA, Kennewick, WA; Allan Willis, Tri-City Music, Kennewick, WA; Carlyne Hart, Olympia Frameworks, Olympia, WA; Laura Waite, Jay's Professional Automotive, Renton, WA; KB Mercer, Traveling Lantern, Portland, OR; Jose Gonzalez, Tu Casa real Estate, Salem, OR; Jason Freilinger, Freilinger Electronics, Inc., Silverton, OR; Martha Eberle, WildWoods of

Texas, Dripping Springs, TX; Ben Knudsen, DIGS, Bellingham, WA; Rick Van Heel, Music Machine, Kennewick, WA; Consuelo Gomez, Marty K Inc., Mercer Island, WA; Randy Eakman, Finish Craft, Pasco, WA; Sarah Stegner, Again and A Gain, Seattle, WA.

Eli Reich, Alchemy Goods, Seattle, WA; Beth Sanders, Athena Video Arts, Seattle, WA; Dan McComb, BizNik, Seattle, WA; Jody Hall, Cupcake Royale, Seattle, WA; Laureen Kelly, Einstein Signs, Seattle, WA; Frank Taylor, Frank's Barber/Salon, Seattle, WA; Kathryn Hooks, J.O.Y Unlimited, Seattle, WA; Tarek Gelate, Lucy Ethiopian Restaurant, Seattle, WA; Beckie Lindley, Merry Tails & Dog Alley, Seattle, WA; Valeriy Arrymanon, Alluan, Inc, Seattle, WA; Ed Whitfield, BBQ Pit, Seattle, WA; Nicole Miller, Blackbird, Seattle, WA; Keith Gormezano, Dr. Quick Books, Inc., Seattle, WA; Peter Aaron, Elliott Bay Book Company, Seattle, WA; Eduardo Revelo, Guaracos Tacos, Seattle, WA; Yong Kim, Jackson Cleaners, Seattle, WA; Malia Keene, Magpie, Seattle, WA; Mary Clark, Merryweather Books, Seattle, WA; Annie Davis, Annie's Nannies Inc, Seattle, WA; Joline El-Hai, Bella Luz Studio, Seattle, WA; Joshua Huisenga, Chalkbox Creative, LLC, Seattle, WA; Berhane Amanuel, East African Imports, Seattle, WA; JK Burwell, Family Heritage, Seattle, WA; Theo Martin, Island Soul, Seattle, WA; Heather Caldwell, Kismet Salon, Seattle, WA; Terry, Many Many Moons, Seattle, WA; Jack Burg, Montlake Mousse, Seattle, WA; Dale Russ, Morning Dew Productions, Seattle, WA; Mohammed Almatn, Professional Copy/Print, Seattle, WA; Wasif Qadri, Shalimar Indian/Pakistani Cuisine, Seattle, WA.

Brian Wells, Tougo Coffee, Seattle, WA; Anil Shrestha, University Food & Deli, Seattle, WA; Mari Cook, Voyeur, Seattle, WA; Steven Hall, MD, Steven M. Hall, MD, Snoqualmie, WA; Eben Cole, Cole Music Co, Spokane, WA; Jason Berg, Infinity Fitness, Spokane, WA; Carl Medeiros, Panache Clothing, Seattle, WA; Eduardo Marlo, Puerto Vallarta Mexican Restaurant, Seattle, WA; Jason Grimes, Spin Cycle, Seattle, WA; Mohammed Toure, Toure Apparel, Seattle, WA; Lois Ko, University Haagen Dais, Seattle, WA; Park, Western Beauty Supply, Seattle, WA; Mark Gerard, Advanced Radon, Spokane, WA; John Friar, Friar Farms, Spokane, WA; Nate Coming, Mark's Guitar Shop, Spokane, WA; Pirkko Karhunen, Pirkko, Seattle, WA; Ben Jenkins, Shadowland, Seattle, WA; Ryan Calkins, Statements, Seattle, WA; Kirk Strong, University Ave Barber, Seattle, WA; Andrew Park, University Teriyaki, Seattle, WA; Deborah Cziske, Cascade Industrial Supply, Shoreline, WA; Michael Bonnes, Brooklyn Deli, Spokane, WA; Rick Ericksen, Halpins, Spokane, WA; Larry Lent, Mr. J's Take & Bake Pizza, Spokane, WA; Janine Vaughn, Revival Lighting, Spokane, WA; Mollie Fenton, Fenton/Stahl Gallery, Walla Walla, WA; James Kytonen, Violin Works, Spokane, WA; Wayne Chabre, Wayne Chabre Sculptor, Walla Walla, WA; Rob Robinson, Building Dynamics LLC, Walla Walla, WA.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to

the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. STEVE KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding and for leading this reform debate for real tax reform.

In the time I came to this Congress, I have made the pledge that I would push for tax reform. I believed at the time that the debate that had been taking place in this Congress over the preceding years would flow into the following years.

I remember the inspiration that came when Billy Tauzin and Dick Armey went around the country and debated tax reform between the flat tax and the Fair Tax. I don't ever remember anyone debating in favor of the Fair Tax having lost that debate. But we had a real tax reform debate.

And in this time—and I have pushed in my time in this Congress—I can think of only one time that we have had a serious debate on tax reform, and that was at a time when we had some debate, and I testified before the Ways and Means Committee in favor of a national sales tax.

This rule that's before us expedites this debate. It expedites the consideration of a bill providing for comprehensive tax reform. And I look at the conditions that are in here. There are five conditions that are written in, and the Fair Tax meets all of those conditions, I think, by design.

I am looking forward to an open debate that will take place at least within the Ways and Means Committee and hopefully come here to the floor. It says to me, as I look at this rule, that the legitimate proposals that would come for real tax reform will be in order before the Ways and Means Committee.

So I encourage those committee members, as this expedited debate takes place, to bring your reforms to the Ways and Means Committee. Bring them in the form of amendment. Let's have a real debate. Let's put the Fair Tax up against everything else.

□ 1330

And I have done that now since about 1980. And even though I have lost a couple of debates with my wife and some with my family, and even one or two with my staff, I've never lost a debate on the fair tax because the American people understand this—right now, the Federal Government has a first lien on all productivity in America. If you punch a time clock on Monday morning, just imagine, Uncle Sam is standing there by that time clock. When it goes thunk, his hand goes out and he gets into his hand what he wants until he gets his share, and then he puts it in his pocket and you get to keep what's left.

Let's change the tax from production to consumption. Let America grow, let America breathe, to quote the Congressman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire of my colleague if he has further speakers?

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I have one.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I thank my freshman colleague from South Carolina.

I rise today in support of this rule. America has waited long enough for the uncertainty over taxes to go away. This rule gives us the opportunity to avoid a huge tax increase and gives us the opportunity to have that debate about a fairer, flatter, simpler tax that the American people want and need and this economy wants and needs.

You know, we shouldn't be having a big argument over these extensions. They passed on a bipartisan basis under Speaker PELOSI. They should pass on a bipartisan basis this time. We do not need the politics of envy and divisiveness. We need tax reform, and this puts us on the path to do it.

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

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

Madam Speaker, we understand the majority intends to have a last-minute change in the rule. The amendment would create a number of obstacles to middle class tax cuts. And under the last-minute change, the middle class taxes could not be cut until the Senate has approved the entire Republican tax reform agenda, and we certainly don't need that kind of obstacle and we don't need that kind of bill. We need quick action on tax cuts, so I hope we can get that today. But let me remind you that you need to vote against this rule, unless you want the Republican bill to pass automatically.

The Senate-passed tax cuts are a simple and fair extension of tax cuts that will directly benefit the middle class. It was quite wonderful to see the Senate of the United States do the sensible thing and say that everyone making \$250,000 and under would receive a tax cut. Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are the only ones standing in the way of the tax cut becoming law.

Their flawed alternative proposal demands that any middle class tax cut be accompanied by an additional tax cut for the richest 2 percent. Such a proposal would be and has been a fiscal disaster. It would explode the Nation's deficit, fail to create jobs, and perpetuate the record of inequality facing our Nation.

The oft-repeated premise that we need to protect job creators—who haven't created new jobs—with lower corporate taxes and lower taxes for the wealthy should be put to bed. It has been thoroughly and convincingly disproven.

Instead of protecting tax loopholes for corporations that ship jobs overseas

and serving the wealthy at the expense of the middle class, we should be making the Tax Code more simple and fair and asking everyone just to pay their fair share. Our proposed middle class tax cut would be a great first step towards doing just that.

In addition, Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to give the House a vote on H. Res. 746, which would prohibit us from going home until the President signs middle class tax cuts into law. Otherwise, we will be going home perhaps tomorrow with that undone.

There is no excuse for Congress to go on summer vacation at the end of this week. No other American leaves work with a job half done, and neither should we. It is our duty to deliver results for the American people, and we should not leave this town until every middle class family has a tax cut in their hands.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support the middle class tax cuts, to vote "no" on the rule and on ordering the previous question.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put the amendment and other extraneous material in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I wonder what my friend from Texas would have said, if she was still here, to the 253,000 women, small business owners, who will be impacted by higher taxes based on the actions of our friends on the left. I wonder, Madam Speaker, what my friends on the left would say to the 710,000 newly unemployed Americans because of their actions on the left? I wonder, Madam Speaker, what my friends on the left would say to the senior citizens who make less than \$100,000, to the senior citizens who make less than \$50,000 who would see a 185 percent increase on their taxes for their dividend income?

Madam Speaker, my friends on the left have asked a very interesting and telling question when they asked: Who deserves a tax increase? Well, we on the right have a very clear answer to that question. We believe everybody deserves a tax decrease.

Madam Speaker, with unemployment for the 41st month over 8 percent, with unemployment in south Atlanta over 9.4 percent, I would suggest, Madam Speaker, now is not the time to engineer fairness. Now is a time for us to keep taxes low.

Madam Speaker, everyone in this room can agree we need to take steps to turn our economy around. But while one side of the room wants to divide our Nation to do so, we understand that punishing some Americans in the name of helping others is not the solution. We must lift everyone up; other-

wise, we will all just end up in the squishy, nebulous middle. And America isn't about being mediocre. America is about being the best, the strongest, and the leader of the free world. Let's stay there as a Nation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I move to amend the resolution with the amendment I have placed at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Add the following new section:

SEC. 10. (a) In the engrossment of H.R. 8 the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 6169, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 8;

(2) conform the title of H.R. 8 to reflect the addition of H.R. 6169, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 6169, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.R. 8, H.R. 6169 shall be laid on the table.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the amendment instructs the Clerk to add the text of H.R. 6169 as new matter at the end of H.R. 8 before transmitting the bill to the Senate.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 747 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 10. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 746) prohibiting the consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment or adjournment sine die unless a law is enacted to provide for the extension of certain expired or expiring tax provisions that apply to middle-income taxpayers if called up by Representative SLAUGHTER of New York or her designee. All points of order against the resolution and against its consideration are waived.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time of any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the amendment, if ordered, and adoption of the resolution, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 540]

YEAS—240

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

NAYS—183

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

Costello	Kaptur	Rahall
Courtney	Keating	Rangel
Critz	Kildee	Reyes
Crowley	Kind	Richardson
Cuellar	Kissell	Richmond
Cummings	Kucinich	Ross (AR)
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Rothman (NJ)
Davis (IL)	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Rush
DeLauro	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Deutch	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Dicks	Lipinski	T.
Doggett	Loeb sack	Sanchez, Loretta
Donnelly (IN)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sarbanes
Doyle	Lowey	Schakowsky
Edwards	Lujan	Schiff
Ellison	Lynch	Schradler
Engel	Maloney	Schwartz
Eshoo	Markey	Scott (VA)
Farr	Matsui	Scott, David
Fattah	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Filner	McCollum	Sewell
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Sherman
Fudge	McGovern	Sires
Garamendi	McNerney	Slaughter
Gonzalez	Meeks	Smith (WA)
Green, Al	Michaud	Speier
Green, Gene	Miller (NC)	Stark
Grijalva	Miller, George	Sutton
Gutierrez	Moore	Thompson (CA)
Hahn	Moran	Thompson (MS)
Hanabusa	Murphy (CT)	Tierney
Hastings (FL)	Nadler	Tonko
Heinrich	Napolitano	Towns
Higgins	Neal	Tsongas
Himes	Olver	Van Hollen
Hinchev	Owens	Velázquez
Hinojosa	Pallone	Visclosky
Hirono	Pascrell	Walz (MN)
Hochul	Pastor (AZ)	Wasserman
Holden	Pelosi	Schultz
Holt	Perlmutter	Waters
Honda	Peters	Watt
Israel	Peterson	Waxman
Jackson Lee	Pingree (ME)	Welch
(TX)	Polis	Wilson (FL)
Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Johnson, E. B.	Quigley	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Akin	Dingell	Sullivan
Cardoza	Hoyer	
Cravaack	Jackson (IL)	

□ 1404

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 186, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

AYES—238

Adams	Bishop (UT)	Canseco
Aderholt	Black	Cantor
Alexander	Blackburn	Capito
Amash	Bonner	Carter
Amodel	Bono Mack	Cassidy
Austria	Boustany	Chabot
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Chaffetz
Bachus	Brooks	Coble
Barletta	Broun (GA)	Coffman (CO)
Bartlett	Buchanan	Cole
Clay	Bucshon	Conaway
Cleaver	Buerkle	Cravaack
Clyburn	Burgess	Crawford
Cohen	Burton (IN)	Crenshaw
Connolly (VA)	Calvert	Culberson
Conyers	Camp	Denham
Cooper	Campbell	Dehaene
Costa		

DesJarlais King (IA)
 Diaz-Balart King (NY)
 Dold Kingston
 Dreier Kinzinger (IL)
 Duffy Kline
 Duncan (SC) Labrador
 Duncan (TN) Lamborn
 Ellmers Lance
 Emerson Landry
 Farenthold Lankford
 Fincher Latham
 Fitzpatrick LaTourette
 Flake Latta
 Fleischmann Lewis (CA)
 Fleming LoBiondo
 Flores Long
 Forbes Lucas
 Fortenberry Luetkemeyer
 Foxx Lummis
 Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel
 Frelinghuysen E.
 Gallegly Mack
 Gardner Manzullo
 Garrett Marchant
 Gerlach Marino
 Gibbs McCarthy (CA)
 Gibson McCaul
 Gingrey (GA) McClintock
 Gohmert McHenry
 Goodlatte McIntyre
 Gosar McKeon
 Gowdy McKinley
 Granger McMorris
 Graves (GA) Rodgers
 Graves (MO) Meehan
 Griffin (AR) Mica
 Griffith (VA) Miller (FL)
 Grimm Miller (MI)
 Guinta Miller, Gary
 Guthrie Mulvaney
 Hall Murphy (PA)
 Hanna Myrick
 Harper Neugebauer
 Harris Noem
 Hartzler Nugent
 Hastings (WA) Nunes
 Hayworth Nunnelee
 Heck Olson
 Hensarling Palazzo
 Hergert Paul
 Herrera Beutler Paulsen
 Huelskamp Pearce
 Huizenga (MI) Pence
 Hultgren Petri
 Hunter Pitts
 Hurt Platts
 Issa Poe (TX)
 Jenkins Pompeo
 Johnson (IL) Posey
 Johnson (OH) Price (GA)
 Johnson, Sam Quayle
 Jones Reed
 Kelly Rehberg

NOES—186

Ackerman Clyburn
 Altmire Cohen
 Andrews Connolly (VA)
 Baca Conyers
 Baldwin Cooper
 Barber Costa
 Barrow Costello
 Bass (CA) Courtney
 Becerra Critz
 Berkley Crowley
 Berman Cuellar
 Bishop (GA) Cummings
 Bishop (NY) Davis (CA)
 Blumenauer Davis (IL)
 Bonamici DeFazio
 Boren DeGette
 Boswell DeLauro
 Brady (PA) Deutch
 Braley (IA) Dicks
 Brown (FL) Doggett
 Butterfield Donnelly (IN)
 Capps Doyle
 Capuano Edwards
 Carnahan Ellison
 Carney Engel
 Carson (IN) Farr
 Castor (FL) Fattah
 Chandler Filner
 Chu Frank (MA)
 Cicilline Fudge
 Clarke (MI) Garamendi
 Clarke (NY) Gonzalez
 Clay Green, Al
 Cleaver Green, Gene

Loeb sack Pelosi
 Lofgren, Zoe Perlmutter
 Lowey Peters
 Lujan Peterson
 Lyneh Pingree (ME)
 Maloney Polis
 Markey Price (NC)
 Matheson Quigley
 Matsui Rahall
 McCarthy (NY) Rangel
 McCollum Reyes
 McDermott Richardson
 McGovern Richmond
 McNeerney Ross (AR)
 Meeks Rothman (NJ)
 Michaud Roybal-Allard
 Miller (NC) Ruppersberger
 Miller, George Rush
 Moore Ryan (OH)
 Moran Sanchez, Linda
 Murphy (CT) T.
 Nadler Schultz
 Napolitano Sarbanes
 Neal Schakowsky
 Oliver Schiff
 Owens Schrader
 Pallone Schwartz
 Pascrell Scott (VA)
 Pastor (AZ) Scott, David

NOT VOTING—6

Akin Dingell
 Cardoza Eshoo
 Jackson (IL)
 Jordan

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

□ 1411

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

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 184, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

AYES—240

Adams Buerkle
 Aderholt Burgess
 Alexander Burton (IN)
 Amash Calvert
 Amodei Camp
 Austria Campbell
 Bachmann Canseco
 Bachus Cantor
 Barletta Capito
 Bartlett Carter
 Barton (TX) Cassidy
 Bass (NH) Chabot
 Benishek Chaffetz
 Berg Coble
 Biggert Coffman (CO)
 Bilbray Cole
 Bilirakis Conaway
 Bishop (UT) Cravaack
 Black Crawford
 Blackburn Crenshaw
 Bonner Culberson
 Bono Mack Denth
 Boren Dent
 Boustany DesJarlais
 Brady (TX) Diaz-Balart
 Brooks Dold
 Broun (GA) Dreier
 Buchanan Duffy
 Bucshon Duncan (SC)

Griffin (AR) Marchant
 Griffith (VA) Marino
 Grimm Matheson
 Guinta McCarthy (CA)
 Guthrie Royce
 Hall McClintock
 Hanna McHenry
 Harper McIntyre
 Harris McKeon
 Hartzler McMorris
 Hastings (WA) Rodgers
 Hayworth Meehan
 Heck Mica
 Hensarling Miller (FL)
 Hergert Miller (MI)
 Herrera Beutler Miller, Gary
 Huelskamp Mulvaney
 Huizenga (MI) Murphy (PA)
 Hultgren Myrick
 Hunter Neugebauer
 Hurt Noem
 Issa Nugent
 Jenkins Nunes
 Johnson (IL) Nunnelee
 Johnson (OH) Olson
 Johnson, Sam Palazzo
 Jones Paul
 Jordan Paulsen
 Kelly Pearce
 King (IA) Pence
 King (NY) Petri
 Kingston Pitts
 Kinzinger (IL) Platts
 Kline Poe (TX)
 Labrador Pompeo
 Lamborn Posey
 Lance Price (GA)
 Landry Quayle
 Lankford Reed
 Latham Rehberg
 LaTourette Reichert
 Latta Renacci
 Lewis (CA) Ribble
 LoBiondo Rigell
 Long Rivera
 Lucas Roby
 Luetkemeyer Roe (TN)
 Lummis Rogers (AL)
 Lungren, Daniel Rogers (KY)
 E. Rogers (MI)
 Mack Rohrabacher
 Manzullo Rokita

NOES—184

Ackerman Davis (CA)
 Altmire Davis (IL)
 Andrews DeFazio
 Baca DeGette
 Baldwin DeLauro
 Barber Deutch
 Barrow Dicks
 Bass (CA) Doggett
 Becerra Donnelly (IN)
 Berkley Doyle
 Berman Edwards
 Bishop (GA) Ellison
 Bishop (NY) Engel
 Blumenauer Eshoo
 Bonamici Farr
 Boswell Fattah
 Brady (PA) Filner
 Braley (IA) Frank (MA)
 Brown (FL) Fudge
 Butterfield Garamendi
 Capps Gonzalez
 Capuano Green, Al
 Carnahan Green, Gene
 Carney Grijalva
 Carson (IN) Hahn
 Castor (FL) Hanabusa
 Chandler Hastings (FL)
 Chu Heinrich
 Cicilline Higgins
 Clarke (MI) Himes
 Clarke (NY) Hinchey
 Clay Hinojosa
 Cleaver Hirono
 Clyburn Hochul
 Cohen Holden
 Connolly (VA) Holt
 Conyers Honda
 Cooper Hoyer
 Costa Israel
 Costello Jackson Lee
 Courtney (TX)
 Critz Johnson (GA)
 Crowley Johnson, E. B.
 Cuellar Kaptur
 Cummings Keating

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

Price (NC)	Schiff	Tonko
Quigley	Schrader	Towns
Rahall	Schwartz	Tsongas
Rangel	Scott (VA)	Van Hollen
Reyes	Scott, David	Velázquez
Richardson	Serrano	Visclosky
Richmond	Sewell	Walz (MN)
Ross (AR)	Sherman	Wasserman
Rothman (NJ)	Shuler	Waters
Roybal-Allard	Sires	Watt
Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Watt
Rush	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Ryan (OH)	Speier	Welch
Sánchez, Linda	Stark	Wilson (FL)
T.	Sutton	Woolsey
Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth
Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)	
Schakowsky	Tierney	

NOT VOTING—6

Akin	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Cardoza	Gutierrez	McKinley

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1420

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1627.

CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1627

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 55) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1627, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 55

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 1627) an Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish hospital care and medical services to veterans who were stationed at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, while the water was contaminated at Camp Lejeune, to improve the provision of housing assistance to veterans and their families, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction: in section 201, strike "Andrew Connelly" and insert "Andrew Connolly".

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO DAW AUNG SAN SUU KYI

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 135) authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, in recognition of her leadership and perseverance in the struggle for freedom and democracy in Burma, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

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. 135

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).

SECTION 1. USE OF ROTUNDA FOR PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO DAW AUNG SAN SUU KYI.

The rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on September 19, 2012, for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, in recognition of her leadership and perseverance in the struggle for freedom and democracy in Burma. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

IRAN THREAT REDUCTION AND SYRIA HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2012

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to

the resolution (H. Res. 750) providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1905, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 750

Resolved. That upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 1905) entitled "An Act to strengthen Iran sanctions laws for the purpose of compelling Iran to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons and other threatening activities, and for other purposes.", with the Senate amendment thereto, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendment thereto be, and the same is hereby, agreed to with the following amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—EXPANSION OF MULTILATERAL SANCTIONS REGIME WITH RESPECT TO IRAN

Sec. 101. Sense of Congress on enforcement of multilateral sanctions regime and expansion and implementation of sanctions laws.

Sec. 102. Diplomatic efforts to expand multilateral sanctions regime.

TITLE II—EXPANSION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO THE ENERGY SECTOR OF IRAN AND PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION BY IRAN

Subtitle A—Expansion of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996

Sec. 201. Expansion of sanctions with respect to the energy sector of Iran.

Sec. 202. Imposition of sanctions with respect to transportation of crude oil from Iran and evasion of sanctions by shipping companies.

Sec. 203. Expansion of sanctions with respect to development by Iran of weapons of mass destruction.

Sec. 204. Expansion of sanctions available under the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996.

Sec. 205. Modification of waiver standard under the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996.

Sec. 206. Briefings on implementation of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996.

Sec. 207. Expansion of definitions under the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996.

Sec. 208. Sense of Congress on energy sector of Iran.

Subtitle B—Additional Measures Relating to Sanctions Against Iran

Sec. 211. Imposition of sanctions with respect to the provision of vessels or shipping services to transport certain goods related to proliferation or terrorism activities to Iran.

Sec. 212. Imposition of sanctions with respect to provision of underwriting services or insurance or reinsurance for the National Iranian Oil Company or the National Iranian Tanker Company.

Sec. 213. Imposition of sanctions with respect to purchase, subscription to, or facilitation of the issuance of Iranian sovereign debt.

- Sec. 214. Imposition of sanctions with respect to subsidiaries and agents of persons sanctioned by United Nations Security Council resolutions.
- Sec. 215. Imposition of sanctions with respect to transactions with persons sanctioned for certain activities relating to terrorism or proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.
- Sec. 216. Expansion of, and reports on, mandatory sanctions with respect to financial institutions that engage in certain activities relating to Iran.
- Sec. 217. Continuation in effect of sanctions with respect to the Government of Iran, the Central Bank of Iran, and sanctions evaders.
- Sec. 218. Liability of parent companies for violations of sanctions by foreign subsidiaries.
- Sec. 219. Disclosures to the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to sanctionable activities.
- Sec. 220. Reports on, and authorization of imposition of sanctions with respect to, the provision of specialized financial messaging services to the Central Bank of Iran and other sanctioned Iranian financial institutions.
- Sec. 221. Identification of, and immigration restrictions on, senior officials of the Government of Iran and their family members.
- Sec. 222. Sense of Congress and rule of construction relating to certain authorities of State and local governments.
- Sec. 223. Government Accountability Office report on foreign entities that invest in the energy sector of Iran or export refined petroleum products to Iran.
- Sec. 224. Reporting on the importation and exportation from Iran of crude oil and refined petroleum products.

TITLE III—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO IRAN'S REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS

- Subtitle A—Identification of, and Sanctions With Respect to, Officials, Agents, Affiliates, and Supporters of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps and Other Sanctioned Persons
- Sec. 301. Identification of, and imposition of sanctions with respect to, officials, agents, and affiliates of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps.
- Sec. 302. Identification of, and imposition of sanctions with respect to, persons that support or conduct certain transactions with Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps or other sanctioned persons.
- Sec. 303. Identification of, and imposition of measures with respect to, foreign government agencies carrying out activities or transactions with certain Iran-affiliated persons.
- Sec. 304. Rule of construction.
- Subtitle B—Additional Measures Relating to Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps
- Sec. 311. Expansion of procurement prohibition to foreign persons that engage in certain transactions with Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps.
- Sec. 312. Determinations of whether the National Iranian Oil Company and the National Iranian Tanker Company are agents or affiliates of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps.

TITLE IV—MEASURES RELATING TO HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN IRAN

Subtitle A—Expansion of Sanctions Relating to Human Rights Abuses in Iran

- Sec. 401. Imposition of sanctions on certain persons responsible for or complicit in human rights abuses committed against citizens of Iran or their family members after the June 12, 2009, elections in Iran.
- Sec. 402. Imposition of sanctions with respect to the transfer of goods or technologies to Iran that are likely to be used to commit human rights abuses.
- Sec. 403. Imposition of sanctions with respect to persons who engage in censorship or other related activities against citizens of Iran.

Subtitle B—Additional Measures to Promote Human Rights

- Sec. 411. Codification of sanctions with respect to grave human rights abuses by the governments of Iran and Syria using information technology.
- Sec. 412. Clarification of sensitive technologies for purposes of procurement ban under Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010.
- Sec. 413. Expedited consideration of requests for authorization of certain human rights-, humanitarian-, and democracy-related activities with respect to Iran.
- Sec. 414. Comprehensive strategy to promote Internet freedom and access to information in Iran.
- Sec. 415. Statement of policy on political prisoners.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

- Sec. 501. Exclusion of citizens of Iran seeking education relating to the nuclear and energy sectors of Iran.
- Sec. 502. Interests in certain financial assets of Iran.
- Sec. 503. Technical correction to section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.
- Sec. 504. Expansion of sanctions under section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.
- Sec. 505. Reports on natural gas exports from Iran.
- Sec. 506. Report on membership of Iran in international organizations.
- Sec. 507. Sense of Congress on exportation of goods, services, and technologies for aircraft produced in the United States.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 601. Implementation; penalties.
- Sec. 602. Applicability to certain intelligence activities.
- Sec. 603. Applicability to certain natural gas projects.
- Sec. 604. Rule of construction with respect to use of force against Iran and Syria.
- Sec. 605. Termination.

TITLE VII—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN SYRIA

- Sec. 701. Short title.
- Sec. 702. Imposition of sanctions with respect to certain persons who are responsible for or complicit in human rights abuses committed against citizens of Syria or their family members.
- Sec. 703. Imposition of sanctions with respect to the transfer of goods or technologies to Syria that are likely to be used to commit human rights abuses.

- Sec. 704. Imposition of sanctions with respect to persons who engage in censorship or other forms of repression in Syria.

- Sec. 705. Waiver.
- Sec. 706. Termination.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Except as otherwise specifically provided, in this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(2) **FINANCIAL TRANSACTION.**—The term “financial transaction” means any transfer of value involving a financial institution, including the transfer of forwards, futures, options, swaps, or precious metals, including gold, silver, platinum, and palladium.

(3) **KNOWINGLY.**—The term “knowingly” has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(4) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8511).

TITLE I—EXPANSION OF MULTILATERAL SANCTIONS REGIME WITH RESPECT TO IRAN

SEC. 101. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ENFORCEMENT OF MULTILATERAL SANCTIONS REGIME AND EXPANSION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF SANCTIONS LAWS.

It is the sense of Congress that the goal of compelling Iran to abandon efforts to acquire a nuclear weapons capability and other threatening activities can be effectively achieved through a comprehensive policy that includes economic sanctions, diplomacy, and military planning, capabilities and options, and that this objective is consistent with the one stated by President Barack Obama in the 2012 State of the Union Address: “Let there be no doubt: America is determined to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, and I will take no options off the table to achieve that goal”. Among the economic measures to be taken are—

(1) prompt enforcement of the current multilateral sanctions regime with respect to Iran;

(2) full, timely, and vigorous implementation of all sanctions enacted into law, including sanctions imposed or expanded by this Act or amendments made by this Act, through—

(A) intensified monitoring by the President and the designees of the President, including the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and senior officials in the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)), as appropriate;

(B) more extensive use of extraordinary authorities provided for under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and other sanctions laws;

(C) reallocation of resources to provide the personnel necessary, within the Department of the Treasury, the Department of State, and the Department of Commerce, and, where appropriate, the intelligence community, to apply and enforce sanctions; and

(D) expanded cooperation with international sanctions enforcement efforts;

(3) urgent consideration of the expansion of existing sanctions with respect to such areas as—

(A) the provision of energy-related services to Iran;

(B) the provision of insurance and reinsurance services to Iran;

(C) the provision of shipping services to Iran; and

(D) those Iranian financial institutions not yet designated for the imposition of sanctions

that may be acting as intermediaries for Iranian financial institutions that are designated for the imposition of sanctions; and

(4) a focus on countering Iran's efforts to evade sanctions, including—

(A) the activities of telecommunications, Internet, and satellite service providers, in and outside of Iran, to ensure that such providers are not participating in or facilitating, directly or indirectly, the evasion of the sanctions regime with respect to Iran or violations of the human rights of the people of Iran;

(B) the activities of financial institutions or other businesses or government agencies, in or outside of Iran, not yet designated for the imposition of sanctions; and

(C) urgent and ongoing evaluation of Iran's energy, national security, financial, and telecommunications sectors, to gauge the effects of, and possible defects in, particular sanctions, with prompt efforts to correct any gaps in the existing sanctions regime with respect to Iran.

SEC. 102. DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS TO EXPAND MULTILATERAL SANCTIONS REGIME.

(a) **MULTILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS.**—Congress urges the President to intensify diplomatic efforts, both in appropriate international fora such as the United Nations and bilaterally with allies of the United States, for the purpose of—

(1) expanding the United Nations Security Council sanctions regime to include—

(A) a prohibition on the issuance of visas to any official of the Government of Iran who is involved in—

(i) human rights violations in or outside of Iran;

(ii) the development of a nuclear weapons program and a ballistic missile capability in Iran; or

(iii) support by the Government of Iran for terrorist organizations, including Hamas and Hezbollah; and

(B) a requirement that each member country of the United Nations—

(i) prohibit the Islamic Republic of Iran Shipping Lines from landing at seaports, and cargo flights of Iran Air from landing at airports, in that country because of the role of those organizations in proliferation and illegal arms sales; and

(ii) apply the prohibitions described in clause (i) to other Iranian entities designated for the imposition of sanctions on or after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) expanding the range of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran by allies of the United States;

(3) expanding efforts to limit the development of petroleum resources and the importation of refined petroleum products by Iran;

(4) developing additional initiatives to—

(A) increase the production of crude oil in countries other than Iran; and

(B) assist countries that purchase or otherwise obtain crude oil or petroleum products from Iran to eliminate their dependence on crude oil and petroleum products from Iran; and

(5) eliminating the revenue generated by the Government of Iran from the sale of petrochemical products produced in Iran to other countries.

(b) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the extent to which diplomatic efforts described in subsection (a) have been successful that includes—

(1) an identification of the countries that have agreed to impose sanctions or take other measures to further the policy set forth in subsection (a);

(2) the extent of the implementation and enforcement of those sanctions or other measures by those countries;

(3) the criteria the President uses to determine whether a country has significantly reduced its crude oil purchases from Iran pursuant to sec-

tion 1245(d)(4)(D) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as amended by section 504, including considerations of reductions both in terms of volume and price;

(4) an identification of the countries that have not agreed to impose such sanctions or measures, including such countries granted exceptions for significant reductions in crude oil purchases pursuant to such section 1245(d)(4)(D);

(5) recommendations for additional measures that the United States could take to further diplomatic efforts described in subsection (a); and

(6) the disposition of any decision with respect to sanctions imposed with respect to Iran by the World Trade Organization or its predecessor organization.

TITLE II—EXPANSION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO THE ENERGY SECTOR OF IRAN AND PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION BY IRAN

Subtitle A—Expansion of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996

SEC. 201. EXPANSION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE ENERGY SECTOR OF IRAN.

Section 5(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “WITH RESPECT TO” and all that follows through “TO IRAN” and inserting “RELATING TO THE ENERGY SECTOR OF IRAN”;

(2) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) by striking “3 or more” and inserting “5 or more”; and

(B) by striking “the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010” and inserting “the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012”;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “3 or more” and inserting “5 or more”; and

(ii) by striking “the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010” and inserting “the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or directly associated infrastructure, including construction of port facilities, railways, and roads, the primary use of which is to support the delivery of refined petroleum products”;

(4) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “3 or more” and inserting “5 or more”; and

(ii) by striking “the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010” and inserting “the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) bartering or contracting by which goods are exchanged for goods, including the insurance or reinsurance of such exchanges; or

“(v) purchasing, subscribing to, or facilitating the issuance of sovereign debt of the Government of Iran, including governmental bonds, issued on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **JOINT VENTURES WITH IRAN RELATING TO DEVELOPING PETROLEUM RESOURCES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) or subsection (f), the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 6(a) with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly participates, on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, in a joint venture

with respect to the development of petroleum resources outside of Iran if—

“(i) the joint venture is established on or after January 1, 2002; and

“(ii)(I) the Government of Iran is a substantial partner or investor in the joint venture; or

“(II) Iran could, through a direct operational role in the joint venture or by other means, receive technological knowledge or equipment not previously available to Iran that could directly and significantly contribute to the enhancement of Iran's ability to develop petroleum resources in Iran.

“(B) **APPLICABILITY.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to participation in a joint venture established on or after January 1, 2002, and before the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, if the person participating in the joint venture terminates that participation not later than the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment.

“(5) **SUPPORT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PETROLEUM RESOURCES AND REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS IN IRAN.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (f), the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 6(a) with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, sells, leases, or provides to Iran goods, services, technology, or support described in subparagraph (B)—

“(i) any of which has a fair market value of \$1,000,000 or more; or

“(ii) that, during a 12-month period, have an aggregate fair market value of \$5,000,000 or more.

“(B) **GOODS, SERVICES, TECHNOLOGY, OR SUPPORT DESCRIBED.**—Goods, services, technology, or support described in this subparagraph are goods, services, technology, or support that could directly and significantly contribute to the maintenance or enhancement of Iran's—

“(i) ability to develop petroleum resources located in Iran; or

“(ii) domestic production of refined petroleum products, including any direct and significant assistance with respect to the construction, modernization, or repair of petroleum refineries or directly associated infrastructure, including construction of port facilities, railways, and roads, the primary use of which is to support the delivery of refined petroleum products.

“(6) **DEVELOPMENT AND PURCHASE OF PETROCHEMICAL PRODUCTS FROM IRAN.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (f), the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 6(a) with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, sells, leases, or provides to Iran goods, services, technology, or support described in subparagraph (B)—

“(i) any of which has a fair market value of \$250,000 or more; or

“(ii) that, during a 12-month period, have an aggregate fair market value of \$1,000,000 or more.

“(B) **GOODS, SERVICES, TECHNOLOGY, OR SUPPORT DESCRIBED.**—Goods, services, technology, or support described in this subparagraph are goods, services, technology, or support that could directly and significantly contribute to the maintenance or expansion of Iran's domestic production of petrochemical products.”.

SEC. 202. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO TRANSPORTATION OF CRUDE OIL FROM IRAN AND EVASION OF SANCTIONS BY SHIPPING COMPANIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by section 201, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) TRANSPORTATION OF CRUDE OIL FROM IRAN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (f), the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 6(a) with respect to a person if the President determines that—

“(i) the person is a controlling beneficial owner of, or otherwise owns, operates, or controls, or insures, a vessel that, on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, was used to transport crude oil from Iran to another country; and

“(ii)(I) in the case of a person that is a controlling beneficial owner of the vessel, the person had actual knowledge the vessel was so used; or

“(II) in the case of a person that otherwise owns, operates, or controls, or insures, the vessel, the person knew or should have known the vessel was so used.

“(B) APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to the transportation of crude oil from Iran only if a determination of the President under section 1245(d)(4)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)(4)(B)) that there is a sufficient supply of petroleum and petroleum products produced in countries other than Iran to permit purchasers of petroleum and petroleum products from Iran to reduce significantly their purchases from Iran is in effect at the time of the transportation of the crude oil.

“(ii) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to the transportation of crude oil from Iran to a country to which the exception under paragraph (4)(D) of section 1245(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)) to the imposition of sanctions under paragraph (1) of that section applies at the time of the transportation of the crude oil.

“(8) CONCEALING IRANIAN ORIGIN OF CRUDE OIL AND REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (f), the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 6(a) with respect to a person if the President determines that the person is a controlling beneficial owner, or otherwise owns, operates, or controls, a vessel that, on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, is used, with actual knowledge in the case of a person that is a controlling beneficial owner or knowingly in the case of a person that otherwise owns, operates, or controls the vessel, in a manner that conceals the Iranian origin of crude oil or refined petroleum products transported on the vessel, including by—

“(i) permitting the operator of the vessel to suspend the operation of the vessel’s satellite tracking device; or

“(ii) obscuring or concealing the ownership, operation, or control of the vessel by—

“(I) the Government of Iran;

“(II) the National Iranian Tanker Company or the Islamic Republic of Iran Shipping Lines; or

“(III) any other entity determined by the President to be owned or controlled by the Government of Iran or an entity specified in subsection (II).

“(B) ADDITIONAL SANCTION.—Subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe and in addition to the sanctions imposed under subparagraph (A), the President may prohibit a vessel owned, operated, or controlled by a person, including a controlling beneficial owner, with respect to which the President has imposed sanctions under that subparagraph and that was used for the activity for which the President imposed those sanctions from landing at a port in the United States for a period of not

more than 2 years after the date on which the President imposed those sanctions.

“(C) VESSELS IDENTIFIED BY THE OFFICE OF FOREIGN ASSETS CONTROL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), a person shall be deemed to have actual knowledge that a vessel is owned, operated, or controlled by the Government of Iran or an entity specified in subclause (II) or (III) of subparagraph (A)(ii) if the International Maritime Organization vessel registration identification for the vessel is—

“(i) included on a list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury for activities with respect to Iran; and

“(ii) identified by the Office of Foreign Assets Control as a vessel in which the Government of Iran or any entity specified in subclause (II) or (III) of subparagraph (A)(ii) has an interest.

“(D) DEFINITION OF IRANIAN ORIGIN.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘Iranian origin’ means—

“(i) with respect to crude oil, that the crude oil was extracted in Iran; and

“(ii) with respect to a refined petroleum product, that the refined petroleum product was produced or refined in Iran.

“(9) EXCEPTION FOR PROVISION OF UNDERWRITING SERVICES AND INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE.—The President may not impose sanctions under paragraph (7) or (8) with respect to a person that provides underwriting services or insurance or reinsurance if the President determines that the person has exercised due diligence in establishing and enforcing official policies, procedures, and controls to ensure that the person does not provide underwriting services or insurance or reinsurance for the transportation of crude oil or refined petroleum products from Iran in a manner for which sanctions may be imposed under either such paragraph.”

(b) REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prescribe such regulations or guidelines as are necessary to implement paragraphs (7), (8), and (9) of section 5(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as added by this section, including such regulations or guidelines as are necessary to implement subparagraph (B) of such paragraph (8).

SEC. 203. EXPANSION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO DEVELOPMENT BY IRAN OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) EXPORTS, TRANSFERS, AND TRANSHIPMENTS.—Except as provided in subsection (f), the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 6(a) with respect to a person if the President determines that the person—

“(A) on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, exported or transferred, or permitted or otherwise facilitated the transshipment of, any goods, services, technology, or other items to any other person; and

“(B) knew or should have known that—

“(i) the export, transfer, or transshipment of the goods, services, technology, or other items would likely result in another person exporting, transferring, transshipping, or otherwise providing the goods, services, technology, or other items to Iran; and

“(ii) the export, transfer, transshipment, or other provision of the goods, services, technology, or other items to Iran would contribute materially to the ability of Iran to—

“(I) acquire or develop chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons or related technologies; or

“(II) acquire or develop destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons.

“(2) JOINT VENTURES RELATING TO THE MINING, PRODUCTION, OR TRANSPORTATION OF URANIUM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) or subsection (f), the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 6(a) with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly participated, on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, in a joint venture that involves any activity relating to the mining, production, or transportation of uranium—

“(i)(I) established on or after February 2, 2012; and

“(II) with—

“(aa) the Government of Iran;

“(bb) an entity incorporated in Iran or subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran; or

“(cc) a person acting on behalf of or at the direction of, or owned or controlled by, the Government of Iran or an entity described in item (bb); or

“(ii)(I) established before February 2, 2012;

“(II) with the Government of Iran, an entity described in item (bb) of clause (i)(II), or a person described in item (cc) of that clause; and

“(III) through which—

“(aa) uranium is transferred directly to Iran or indirectly to Iran through a third country;

“(bb) the Government of Iran receives significant revenue; or

“(cc) Iran could, through a direct operational role or by other means, receive technological knowledge or equipment not previously available to Iran that could contribute materially to the ability of Iran to develop nuclear weapons or related technologies.

“(B) APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to participation in a joint venture established before the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 if the person participating in the joint venture terminates that participation not later than the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this section and sections 201 and 202, is further amended—

(1) in section 5—

(A) in paragraph (3) of subsection (b), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section—

(i) by striking “paragraph (1)” each place it appears and inserting “paragraph (1) or (2)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (F)—

(I) by striking “that paragraph” and inserting “paragraph (1) or (2), as the case may be”; and

(II) by striking “the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010” and inserting “the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012”;

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “subsections (a) and (b)(1)” and inserting “subsection (a) and paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b)”; and

(ii) in paragraph (1), by striking “subsection (a) or (b)(1)” and inserting “subsection (a) or paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b)”; and

(C) in subsection (f)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “subsection (a) or (b)(1)” and inserting “subsection (a) or paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b)”; and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(2) in section 9, by striking “section 5(a) or 5(b)(1)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (a) or paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) of section 5”.

SEC. 204. EXPANSION OF SANCTIONS AVAILABLE UNDER THE IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (12); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) **BAN ON INVESTMENT IN EQUITY OR DEBT OF SANCTIONED PERSON.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations or guidelines as the President may prescribe, prohibit any United States person from investing in or purchasing significant amounts of equity or debt instruments of a sanctioned person.

“(10) **EXCLUSION OF CORPORATE OFFICERS.**—The President may direct the Secretary of State to deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to exclude from the United States, any alien that the President determines is a corporate officer or principal of, or a shareholder with a controlling interest in, a sanctioned person.

“(11) **SANCTIONS ON PRINCIPAL EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.**—The President may impose on the principal executive officer or officers of any sanctioned person, or on persons performing similar functions and with similar authorities as such officer or officers, any of the sanctions under this subsection.”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to activities described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 5 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this title, commenced on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 205. MODIFICATION OF WAIVER STANDARD UNDER THE IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.

Section 9(c) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by section 203, is further amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) **AUTHORITY.**—

“(A) **SANCTIONS RELATING TO THE ENERGY SECTOR OF IRAN.**—The President may waive, on a case-by-case basis and for a period of not more than one year, the requirement in section 5(a) to impose a sanction or sanctions on a person described in section 5(c), and may waive the continued imposition of a sanction or sanctions under subsection (b) of this section, 30 days or more after the President determines and so reports to the appropriate congressional committees that it is essential to the national security interests of the United States to exercise such waiver authority.

“(B) **SANCTIONS RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION OR OTHER MILITARY CAPABILITIES.**—The President may waive, on a case-by-case basis and for a period of not more than one year, the requirement in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 5(b) to impose a sanction or sanctions on a person described in section 5(c), and may waive the continued imposition of a sanction or sanctions under subsection (b) of this section, 30 days or more after the President determines and so reports to the appropriate congressional committees that it is vital to the national security interests of the United States to exercise such waiver authority.

“(C) **RENEWAL OF WAIVERS.**—The President may renew, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver with respect to a person under subparagraph (A) or (B) for additional one-year periods if, not later than 30 days before the waiver expires, the President makes the determination and submits to the appropriate congressional committees the report described in subparagraph (A) or (B), as applicable.”

SEC. 206. BRIEFINGS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.

Section 4 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **BRIEFINGS ON IMPLEMENTATION.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, and every 120 days thereafter, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, shall provide to the appro-

priate congressional committees a comprehensive briefing on efforts to implement this Act.”

SEC. 207. EXPANSION OF DEFINITIONS UNDER THE IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (17) and (18) as paragraphs (20) and (21), respectively;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (15) and (16) as paragraphs (17) and (18), respectively;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (14) as paragraphs (5) through (15), respectively;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) **CREDIBLE INFORMATION.**—The term ‘credible information’, with respect to a person—

“(A) includes—

“(i) a public announcement by the person that the person has engaged in an activity described in subsection (a) or (b) of section 5; and

“(ii) information set forth in a report to stockholders of the person indicating that the person has engaged in such an activity; and

“(B) may include, in the discretion of the President—

“(i) an announcement by the Government of Iran that the person has engaged in such an activity; or

“(ii) information indicating that the person has engaged in such an activity that is set forth in—

“(I) a report of the Government Accountability Office, the Energy Information Administration, or the Congressional Research Service; or

“(II) a report or publication of a similarly reputable governmental organization or trade or industry organization.”;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (15), as redesignated by paragraph (3), the following:

“(16) **PETROCHEMICAL PRODUCT.**—The term ‘petrochemical product’ includes any aromatic, olefin, or synthesis gas, and any derivative of such a gas, including ethylene, propylene, butadiene, benzene, toluene, xylene, ammonia, methanol, and urea.”; and

(6) by inserting after paragraph (18), as redesignated by paragraph (2), the following:

“(19) **SERVICES.**—The term ‘services’ includes software, hardware, financial, professional consulting, engineering, and specialized energy information services, energy-related technical assistance, and maintenance and repairs.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to activities described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 5 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this title, commenced on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 208. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ENERGY SECTOR OF IRAN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the energy sector of Iran remains a zone of proliferation concern since the Government of Iran continues to divert substantial revenues derived from sales of petroleum resources to finance its illicit nuclear and missile activities; and

(2) the President should apply the full range of sanctions under the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this Act, to address the threat posed by the Government of Iran.

Subtitle B—Additional Measures Relating to Sanctions Against Iran

SEC. 211. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE PROVISION OF VESSELS OR SHIPPING SERVICES TO TRANSPORT CERTAIN GOODS RELATED TO PROLIFERATION OR TERRORISM ACTIVITIES TO IRAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), if the President determines that a person, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, knowingly sells, leases, or provides a vessel or provides insurance or reinsurance or

any other shipping service for the transportation to or from Iran of goods that could materially contribute to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or support for acts of international terrorism, the President shall, pursuant to Executive Order 13382 (70 Fed. Reg. 38567; relating to blocking of property of weapons of mass destruction proliferators and their supporters) or Executive Order 13224 (66 Fed. Reg. 49079; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism), or otherwise pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of the persons specified in subsection (b) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(b) **PERSONS SPECIFIED.**—The persons specified in this subsection are—

(1) the person that sold, leased, or provided a vessel or provided insurance or reinsurance or another shipping service described in subsection (a); and

(2) any person that—

(A) is a successor entity to the person referred to in paragraph (1);

(B) owns or controls the person referred to in paragraph (1), if the person that owns or controls the person referred to in paragraph (1) had actual knowledge or should have known that the person referred to in paragraph (1) sold, leased, or provided the vessel or provided the insurance or reinsurance or other shipping service; or

(C) is owned or controlled by, or under common ownership or control with, the person referred to in paragraph (1), if the person owned or controlled by, or under common ownership or control with (as the case may be), the person referred to in paragraph (1) knowingly engaged in the sale, lease, or provision of the vessel or the provision of the insurance or reinsurance or other shipping service.

(c) **WAIVER.**—The President may waive the requirement to impose sanctions with respect to a person under subsection (a) on or after the date that is 30 days after the President—

(1) determines that such a waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States; and

(2) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the reasons for that determination.

(d) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report identifying operators of vessels and other persons that conduct or facilitate significant financial transactions with persons that manage ports in Iran that have been designated for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(2) **FORM OF REPORT.**—A report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President to designate persons for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to Executive Order 13382 (70 Fed. Reg. 38567; relating to the blocking of property of weapons of mass destruction proliferators and their supporters) or Executive Order 13224 (66 Fed. Reg. 49079; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism), or otherwise pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

SEC. 212. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PROVISION OF UNDERWRITING SERVICES OR INSURANCE OR REINSURANCE FOR THE NATIONAL IRANIAN OIL COMPANY OR THE NATIONAL IRANIAN TANKER COMPANY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 6(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by section 204, with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly, on or after such date of enactment, provides underwriting services or insurance or reinsurance for the National Iranian Oil Company, the National Iranian Tanker Company, or a successor entity to either such company.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) UNDERWRITERS AND INSURANCE PROVIDERS EXERCISING DUE DILIGENCE.—The President is authorized not to impose sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person that provides underwriting services or insurance or reinsurance if the President determines that the person has exercised due diligence in establishing and enforcing official policies, procedures, and controls to ensure that the person does not provide underwriting services or insurance or reinsurance for the National Iranian Oil Company, the National Iranian Tanker Company, or a successor entity to either such company.

(2) FOOD; MEDICINE; HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.—The President may not impose sanctions under subsection (a) for the provision of underwriting services or insurance or reinsurance for any activity relating solely to—

(A) the provision of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to Iran; or

(B) the provision of humanitarian assistance to the people of Iran.

(3) TERMINATION PERIOD.—The President is authorized not to impose sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person if the President receives reliable assurances that the person will terminate the provision of underwriting services or insurance or reinsurance for the National Iranian Oil Company, the National Iranian Tanker Company, and any successor entity to either such company, not later than the date that is 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term “agricultural commodity” has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(2) MEDICAL DEVICE.—The term “medical device” has the meaning given the term “device” in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(3) MEDICINE.—The term “medicine” has the meaning given the term “drug” in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(d) APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.—The following provisions of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this Act, apply with respect to the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a) to the same extent that such provisions apply with respect to the imposition of sanctions under section 5(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996:

(1) Subsection (c) of section 4.

(2) Subsections (c), (d), and (f) of section 5.

(3) Section 8.

(4) Section 9.

(5) Section 11.

(6) Section 12.

(7) Subsection (b) of section 13.

(8) Section 14.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION AND IMPLEMENTATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President to impose sanctions pursuant to the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Ac-

countability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a), or any other provision of this Act.

SEC. 213. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PURCHASE, SUBSCRIPTION TO, OR FACILITATION OF THE ISSUANCE OF IRANIAN SOVEREIGN DEBT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 6(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by section 204, with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, purchases, subscribes to, or facilitates the issuance of—

(1) sovereign debt of the Government of Iran issued on or after such date of enactment, including governmental bonds; or

(2) debt of any entity owned or controlled by the Government of Iran issued on or after such date of enactment, including bonds.

(b) APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.—The following provisions of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this Act, apply with respect to the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a) to the same extent that such provisions apply with respect to the imposition of sanctions under section 5(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996:

(1) Subsection (c) of section 4.

(2) Subsections (c), (d), and (f) of section 5.

(3) Section 8.

(4) Section 9.

(5) Section 11.

(6) Section 12.

(7) Subsection (b) of section 13.

(8) Section 14.

SEC. 214. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO SUBSIDIARIES AND AGENTS OF PERSONS SANCTIONED BY UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 104(c)(2)(B) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking “of a person subject” and inserting the following: “of—

“(i) a person subject”;

(2) in clause (i), as designated by paragraph (1), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; or”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) a person acting on behalf of or at the direction of, or owned or controlled by, a person described in clause (i);”.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such revisions to the regulations prescribed under section 104 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513) as are necessary to carry out the amendments made by subsection (a).

SEC. 215. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS SANCTIONED FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO TERRORISM OR PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)(E)(ii)) is amended in the matter preceding subclause (I) by striking “financial institution” and inserting “person”.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such revisions to the regulations prescribed under section 104 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513) as are necessary to carry out the amendment made by subsection (a).

SEC. 216. EXPANSION OF, AND REPORTS ON, MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 104 the following:

“SEC. 104A. EXPANSION OF, AND REPORTS ON, MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, the Secretary of the Treasury shall revise the regulations prescribed under section 104(c)(1) to apply to a foreign financial institution described in subsection (b) to the same extent and in the same manner as those regulations apply to a foreign financial institution that the Secretary of the Treasury finds knowingly engages in an activity described in section 104(c)(2).

“(b) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DESCRIBED.—A foreign financial institution described in this subsection is a foreign financial institution, including an Iranian financial institution, that the Secretary of the Treasury finds—

“(1) knowingly facilitates, or participates or assists in, an activity described in section 104(c)(2), including by acting on behalf of, at the direction of, or as an intermediary for, or otherwise assisting, another person with respect to the activity;

“(2) attempts or conspires to facilitate or participate in such an activity; or

“(3) is owned or controlled by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly engages in such an activity.

“(c) REPORTS REQUIRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a detailed description of—

“(A) the effect of the regulations prescribed under section 104(c)(1) on the financial system and economy of Iran and capital flows to and from Iran; and

“(B) the ways in which funds move into and out of financial institutions described in section 104(c)(2)(E)(ii), with specific attention to the use of other Iranian financial institutions and other foreign financial institutions to receive and transfer funds for financial institutions described in that section.

“(2) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘financial institution’ means a financial institution specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), (K), (M), (N), (R), or (Y) of section 5312(a)(2) of title 31, United States Code.

“(2) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘foreign financial institution’ has the meaning of that term as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 104(i).

“(3) IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘Iranian financial institution’ means—

“(A) a financial institution organized under the laws of Iran or any jurisdiction within Iran, including a foreign branch of such an institution;

“(B) a financial institution located in Iran;

“(C) a financial institution, wherever located, owned or controlled by the Government of Iran; and

“(D) a financial institution, wherever located, owned or controlled by a financial institution described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 104 the following:

“Sec. 104A. Expansion of, and reports on, mandatory sanctions with respect to financial institutions that engage in certain activities.”.

SEC. 217. CONTINUATION IN EFFECT OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN, THE CENTRAL BANK OF IRAN, AND SANCTIONS EVADERS.

(a) SANCTIONS RELATING TO BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN AND IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—United States sanctions with respect to Iran provided for in Executive Order 13599 (77 Fed. Reg. 6659), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall remain in effect until the date that is 90 days after the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the certification described in subsection (d).

(b) SANCTIONS RELATING TO FOREIGN SANCTIONS EVADERS.—United States sanctions with respect to Iran provided for in Executive Order 13608 (77 Fed. Reg. 26409), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall remain in effect until the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the certification described in section 401(a) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8551(a)).

(c) CONTINUATION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE CENTRAL BANK OF IRAN.—In addition to the sanctions referred to in subsection (a), the President shall continue to apply to the Central Bank of Iran sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), including blocking of property and restrictions or prohibitions on financial transactions and the exportation of property, until the date that is 90 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress the certification described in subsection (d).

(d) CERTIFICATION DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The certification described in this subsection is the certification of the President to Congress that the Central Bank of Iran is not—

(A) providing financial services in support of, or otherwise facilitating, the ability of Iran to—

(i) acquire or develop chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons, or related technologies;

(ii) construct, equip, operate, or maintain nuclear facilities that could aid Iran's effort to acquire a nuclear capability; or

(iii) acquire or develop ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, or destabilizing types and amounts of conventional weapons; or

(B) facilitating transactions or providing financial services for—

(i) Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps; or

(ii) financial institutions the property or interests in property of which are blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) in connection with—

(I) Iran's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction; or

(II) Iran's support for international terrorism.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit the certification described in paragraph (1) to the appropriate congressional committees in writing and shall include a justification for the certification.

(B) FORM OF CERTIFICATION.—The certification described in paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.).

SEC. 218. LIABILITY OF PARENT COMPANIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF SANCTIONS BY FOREIGN SUBSIDIARIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ENTITY.—The term “entity” means a partnership, association, trust, joint venture, corporation, or other organization.

(2) OWN OR CONTROL.—The term “own or control” means, with respect to an entity—

(A) to hold more than 50 percent of the equity interest by vote or value in the entity;

(B) to hold a majority of seats on the board of directors of the entity; or

(C) to otherwise control the actions, policies, or personnel decisions of the entity.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prohibit an entity owned or controlled by a United States person and established or maintained outside the United States from knowingly engaging in any transaction directly or indirectly with the Government of Iran or any person subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran that would be prohibited by an order or regulation issued pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) if the transaction were engaged in by a United States person or in the United States.

(c) CIVIL PENALTY.—The civil penalties provided for in section 206(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705(b)) shall apply to a United States person to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a) of that Act if an entity owned or controlled by the United States person and established or maintained outside the United States violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of any order or regulation issued to implement subsection (b).

(d) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (c) shall not apply with respect to a transaction described in subsection (b) by an entity owned or controlled by a United States person and established or maintained outside the United States if the United States person divests or terminates its business with the entity not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 219. DISCLOSURES TO THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION RELATING TO SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITIES.

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

“(r) DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO IRAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each issuer required to file an annual or quarterly report under subsection (a) shall disclose in that report the information required by paragraph (2) if, during the period covered by the report, the issuer or any affiliate of the issuer—

“(A) knowingly engaged in an activity described in subsection (a) or (b) of section 5 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

“(B) knowingly engaged in an activity described in subsection (c)(2) of section 104 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513) or a transaction described in subsection (d)(1) of that section;

“(C) knowingly engaged in an activity described in section 105A(b)(2) of that Act; or

“(D) knowingly conducted any transaction or dealing with—

“(i) any person the property and interests in property of which are blocked pursuant to Exec-

utive Order 13224 (66 Fed. Reg. 49079; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism);

“(ii) any person the property and interests in property of which are blocked pursuant to Executive Order 13382 (70 Fed. Reg. 38567; relating to blocking of property of weapons of mass destruction proliferators and their supporters); or

“(iii) any person or entity identified under section 560.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to the definition of the Government of Iran) without the specific authorization of a Federal department or agency.

“(2) INFORMATION REQUIRED.—If an issuer or an affiliate of the issuer has engaged in any activity described in paragraph (1), the issuer shall disclose a detailed description of each such activity, including—

“(A) the nature and extent of the activity;

“(B) the gross revenues and net profits, if any, attributable to the activity; and

“(C) whether the issuer or the affiliate of the issuer (as the case may be) intends to continue the activity.

“(3) NOTICE OF DISCLOSURES.—If an issuer reports under paragraph (1) that the issuer or an affiliate of the issuer has knowingly engaged in any activity described in that paragraph, the issuer shall separately file with the Commission, concurrently with the annual or quarterly report under subsection (a), a notice that the disclosure of that activity has been included in that annual or quarterly report that identifies the issuer and contains the information required by paragraph (2).

“(4) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—Upon receiving a notice under paragraph (3) that an annual or quarterly report includes a disclosure of an activity described in paragraph (1), the Commission shall promptly—

“(A) transmit the report to—

“(i) the President;

“(ii) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

“(iii) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

“(B) make the information provided in the disclosure and the information available to the public by posting the information on the Internet website of the Commission.

“(5) INVESTIGATIONS.—Upon receiving a report under paragraph (4) that includes a disclosure of an activity described in paragraph (1) (other than an activity described in subparagraph (D)(iii) of that paragraph), the President shall—

“(A) initiate an investigation into the possible imposition of sanctions under the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), section 104 or 105A of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, an Executive Order specified in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (1)(D), or any other provision of law relating to the imposition of sanctions with respect to Iran, as applicable; and

“(B) not later than 180 days after initiating such an investigation, make a determination with respect to whether sanctions should be imposed with respect to the issuer or the affiliate of the issuer (as the case may be).

“(6) SUNSET.—The provisions of this subsection shall terminate on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President makes the certification described in section 401(a) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8551(a)).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect with respect to reports required to be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 220. REPORTS ON, AND AUTHORIZATION OF IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO, THE PROVISION OF SPECIALIZED FINANCIAL MESSAGING SERVICES TO THE CENTRAL BANK OF IRAN AND OTHER SANCTIONED IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) providers of specialized financial messaging services are a critical link to the international financial system;

(2) the European Union is to be commended for strengthening the multilateral sanctions regime against Iran by deciding that specialized financial messaging services may not be provided to the Central Bank of Iran and other sanctioned Iranian financial institutions by persons subject to the jurisdiction of the European Union; and

(3) the loss of access by sanctioned Iranian financial institutions to specialized financial messaging services must be maintained.

(b) REPORTS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains—

(A) a list of all persons that the Secretary has identified that directly provide specialized financial messaging services to, or enable or facilitate direct or indirect access to such messaging services for, the Central Bank of Iran or a financial institution described in section 104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)(E)(ii)); and

(B) a detailed assessment of the status of efforts by the Secretary to end the direct provision of such messaging services to, and the enabling or facilitation of direct or indirect access to such messaging services for, the Central Bank of Iran or a financial institution described in that section.

(2) ENABLING OR FACILITATION OF ACCESS TO SPECIALIZED FINANCIAL MESSAGING SERVICES THROUGH INTERMEDIARY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1) and subsection (c), enabling or facilitating direct or indirect access to specialized financial messaging services for the Central Bank of Iran or a financial institution described in section 104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)(E)(ii)) includes doing so by serving as an intermediary financial institution with access to such messaging services.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—A report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), if, on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a person continues to knowingly and directly provide specialized financial messaging services to, or knowingly enable or facilitate direct or indirect access to such messaging services for, the Central Bank of Iran or a financial institution described in paragraph (2)(E)(ii) of section 104(c) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(c)), the President may impose sanctions pursuant to that section and the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) with respect to the person.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The President may not impose sanctions pursuant to paragraph (1) with respect to a person for directly providing specialized financial messaging services to, or enabling or facilitating direct or indirect access to such messaging services for, the Central Bank of Iran or a financial institution described in section 104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)(E)(ii)) if—

(A) the person is subject to a sanctions regime under its governing foreign law that requires it to eliminate the knowing provision of such messaging services to, and the knowing enabling and facilitation of direct or indirect access to such messaging services for—

(i) the Central Bank of Iran; and
(ii) a group of Iranian financial institutions identified under such governing foreign law for purposes of that sanctions regime if the President determines that—

(I) the group is substantially similar to the group of financial institutions described in section 104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)(E)(ii)); and

(II) the differences between those groups of financial institutions do not adversely affect the national interest of the United States; and

(B) the person has, pursuant to that sanctions regime, terminated the knowing provision of such messaging services to, and the knowing enabling and facilitation of direct or indirect access to such messaging services for, the Central Bank of Iran and each Iranian financial institution identified under such governing foreign law for purposes of that sanctions regime.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.).

SEC. 221. IDENTIFICATION OF, AND IMMIGRATION RESTRICTIONS ON, SENIOR OFFICIALS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN AND THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS.

(a) IDENTIFICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall publish a list of each individual the President determines is—

(1) a senior official of the Government of Iran described in subsection (b) that is involved in Iran's—

(A) illicit nuclear activities or proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction;

(B) support for international terrorism; or

(C) commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members; or

(2) a family member of such an official.

(b) SENIOR OFFICIALS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN DESCRIBED.—A senior official of the Government of Iran described in this subsection is any senior official of that Government, including—

(1) the Supreme Leader of Iran;

(2) the President of Iran;

(3) a member of the Cabinet of the Government of Iran;

(4) a member of the Assembly of Experts;

(5) a senior member of the Intelligence Ministry of Iran; or

(6) a senior member of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps, including a senior member of a paramilitary organization such as Ansar-e Hezbollah or Basij-e Motaz'afin.

(c) EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any alien who is on the list required by subsection (a).

(d) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Subsection (c) shall not apply to an individual if admitting the individual to the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, and other applicable international obligations.

(e) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of subsection (a) or (c) with respect to an individual if the President—

(1) determines that such a waiver is essential to the national interests of the United States; and

(2) not less than 7 days before the waiver takes effect, notifies Congress of the waiver and the reason for the waiver.

SEC. 222. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO CERTAIN AUTHORITIES OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should support actions by States or local governments that are within their authority, including determining how investment assets are valued for purposes of safety and soundness of financial institutions and insurers, that are consistent with and in furtherance of the purposes of this Act and other Acts that are amended by this Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Section 202 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8532) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or any other provision of law authorizing sanctions with respect to Iran shall be construed to abridge the authority of a State to issue and enforce rules governing the safety, soundness, and solvency of a financial institution subject to its jurisdiction or the business of insurance pursuant to the Act of March 9, 1945 (15 U.S.C. 1011 et seq.) (commonly known as the ‘McCarran-Ferguson Act’).”

SEC. 223. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT ON FOREIGN ENTITIES THAT INVEST IN THE ENERGY SECTOR OF IRAN OR EXPORT REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO IRAN.

(a) INITIAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report—

(A) listing all foreign investors in the energy sector of Iran during the period specified in paragraph (2), including—

(i) entities that exported gasoline and other refined petroleum products to Iran;

(ii) entities involved in providing refined petroleum products to Iran, including—

(I) entities that provided ships to transport refined petroleum products to Iran; and

(II) entities that provided insurance or reinsurance for shipments of refined petroleum products to Iran; and

(iii) entities involved in commercial transactions of any kind, including joint ventures anywhere in the world, with Iranian energy companies; and

(B) identifying the countries in which gasoline and other refined petroleum products exported to Iran during the period specified in paragraph (2) were produced or refined.

(2) PERIOD SPECIFIED.—The period specified in this paragraph is the period beginning on January 1, 2009, and ending on the date that is 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) UPDATED REPORT.—Not later than one year after submitting the report required by subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the matters required in the report under subsection (a)(1) for the one-year period beginning on the date that is 30 days before the date on which the preceding report was required to be submitted by this section.

SEC. 224. REPORTING ON THE IMPORTATION TO AND EXPORTATION FROM IRAN OF CRUDE OIL AND REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.

Section 110(b) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8518(b)) is amended by striking “a report containing the matters” and all that follows through the period at the end and

inserting the following: “a report, covering the 180-day period beginning on the date that is 30 days before the date on which the preceding report was required to be submitted by this section, that—

“(1) contains the matters required in the report under subsection (a)(1); and

“(2) identifies—

“(A) the volume of crude oil and refined petroleum products imported to and exported from Iran (including through swaps and similar arrangements);

“(B) the persons selling and transporting crude oil and refined petroleum products described in subparagraph (A), the countries with primary jurisdiction over those persons, and the countries in which those products were refined;

“(C) the sources of financing for imports to Iran of crude oil and refined petroleum products described in subparagraph (A); and

“(D) the involvement of foreign persons in efforts to assist Iran in—

“(i) developing upstream oil and gas production capacity;

“(ii) importing advanced technology to upgrade existing Iranian refineries;

“(iii) converting existing chemical plants to petroleum refineries; or

“(iv) maintaining, upgrading, or expanding existing refineries or constructing new refineries.”.

TITLE III—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO IRAN'S REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS

Subtitle A—Identification of, and Sanctions With Respect to, Officials, Agents, Affiliates, and Supporters of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps and Other Sanctioned Persons

SEC. 301. IDENTIFICATION OF, AND IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO, OFFICIALS, AGENTS, AND AFFILIATES OF IRAN'S REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and as appropriate thereafter, the President shall—

(1) identify foreign persons that are officials, agents, or affiliates of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps; and

(2) for each foreign person identified under paragraph (1) that is not already designated for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)—

(A) designate that foreign person for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to that Act; and

(B) block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of that foreign person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(b) PRIORITY FOR INVESTIGATION.—In identifying foreign persons pursuant to subsection (a)(1) as officials, agents, or affiliates of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps, the President shall give priority to investigating—

(1) foreign persons or entities identified under section 560.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to the definition of the Government of Iran); and

(2) foreign persons for which there is a reasonable basis to find that the person has conducted or attempted to conduct one or more sensitive transactions or activities described in subsection (c).

(c) SENSITIVE TRANSACTIONS AND ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—A sensitive transaction or activity described in this subsection is—

(1) a financial transaction or series of transactions valued at more than \$1,000,000 in the aggregate in any 12-month period involving a non-Iranian financial institution;

(2) a transaction to facilitate the manufacture, importation, exportation, or transfer of items needed for the development by Iran of nuclear, chemical, biological, or advanced conventional weapons, including ballistic missiles;

(3) a transaction relating to the manufacture, procurement, or sale of goods, services, and technology relating to Iran's energy sector, including a transaction relating to the development of the energy resources of Iran, the exportation of petroleum products from Iran, the importation of refined petroleum to Iran, or the development of refining capacity available to Iran;

(4) a transaction relating to the manufacture, procurement, or sale of goods, services, and technology relating to Iran's petrochemical sector; or

(5) a transaction relating to the procurement of sensitive technologies (as defined in section 106(c) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8515(c))).

(d) EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any alien who, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is a foreign person designated pursuant to subsection (a) for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(2) REGULATORY EXCEPTIONS TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS.—The requirement to deny visas to and exclude aliens from the United States pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, including regulatory exceptions to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, and other applicable international obligations.

(e) WAIVER OF IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive the application of subsection (a) or (d) with respect to a foreign person if the President—

(A) determines that it is vital to the national security interests of the United States to do so; and

(B) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(i) identifies the foreign person with respect to which the waiver applies; and

(ii) sets forth the reasons for the determination.

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—A report submitted under paragraph (1)(B) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to remove any sanction of the United States in force with respect to Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. IDENTIFICATION OF, AND IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO, PERSONS THAT SUPPORT OR CONDUCT CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN'S REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS OR OTHER SANCTIONED PERSONS.

(a) IDENTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report identifying foreign persons that the President determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, knowingly—

(A) materially assist, sponsor, or provide financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps or any of its officials, agents, or affiliates the property and interests in property of which are blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(B) engage in a significant transaction or transactions with Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps or any of its officials, agents, or affiliates—

(i) the property and interests in property of which are blocked pursuant to that Act; or

(ii) that are identified under section 301(a)(1) or pursuant to paragraph (4)(A) of section 104(c) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, as added by section 312; or

(C) engage in a significant transaction or transactions with—

(i) a person subject to financial sanctions pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1737 (2006), 1747 (2007), 1803 (2008), or 1929 (2010), or any other resolution that is adopted by the Security Council and imposes sanctions with respect to Iran or modifies such sanctions; or

(ii) a person acting on behalf of or at the direction of, or owned or controlled by, a person described in clause (i).

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—A report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(3) BARTER TRANSACTIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term “transaction” includes a barter transaction.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—If the President determines under subsection (a)(1) that a foreign person has knowingly engaged in an activity described in that subsection, the President—

(1) shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 6(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by section 204; and

(2) may impose additional sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) with respect to the person.

(c) TERMINATION.—The President may terminate a sanction imposed with respect to a foreign person pursuant to subsection (b) if the President determines that the person—

(1) no longer engages in the activity for which the sanction was imposed; and

(2) has provided assurances to the President that the person will not engage in any activity described in subsection (a)(1) in the future.

(d) WAIVER OF IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive the imposition of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a foreign person if the President—

(A)(i) determines that the person has ceased the activity for which sanctions would otherwise be imposed and has taken measures to prevent a recurrence of the activity; or

(ii) determines that it is essential to the national security interests of the United States to do so; and

(B) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(i) identifies the foreign person with respect to which the waiver applies;

(ii) describes the activity that would otherwise subject the foreign person to the imposition of sanctions under subsection (b); and

(iii) sets forth the reasons for the determination.

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—A report submitted under paragraph (1)(B) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(e) WAIVER OF IDENTIFICATIONS AND DESIGNATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle and subject to paragraph (2), the President shall not be required to make any identification of a foreign person under subsection (a) or any identification or designation of a foreign person under section 301(a) if the President—

(1) determines that doing so would cause damage to the national security of the United States; and

(2) notifies the appropriate congressional committees of the exercise of the authority provided under this subsection.

(f) APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.—The following provisions of

the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this Act, apply with respect to the imposition under subsection (b)(1) of sanctions relating to activities described in subsection (a)(1) to the same extent that such provisions apply with respect to the imposition of sanctions under section 5(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996:

- (1) Subsections (c) and (e) of section 4.
- (2) Subsections (c), (d), and (f) of section 5.
- (3) Section 8.
- (4) Section 9.
- (5) Section 11.
- (6) Section 12.
- (7) Subsection (b) of section 13.
- (8) Section 14.

SEC. 303. IDENTIFICATION OF, AND IMPOSITION OF MEASURES WITH RESPECT TO, FOREIGN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES CARRYING OUT ACTIVITIES OR TRANSACTIONS WITH CERTAIN IRAN-AFFILIATED PERSONS.

(a) IDENTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that identifies each agency of the government of a foreign country (other than Iran) that the President determines knowingly and materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, or knowingly and materially engaged in a significant transaction with, any person described in paragraph (2).

(2) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person described in this paragraph is—

(A) a foreign person that is an official, agent, or affiliate of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps that is designated for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(B) a foreign person that is designated and subject to financial sanctions pursuant to—

(i) the Annex of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1737 (2006);

(ii) Annex I of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1747 (2007);

(iii) Annex I, II, or III of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1803 (2008);

(iv) Annex I, II, or III of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1929 (2010); or

(v) any subsequent and related United Nations Security Council resolution, or any annex thereto, that imposes new sanctions with respect to Iran or modifies existing sanctions with respect to Iran; or

(C) a foreign person that the agency knows is acting on behalf of or at the direction of, or owned or controlled by, a person described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(b) IMPOSITION OF MEASURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may impose any of the following measures with respect to an agency identified pursuant to subsection (a) if the President determines that the assistance, exports, or other support to be prohibited by reason of the imposition of the measures have contributed and would otherwise directly or indirectly contribute to the agency's capability to continue the activities or transactions for which the agency has been identified pursuant to subsection (a):

(A) No assistance may be provided to the agency under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) or the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) other than humanitarian assistance or the provision of food or other agricultural commodities.

(B) No sales of any defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) may be made to the agency.

(C) No licenses for export of any item on the United States Munitions List that include the agency as a party to the license may be granted.

(D) No exports may be permitted to the agency of any goods or technologies controlled for national security reasons under the Export Administration Regulations, except that such prohibition shall not apply to any transaction subject to the reporting requirements of title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.; relating to congressional oversight of intelligence activities).

(E) The United States shall oppose any loan or financial or technical assistance to the agency by international financial institutions in accordance with section 701 of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262d).

(F) The United States shall deny to the agency any credit or financial assistance by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except that this paragraph shall not apply—

(i) to any transaction subject to the reporting requirements of title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.; relating to congressional oversight of intelligence activities);

(ii) to the provision of medicines, medical equipment, and humanitarian assistance; or

(iii) to any credit, credit guarantee, or financial assistance provided by the Department of Agriculture to support the purchase of food or other agricultural commodities.

(G) Additional restrictions as may be imposed pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impose measures with respect to programs under section 1501 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (50 U.S.C. 2632 note) and programs under the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.).

(c) TERMINATION.—The President may terminate any measures imposed with respect to an agency pursuant to subsection (b) if the President determines and notifies the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1)(A) a person described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(2) with respect to which the agency is carrying out activities or transactions is no longer designated pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(2); or

(B) any person described in subparagraph (C) of subsection (a)(2) with respect to which the agency is carrying out activities or transactions is no longer acting on behalf of or at the direction of, or owned or controlled by, any person described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(2);

(2) the agency is no longer carrying out activities or transactions for which the measures were imposed and has provided assurances to the United States Government that the agency will not carry out the activities or transactions in the future; or

(3) it is essential to the national security interest of the United States to terminate such measures.

(d) WAIVER.—If the President does not impose one or more measures described in subsection (b) with respect to an agency identified in the report required by subsection (a), the President shall include in the subsequent report an explanation as to why the President did not impose such measures.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Finance, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act

and apply with respect to activities and transactions described in subsection (a) that are carried out on or after the later of—

(1) the date that is 45 days after such date of enactment; or

(2) the date that is 45 days after a person is designated as described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 304. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to limit the authority of the President to designate foreign persons for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

Subtitle B—Additional Measures Relating to Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps

SEC. 311. EXPANSION OF PROCUREMENT PROHIBITION TO FOREIGN PERSONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN'S REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(b)(1) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) by striking "Not later than 90 days" and inserting the following:

"(A) CERTIFICATIONS RELATING TO ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED IN SECTION 5.—Not later than 90 days"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) CERTIFICATIONS RELATING TO TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN'S REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be revised to require a certification from each person that is a prospective contractor that the person, and any person owned or controlled by the person, does not knowingly engage in a significant transaction or transactions with Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps or any of its officials, agents, or affiliates the property and interests in property of which are blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 6(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), as designated by subsection (a)(1), by striking "issued pursuant to section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421)";

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking "the revision" and inserting "the applicable revision"; and

(II) by striking "not more than 3 years" and inserting "not less than 2 years"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking "issued pursuant to section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421)";

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking "in the national interest" and inserting "essential to the national security interests";

(D) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

"(6) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

"(A) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term 'executive agency' has the meaning given that term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

"(B) FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—The term 'Federal Acquisition Regulation' means the regulation issued pursuant to section 1303(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code.";

(E) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking "The revisions to the Federal Acquisition Regulation required under paragraph (1)" and inserting the following:

"(A) CERTIFICATIONS RELATING TO ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED IN SECTION 5.—The revisions to the Federal Acquisition Regulation required under paragraph (1)(A)"; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) CERTIFICATIONS RELATING TO TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN’S REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS.—The revisions to the Federal Acquisition Regulation required under paragraph (1)(B) shall apply with respect to contracts for which solicitations are issued on or after the date that is 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012.”.

(2) Section 101(3) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8511(3)) is amended by striking “section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)” and inserting “section 133 of title 41, United States Code”.

SEC. 312. DETERMINATIONS OF WHETHER THE NATIONAL IRANIAN OIL COMPANY AND THE NATIONAL IRANIAN TANKER COMPANY ARE AGENTS OR AFFILIATES OF IRAN’S REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the National Iranian Oil Company and the National Iranian Tanker Company are not only owned and controlled by the Government of Iran but that those companies provide significant support to Iran’s Revolutionary Guard Corps and its affiliates.

(b) DETERMINATIONS.—Section 104(c) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) DETERMINATIONS REGARDING NIOC AND NITC.—

“(A) DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(E), the Secretary of the Treasury shall, not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012—

“(i) determine whether the NIOC or the NITC is an agent or affiliate of Iran’s Revolutionary Guard Corps; and

“(ii) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the determinations made under clause (i), together with the reasons for those determinations.

“(B) FORM OF REPORT.—A report submitted under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

“(C) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO PETROLEUM TRANSACTIONS.—

“(i) APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS.—Except as provided in clause (ii), if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the NIOC or the NITC is a person described in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (2)(E), the regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to a significant transaction or transactions or significant financial services knowingly facilitated or provided by a foreign financial institution for the NIOC or the NITC, as applicable, for the purchase of petroleum or petroleum products from Iran, only if a determination of the President under section 1245(d)(4)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)(4)(B)) that there is a sufficient supply of petroleum and petroleum products produced in countries other than Iran to permit purchasers of petroleum and petroleum products from Iran to reduce significantly their purchases from Iran is in effect at the time of the transaction or the provision of the service.

“(ii) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—If the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the NIOC or the NITC is a person described in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (2)(E), the regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall not apply to a significant transaction or transactions or significant financial services knowingly facilitated or provided by a foreign financial institution for the NIOC or the NITC, as applicable, for the purchase of petroleum or petroleum products from Iran if an exception under paragraph (4)(D) of section 1245(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)) applies to the country with primary jurisdiction over the for-

eign financial institution at the time of the transaction or the provision of the service.

“(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The exceptions in clauses (i) and (ii) shall not be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to impose sanctions pursuant to the regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) for an activity described in paragraph (2) to the extent the activity would meet the criteria described in that paragraph in the absence of the involvement of the NIOC or the NITC.

“(D) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) NIOC.—The term ‘NIOC’ means the National Iranian Oil Company.

“(ii) NITC.—The term ‘NITC’ means the National Iranian Tanker Company.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) WAIVER.—Section 104(f) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(f)) is amended by inserting “or section 104A” after “subsection (c)”.

(2) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Section 104(g) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(g)) is amended by striking “subsection (c)(1)” and inserting “paragraph (1) or (4) of subsection (c) or section 104A” both places it appears.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an exception to sanctions described in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (4)(C) of section 104(c) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, as added by subsection (b), applies to a person that engages in a transaction described in paragraph (2) at the time of the transaction, the President is authorized not to impose sanctions with respect to the transaction under—

(A) section 302(b)(1);

(B) section 104A of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, as added by section 216; or

(C) any other applicable provision of law authorizing the imposition of sanctions with respect to Iran.

(2) TRANSACTION DESCRIBED.—A transaction described in this paragraph is a transaction—

(A) solely for the purchase of petroleum or petroleum products from Iran; and

(B) for which sanctions may be imposed solely as a result of the involvement of the National Iranian Oil Company or the National Iranian Tanker Company in the transaction under—

(i) section 302(b)(1);

(ii) section 104A of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, as added by section 216; or

(iii) any other applicable provision of law authorizing the imposition of sanctions with respect to Iran.

TITLE IV—MEASURES RELATING TO HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN IRAN

Subtitle A—Expansion of Sanctions Relating to Human Rights Abuses in Iran

SEC. 401. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS ON CERTAIN PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR OR COMPLICIT IN HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES COMMITTED AGAINST CITIZENS OF IRAN OR THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS AFTER THE JUNE 12, 2009, ELECTIONS IN IRAN.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Supreme Leader of Iran, the President of Iran, senior members of the Intelligence Ministry of Iran, senior members of Iran’s Revolutionary Guard Corps, Ansar-e-Hezbollah and Basij-e-Mostaz’afin, and the Ministers of Defense, Interior, Justice, and Telecommunications are ultimately responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing a pattern and practice of serious human rights abuses against the Iranian people, and thus the President should include such persons on the list of persons who are responsible for or complicit in committing serious human rights abuses and subject to sanctions pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions,

Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8514).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report with respect to whether each person described in subsection (a) is responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members on or after June 12, 2009, regardless of whether such abuses occurred in Iran. For any such person who is not included in such report, the Secretary of State should describe in the report the reasons why the person was not included, including information on whether sufficient credible evidence of responsibility for such abuses was found.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 402. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSFER OF GOODS OR TECHNOLOGIES TO IRAN THAT ARE LIKELY TO BE USED TO COMMIT HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 105 the following:

“SEC. 105A. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSFER OF GOODS OR TECHNOLOGIES TO IRAN THAT ARE LIKELY TO BE USED TO COMMIT HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose sanctions in accordance with subsection (c) with respect to each person on the list required by subsection (b).

“(b) LIST.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of persons that the President determines have knowingly engaged in an activity described in paragraph (2) on or after such date of enactment.

“(2) ACTIVITY DESCRIBED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A person engages in an activity described in this paragraph if the person—

“(i) transfers, or facilitates the transfer of, goods or technologies described in subparagraph (C) to Iran, any entity organized under the laws of Iran or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran, or any national of Iran, for use in or with respect to Iran; or

“(ii) provides services (including services relating to hardware, software, and specialized information, and professional consulting, engineering, and support services) with respect to goods or technologies described in subparagraph (C) after such goods or technologies are transferred to Iran.

“(B) APPLICABILITY TO CONTRACTS AND OTHER AGREEMENTS.—A person engages in an activity described in subparagraph (A) without regard to whether the activity is carried out pursuant to a contract or other agreement entered into before, on, or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012.

“(C) GOODS OR TECHNOLOGIES DESCRIBED.—Goods or technologies described in this subparagraph are goods or technologies that the President determines are likely to be used by the Government of Iran or any of its agencies or instrumentalities (or by any other person on behalf of

the Government of Iran or any of such agencies or instrumentalities) to commit serious human rights abuses against the people of Iran, including—

“(i) firearms or ammunition (as those terms are defined in section 921 of title 18, United States Code), rubber bullets, police batons, pepper or chemical sprays, stun grenades, electroshock weapons, tear gas, water cannons, or surveillance technology; or

“(ii) sensitive technology (as defined in section 106(c)).

“(3) SPECIAL RULE TO ALLOW FOR TERMINATION OF SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITY.—The President shall not be required to include a person on the list required by paragraph (1) if the President certifies in writing to the appropriate congressional committees that—

“(A) the person is no longer engaging in, or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping, the activity described in paragraph (2) for which the President would otherwise have included the person on the list; and

“(B) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in any activity described in paragraph (2) in the future.

“(4) UPDATES OF LIST.—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an updated list under paragraph (1)—

“(A) each time the President is required to submit an updated list to those committees under section 105(b)(2)(A); and

“(B) as new information becomes available.

“(5) FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

“(A) FORM.—The list required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

“(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The unclassified portion of the list required by paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public and posted on the websites of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of State.

“(c) APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the President shall impose sanctions described in section 105(c) with respect to a person on the list required by subsection (b).

“(2) TRANSFERS TO IRAN’S REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS.—In the case of a person on the list required by subsection (b) for transferring, or facilitating the transfer of, goods or technologies described in subsection (b)(2)(C) to Iran’s Revolutionary Guard Corps, or providing services with respect to such goods or technologies after such goods or technologies are transferred to Iran’s Revolutionary Guard Corps, the President shall—

“(A) impose sanctions described in section 105(c) with respect to the person; and

“(B) impose such other sanctions from among the sanctions described in section 6(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) as the President determines appropriate.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 105 the following:

“Sec. 105A. Imposition of sanctions with respect to the transfer of goods or technologies to Iran that are likely to be used to commit human rights abuses.”

SEC. 403. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO ENGAGE IN CENSORSHIP OR OTHER RELATED ACTIVITIES AGAINST CITIZENS OF IRAN.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) satellite service providers and other entities that have direct contractual arrangements to provide satellite services to the Government of Iran or entities owned or controlled by that Government should cease providing broadcast services to that Government and those entities

unless that Government ceases activities intended to jam or restrict satellite signals; and

(2) the United States should address the illegal jamming of satellite signals by the Government of Iran through the voice and vote of the United States in the United Nations International Telecommunications Union.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), as amended by section 402, is further amended by inserting after section 105A the following:

SEC. 105B. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO ENGAGE IN CENSORSHIP OR OTHER RELATED ACTIVITIES AGAINST CITIZENS OF IRAN.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose sanctions described in section 105(c) with respect to each person on the list required by subsection (b).

“(b) LIST OF PERSONS WHO ENGAGE IN CENSORSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of persons that the President determines have, on or after June 12, 2009, engaged in censorship or other activities with respect to Iran that—

“(A) prohibit, limit, or penalize the exercise of freedom of expression or assembly by citizens of Iran; or

“(B) limit access to print or broadcast media, including the facilitation or support of intentional frequency manipulation by the Government of Iran or an entity owned or controlled by that Government that would jam or restrict an international signal.

“(2) UPDATES OF LIST.—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an updated list under paragraph (1)—

“(A) each time the President is required to submit an updated list to those committees under section 105(b)(2)(A); and

“(B) as new information becomes available.

“(3) FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

“(A) FORM.—The list required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

“(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The unclassified portion of the list required by paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public and posted on the websites of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of State.”

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, as amended by section 402, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 105A the following:

“Sec. 105B. Imposition of sanctions with respect to persons who engage in censorship or other related activities against citizens of Iran.”

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 401(b)(1) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8551(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, 105A(a), or 105B(a)” after “105(a)”; and

(2) by inserting “, 105A(b), or 105B(b)” after “105(b)”.

Subtitle B—Additional Measures to Promote Human Rights

SEC. 411. CODIFICATION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO GRAVE HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES BY THE GOVERNMENTS OF IRAN AND SYRIA USING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

United States sanctions with respect to Iran and Syria provided for in Executive Order 13606 (77 Fed. Reg. 24571), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall remain in effect—

(1) with respect to Iran, until the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President

submits to Congress the certification described in section 401(a) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8551(a)); and

(2) with respect to Syria, until the date on which the provisions of and sanctions imposed pursuant to title VII terminate pursuant to section 706.

SEC. 412. CLARIFICATION OF SENSITIVE TECHNOLOGIES FOR PURPOSES OF PROCUREMENT BAN UNDER COMPREHENSIVE IRAN SANCTIONS, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND DIVESTMENT ACT OF 2010.

The Secretary of State shall—

(1) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, issue guidelines to further describe the technologies that may be considered “sensitive technology” for purposes of section 106 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8515), with special attention to new forms of sophisticated jamming, monitoring, and surveillance technology relating to mobile telecommunications and the Internet, and publish those guidelines in the Federal Register;

(2) determine the types of technologies that enable any indigenous capabilities that Iran has to disrupt and monitor information and communications in that country, and consider adding descriptions of those items to the guidelines; and

(3) periodically review, but in no case less than once each year, the guidelines and, if necessary, amend the guidelines on the basis of technological developments and new information regarding transfers of technologies to Iran and the development of Iran’s indigenous capabilities to disrupt and monitor information and communications in Iran.

SEC. 413. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF REQUESTS FOR AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN HUMAN RIGHTS, HUMANITARIAN, AND DEMOCRACY-RELATED ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO IRAN.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Office of Foreign Assets Control, in consultation with the Department of State, shall establish an expedited process for the consideration of complete requests for authorization to engage in human rights-, humanitarian-, or democracy-related activities relating to Iran that are submitted by—

(1) entities receiving funds from the Department of State to engage in the proposed activity;

(2) the Broadcasting Board of Governors; and

(3) other appropriate agencies of the United States Government.

(b) PROCEDURES.—Requests for authorization under subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Office of Foreign Assets Control in conformance with the Office’s regulations, including section 501.801 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as the Reporting, Procedures and Penalties Regulations). Applicants shall fully disclose the parties to the transactions as well as describe the activities to be undertaken. License applications involving the exportation or reexportation of goods, technology, or software to Iran shall include a copy of an official Commodity Classification issued by the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Industry and Security, as part of the license application.

(c) FOREIGN POLICY REVIEW.—The Department of State shall complete a foreign policy review of a request for authorization under subsection (a) not later than 30 days after the request is referred to the Department by the Office of Foreign Assets Control.

(d) LICENSE DETERMINATIONS.—License determinations for complete requests for authorization under subsection (a) shall be made not later than 90 days after receipt by the Office of Foreign Assets Control, with the following exceptions:

(1) Any requests involving the exportation or reexportation to Iran of goods, technology, or software listed on the Commerce Control List maintained pursuant to part 774 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be processed in a

manner consistent with the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (title XVI of Public Law 102-484) and other applicable provisions of law.

(2) Any other requests presenting unusual or extraordinary circumstances.

(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe such regulations as are appropriate to carry out this section.

SEC. 414. COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY TO PROMOTE INTERNET FREEDOM AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION IN IRAN.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the heads of other Federal agencies, as appropriate, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive strategy to—

(1) assist the people of Iran to produce, access, and share information freely and safely via the Internet, including in Farsi and regional languages;

(2) support the development of counter-censorship technologies that enable the citizens of Iran to undertake Internet activities without interference from the Government of Iran;

(3) increase the capabilities and availability of secure mobile and other communications through connective technology among human rights and democracy activists in Iran;

(4) provide resources for digital safety training for media and academic and civil society organizations in Iran;

(5) provide accurate and substantive Internet content in local languages in Iran;

(6) increase emergency resources for the most vulnerable human rights advocates seeking to organize, share information, and support human rights in Iran;

(7) expand surrogate radio, television, live stream, and social network communications inside Iran, including—

(A) by expanding Voice of America's Persian News Network and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's Radio Farda to provide hourly live news update programming and breaking news coverage capability 24 hours a day and 7 days a week; and

(B) by assisting telecommunications and software companies that are United States persons to comply with the export licensing requirements of the United States for the purpose of expanding such communications inside Iran;

(8) expand activities to safely assist and train human rights, civil society, and democracy activists in Iran to operate effectively and securely;

(9) identify and utilize all available resources to overcome attempts by the Government of Iran to jam or otherwise deny international satellite broadcasting signals;

(10) expand worldwide United States embassy and consulate programming for and outreach to Iranian dissident communities;

(11) expand access to proxy servers for democracy activists in Iran; and

(12) discourage telecommunications and software companies from facilitating Internet censorship by the Government of Iran.

SEC. 415. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON POLITICAL PRISONERS.

It shall be the policy of the United States—

(1) to support efforts to research and identify prisoners of conscience and cases of human rights abuses in Iran;

(2) to offer refugee status or political asylum in the United States to political dissidents in Iran if requested and consistent with the laws and national security interests of the United States;

(3) to offer to assist, through the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, with the relocation of such political prisoners to other countries if requested, as appropriate and with appropriate consideration for the national security interests of the United States; and

(4) to publicly call for the release of Iranian dissidents by name and raise awareness with re-

spect to individual cases of Iranian dissidents and prisoners of conscience, as appropriate and if requested by the dissidents or prisoners themselves or their families.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 501. EXCLUSION OF CITIZENS OF IRAN SEEKING EDUCATION RELATING TO THE NUCLEAR AND ENERGY SECTORS OF IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any alien who is a citizen of Iran that the Secretary of State determines seeks to enter the United States to participate in coursework at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))) to prepare the alien for a career in the energy sector of Iran or in nuclear science or nuclear engineering or a related field in Iran.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to visa applications filed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 502. INTERESTS IN CERTAIN FINANCIAL ASSETS OF IRAN.

(a) INTERESTS IN BLOCKED ASSETS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any provision of law relating to sovereign immunity, and preempting any inconsistent provision of State law, a financial asset that is—

(A) held in the United States for a foreign securities intermediary doing business in the United States,

(B) a blocked asset (whether or not subsequently unblocked) that is property described in subsection (b), and

(C) equal in value to a financial asset of Iran, including an asset of the central bank or monetary authority of the Government of Iran or any agency or instrumentality of that Government, that such foreign securities intermediary or a related intermediary holds abroad,

shall be subject to execution or attachment in aid of execution in order to satisfy any judgment to the extent of any compensatory damages awarded against Iran for damages for personal injury or death caused by an act of torture, extrajudicial killing, aircraft sabotage, or hostage-taking, or the provision of material support or resources for such an act.

(2) COURT DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—In order to ensure that Iran is held accountable for paying the judgments described in paragraph (1) and in furtherance of the broader goals of this Act to sanction Iran, prior to an award turning over any asset pursuant to execution or attachment in aid of execution with respect to any judgments against Iran described in paragraph (1), the court shall determine whether Iran holds equitable title to, or the beneficial interest in, the assets described in subsection (b) and that no other person possesses a constitutionally protected interest in the assets described in subsection (b) under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. To the extent the court determines that a person other than Iran holds—

(A) equitable title to, or a beneficial interest in, the assets described in subsection (b) (excluding a custodial interest of a foreign securities intermediary or a related intermediary that holds the assets abroad for the benefit of Iran), or

(B) a constitutionally protected interest in the assets described in subsection (b),

such assets shall be available only for execution or attachment in aid of execution to the extent of Iran's equitable title or beneficial interest therein and to the extent such execution or attachment does not infringe upon such constitutionally protected interest.

(b) FINANCIAL ASSETS DESCRIBED.—The financial assets described in this section are the financial assets that are identified in and the

subject of proceedings in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in *Peterson et al. v. Islamic Republic of Iran et al.*, Case No. 10 Civ. 4518 (BSJ) (GWG), that were restrained by restraining notices and levies secured by the plaintiffs in those proceedings, as modified by court order dated June 27, 2008, and extended by court orders dated June 23, 2009, May 10, 2010, and June 11, 2010, so long as such assets remain restrained by court order.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to affect the availability, or lack thereof, of a right to satisfy a judgment in any other action against a terrorist party in any proceedings other than proceedings referred to in subsection (b); or

(2) to apply to assets other than the assets described in subsection (b), or to preempt State law, including the Uniform Commercial Code, except as expressly provided in subsection (a)(1).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BLOCKED ASSET.—The term “blocked asset” —

(A) means any asset seized or frozen by the United States under section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 5(b)) or under section 202 or 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 and 1702); and

(B) does not include property that—

(i) is subject to a license issued by the United States Government for final payment, transfer, or disposition by or to a person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States in connection with a transaction for which the issuance of the license has been specifically required by a provision of law other than the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287 et seq.); or

(ii) is property subject to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations or the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, or that enjoys equivalent privileges and immunities under the laws of the United States, and is being used exclusively for diplomatic or consular purposes.

(2) FINANCIAL ASSET; SECURITIES INTERMEDIARY.—The terms “financial asset” and “securities intermediary” have the meanings given those terms in the Uniform Commercial Code, but the former includes cash.

(3) IRAN.—The term “Iran” means the Government of Iran, including the central bank or monetary authority of that Government and any agency or instrumentality of that Government.

(4) PERSON.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(B) ENTITY.—The term “entity” means a partnership, association, trust, joint venture, corporation, group, subgroup, or other organization.

(5) TERRORIST PARTY.—The term “terrorist party” has the meaning given that term in section 201(d) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (28 U.S.C. 1610 note).

(6) UNITED STATES.—The term “United States” includes all territory and waters, continental, or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(e) TECHNICAL CHANGES TO THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITIES ACT.—

(1) TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1610 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(7), by inserting after “section 1605A” the following: “or section 1605(a)(7) (as such section was in effect on January 27, 2008)”; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking “(5), 1605(b), or 1605A” and inserting “(5) or 1605(b)”; and

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting “, or”; and

(ii) by adding after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) the judgment relates to a claim for which the agency or instrumentality is not immune by virtue of section 1605A of this chapter or section 1605(a)(7) of this chapter (as such section was in effect on January 27, 2008), regardless of whether the property is or was involved in the act upon which the claim is based.”.

(2) **TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE ACT OF 2002.**—Section 201(a) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (28 U.S.C. 1610 note) is amended by striking “section 1605(a)(7)” and inserting “section 1605A or 1605(a)(7)” (as such section was in effect on January 27, 2008).”.

SEC. 503. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO SECTION 1245 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012.

(a) **EXCEPTION FOR SALES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1245(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES,” after “SALES OF”; and

(B) in the text, by inserting “agricultural commodities,” after “sale of”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1298).

(b) **REPORT OF ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1245(d)(4)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)(4)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking “60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 60 days thereafter” and inserting “October 25, 2012, and the last Thursday of every other month thereafter”; and

(B) by striking “60-day period” and inserting “2-month period”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on September 1, 2012.

SEC. 504. EXPANSION OF SANCTIONS UNDER SECTION 1245 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a), as amended by section 503, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “a foreign financial institution owned or controlled by the government of a foreign country, including”; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(D)—

(i) by striking “Sanctions imposed” and inserting the following:

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Sanctions imposed”;

(ii) in clause (i), as designated by clause (i) of this subparagraph—

(I) by striking “a foreign financial institution” and inserting “a financial transaction described in clause (ii) conducted or facilitated by a foreign financial institution”;

(II) by striking “institution has significantly” and inserting “institution—

“(I) has significantly reduced”;

(III) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) in the case of a country that has previously received an exception under this subparagraph, has, after receiving the exception, reduced its crude oil purchases from Iran to zero.”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) **FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS DESCRIBED.**—A financial transaction conducted or facilitated by a foreign financial institution is described in this clause if—

“(I) the financial transaction is only for trade in goods or services between the country with primary jurisdiction over the foreign financial institution and Iran; and

“(II) any funds owed to Iran as a result of such trade are credited to an account located in the country with primary jurisdiction over the foreign financial institution.”;

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) **SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS.**—The terms ‘reduce significantly’, ‘significant reduction’, and ‘significantly reduced’, with respect to purchases from Iran of petroleum and petroleum products, include a reduction in such purchases in terms of price or volume toward a complete cessation of such purchases.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **TERMINATION.**—The provisions of this section shall terminate on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress the certification described in section 401(a) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8551(a)).”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to financial transactions conducted or facilitated on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 505. REPORTS ON NATURAL GAS EXPORTS FROM IRAN.

(a) **REPORT BY ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration shall submit to the President and the appropriate congressional committees a report on the natural gas sector of Iran that includes—

(1) an assessment of exports of natural gas from Iran;

(2) an identification of the countries that purchase the most natural gas from Iran;

(3) an assessment of alternative supplies of natural gas available to those countries;

(4) an assessment of the impact a reduction in exports of natural gas from Iran would have on global natural gas supplies and the price of natural gas, especially in countries identified under paragraph (2); and

(5) such other information as the Administrator considers appropriate.

(b) **REPORT BY PRESIDENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after receiving the report required by subsection (a), the President shall, relying on information in that report, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(A) an assessment of—

(i) the extent to which revenues from exports of natural gas from Iran are still enriching the Government of Iran;

(ii) whether a sanctions regime similar to the sanctions regime imposed with respect to purchases of petroleum and petroleum products from Iran pursuant to section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as amended by sections 503 and 504, or other measures could be applied effectively to exports of natural gas from Iran;

(iii) the geostrategic implications of a reduction in exports of natural gas from Iran, including the impact of such a reduction on the countries identified under subsection (a)(2);

(iv) alternative supplies of natural gas available to those countries; and

(v) the impact a reduction in exports of natural gas from Iran would have on global natural gas supplies and the price of natural gas and the impact, if any, on swap arrangements for natural gas in place between Iran and neighboring countries; and

(B) specific recommendations with respect to measures designed to limit the revenue received

by the Government of Iran from exports of natural gas; and

(C) any other information the President considers appropriate.

(2) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 506. REPORT ON MEMBERSHIP OF IRAN IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than September 1 of each year thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report listing the international organizations of which Iran is a member and detailing the amount that the United States contributes to each such organization on an annual basis.

SEC. 507. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EXPORTATION OF GOODS, SERVICES, AND TECHNOLOGIES FOR AIRCRAFT PRODUCED IN THE UNITED STATES.

It is the sense of Congress that licenses to export or reexport goods, services, or technologies for aircraft produced in the United States should be provided only in situations in which such licenses are truly essential and in a manner consistent with the laws and foreign policy goals of the United States.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.

(a) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out—

(1) sections 211, 212, 213, 217, 218, 220, 312, and 411, subtitle A of title III, and title VII;

(2) section 104A of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, as added by section 312; and

(3) sections 105A and 105B of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, as added by subtitle A of title IV.

(b) **PENALTIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of a provision specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection, or an order or regulation prescribed under such a provision, to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a) of that Act.

(2) **PROVISIONS SPECIFIED.**—The provisions specified in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Sections 211, 212, 213, and 220, subtitle A of title III, and title VII.

(B) Sections 105A and 105B of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, as added by subtitle A of title IV.

SEC. 602. APPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN INTELIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall apply to the authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

SEC. 603. APPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN NATURAL GAS PROJECTS.

(a) **EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN NATURAL GAS PROJECTS.**—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall apply to any activity relating to a project—

(1) for the development of natural gas and the construction and operation of a pipeline to transport natural gas from Azerbaijan to Turkey and Europe;

(2) that provides to Turkey and countries in Europe energy security and energy independence from the Government of the Russian Federation and other governments with jurisdiction over persons subject to sanctions imposed under this Act or amendments made by this Act; and

(3) that was initiated before the date of the enactment of this Act pursuant to a production-

sharing agreement, or an ancillary agreement necessary to further a production-sharing agreement, entered into with, or a license granted by, the government of a country other than Iran before such date of enactment.

(b) TERMINATION OF EXCEPTION.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The exception under subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to a project described in that subsection on or after the date on which the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) the percentage of the equity interest in the project held by or on behalf of an entity described in paragraph (2) has increased relative to the percentage of the equity interest in the project held by or on behalf of such an entity on January 1, 2002; or

(B) an entity described in paragraph (2) has assumed an operational role in the project.

(2) **ENTITY DESCRIBED.**—An entity described in this paragraph is—

(A) an entity—

(i) owned or controlled by the Government of Iran or identified under section 560.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to the definition of the Government of Iran); or

(ii) organized under the laws of Iran or with the participation or approval of the Government of Iran;

(B) an entity owned or controlled by an entity described in subparagraph (A); or

(C) a successor entity to an entity described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 604. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO USE OF FORCE AGAINST IRAN AND SYRIA.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed as a declaration of war or an authorization of the use of force against Iran or Syria.

SEC. 605. TERMINATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The provisions of sections 211, 212, 213, 218, 220, 221, and 501, title I, and subtitle A of title III shall terminate on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President makes the certification described in section 401(a) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8551(a)).

(b) **AMENDMENT TO TERMINATION DATE OF COMPREHENSIVE IRAN SANCTIONS, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND DIVESTMENT ACT OF 2010.**—Section 401(a)(2) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8551(a)(2)) is amended by inserting “, and verifiably dismantled its,” after “development of”.

TITLE VII—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN SYRIA

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Syria Human Rights Accountability Act of 2012”.

SEC. 702. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN PERSONS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR OR COMPLICIT IN HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES COMMITTED AGAINST CITIZENS OF SYRIA OR THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall impose sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to each person on the list required by subsection (b).

(b) **LIST OF PERSONS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR OR COMPLICIT IN CERTAIN HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of persons who are officials of the Government of Syria or persons acting on behalf of that Government that the President determines, based on credible evidence, are responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Syria or their family mem-

bers, regardless of whether such abuses occurred in Syria.

(2) **UPDATES OF LIST.**—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an updated list under paragraph (1)—

(A) not later than 300 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 180 days thereafter; and

(B) as new information becomes available.

(3) **FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—

(A) **FORM.**—The list required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(B) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The unclassified portion of the list required by paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public and posted on the websites of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of State.

(4) **CONSIDERATION OF DATA FROM OTHER COUNTRIES AND NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—In preparing the list required by paragraph (1), the President shall consider credible data already obtained by other countries and nongovernmental organizations, including organizations in Syria, that monitor the human rights abuses of the Government of Syria.

(c) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), including blocking of property and restrictions or prohibitions on financial transactions and the exportation of property, subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe.

SEC. 703. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSFER OF GOODS OR TECHNOLOGIES TO SYRIA THAT ARE LIKELY TO BE USED TO COMMIT HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall impose sanctions described in section 702(c) with respect to—

(1) each person on the list required by subsection (b); and

(2) any person that—

(A) is a successor entity to a person on the list;

(B) owns or controls a person on the list, if the person that owns or controls the person on the list had actual knowledge or should have known that the person on the list engaged in the activity described in subsection (b)(2) for which the person was included in the list; or

(C) is owned or controlled by, or under common ownership or control with, the person on the list, if the person owned or controlled by, or under common ownership or control with (as the case may be), the person on the list knowingly engaged in the activity described in subsection (b)(2) for which the person was included in the list.

(b) **LIST.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of persons that the President determines have knowingly engaged in an activity described in paragraph (2) on or after such date of enactment.

(2) **ACTIVITY DESCRIBED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A person engages in an activity described in this paragraph if the person—

(i) transfers, or facilitates the transfer of, goods or technologies described in subparagraph (C) to Syria; or

(ii) provides services with respect to goods or technologies described in subparagraph (C) after such goods or technologies are transferred to Syria.

(B) **APPLICABILITY TO CONTRACTS AND OTHER AGREEMENTS.**—A person engages in an activity described in subparagraph (A) without regard to whether the activity is carried out pursuant to a contract or other agreement entered into before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(C) **GOODS OR TECHNOLOGIES DESCRIBED.**—Goods or technologies described in this subpara-

graph are goods or technologies that the President determines are likely to be used by the Government of Syria or any of its agencies or instrumentalities to commit human rights abuses against the people of Syria, including—

(i) firearms or ammunition (as those terms are defined in section 921 of title 18, United States Code), rubber bullets, police batons, pepper or chemical sprays, stun grenades, electroshock weapons, tear gas, water cannons, or surveillance technology; or

(ii) sensitive technology.

(D) **SENSITIVE TECHNOLOGY DEFINED.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of subparagraph (C), the term “sensitive technology” means hardware, software, telecommunications equipment, or any other technology, that the President determines is to be used specifically—

(I) to restrict the free flow of unbiased information in Syria; or

(II) to disrupt, monitor, or otherwise restrict speech of the people of Syria.

(ii) **EXCEPTION.**—The term “sensitive technology” does not include information or informational materials the exportation of which the President does not have the authority to regulate or prohibit pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)(3)).

(3) **SPECIAL RULE TO ALLOW FOR TERMINATION OF SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITY.**—The President shall not be required to include a person on the list required by paragraph (1) if the President certifies in writing to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) the person is no longer engaging in, or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping, the activity described in paragraph (2) for which the person would otherwise have included the person on the list; and

(B) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in any activity described in paragraph (2) in the future.

(4) **UPDATES OF LIST.**—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an updated list under paragraph (1)—

(A) not later than 300 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 180 days thereafter; and

(B) as new information becomes available.

(5) **FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—

(A) **FORM.**—The list required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(B) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The unclassified portion of the list required by paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public and posted on the websites of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of State.

SEC. 704. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO ENGAGE IN CENSORSHIP OR OTHER FORMS OF REPRESSION IN SYRIA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall impose sanctions described in section 702(c) with respect to each person on the list required by subsection (b).

(b) **LIST OF PERSONS WHO ENGAGE IN CENSORSHIP.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of persons that the President determines have engaged in censorship, or activities relating to censorship, in a manner that prohibits, limits, or penalizes the legitimate exercise of freedom of expression by citizens of Syria.

(2) **UPDATES OF LIST.**—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an updated list under paragraph (1)—

(A) not later than 300 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 180 days thereafter; and

(B) as new information becomes available.

(3) **FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—

(A) **FORM.**—The list required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The unclassified portion of the list required by paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public and posted on the websites of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of State.

SEC. 705. WAIVER.

The President may waive the requirement to include a person on a list required by section 702, 703, or 704 or to impose sanctions pursuant to any such section if the President—

(1) determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(2) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the reasons for that determination.

SEC. 706. TERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of this title and any sanctions imposed pursuant to this title shall terminate on the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) the certification described in subsection (b); and

(2) a certification that—

(A) the Government of Syria is democratically elected and representative of the people of Syria; or

(B) a legitimate transitional government of Syria is in place.

(b) CERTIFICATION DESCRIBED.—A certification described in this subsection is a certification by the President that the Government of Syria—

(1) has unconditionally released all political prisoners;

(2) has ceased its practices of violence, unlawful detention, torture, and abuse of citizens of Syria engaged in peaceful political activity;

(3) has ceased its practice of procuring sensitive technology designed to restrict the free flow of unbiased information in Syria, or to disrupt, monitor, or otherwise restrict the right of citizens of Syria to freedom of expression;

(4) has ceased providing support for foreign terrorist organizations and no longer allows such organizations, including Hamas, Hezbollah, and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, to maintain facilities in territory under the control of the Government of Syria; and

(5) has ceased the development and deployment of medium- and long-range surface-to-surface ballistic missiles;

(6) is not pursuing or engaged in the research, development, acquisition, production, transfer, or deployment of biological, chemical, or nuclear weapons, and has provided credible assurances that it will not engage in such activities in the future; and

(7) has agreed to allow the United Nations and other international observers to verify that the Government of Syria is not engaging in such activities and to assess the credibility of the assurances provided by that Government.

(c) SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS AFTER ELECTION OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT.—If the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the certification described in subsection (a)(2), the President may suspend the provisions of this title and any sanctions imposed under this title for not more than 180 days to allow time for a certification described in subsection (b) to be submitted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, by prior agreement with the gentleman from California, who will do the same, I would like to yield 5 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr.

KUCINICH) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control those 5 minutes.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are we apportioning that 5 minutes from each side?

Mr. BERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. At the point where I am recognized, I will be also seeking unanimous consent for the same kind of referral of time to your control.

Mr. KUCINICH. I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would also yield 5 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control those 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on this floor many times about the Iranian threat and the need for action to stop it, but ultimately we will all be judged by a simple question: Did we stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapons capability? If the answer is “no,” if we fail, then nothing else matters. If we fail, it would be of no comfort to the American people whose security and future would be put in danger. If we fail, it would be of no comfort to our ally, Israel, whose very existence would be put in danger.

History is full of avoidable tragedies, of foolish countries that have allowed their enemies to prepare to destroy them. The entire world now is fully aware of Iran's true intention. Now is the time to take a stand. As Sir Winston Churchill said:

You ask, What is our aim? I can answer with one word: victory. For without victory, there is no survival.

To get us on that path to victory, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to render their full support to the Iran Threat Reduction and the Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, a bicameral, bipartisan agreement that represents the strongest set of sanctions ever put in place against the regime in Tehran. It black-

lists virtually all of Iran's energy, financial, and transportation sectors, and cuts off companies that keep doing business with Iran from access to our markets in the United States.

This legislation also imposes sanctions to prevent Iran from repatriating any proceeds from its oil sales, depriving the Iranian regime of 80 percent of its hard currency earnings and half of the funds that support its budget. This bill also imposes tough new sanctions on the National Iranian Oil Company, the National Iranian Tanker Company, and Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. It also targets Iran's use of barter transactions to bypass sanctions, the provisions of insurance to Iran's energy sector. It also targets provisions of specialized financial messaging services to the Central Bank of Iran.

Mr. Speaker, in 1995, the late former Secretary of State, Warren Christopher said:

In terms of its organization, programs, procurement, and covert activities, Iran is pursuing the classic route to nuclear weapons, which has been followed by almost all states that have recently sought a nuclear capability.

That was in 1995.

Secretary Christopher added:

There is no room for complacency.

Congress passed the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act in '96. That law, now called the Iran Sanctions Act, sought to target Iran's economic lifeline—its energy sector—and denied Tehran the financial resources to pursue its nuclear ambitions, to sponsor violent Islamic groups, and to dominate the region.

□ 1430

Regrettably, just a couple years after enactment of that law, the Clinton administration issued a blanket waiver of energy sector sanctions that has been continued by successive administrations.

In 1996, U.S. concerns were not shared by our allies in Europe and Asia, who argued that trade, dialogue, and engagement toward the Iranian regime would succeed in moderating Tehran's behavior. This allowed the Iranian threat to flourish.

However, Congress continued to develop new legislative countermeasures in the form of the Iran Freedom Support Act of 2006 and the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 to address these Iranian threats and to hold the regime accountable for its human rights violations, for its state sponsorship of violent extremists, and for its pursuit of a nuclear capability.

We have analyzed Iranian reaction and behavior in response to these new sanctions. We have looked at what steps our allies have undertaken and considered the actions, or the paralysis, of the United Nations. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, we have intensified our response as the Iranian threat has evolved and grown.

We know that “the price of freedom is eternal vigilance.” But far more than vigilance is needed in this case.

Which brings us to the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act, which we are considering today. This bipartisan, bicameral agreement seeks to tighten the choke hold on the regime beyond anything that has been done before. It sends a clear message that the American people, through their elected representatives, are fully committed to using every economic and political lever at their disposal to prevent Iran from crossing the nuclear threshold.

Through this bill, we declare that the Iranian energy sector is off limits, and it blacklists any related unauthorized dealings. It will undermine Iran's ability to repatriate the revenues it receives from the sale of crude oil, depriving Iran of hard currency earnings and funds needed to sustain its nuclear program. It prevents the purchasing of Iranian sovereign debt, thereby further limiting the regime's ability to finance its illicit activities. It also expands sanctions against Iranian and Syrian officials for human rights abuses, particularly those facilitated by computer and network disruption, monitoring, and tracking by those governments.

Yet we should be under no illusions, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is a magic wand that we wave, and we will resolve the problem overnight. Sanctions have helped to knock the regime off balance. But unless the executive branch fully implements these measures immediately, the regime is likely to regain its footing and further speed up its nuclear march. So let us act now to stop that march.

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

Mr. Speaker, the threat posed by the Iranian regime is not just a threat to the United States, or to our allies, or to the Iranian people.

The Iranian regime is also a threat to the Syrian people, because of Iran's close ties and assistance, including weapons that have helped the regime in Syria to slaughter thousands.

Like Iran, Syria is a state sponsor of terrorism that poses a threat to the U.S., to our ally Israel, and to other responsible nations.

I hope to be back on the House floor in the near future with the Syria Freedom Support Act to address the totality of the Syrian threat, but today we stand ready to hold the Assad regime accountable for its gross human rights violations.

Today, we seek to ensure that neither of these brutal regimes has access to resources that would enable them to perpetuate their cruelty.

Those allies who, 16 years ago, wanted to engage and continue business as usual with Iran and who, until just a few years ago, were proposing expanded trade agreements with the Assad regime in Syria, have awoken to take a stand against the threatening activities of these pariah states.

Congress must carry out its responsibility to the American people and overwhelmingly adopt the bicameral, bipartisan agreement we are considering today.

I urge the President to quickly sign it into law and immediately and fully implement the sanctions it contains.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), a national leader on the issue of non-proliferation and human rights and particularly our efforts to stop Iran's nuclear weapons program, the Democratic whip of the House.

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

First, I want to rise and thank Chairwoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for her continuing leadership and focus on this important issue, as she does on so many other issues as well.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend, the gentleman from California and ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. BERMAN. His leadership on this issue in Congress is second to none, and I commend him for his work.

This is a bill I expect will pass with overwhelming support in both parties and for good reason. Iran cannot be allowed to develop a nuclear weapon. America's policy, as President Obama has stated, is prevention, not containment.

We have many tools at our disposal to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons technology. While President Obama is keeping all options on the table, the best diplomatic tool we have to deter Iran is the sanctions regime his administration has expanded along with our allies in Europe and elsewhere. These sanctions have already had a significant effect, and Iran continues to face the prospect of severe economic repercussions if they fail to abandon their nuclear weapons plan.

President Obama deserves credit for his tough stances. The new sanctions this legislation would impose target entities conducting business with Iran's insurance, energy, and shipping sectors. As a result of prohibitions on repatriating oil revenues, these sanctions would deny Iran 80 percent of its hard currency earnings. Iran's banking sector, including its central bank, is already sanctioned, a result of the Iranian Government's financial support for terrorism in the region and around the world.

There is no better evidence why this bill is so important than the fact that 2 weeks ago, a terrorist attack in Bulgaria killed six innocent civilians, five of them vacationing Israelis. There have been numerous press reports linking Iran to that attack.

As long as Iran continues to pursue nuclear weapons, call for the destruction of Israel, and provide arms to terror groups like Hamas and Hezbollah, it will face the consequences in the form of sanctions, isolation, and the continuing reality of the option of military action.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I am pleased to yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. The United States continues to stand strongly with our ally Israel. And I am

proud to have led an effort earlier this year with the majority leader to strengthen U.S.-Israel military and intelligence relations.

I urge all of my colleagues to unite behind this bill, just as we did behind that one. A nuclear-armed Iran is not an option for the Middle East, for the international community, and for the United States.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Congressman RON PAUL, an American patriot, someone who has been relentless in his efforts to stop America from blundering into foreign adventures.

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think this bill would be better named if we called it "Obsession with Iran Act of 2012" because this is what we continue to be doing—obsess with Iran and the idea that Iran is a threat to our national security.

Iran happens to be a Third World nation. They have no significant navy, air force, intercontinental ballistic missiles. The IAEA and our CIA say they are not on the verge of a nuclear weapon.

It's so similar to what we went through in the early part of this last decade where we were beating the war drums to go to war against Iraq. And it was all a facade. There was no danger from Iraq. So this is what we're doing, beating the war drums once again.

Since the bill has come back from the conference, if we are to deal with civil liberties in Syria—well, I happen to be a civil libertarian. I am very concerned about civil liberties. But let me tell you, this bill is not going to do anything to enhance the civil liberties of the individuals in Syria.

If we were really interested in civil liberties, why wouldn't we look to ourselves? Why wouldn't we look to the things we do here? What about our warrantless searches under the PATRIOT Act? What about the policy of assassination, assassinating American citizens? What about arrests by the military, the National Defense Authorization Act? What about the drone warfare that we go on? Do you think we are protecting civil liberties by arbitrarily dropping drones or threatening to drop drones anyplace in the world, with innocent people dying?

If we want to really care about civil liberties in Syria, why don't we care about the secret prisons we have and the history of torture that we have had in this country?

What about the fact that kill lists are being made by the executive branch of government, and we sit idly by and approve of it by saying nothing, and the American people put up with it, and we march in this direction, marching into a determination to have another war?

When you put sanctions on a country, it's an act of war, and that is what this is all about. The first thing you do when war breaks out between two

countries is you put sanctions on them. You blockade the country. So this is an act of war.

What would we do if somebody blockaded and put sanctions on us and prevented the importation of any product of this country? We would be furious. We would declare war. We would go to war.

□ 1440

So we are the antagonists. We're over there poking our nose and poking our nose in other people's affairs, just looking for a chance to start another war. First it's Syria and then Iran. We have too many wars. We need to stop the wars. We don't have the money to fight these wars any longer.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TURNER), a member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. TURNER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1905, the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012. I would like to applaud Chairwoman ROS-LEHTINEN's tireless effort on this legislation to ensure that Iran's terrorist regime does not threaten the security of the United States and our greatest ally in the Middle East, Israel.

I'm sure many of you remember that Iran was found by a Federal court to have been directly involved in both the 1983 attacks on the marine barracks in Beirut which killed 241 soldiers and the Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia where a suicide bomber killed 14 airmen. The victims and their families won a judgment in court against the Iranian Government, but have had difficulty enforcing it because Iran could hide behind sovereign immunity.

I introduced H.R. 4070, which is now part of this bill, to change a specific part of Federal law to allow assets seized from the Iranian Government to be allocated to the Beirut and Khobar Towers families to recover the judgments owed to them. It is time that Iran is held accountable for their involvement in the deaths of our soldiers.

I'm proud to say that this provision is truly bipartisan. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle stand together against Iran. By passing this bill today, we offer the victims' families the justice that they have long been denied.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 750, and I yield myself 2½ minutes.

The bill before us today marks a significant step forward in our sanctions effort against the Iranian regime and its illicit nuclear program, the sanctions effort which even Tehran acknowledges is already having a stressful impact on Iran's economy. I want to commend my colleague, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for her work on this legislation; and I'm proud to be the bill's chief cosponsor in the House.

Building on previous sanctions, this bill adds to what the gentlelady and I

set out to do when we introduced it. For example, through further limiting transitions with the Central Bank of Iran, an initiative I originated, this legislation restricts Iran's ability to repatriate the revenue it receives from its diminishing oil sales. It includes provisions that clamp down on Iran's oil exports by targeting the National Iranian Oil Company and the National Iranian Tanker Company; and it expands sanctions on Iranian shipping, insurance, and financing in the energy sector.

The bill also increases sanctions on transactions with Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, the spearhead of Iran's nuclear proliferation and terrorism effort and the dominant player in the Iranian economy. Further, at my suggestion, this bill now includes a measure which expands CISADA sanctions beyond financial institutions to include more than 200 additional individuals and companies that have been linked to Iran's nuclear weapons of mass destruction and terrorism programs.

And of critical importance, this bill vastly strengthens sanctions on both Iranian and Syrian human rights abusers. These provisions are very important, but the Iranians should not be fooled into thinking this is the last word on sanctions. Far from it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to call on the administration to implement the authorities we have given them, fully and without delay. Iran's nuclear clock is ticking, and time is not on our side. The actions the executive branch took yesterday, including the first-ever CISADA sanctions on foreign banks—more than 2 years after CISADA became law—are a good beginning, but Iran's nuclear weapons program continues apace. Every day, it is enriching more uranium and at higher levels.

The only hope we have for a peaceful solution is to apply enough pressure to ensure that Iran ends its nuclear weapons program. The bill before us and the action the administration has taken applies significantly more pressure; but let there be no doubt, there is more we can do and more that we will do if Iran doesn't end its nuclear weapons program verifiably and completely. We have more work to do.

SPECIALLY DESIGNATED NATIONALS AND
BLOCKED PERSONS LIST SEARCH (UPDATED:
6/25/2012)

NPWMD
ENTITIES/INDIVIDUALS

Advanced Information and Communication Technology Center; ADVANCE NOVEL LIMITED; AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES ORGANIZATION; APZALI, Ali; ALPHA EFFORT LIMITED; ASHTEAD SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; ASIA MARINE NETWORK PTE. LTD.; ASSA CO. LTD.; ASSA CORP.; ATLANTIC INTERMODAL; AZORES SHIPPING COMPANY LL FZE; BALDACCHINO, Adrian; BATENI, Naser; BEST PRECISE LIMITED; BIIS MARITIME LIMITED; BMMC INTERNATIONAL GENERAL TRADING LTD; BUSHEHR SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; BYFLEET SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; CARVANA COMPANY; CEMENT

INVESTMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMPANY.

CIRE, Kursad Zafer; COBHAM SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; CONCEPT GIANT LIMITED; CRYSTAL SHIPPING FZE; DAJMAR, Mohhammad Hossein; DARYA CAPITAL ADMINISTRATION GMBH; Digital Media Lab; DIVANDARI, Ali; DORKING SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; DURANSOY, Cagri; DURANSOY, Muammer Kuntay; EFFINGHAM SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; EIGHTH OCEAN ADMINISTRATION GMBH; EIGHTH OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; Electronic Components Industries; ELECTRONICS INSTITUTE; ELEVENTH OCEAN ADMINISTRATION GMBH; ELEVENTH OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; EZATI, Ali; FAIRWAY SHIPPING LTD.

FALSAFI, Mahin; FARNHAM SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; FAROOQ, Muhammad; FIFTEENTH OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; FIFTH OCEAN ADMINISTRATION GMBH; FIFTH OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; FIRST OCEAN ADMINISTRATION GMBH; FIRST OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; FIRST PERSIA EQUITY FUND; FOURTEENTH OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; FOURTH OCEAN ADMINISTRATION GMBH; FOURTH OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; Frosch, Daniel; FULMEN GROUP; GALLIOT MARITIME INC; GHEZEL AYAGH, Alireza; GLOBAL INTERFACE COMPANY INC.; GOLPARVAR, Gholamhossein; GOMSHALL SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; Good Luck Shipping.

GREAT METHOD LIMITED; GREAT OCEAN SHIPPING SERVICES (L.L.C.); HAFIZ DARYA SHIPPING CO; HIGHER INSTITUTE OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY; HORSHAM SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; HTTS HANSEATIC TRADE TRUST AND SHIPPING, GMBH; IDEAL SUCCESS INVESTMENTS LIMITED; INDUS MARITIME INC; International General Resourcing; IRAN AIR; IRAN AIRCRAFT MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIAL COMPANY; IRAN CENTRIFUGE TECHNOLOGY COMPANY; IRAN COMMUNICATION INDUSTRIES; IRAN ELECTRONICS INDUSTRIES; IRAN O MISR SHIPPING COMPANY; IRANAIR TOURS; IRINVESTSHIP LTD.; IRISL (MALTA) LIMITED; IRISL (UK) LTD.; IRISL CHINA SHIPPING CO., LTD.

IRISL EUROPE GMBH; IRISL MARINE SERVICES & ENGINEERING COMPANY; IRISL MULTIMODAL TRANSPORT CO.; IRITAL SHIPPING SRL COMPANY; ISI MARITIME LIMITED; ISIM AMIN LIMITED; ISIM ATR LIMITED; ISIM OLIVE LIMITED; ISIM SAT LIMITED; ISIM SEA CHARIOT LIMITED; ISIM SEA CRESCENT LIMITED; ISIM SININ LIMITED; ISIM TAJ MAHAL LIMITED; ISIM TOUR LIMITED; ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN SHIPPING LINES; JAFARI, Mani; JAFARI, Milad; JAFARI, Mohammad Javad; JAVEDAN MEHR TOOS; KAVERI MARITIME INC.

KERMAN SHIPPING CO LTD; KHALILI, Jamshid; KHAZAR SEA SHIPPING LINES; KOHAS AG; LANCELIN SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; LEADING MARITIME PTE. LTD.; LERCH, Gotthard; LOGISTIC SMART LIMITED; LOWESWATER LIMITED; M. BABAIE INDUSTRIES; MACHINE PARDAZAN CO.; MACPAR MAKINA SAN VE TIC A.S.; Malek Ashtar University; MALEKI, Naser; MALSHIP SHIPPING AGENCY LTD.; MARANER HOLDINGS LIMITED; MARBLE SHIPPING LIMITED; MAZANDARAN CEMENT COMPANY; MAZANDARAN TEXTILE COMPANY; MEHR CAYMAN LTD.

MELODIOUS MARITIME INC; MILL DENE LIMITED; MINISTRY OF DEFENSE FOR ARMED FORCES LOGISTICS; Ministry of Defense Logistics Export; MODALITY LIMITED; MOGHADDAMI FARD, Mohammad; MOUNT EVEREST MARITIME INC;

MULTIMAT IC VE DIS TICARET PAZARLAMA LIMITED SIRKETI; MUNITIONS INDUSTRY DEPARTMENT; NABIPOUR, Ghasem; NARI SHIPPING AND CHARTERING GMBH & CO. KG; NATIONAL STANDARDS AND CALIBRATION LABORATORY; NEKA NOVIN; NEUMAN LIMITED; NEW DESIRE LIMITED; NINTH OCEAN ADMINISTRATION GMBH; NINTH OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; NOOR AFZAR GOSTAR COMPANY; OCEAN CAPITAL ADMINISTRATION GMBH; PACIFIC SHIPPING DMCEST.

PAJAND, Mohammad Hadi; PARTNER CENTURY LIMITED; PARTO SANAT CO.; PAYA PARTOV CO.; PEARL ENERGY COMPANY LTD.; PEARL ENERGY SERVICES, SA; PEARL SHIP MANAGEMENT L.L.C.; QANNADI, Mohammad; Rabiee, Hamid Reza; RISHI MARITIME INC; ROYAL-MED SHIPPING AGENCY LTD; SACKVILLE HOLDINGS LIMITED; SAFIRAN PAYAM DARYA SHIPPING COMPANY; SANDFORD GROUP LIMITED; SARKANDI, Ahmad; SCIENTIFIC STUDIES AND RESEARCH CENTER; SECOND ACADEMY OF NATURAL SCIENCES; SECOND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE; SECOND OCEAN ADMINISTRATION GMBH; SECOND OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG.

SEVENTH OCEAN ADMINISTRATION GMBH; SEVENTH OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; SHAHID AHMAD KAZEMI INDUSTRIES GROUP; SHAHID BAKERI INDUSTRIAL GROUP; SHAHID SATTARI INDUSTRIES; SHALLON LIMITED; SHERE SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; SHIPPING COMPUTER SERVICES COMPANY; SHIRAZ ELECTRONICS INDUSTRIES; SHOMAL CEMENT COMPANY; SIMATIC DEVELOPMENT CO.; SINO ACCESS HOLDINGS LIMITED; SINOSE MARITIME PTE. LTD.; SIXTH OCEAN ADMINISTRATION GMBH; SIXTH OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; SMART DAY HOLDINGS GROUP LIMITED; SOROUSH SARZAMIN ASATIR SHIP MANAGEMENT COMPANY; SPRINGTHORPE LIMITED; STARRY SHINE INTERNATIONAL LIMITED; STEIGER, Jakob.

STEP A.S.; SYSTEM WISE LIMITED; TAFAZOLI, Ahmad; TAHIR, Buhary Seyed Abu; TALAI, Mohamad; TENTH OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; THE NUCLEAR REACTORS FUEL COMPANY; THIRD OCEAN ADMINISTRATION GMBH; THIRD OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; THIRTEENTH OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; TONGHAM SHIPPING CO LTD; TOP GLACIER COMPANY LIMITED; TOP PRESTIGE TRADING LIMITED; TOSONG TECHNOLOGY TRADING CORPORATION; TRADE TREASURE LIMITED.

TRANS MERITS CO. LTD.; TRUE HONOUR HOLDINGS LIMITED; TWELFTH OCEAN ADMINISTRATION GMBH; TWELFTH OCEAN GMBH & CO. KG; UPPERCOURT SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; VAHIDI, Ahmad; Value-Added Services Laboratory; VALFAJR 8TH SHIPPING LINE CO SSK; VOBSTER SHIPPING COMPANY LTD; WISSER, Gerhard; WOKING SHIPPING INVESTMENTS LIMITED; YASA PART; ZADEH, Hassan Jalil.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 30 seconds.

What this is doing is essentially stopping any kind of a negotiated deal and putting us on a path towards war with Iran. You know, it is likely that any negotiated deal that would prevent a nuclear-armed Iran would provide for Iranian enrichment for peaceful purposes under the framework of the nuclear nonproliferation weapons treaty with strict safeguards and inspections. So we're taking a path here that guarantees that we're put on a glide slope right to war. Why are we doing this, we

don't have enough wars in this country? We aren't involved in enough places around the world in war?

This is a bad resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is our subcommittee chairman on Middle East and South Asia of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and I thank her for her very strong support and leadership on this particular issue and on so many issues in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this well-crafted legislation which significantly ratchets up pressure on the regime in Tehran, as well as all those who support or enable its dangerous quest for a nuclear weapons capability. As we stand here today, Iran's centrifuges continue to spin and the regime inches closer to that very end. If allowed to cross that threshold, untold consequences would surely follow.

Iran, which former President George W. Bush aptly called the "world's primary state sponsor of terror," would no doubt feel emboldened in its meddling in the internal affairs of our gulf allies and in threats to U.S. global and regional interests. Questions of rationality aside, the regime would also have the ability to follow through on its repeated threats to eradicate the State of Israel. Iran cannot be allowed to acquire this capability, and I believe that this legislation may very well significantly enhance pressure on the regime.

The nuclear program is, however, a symptom of the disease rather than the disease itself. A nuclear program is not in and of itself what makes this particular regime so nefarious. Rather, it is the perverse nature of the regime that makes the nuclear program so dangerous. And there can be no doubt that the regime in Tehran is a blight upon the Iranian people and on the region, and, in fact, on the whole world. To speak of the nuclear program independently of the regime which pursues it is in effect putting the cart before the horse.

But this legislation does not fall into that trap. In addition to targeting the nuclear program, H.R. 1905 puts significant pressure on the regime for its horrific human rights abuses and supports the oppressed Iranian people in their fight for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this critical legislation, and I want to once again thank the distinguished chairwoman, Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN from Florida, for her leadership on this issue. She has been pushing and pushing and pushing against this corrupt Iranian regime for such a long time, and to do right by our ally Israel, and ultimately to do what is in the best interest of the people of the United States as well. It is in nobody's interest to have a nuclear Iran, and so I want to thank her for her leadership.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Nonproliferation and Trade.

□ 1450

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank the chairwoman of the Foreign Affairs Committee for her work on this bill and for reaching an agreement with the Senate Banking Committee, and I rise in strong support of this measure.

I especially want to thank the chairman for working with me on title III of this bill, as it reflects several years of our work together. Title III targets the Iran Revolutionary Guard Corps and began its life as H.R. 2379, then designated the Iran Revolutionary Guard Corps Designation Implementation Act, which I introduced along with the chairman in May of 2009.

These provisions impose tough secondary sanctions against any person, including foreign companies, that conduct any significant transaction with the IRGC or any of its designated fronts and affiliates. The IRGC, through its support of Hezbollah and its direct action, has much blood on its hands.

I want to thank the chairman and her staff for including section 303, which applies sanctions to countries and governments—not just companies—that conduct transactions or provide support for the IRGC and for provisions which indicate that if you want to be a Federal contractor, you must certify that you do not do prohibited business with the IRGC.

This bill also includes important provisions I first proposed in the Stop Iran's Nuclear Weapons Program Act that will provide sanctions against those who lend money to the Iranian Government. It includes another provision I authored which will implement sanctions against those firms that give the Iranian Government the technologies for surveillance and repression of their own people.

This is not the final act, literally or figuratively. What we've done so far is not enough to force Iran to abandon its nuclear program. We ought to stay in session and pass even more sanctions against Iran.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would like to include for the RECORD a statement by the Friends Committee on National Legislation, which says that the new sanctions push the U.S. and Iran closer to war.

NEW IRAN SANCTIONS PUSH U.S., IRAN CLOSER TOWARD WAR—FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION

WASHINGTON, DC.—FCNL's Lobbyist on Middle East issues Kate Gould issued the following statement opposing the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (H.R. 1905) that could reach the House floor as early as today:

The Friends Committee on National Legislation strongly opposes the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (H.R. 1905). We believe this legislation would

undermine human rights in Iran and cripple the accountability of the diplomatic process now underway to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, pushing the U.S. and Iran closer toward a devastating war.

War is the ultimate human rights violation, and this bill lays the groundwork for war by escalating the scale of economic warfare that Congress would impose on ordinary Iranian citizens. As in the case of the decades of U.S. and U.N. sanctions against Iraq that culminated in a U.S. invasion of that country, economic warfare punishes civilians, emboldens hardliners in Iran's regime, and forecloses diplomatic options to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran and war.

PUNISHING IRANIAN CIVILIANS

FCNL and ten other national advocacy and religious organizations from the human rights and peace and security community wrote to Senator Tim Johnson, Chair of the Senate Banking Committee, last week to oppose this bill, and to highlight the importance of keeping channels open for Iranians to have access to food, medicine, and other humanitarian goods and services.

Ordinary Iranians already face tremendous difficulties in accessing basic medicine under sanctions. For example, this week, the board of directors of the Iranian Hemophilia Society informed the World Federation of Hemophilia that the lives of tens of thousands of children are being endangered by the lack of proper drugs, as a consequence of international sanctions.

The Iranian Hemophilia Society notes that U.S. and international sanctions technically do not ban medical goods. Yet, despite the 'humanitarian exemption' in U.S. sanctions laws, medicine is not getting in to Iran because the "sanctions imposed on the Central Bank of Iran and the country's other financial institutions have severely disrupted the purchase and transfer of medical goods."

The humanitarian exemption is of profound importance, as the U.S. business community and humanitarian organizations have pointed out. We are relieved that this legislation does not directly prohibit Iranians from accessing food, medicine, and humanitarian trade. However, if the Iranian civilian economy is destroyed by sanctions, then millions of Iranians will be deprived of their livelihoods, and unable to purchase the food, medicine, and other goods that the humanitarian exemption is supposed to protect. Further destabilization of the Iranian currency and decimation of the Iranian economy will push Iran closer to the state of Iraq when it was under sanctions. During that time, UNICEF estimated that U.N. sanctions contributed to the deaths of half a million children.

EMBOLDENING HARDLINERS IN IRAN

This bill would embolden hardliners in the Iranian regime, at the expense of the civilians who will overwhelmingly bear the brunt of these sanctions. Just as Saddam Hussein never missed a meal under the decades of sanctions against Iraq, top Iranian officials will not have difficulty accessing food and medicine. National security expert Fareed Zakaria has noted that the U.S./U.N. sanctions "basic effect has been to weaken civil society and strengthen the state", and that "the other effects of the sanctions has been that larger and larger parts of the economy are now controlled by Iran's Revolutionary Guard—the elite corps of the armed forces."

FORECLOSING DIPLOMATIC OPTIONS, LAYING GROUNDWORK FOR WAR

As countless U.S. and Israeli security officials have pointed out, diplomacy is the single most effective way to prevent war and a nuclear-armed Iran. This bill would be a setback to achieving a near-term diplomatic

resolution of the standoff over Iran's nuclear program, foreclosing diplomatic options to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran and a devastating war.

This bill would tie the President's hands, eroding the little flexibility that Congress normally allows the executive branch to conduct negotiations with Iran and allow for sanctions relief in exchange for serious, verifiable Iranian concessions. We are particularly concerned about section 217, which effectively endorses regime change. The provision would prohibit the President from lifting sanctions against the Central Bank of Iran unless Iran agrees to a host of conditions that the Islamic Republic of Iran cannot reasonably be expected to agree to.

As veteran intelligence officer Paul Pillar has pointed out, requiring Iran to end efforts to "acquire or develop ballistic missiles", [section 217 (d)(1)(A)(iii)] "goes beyond any United Nations resolutions on Iran, which talk about nuclear capability of missiles, and even beyond anything ever demanded of Saddam Hussein's Iraq, for which range limits were imposed. It would be understandable if Tehran reads such language as further evidence that the United States is not interested in any negotiated agreement but instead only in regime change."

The bill even requires the President to certify that Iran does not "construct, equip, operate, or maintain nuclear facilities that could aid Iran's effort to acquire a nuclear capability" [section 217 (d)(1)(A)(ii.)]: in order to lift sanctions against Iran's Central Bank. It appears that Congress is requiring that broad indiscriminate sanctions remain in place unless Iran surrenders its nuclear program entirely, even if it is a verifiably peace program.

FCNL strongly urges members of Congress to speak out and vote against this broad, indiscriminate sanctions legislation on the House floor today.

I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Representative RON PAUL.

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I'm still rather impressed with the obsession over a weapon that does not exist and no concern whatsoever about many nuclear weapons that are held by countries that never even joined the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

It's called for in the debate that Iran should end all its nuclear programs, but they're permitted to have the nuclear program under the nonproliferation treaty. And the other countries that have weapons, including the countries that hold the weapons that came from the Soviet system, it seems like that would be a much greater danger.

The investigation by either the U.N. or by our CAs has never indicated that they have ever enriched above 20 percent. And they said they won't even do it to 20 percent if the West would cooperate and sell them this material. They said, we don't need it, but we need 20 percent enrichment for nuclear isotopes, medical isotopes. So our refusal to deal with them prompts them to take up enrichment to 25 percent; 5 percent, of course, is what they're allowed to do for nuclear energies.

But this idea that we can badger people and then defy the law, what we're asking them to do, to close down their program, is you're asking them to defy international law. They agreed to this. They have a right to do this under this

treaty. And for us to come and say, well, they must quit it, I think it really is very close to an obsession on a country that is incapable of attacking us, or attacking—they don't have a history of invading their neighboring countries. The last time they were at war was with Iraq, and we bugged Iraq to go into Iran.

So I find this very distressing that the obsession continues. I find it very, very upsetting that this vote will, of course, be overwhelmingly in support of correcting the civil liberties of Syria and making Iran toe the line and give up on something that they're permitted to do. A vote for this, in my opinion, in time will show that it's just one more step to another war that we don't need.

We have not been provoked. They are not a threat to our national security, and we should not be doing this. We've been doing it too long. For the last 10, 15 years we have been just obsessed with this idea that we go to war and try to solve all the problems of the world; and at the same time, it is bankrupting us.

I strongly urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), who is the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to start here by commending Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN for this sustained focus on Iran that she has had for many, many years. I also want to thank Ranking Member BERMAN for the strong pressure that he has put on the regime in Iran, as well.

Recently, we had the administration fighting hard against bipartisan sanctions targeting the Central Bank of Iran. But what I want to point out is that in a bipartisan way here, Congress insisted on, and today the administration touts, the impact of sanctions on Iran's economy.

Here is the point I'd like to make: we'd be in a much better position if the executive branch, both Republicans and Democrats—right now we have the problem with the Obama administration's slow-walking this; but had they been more willing to work with Congress to craft tougher sanctions earlier, we'd be in a lot better position right now. The bill's stepped-up penalties on those cooperating with Iran's energy and shipping sectors, frankly, that's the Achilles' heel that we should be aiming at.

Very importantly, this bill also includes a human rights title to go after those abusing Iran's citizens. Let's let Iranians know that we are on their side and we are going to focus on those crimes against humanity and on the brutal regime opposing them. It's a regime that beats and that imprisons—I've talked to some of these victims—and that often rapes its own people in

order to try to impose its will. It's a regime that executes political prisoners by the hundreds.

Congress is increasing the pressure. Many of us, certainly the chairman, would like to go further. Iran's centrifuges are spinning, but this progress here today deserves support.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the author of the bill which declares Iran's energy sector a zone of proliferation.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to recognize Chairman LEANA ROS-LEHTINEN and Ranking Member HOWARD BERMAN for their extraordinary leadership and their tireless work to bring forward a bipartisan and bicameral bill. I thank you for working with me to include several of my provisions in this legislation, including the Iran Transparency and Accountability Act, a measure that will, for the first time, require companies to disclose their business with Iran on SEC filings and for the first time create a public listing of these disclosures to clearly and definitively let the American people know which companies continue to support the illicit nuclear weapons program of Iran.

Mr. Speaker, the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act significantly expands sanctions against the Iranian regime and those who, in the face of united international opposition, continue to contribute to Iran's quest for nuclear weapons.

This bill sends one clear message to the entire world: if you do virtually any business in the Iranian energy sector—the financial lifeline of this regime's nuclear program—you will be subject to sanctions.

Today, the United States Congress takes U.S. sanctions policy to an unprecedented level. By sending this legislation to the President's desk, Congress can initiate an unprecedented crackdown on the Iranian regime. But our work does not end here. These punishing sanctions are a means to an end; and we cannot, for one moment, take our eye off the endgame—halting Iran's march toward a nuclear weapon.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their leadership. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill. Now is the time to stand for human rights in Iran and Syria. Now is the time. Now is the time to stop Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would like to include for the RECORD a publication from the International Civil Society Action Network, "What the Women Say: Killing Them Softly: The Stark Impact of Sanctions on the Lives of Ordinary Iranians."

WHAT THE WOMEN SAY: KILLING THEM SOFTLY: THE STARK IMPACT OF SANCTIONS ON THE LIVES OF ORDINARY IRANIANS—BRIEF 3: JULY 2012

The unprecedented, devastating and counterproductive impact of sanctions, coupled

with the on-and-off threat of war, is an ever-growing reality in the lives of ordinary Iranians. For the generation of Iranians whose childhood was punctured by nightly bombings, fear of chemical attacks, and eight years of death and destruction resulting from the Iran-Iraq war, the current state of uncertainty, prospects of hardship and unraveling of the lives they rebuilt is overwhelming.

In New York, London, Washington and Brussels the rationale for sanctions vary. Central to the case is the notion that only crippling sanctions can slow Iran's nuclear program and bring about change. A number of the sanctions also target state institutions and individuals implicated in human rights violations. Regardless of their political leanings, among western leaders, policy-makers and pundits, no one denies that economic sanctions are blunt instruments that typically harm the civilian population far more than the state. Western policy makers, however, respond that "this is the price that has to be paid"—the questions of price for what, how much, how long and by whom are left hanging.

Iranians have the answers. The earliest sanctions imposed in the immediate aftermath of the 1979 Iranian revolution (and American hostage taking) had less direct impact on the public. But since 1995, when the Clinton Administration honed in on the oil and gas sector to the current day where the banking and financial sectors have been targeted, private enterprise and ordinary citizens are the primary and overwhelming victims. Needless to say, they are skeptical of western politicians or institutions that claim to care about the well being, human rights or aspirations of the Iranian populace.

It is not uncommon for Iranians in every walk of life to recall the Iran-Iraq war (1980–88), when the Western world was complicit with Saddam's Iraq and its use of chemical weapons. With the impact of current sanctions seeping into every day life now, many Iranians consider them to be a profoundly insidious and destructive force and source of basic human rights violations, affecting a wide cross section of Iranians.

As one women's rights activist stated, "the international community's sole focus on the nuclear issue has resulted in the adoption of policies that inflict great damage on the Iranian people, civil society and women. Militarization of the environment will prompt repressive state policies and the possibility of promoting reform in Iran will diminish."

Iranians' wariness of the international community, however, has not quelled criticism of their own government. They have neither an appetite for war nor for the bellicose language of the state. They criticize the government's mishandling of the economy in recent years. They balk at the continued imposition of social restrictions. Those involved in civil rights activism including students, workers, women and leaders from ethnic groups and religious minority communities are among the first to feel the endless pressures and limitations imposed on them. Not least because the sanctions and threat of war allow the state to invoke "a state of emergency" and in so doing suppress critics and voices of dissent.

In its ongoing series of MENA region 'What the Women Say' briefs, ICAN provides a gendered analysis of the impact of sanctions, echoing the voices and experiences of Iranians, particularly women's rights activists, regarding the social, economic, political and security consequences. At a time when the United States, the European Union and others are heralding their national action plans on women, peace and security that highlight the need for women's protection in times of crisis and their participation in conflict pre-

vention and peacemaking, this brief offers the international community recommendations on limiting the immediate and long-term damage being wrought on women, Iranian society and ultimately regional security.

1. CURRENT SANCTIONS CUT DEEP AND WIDE INTO THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE OF ORDINARY IRANIANS

Iranians know war and they know sanctions. The experiences of women, men, the elderly and the young who lived through the eight years of the Iran-Iraq war are rarely recounted today, but the long term impact is still evident. Though their plight is rarely discussed, women of child bearing age and soldiers exposed to chemical warfare still suffer from complex health problems. Similarly the thousands of men handicapped by landmines and war wounds are rarely a topic of conversation. Another long term impact has been the rise of female headed households in part due to war deaths among men.

Throughout the 1980s war years, Iranians also suffered from sanctions and lived under a strict rations policy. But it was a very different society then. Some 50 percent of Iranians lived in rural areas and were largely self sufficient through domestic agricultural production. The sanctions too were limited to key sectors pertaining to military equipment. As a result the public impact was less evident. International trade relations were sustained including with the U.S. private sector. Today only 29 percent of Iranians live in rural areas. Continued migration to urban areas has led to the expansion of cities and their peripheries. The majority of migrants eke out their living in the service industry and informal economy on the margins of cities. The sanctions regime is doing most damage to those who are already vulnerable—the urban poor. As the pressures increase, economic class and social divisions are also being exacerbated.

2010 sanctions choking insurance and shipping sectors with implications for public health: Sanctions introduced in the summer of 2010 directly targeted insurance companies that insured Iranian shipping involved in the import and export of products. Despite denials by proponents of the sanctions regime, this round of sanctions directly affected the availability of foreign-made medication and other healthcare products to Iranians including vitamins for children and pregnant women and sanitary products. The implication for serious illnesses including cancer is particularly profound. As one women's rights activists recounted, "foreign made medicine became difficult to find in 2010, and with the intensification of sanctions this trend has continued. Domestically produced drugs, which are dependent on imported ingredients, are also more expensive and difficult to find." Others echo this experience. "Many Iranians can no longer afford the high cost of cancer treatment drugs that have become hard to find," says the daughter of a female cancer patient. "Family members have to go from one hospital to another and to multiple pharmacies to find and then purchase the medicines at high costs for the treatment and life of their family members. Patients with poorer prognoses or those who cannot afford it are forgoing treatments and opting for an early death so they don't burden their families financially."

Sanctions targeting Iran's oil and gas sector were also intensified in 2010, through limiting or ending the sale of gasoline products to Iran. In anticipation, the Iranian government initiated a number of steps including ending of subsidies for gasoline, rationing gasoline and increasing domestic refining processes. As a result, the price increase has been significant, with unrationed gasoline

costing 4000 Rials per liter in 2009 and projected to increase to 8000 Rials in 2012. Free market prices for gasoline are currently at 7000 Rials per liter. Additionally the quality of the domestic product is much lower than imports, according to experts.

One significant impact of the increased use of domestically produced gasoline has been a noticeable decline in air quality, particularly in Tehran. Reports note that Tehran's air quality, which was already poor, has worsened significantly since gasoline imports were sanctioned. Even the New York Times report explained the connection between the ban on gasoline imports, the push to use domestically produced gasoline and the rapid air quality deterioration:

"According to e-mails circulated to industry experts . . . Iran's new supply of domestic gasoline may contain high levels of aromatics—more than twice the level permitted by Iranian law. Burning aromatics in car engines produces exhaust packed with high concentrations of "floating particles" or "particulates" that, added to the typical smog caused by nitrous oxides and ozone, can cause a range of health problems, from headaches and dizziness to more serious cardiac and respiratory complaints."

In the same year, Mohsen Nariman, MP from Babol said, "air pollution is on the rise at an unusual rate and it seems that one of the main causes is the substandard gasoline that is being used in Tehran." One newspaper, the Hamshahri Daily, reported that 310 persons died per day as a result of poor air quality in Tehran in the months of October and November 2011. The cause of death included increased respiratory complications, heart attacks and stroke.

Unprecedented banking sanctions targeting Iranians in all areas of life: The banking sanctions that went into effect in December 2011 have also wreaked havoc in people's lives. The Iranian Rial has almost halved in value against the US dollar and other currencies. With memories of the Iran-Iraq war still fresh for many Iranians, across Tehran and other cities, people, including shopkeepers and merchants reacted by hoarding products. Consequently the price of a wide range of goods and products including foodstuffs rose between 20–100 percent, and continues to fluctuate.

The knock-on effect is evident in all areas of life. While incomes have not increased, rents have doubled in some areas of the city. The price of bread—a staple of the Iranian diet especially for the poor—has increased by some 1500% in the past 2 years, in part due to the removal of state subsidies. The uncertainty is causing stagnation for the private sector, while some businessmen point out that companies affiliated with the state are exploiting the situation as they have access to government exchange rates. Sanctions were imposed to prevent a nuclear weapons program. Instead, as one commentator notes, the price of manure has risen.

Iranian students studying abroad have also been impacted seriously. Many are being forced to give up their education as their families can no longer afford the tuition. Some UK universities are refusing to register Iranian students because they cannot prove that they can transfer the necessary fees. But the sanctions—or the way that banks and other bodies currently interpret them—make it impossible for most Iranian students to do so.

In addition countless Iranians who have relatives living in the EU and US and those who travel for medical treatment have become entangled in the vast banking sanctions net. Thousands have personal bank accounts and savings in western banks, some dating back decades. Now they are being forced to shut down their accounts and find

themselves caught in a financial no-man's land; being forced to close existing accounts, while barred from transferring their savings to other accounts internationally or in Iran.

In effect the banking sanctions are forcing massive reliance on a cash based economy, making already vulnerable Iranians dependent on black marketeers for the transfer of funds to cover educational, health or other legitimate costs. It is also fostering the rise of informal power structures and contributing to the lack of accountability and transparency. Even the Iranian Vice President has acknowledged this development, stating, "in the framework of these sanctions we [the Iranian government] have to begin negotiations with goods traffickers near the borders and use them to buy products which are included in the sanctions."

Not surprisingly many Iranians are left questioning if the banking sanctions are intent on forcing Iran's rulers to come to the negotiating table or if Iranian society and the country's infrastructure at large are being deliberately targeted and weakened. The timing of the intensification of sanctions is particularly questionable. Iranian observers, notably civil and political activists are asking whether sanctions are in fact intent on balancing power in the region in favor of regimes that "despite their authoritarian nature accommodate the west and its security agenda in the Middle East, at a time when revolutions may threaten the existing security dynamics in the region."

In an interview with Radio Farda, Mehrdad Emadi, Economic Consultant to the EU, stressed the destructive nature of these sanctions, noting:

"This particular form of sanctioning a nation has been unprecedented in the history of the world. The only similar type of sanctions, were implemented for a short period of time, and were intended to prevent the illegal transfer of funds by Qaddafi within the framework of the activities of Libya's Central Bank. But even during that time, [the sanctions] weren't implemented in this fashion [as we see against Iran's Central Bank], . . . not all the transactions of the Libyan Central Bank were sanctioned and the sanctions focused only on the illegal transfer of funds and money laundering . . . [The Iranian sanctions] are not related to a specific sector or industry nor to business entities or specific individuals. In this framework, all monetary transactions, currency transactions and business credit accounts for imports as well as exports and for the coverage and payment of insurance, which in every country falls under the responsibilities of the Central Bank of that country, will be made illegal in Iran. Iran's Central Bank will no longer be able to carry-out these duties, because it has now been identified as a center for money laundering. In this framework, international corporations, governmental organizations, non-governmental bodies or security organizations will no longer be able to transfer funds or open credit lines for trade, using the Central Bank."

In the same interview, Hossein Mansour, a UK-based economist offered a bleaker analysis, noting, "the negative impact on Iran's economy, especially in the long run, will only be addressed with the expenditure of billions of dollars and after several generations, and will be devastating for the infrastructure of the Iranian economy."

2. WOMEN ARE BEARING THE BRUNT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACT OF SANCTIONS

Women are especially affected by the economic fall out of the sanctions. They are being pushed out of the job market and bearing the brunt of increased unemployment. Women's rights experts recognize socio-economic pattern emerging similar to those in

Iraq when sanctions were imposed. In Iraq sanctions and the ensuing poverty resulted in the withdrawal of girls from education and increases in child marriage (families were forced to marry off their young daughters to reduce the number of mouths to feed). Iranian girls are at risk of similar developments." Moreover, women's rights experts believe that the externally imposed sanctions will allow conservatives to further their regressive social agenda by relegating women back to the domestic sphere, limiting their access to education and the job market and couching it as an attempt to increase male employment.

Despite significant societal changes, Iran remains a male dominated culture, reinforced by the government's conservative ideology that considers men as the heads of households and primary breadwinners. Programs in line with this ideology, seeking to relegate women to the home as wives and mothers only have been stepped up in recent years.

Indirect and immeasurable consequences of sanctions: stifling women's education, a key engine of socio-political change: Women's rights activists are also wary of the indirect impact of sanctions—and the manipulation of the economic hardships by conservatives—on women's access to higher education. Educated women from middle and traditional working classes across rural and urban areas, among the rich and the poor, have been the primary engine of socio-political change in Iran. The demand for equal rights and equal socio-political, economic and cultural rights permeates every level of society. From the outset of the Islamic republic, the status of women has been a critical and contentious issue. In 2003, conservatives proposed the imposition of quotas to limit women's access to higher education and the measures were briefly implemented across some medical fields in the 2004 national university entrance exams. Massive outcry among students and women's rights activists forced the withdrawal of the quotas.

Conservatives have not backed down however. They continue to argue that when women are more educated than men, traditional family values are undermined, as women prefer to marry at an older age, seek similarly educated (or more educated spouses) and have higher expectations. These traditionalists also posit that women in the work force take away men's jobs. Concerns about the impact of women being more educated than men have prompted some conservative lawmakers to reinstate quotas limiting women's participation in higher education. Women and student's rights activists believe that during President Ahmadinejad's second term the quotas have been introduced with greater zeal and less accountability. They coincide with the intensification of sanctions and increased economic hardships. As the economic situation worsens, women's access to higher education, will likely endure further limitations. Even school age girls are at risk as economic pressures may force families to make choices and opt for boys' schooling. This may lead to diminished literacy rates among girls in the near future.

In effect, the marginalization of women from education and employment enables extreme conservatives to kill many birds with one stone. They prevent a high rate of women's entry into the public space (via universities). They eliminate women from the economy and job market, particularly, higher earning and more influential positions. They sustain and revive the power imbalance between women and men, as women will have fewer choices in life, limited control of resources and become (and remain) more economically dependent on men at greater rates than already exist. Ultimately they

may quash the force of women's demands—the next generation's voices—for progressive change in society at large. As one conservative member of parliament and staunch supporter of limiting women's presence in university has put it: "when women can't travel to far away cities without the permission of their husbands, their expertise has no impact on improving the situation of the country!"

There is also a significant reduction in women's share of the national budget. In the past for example, housewives received national insurance, but this has been eliminated, while the military budget has doubled for next year.

Downturns in domestic production, increases male unemployment and violence against women: There are also more insidious effects, difficult to quantify but increasingly evident. The sanctions have caused massive downturns in domestic production. The fledgling private sector is unable to import the necessary raw materials for manufacturing. The banking sanctions are causing a virtual standstill in imports and exports by legitimate businesses. Even domestic agriculture will lose its markets.

Meanwhile those with political connections are exploiting the situation often by importing cheaper Chinese products. This downward trend in domestic production will give rise to lower wages, increase unemployment among men and women and ultimately put pressure on families. As evident in other settings, women will bear the brunt of dealing with their unemployed spouses and the men of the family within the home. These new dynamics are likely to lead to increased incidences of domestic violence and family conflicts, as men's inability to live up to social expectations can lead to depression and attacks on women. Reduction in family income inevitably is forcing women to find new sources of income. Their coping strategies will likely include cutting back on their own health, wellbeing and dietary needs to provide for their dependents. As in other countries, for the most vulnerable, poverty will likely lead to risky survival strategies including child labor and sex work—in informal sectors which have expanded in Iran in recent years.

The most vulnerable are at the greatest risk: Afghan refugee women and children: Vulnerable groups, such as Afghan refugees and migrants who have been living in Iran legally and illegally as a result of decades of war and unrest in their own country, are also at greater risk. The situation is most severe for Afghan women and children refugees or Iranian women married to Afghan men and their children who do not have identity cards. The intensification of government crackdowns and forced repatriation programs, against Afghans (including their Iranian wives and children) with illegal status in Iran, has already had a negative impact on the livelihood of these groups, but as the economy has worsened the hostility they face from Iranian society and the government has also increased. Afghans have been targeted with segregation programs in public spaces and are facing increased state and other forms of violence, while their access to income and jobs has also been severely limited. Comprising a large percent of those employed in the informal sector as household help, street peddlers and in the service industry Afghan women and children are at risk of facing worsening working conditions and abuse in their place of employment.

3. INDEPENDENT CIVIL SOCIETY AND CIVIC ACTIVISM ARE AMONG THE FIRST CASUALTIES OF CURRENT INTERNATIONAL POLICIES

Many of the men and women who founded and run Iran's civil rights movements in-

cluding human rights and women's rights activists, workers unions and journalists spent their childhood or young adulthood at war. They have tasted and experienced the impact of war and sanctions on a personal level. They are also fierce advocates of international human rights and humanitarian norms and ideals.

The public outpouring in the aftermath of the disputed 2009 presidential elections prompted the state to impose heavy security measures against civic actors. But debilitating sanctions coupled with the daily rhetoric of war has elevated national security concerns and further diminished the state's tolerance of dissent internally. Activists are regularly accused of working in concert with the west to destroy the Islamic Republic. The uncertainty and fear has also affected the public's receptivity to social activism. It is seen as a secondary issue compared to the urgent realities of poverty and prospect of war.

The sanctions are having a long-term negative impact on the source of societal change in Iran. The urban middle class that has historically played a central role in creating change and promoting progress in Iran are key casualties of the sanctions regime. Many civil society organizations and charities survive on the basis of voluntary activism and support. But facing economic uncertainty, many people are retreating from public voluntary work. Even the most committed have less time, as they are working longer hours and often at multiple jobs to meet their economic needs. Moreover with private enterprise in demise, more people will become dependent on the state and thus unable and fearful of engaging in civil activism. Additionally, sanctions and in particular the limitations placed on transfer of funds, has created serious impediments for charity organizations engaged in health and medical services, education efforts, support for orphans and disadvantaged women and children to carry-out their work. Many of these organizations have ceased their activities.

Sanctions are isolating Iranians from international forums: Beyond the economic impact, civil society, including the women's movement in Iran has been further isolated from their international counterparts, as a result of the sanctions. Security challenges imposed by their own government already curtail civil society's ability to attend regional and international conferences, workshops and other events. But the policies of other governments further complicate their lives. Visas that Iranian passport holders need to travel internationally, take considerable amount of time and resources. The new banking sanctions have ended the possibility of financial exchanges, while the falling price of the Rial has increased the financial burden for those activists who want to participate in conferences and training opportunities. Activists, like regular Iranians, cannot use banks to transfer funds for conference participation, hotel reservations, or to attend courses abroad. Finally, for years despite state restrictions, activists have used the internet as a critical tool for communication. But the sanctions policies have led many large hardware and software manufacturers in the United States to deny services and products to Iranians. Thus just when contact with and solidarity from the outside world are most needed, Iranians are faced with the greatest level of isolation.

4. WHAT WOMEN DO: RESILIENCE, COURAGE, VOICES OF PEACE AND A WINDOW TO THE FUTURE

Women's rights activists have never had it easy. They have fought against an assault on their legal and political rights as well as their demand for equal opportunities in the

economic, social and cultural life of the country. In 2006, when a group of women initiated the Million Signatures Campaign to demand the reform of laws that discriminate against women, they immediately faced state scrutiny and obstruction. The movement thrived however, transcending age, economic, rural, urban and even political and religious divisions to draw in a mix of volunteers. Using new and old media, improvised street theater and small group education and outreach initiatives they raised public awareness about the impact of gender based discriminatory laws and called on people to sign up and join their campaign in favor of legal changes. Despite security pressures the movement elevated issues of gender equality to the national level both politically and within wider society.

After the summer of 2009, and the mass post-election protests, women's rights activists faced increased restrictions as the space for dissent became ever more limited. With the rise of sanctions and ratcheting up of the war rhetoric, these activists are under immense pressure to become silent and conform. Countless social and political activists have been imprisoned and or forced into exile. Students—female and male have been expelled from universities because of their civil activism. Under these circumstances, with economic hardships and prospects of yet another devastating war, longterm planning and the development of sustainable programs to maintain the gains already made and push for basic rights are increasingly difficult, if not impossible.

Women's Demands: no sanctions, no war, talk it out! Despite these pressures, the Iranian women's movement has not been silenced. The call against war, in favor of a negotiated settlement, and an end to sanctions has become a primary issue for many, despite the risks they incur. They are using every opportunity to send their message to the world.

Women's rights activists now living outside of Iran draw on international platforms to echo the concerns and voices of their counterparts inside the country. Meanwhile, despite the risks, women in Iran have not been silenced either. One group, the Mothers for Peace, representing different sectors and ideologies began its activities in 2008, with the aim of preventing war and violence in the country and promoting peace regionally. They, along with other women's groups, have issued several statements opposing the possibility of war. Echoing this, in 2011, on the International Day to Fight Violence Against Women (November 25th), another group of Iranian activists issued their antiwar and violence statement, noting:

"We a group of women's rights activists in Iran, are worried about the increasing violence against women and children [that is the result] of the polarized and hostile atmosphere [and] dead-end national and international politics of tension and violence. As a result of these policies, violence against women and children infiltrates the deepest social and political and familial layers of Iranian society."

On March 8, 2012, in honor of International Women's Day, several activists involved in the One Million Signatures Campaign recorded video messages opposing war. They reject the official narratives that often pose the problems in the terms of good and evil, just and unjust, and call on all sides—including their own government—to engage in constructive dialogue rather than the rhetoric of war and threats.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY, PARTICULARLY THE US AND EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Fundamentally rethink policy on Iran:

1. End the sanctions policy against Iran. Recognize that sanctions as a general rule have a poor record of influencing the behavior of states and in many situations have severely harming the population at large, particularly vulnerable groups and democratic movements. Ninety-nine percent of the current sanctions against Iran are too broad to impact the behavior of the government, instead they target the population.

2. Sanctions are not a substitute for war. They are a step closer to war. Failed sanctions will only work to strengthen the position of those advocating for another war in the region. Resolve to address the differences in a mutually respectful manner immediately.

3. Recognize that sanctions weaken society not the state. Iranian society is already witnessing the emergence of radical groups. As one women's rights activist notes, in countries of this region, including Iran, growing gaps between the rich and poor do not make governments vulnerable, rather they make the population vulnerable to increased radicalization against the West as a way of coping with humiliation. In border areas, where poverty is severe, we already witness the increasing influence of terrorist groups. If this trend continues we will be faced with a weakened Iranian society—at risk of being radicalized, with detrimental consequences for regional security in the medium and long term.

4. Recognize that sanctions undermine women's security and empowerment. The US and EU have been strong proponents of the global women, peace and security agenda with the development of priorities and action plans to ensure women's empowerment. But sanctions undermine and contravene these policies. The contradictory nature of US and EU rhetoric, policies and actions increase the Iranian public's suspicion about them, and credence to charges of hypocrisy. On negotiations with the Iranian government:

5. Engage Iran on the full range of issues, including regional security, economic issues, human rights, culture, etc. Incentives, especially those that reduce the hardship of ordinary Iranians, should be put forth to encourage a peaceful settlement to the disputes of the international community with Iran.

6. Call for the inclusion of civil society in engagement with Iran. Should Iran and the international community reach an agreement that would allow for negotiations and dialogue on a wider set of issues, civil society, including women's groups, human rights groups and peace activists, should participate.

On immediate steps for redressing the impact of sanctions on ordinary citizens:

7. Do not force an entire nation to adopt nontransparent means of financial transactions. Revise the banking sanctions so that ordinary people are not caught in them. Specifically, adopt measures to facilitate the transfer of funds by ordinary Iranian citizens and Iranians with dual nationality (EU, US, UK etc) for travel, tuition, and medical care, in the case of sale of property, inheritance or for other personal and familial purposes. Forcing Iranians to move toward a cash economy reduces transparency and fosters the growth of shadowy actors.

8. Address the adverse healthcare impact of sanctions immediately. Sanctions including limitations impacting the import of medicines, medical equipment and forced usage of substandard gasoline are affecting people's health and lives. These issues should be investigated and alleviated immediately with cooperation between the US, European and Iranian governments.

9. Help ease and enable visa applications for Iranians seeking to visit relatives.

Throughout the EU, US, Canada and Australia there are millions of citizens of Iranian descent. They have elderly parents and relatives living in Iran who visit them regularly. Visas for relatives should be expedited and offered for longer periods.

10. Encourage student visas and conference attendance. Student visas and visas for conference participation should be processed more quickly and with less financial burden on applicants.

11. Facilitate free and safe access to the internet to help foster independent civil society. Sanctions have severely limited Iranian civil society's safe access to the internet including necessary software and hardware. The international community should help provide this access and limit the imposition of sanctions in this sector.

□ 1500

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 30 seconds.

The Senate Banking Committee summarized this bill by saying that it "aims to prevent Iran from repatriating any of the revenue from sale of its crude oil, depriving Iran of hard currency earnings and funds to run its state budget."

Spoken plainly, this bill would destroy the Iranian economy and further hurt the Iranian people that we claim to support. Iranians are already suffering under stifling sanctions as they experience rising food prices and lack of access to basic medicine. For example, the sanctions against the Iranian banking sector have greatly diminished the value of Iranian currency and have a negative effect on nearly every aspect of the lives of ordinary Iranians. The price of rent, education, and bread have all increased.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), an esteemed member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. DOLD. I certainly want to thank the chairwoman for her leadership on this very important issue. I also want to thank the ranking member for his bipartisan leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a nuclear-armed Iran is actually the greatest threat we have to our own national security here at home. This issue is not a right versus left issue; this is a right versus wrong issue.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is significant in its seriousness and its scope. By blacklisting virtually all of Iran's energy, banking, and transportation sectors, and specifically targeting those who enable Iran's attempted evasion of sanctions, this legislation sends a powerful signal to the Iranian regime that they should not ever question the resolve of the United States Congress to do what is necessary to confront Iran's illicit nuclear ambitions.

This legislation is the product of bipartisan efforts and hard work of many people, and I certainly appreciate Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN's and Ranking Member BERMAN's focus to try to get this passed as quickly as possible.

I'm pleased to have contributed to strengthening this sanctions package with bipartisan proposals that I introduced with Representative DEUTCH from Florida, whom we just heard from, that declare the Iranian energy sector a "zone of proliferation concern," and which will enhance the human rights portion of the bill.

I also want to note the significant contributions by Senator MARK KIRK, who has been a consistent champion and leader on the forcefulness of Iran sanctions.

I look forward to this legislation's passage today and implementation with urgency by the administration, and I look to continue to work with my colleagues in Congress on this issue until we can affirm that the Iranian regime is no longer pursuing a nuclear weapons capability.

I urge adoption of this resolution and for the immediate implementation by this administration.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman who organized the Iran Working Group 7 or 8 years ago to focus congressional attention on the looming threat of a nuclear Iran, my friend from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the chairlady from Florida and my friend from California for recognizing some grave and serious points.

First, they recognize that on the 11th of September of 2001, 19 people armed with airplane tickets and box cutters wreaked havoc on the United States of America. They recognize that a group of people with a small, improvised nuclear device could wreak havoc far worse than that on the Mall that stands in front of this building or on Times Square.

Weapons these days are not just delivered by intercontinental ballistic missiles; they can be delivered by U-Haul trucks or by other means. This is the essential threat of Iranian nuclear proliferation to the United States.

The choice that we face is whether we should take concerted action to prevent that threat or whether we shouldn't. I commend the chairlady and my friend from California for choosing to unify this Congress, this country with the rest of the world with the proposition that we should present the Iranian leadership with a choice. If they decide to abandon their nuclear weapons program—which they illicitly concealed for 25 years—if they agree to live under international protocols, then the sanctions that have been imposed will be lifted and we can move forward toward peace and progress. But if they do not, they will most certainly suffer the consequences of a deteriorating economy and problems within their social structure.

We have made our choice to stand united in favor of these strong sanctions. We are presenting the Iranians

with their choice. Let us hope and pray they make a choice for peace and renewed prosperity.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 30 seconds.

We went to war against Iraq under the assumption they had weapons of mass destruction. Iran doesn't have weapons of mass destruction.

One of the problems with this bill is that it effectively states that sanctions on Iran's Central Bank would not be lifted unless there's a regime change. So we're bringing a whole new dimension here. It's about even more than nuclear weapons; now we're talking about regime change, because this resolution creates a new requirement for the termination of sanctions that are dependent on the cessation of the Central Bank's financing of the Revolutionary Guard, and it imposes new restrictions on the President's ability to waive sanctions.

So, what are we doing here? Setting the stage for another war. Regime change, and then upping the bar for Iran and essentially laying the groundwork for a conflict.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to close.

Mr. BERMAN. I'm very pleased to yield 1 minute to a former member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my friend from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the ranking member and the chairwoman of this committee for bringing us together.

I don't like sanctions, Mr. Speaker, but I rise in strong support of this legislation. And when I say that, I understand what sanctions can do to women and children and families. In fact, I'm reminded of a debate on apartheid and sanctions in South Africa. That debate was a question of whether you undermine that nation. But we saw what happened with sanctions when we came together as a Nation to bring down the dastardly structure of apartheid.

Iran, right now today, can stop this legislation by shedding itself of all signs of building a nuclear weapon. The regime change is not by war. This bill does not suggest war. It means that voluntarily, by election, their government can change. But what I believe is most important is that we recognize, having seen that fallen woman bleeding in the street, that human rights abuses are massive. They're massive in their influence on Iraq, where they're influencing the treatment of residents of Camp Ashraf. That must stop.

So this legislation is crucial because it impacts the human rights abuses, it indicates that there is no giving on a nuclear weapon, and it gives Iran, right now today, the ability to stop this legislation and sanctions by owning up to eliminating any sign of a nuclear weaponization, treating its people with dignity, and responding to the needs of the people in Camp Ashraf.

I support the legislation enthusiastically.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Collectively, the provisions in this bill move the goalpost from negotiations over Iran's nuclear enrichment program to regime change. I just want to point out that the record of our country on regime change isn't all that good. Yes, we knocked out Saddam Hussein under the lie that he had weapons of mass destruction, and now al Qaeda is all over Iraq.

So, what are we about here? We're setting the stage for another war where we syphon the revenue out of this country, send it to war machines, can't meet our own needs. Since when does Iran achieve greater importance than our own country? That's what I want to know. I want somebody to explain that to me.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, could I get another indication of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Ohio has 3 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from Florida has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. In this case, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, a longtime member and leader on the Foreign Affairs Committee and a very active legislator on the issue before us today—that is, the effort to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon—my friend from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend for yielding to me, and I rise in strong support of this legislation.

I am glad that the Senate and the House finally came together on this very, very important bill.

□ 1510

This bill has very, very strong support, as you can tell, on both sides of the aisle, and the reason it does is because Iran has proven itself to be a very, very dangerous player.

Iran is the leading supporter of terrorism in the world. Iran supplies and supports the terrorist group Hezbollah in Lebanon. And, in fact, now we see what's going on in Syria. And if it was not for Iran, Assad would not be able to continue his brutal ways and his murdering of his own people. Right now, as we talk, there are Iranian guards fighting on the side of Assad in Syria, and Iran chooses to be, and continues to be, a rogue nation.

Iran must not be allowed to have a nuclear weapon. She has lied to the world consistently in talking about her purposes of the weapon, but Iran is not fooling anybody.

And so what these sanctions do is hits at Iran's oil and natural gas sectors, making it very, very difficult for them to launder money and making it very, very difficult to continue their repressive ways.

The world has spoken. This isn't only the United States. These are countries

all over the world. And unfortunately, or the blocking of some vetoes in the United Nations, there would already be sanctions in Iran.

So I urge my colleagues to support this. I think there's a reason why virtually every Member of Congress on both sides of the aisle supports it.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 1 minute.

These sanctions are hurting ordinary people in Iran. I pointed out earlier, matters like the price of rent, bread—Americans can understand that—education, all of these things are increasing. And these sanctions then directly undermine Iran's civil society by giving the regime a chance to crack down even harder on internal dissent. These sanctions will ensure that those crack-downs continue.

Ordinary Iranians are struggling simply to make ends meet under this sanctions regime that already exists. They cannot afford to suspend the time necessary to participate in social movements which provide basic social services to push for democratic change in their country.

Are these the intended effects that we wish to have on the Iranian people and Iranian Americans?

And if not, passing this kind of a broad, indiscriminate sanctions bill sends the wrong message. If the sanctions imposed on Iraq are any precedent, we know that sanctions are not an effective tool in promoting or supporting domestic democracy movements.

We also know those sanctions did not prevent an unnecessary and wasteful war with Iraq. In effect, the expansion of the broad and indiscriminate sanctions, including this legislation, hurts our ability to negotiate with Iran, imposes long-term harm detrimental to the Iranian people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have no further requests for time.

And I'd like to just raise a couple of the issues that my friends, Mr. PAUL from Texas and Mr. KUCINICH from Ohio, have put forth in the context of opposition to this bill.

This is not the next step to war. This is the alternative to war. Iran having a nuclear weapon is unacceptable for many, many reasons:

It means the end of the nonproliferation regime;

It means countries all through that part of the world will seek their own nuclear weapons;

It raises the specter of nuclear weapons being passed on and dirty bombs being passed on to terrorists, and there is nothing in the comments of the regime that could let one relax and think they would never be the first to use those nuclear weapons.

That is unacceptable. Our alternatives are either war or finding a diplomatic resolution of their nuclear weapons program, the end of that program.

They've been found, not by the White House, not by some Vulcans in foreign policy, but by the IAEA and the U.N. Security Council, over and over again, to have violated their obligations under the nonproliferation treaty to which they are a signatory. They don't ratify the additional protocols. They move ahead with enrichment plants that they don't need for a peaceful weapons program.

They do not have a right to enrich. You could argue they have a right to a nuclear energy program, but not a right to enrich. They conceal information in violation of their treaty obligations.

This is, hopefully, the final step, but if not we will have to intensify the sanctions to achieve that diplomatic program.

And Iran is not some bucolic, peace-loving state that has never done anything against its neighbors. Everyone knows that Hezbollah is a direct foreign agent of Iran that gets its funding, its training, and its sponsorship and its directions from Iran.

We know what they've done to the marines in Lebanon. We've known what they tried to do to the Saudi Ambassador here in Washington. We know that in Delhi and in Bulgaria and a number of other capitals around the world, their effort to commit terrorist acts against Israeli diplomats and Israeli citizens. Their record as a state sponsor of terror is the largest and most impactful in the world.

They are pursuing a nuclear weapons capability. It is our obligation to do every measure we have to stop them from getting that, and we want to do it peacefully. This strategy that we are embarked on is an effort to find a way to do this without resorting to war, and I urge my colleagues to stand strongly behind this bill.

This is the alternative. It is the only feasible alternative. Otherwise, we are faced with two very dismal prospects: a military action or an Iran with nuclear weapons and all that means.

I urge an "aye" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 1 minute.

Sanctions are a form of war in this case, and it will lead to war. And remember, we're not talking about—some time ago we were talking about if Iran would have a nuclear weapon, but then the bar's been lowered to say nuclear weapon capability. And now the game's being changed to say not just nuclear weapon capability, but we want regime change as well.

I mean, if this isn't a prescription for war, then I didn't participate in the debate in this House of Representatives in October of 2002 warning this Congress, chapter and verse, that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction, no role with al Qaeda in 9/11, did not have any intention or capability of attacking the United States. This is a version of that debate all over again.

I mean, come on. What are we doing here? Why is this more important than our country?

You know, our postal service is going into default tonight, a manufactured default, mind it. No debate on the House floor about this today, but an attempt to manufacture a war with Iran.

What are we about?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

I will retain my time to close, so if Mr. KUCINICH could wrap up his part of the debate, we can conclude.

Mr. KUCINICH. Could I ask how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KUCINICH. And how much time does the gentlelady have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 1 minute.

This legislation also requires the President to impose sanctions on those who are responsible for or are complicit in certain human rights abuses in Syria, but it fails to acknowledge that our own country and a number of our allies are actively participating and stoking the violence on the ground. Divisions and infighting within the various militias operating on the ground are already occurring. And we also read that al Qaeda's also been involved in Syria.

So, look, we have to get serious about what America's purpose is in the world. It's not to be a heavy foot. It's not to proliferate wars all over.

The first thing we have to do is take care of things here at home: jobs for all, health care for all, education for all, retirement security for all. When we can do those kinds of things, then we can pretend that we can be the policeman of the world. But until we've done that, we don't have any right to go all around the world trying to tell people how to live.

And we can settle this matter with Iran without war. We can settle it through diplomacy. Diplomacy. It would be real interesting to try it. And we ought to support any efforts of the Obama administration to use diplomacy here. Let's not use this political climate to push us into a war.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1520

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

I would like to recognize the commitment, the dedication and tireless efforts of the members of our House Foreign Affairs Committee family, particularly of our staff director, Dr. Yleem Poblete, who Ranking Member BERMAN once described as driving a hard bargain. Just ask her hubby, Jason. Also, thanks to Matt Zweig and Ari Fridman.

Thanks to Chairman JOHNSON of the Senate Banking Committee and to his staff, particularly Colin McGinnis, Patrick Grant and Steve Kroll, as well as Ranking Member SHELBY and his staff.

A strong and warm thanks and big hug to my good friend Mr. BERMAN—the ranking member—and to his staff, particularly Shanna Winters, Alan Makovsky and Ed Rice, as well as minority staff director Richard Kessler.

I would like to thank Senators MENENDEZ and MARK KIRK and the critical Representatives, DEUTCH, SHERMAN and DOLD.

Let's stop Iran before it's too late. Let's pass this bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2012.

Hon. LEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Rayburn, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROS-LEHTINEN: I write concerning the House-Senate negotiations on H.R. 1905, an Act to strengthen Iran sanctions laws for the purpose of compelling Iran to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons and other threatening activities, and for other purposes. I understand the House and Senate have reached an agreement on provisions related to an Energy Information Administration report on Iran's natural gas sector.

I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on this House-Senate compromise language so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration. This is done with the understanding that the Committee is not waiving any of its jurisdiction on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to this provision of the House-Senate compromise to H.R. 1905, and I ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during its consideration on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2012.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Rayburn, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 1905, an Act to strengthen Iran sanctions laws for the purpose of compelling Iran to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons and other threatening activities, and for other purposes.

I appreciate your Committee's decision to forgo action on the House-Senate compromise text so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that your decision in this case does not represent the waiver of any of your jurisdiction over this bill or similar legislation.

I will place a copy of your letter and this reply into the Congressional Record during House consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1905.

Sincerely,

LEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
Chairman.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1905, the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012. This bill is a critical effort to tighten sanctions against the Tehran regime, and to increase pressure to force the government to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons.

Iran's nuclear ambitions pose a grave threat to the United States, to regional stability in the

Middle East, and to the entire international community. Both President Obama and the United States Congress have unequivocally stated that Iran must not be permitted to develop nuclear weapons.

On his visit to the Middle East this week, U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta stated that “sanctions are having a serious impact in terms of the economy in Iran.” Iran is now struggling to conduct international trade, losing markets and trading partners. Its currency has lost over half of its value.

Meanwhile, the administration continues to expand sanctions against Tehran. Earlier this week, President Obama signed an executive order to extend sanctions to anyone, using any method of payment, who purchases Iranian crude oil—preventing Iran from circumventing sanctions by using bartering and other unconventional payment options. It also expanded sanctions on buyers of Iranian petrochemical products, and authorized penalties for entities seeking to evade U.S. sanctions. Also this week, the U.S. Treasury sanctioned the Bank of Kunlun in China and Elaf Islamic Bank in Iraq for providing financial services to Iranian banks.

Today, Congress is acting to further tighten the economic noose on the Iranian regime. The bill under consideration today, H.R. 1905, strengthens and expands existing sanctions, banning any commercial activities with Iran’s oil and natural gas sector, including helping Iran ship its oil under the flag of another nation. This bill increases sanctions targeting entities involved with the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and sanctions human rights offenders.

When coupled with existing sanctions, today’s bill represents the strongest-ever effort to financially isolate Iran. This is critical, because we must persuade the Tehran government to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons. I strongly support utilizing our entire diplomatic and economic arsenal to ensure that Iran does not develop nuclear weapons.

Today’s bill is a critical step towards increasing pressure on the Iranian government. I urge my colleagues to join me in strongly supporting this legislation.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reaffirm my support for sanctions to be placed upon Iran. Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Ali Khamenei are once again stressing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles within Iran’s borders and we must take swift and strong actions against these measures.

Iran is not just a threat to the United States, but to all free countries around the globe. As a country that harbors terrorists, foreign leaders must stay vigilant and recognize Iran’s practices as a national security concern.

Lastly, we must stand up against the human rights abuses the Iranian regime is supporting. Its citizens have continually been sheltered from outside information and ideas due to strict governmental control. We need to inform the regime that the Iranian citizens deserve the basic human rights as laid out by the United Nations. I am proud to support H.R. 1905 and I encourage the President to sign this into law promptly.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 1905, the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012. This bipartisan legislation represents the strongest

set of sanctions to isolate any country in the world during peacetime.

It is imperative that our nation takes all steps necessary to isolate Iran, force them to end their dangerous pursuit of nuclear weapons, and secure that the regime in Teheran will no longer be a threat to peace and prosperity in the Middle East.

Once this legislation is passed and signed into law, virtually all of Iran’s energy, financial, and transportation sectors would be subject to U.S. sanctions. Companies conducting business in these industries would face the possibility of losing access to U.S. markets.

I also applaud the inclusion of sanctions against human rights abusers in Iran and Syria in this legislation. The deplorable actions by the political and military leaders in Iran and Syria against their own people must come to an immediate halt and deserve global condemnation.

Important allies, such as the European Union, Canada, Australia, Japan, South Korea, India, and Israel, have joined the American people in enacting sanctions against Iran.

It is important that this Chamber say with a strong, unified voice that we stand with Israel during these difficult times.

As co-chair of the Democratic Israel Working Group, I call on Members from both sides of the aisle to vote in support of this bipartisan resolution.

I would also like to take a moment to thank the President for his leadership on sanctions on Iran. Yesterday, President Obama signed an Executive Order that imposes new sanctions against the Iranian energy and petrochemical sectors, as well as sanctions against those who are providing material support to the National Iranian Oil Company, Naftiran Intertrade Company, or the Central Bank of Iran. These measures will help strengthen the existing sanctions regime and bring Iran that much closer to ending its heedless quest for nuclear weapons.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the House amendment to the previous Senate amendment to H.R. 1905. In his 2002 State of the Union Address, former President George H.W. Bush said that Iran was pursuing weapons of mass destruction and exporting terror. A decade later, Iran’s global threat is greater than ever.

We are currently embroiled in a standoff with Iran over its pursuit of nuclear capability. We find ourselves on the brink of conflict over potential Iranian armed interference with oil and other shipments through the Strait of Hormuz and its persistent threats against Israel. Even prior to 9–11, Hezbollah, supported by Iran, was responsible for more American deaths around the world than any other terrorist organization. Since 2001, Iran has embarked on more direct efforts to harm American interests as evidenced by last year’s foiled Iranian-backed assassination plot against the Saudi ambassador to the United States.

The current state of Iranian sanctions clearly has not worked to reduce Tehran’s threat to global peace. That’s why we need the enhanced approach this legislation will take in countering efforts by Iran to evade the impact of international sanctions. H.R. 1905 as amended tightens reporting on countries violating sanctions on these countries and

strengthens measures against those who would aid and abet these disturbers of global peace.

It also effectively blacklists Iran’s energy sector and anyone doing business with it. By preventing Iran from repatriating the proceeds from its oil sales, this rogue government will be deprived of 80 percent of its hard currency earning and half of the funds used to support its national budget.

Iran has used many tricks to subvert current sanctions—from oil for gold swaps to selling energy bonds to other trading and bartering schemes. They have been successful because there are governments who care more for making profit from doing business in Iran than in preventing threats to world peace. International efforts to rein in the nuclear ambitions of Iran have been stymied particularly by China.

Despite expressing formal support for United Nations Security Council sanctions against Iran since 2005, China has stepped in where other nations have curtailed trade with Iran. China’s Bank of Kunlun and the Elaf Islamic Bank in Iraq have facilitated transactions worth millions of dollars for Iranian banks already under sanctions. Stronger sanctions will make such unsavory alliances more difficult. This is why the reformulated bill we consider today is so vital in eliminating to the extent possible all avenues for Iran’s allies to play enabler to its nuclear ambitions and to its patronage of terrorist operations.

I want to congratulate House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee Chairman TIM JOHNSON and other members for their hard work in crafting a bipartisan, bicameral bill that works.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 750.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

JOB PROTECTION AND RECESSION PREVENTION ACT OF 2012

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 747, I call up the bill (H.R. 8) to extend certain tax relief provisions enacted in 2001 and 2003, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 747, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Job Protection and Recession Prevention Act of 2012”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF 2001 AND 2003 TAX RELIEF.**(a) EXTENSION OF 2001 TAX RELIEF.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 is amended by striking “December 31, 2012” both places it appears and inserting “December 31, 2013”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001.

(b) EXTENSION OF 2003 TAX RELIEF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 303 of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 is amended by striking “December 31, 2012” and inserting “December 31, 2013”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF INCREASED SMALL BUSINESS EXPENSING.

(a) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Section 179(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C), by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E), and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

“(D) \$100,000 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2013, and”, and

(2) by striking “2012” in subparagraph (E) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) and inserting “2013”.

(b) REDUCTION IN LIMITATION.—Section 179(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C), by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E), and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

“(D) \$400,000 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2013, and”, and

(2) by striking “2012” in subparagraph (E) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) and inserting “2013”.

(c) APPLICATION OF INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 179(b)(6)(A) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “calendar year 2012, the \$125,000 and \$500,000 amounts in paragraphs (1)(C) and (2)(C)” in the matter preceding clause (i) and inserting “calendar year 2013, the \$100,000 and \$400,000 amounts in paragraphs (1)(D) and (2)(D)”, and

(2) by striking “calendar year 2006” in clause (ii) and inserting “calendar year 2002”.

(d) COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—Section 179(d)(1)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR REVOCATION OF ELECTIONS.—Section 179(c)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX RELIEF FOR INDIVIDUALS.

(a) EXTENSION OF INCREASED ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—Section 55(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “\$72,450” and all that follows through “2011” in subparagraph (A) and inserting “\$78,750 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2012 and \$79,850 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2013”, and

(2) by striking “\$47,450” and all that follows through “2011” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “\$50,600 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2012 and \$51,150 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2013”.

(b) EXTENSION OF ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX RELIEF FOR NONREFUNDABLE PERSONAL CREDITS.—Section 26(a)(2) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “during 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, or 2011” and inserting “after 1999 and before 2014”, and

(2) by striking “2011” in the heading thereof and inserting “2013”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 5. TREATMENT FOR PAYGO PURPOSES.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of House Report 112-641, if offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 8.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 8, the Job Protection and Recession Prevention Act. In doing so, I and my fellow Republican House colleagues have made an important choice—the choice to focus on job creation. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who oppose this important piece of legislation have made a different choice—the choice to focus on tax hikes that destroy jobs.

The Job Protection and Recession Prevention Act stops the tax hike we face at the end of the year and provides a 1-year extension of the low tax policies originally enacted in 2001 and 2003 and then extended again in 2010. The 2010 bill was supported by 85 current House Democrats, 40 current Senate Democrats, and President Obama.

Importantly, this legislation allows Congress time to pass and enact comprehensive tax reform without causing undue harm to our fragile economy. Economists have noted that comprehensive tax reform, when paired with appropriate government spending cuts, could lead to the creation of 1 million American jobs in the first year alone.

The choice Republicans have made is to pass this bill, work toward com-

prehensive tax reform, and create jobs. In contrast, my Democrat colleagues have proposed raising taxes. They claim the tax hike will only affect the rich. What they don't want to tell you is that, in reality, this tax hike will hit nearly 1 million small businesses and 53 percent of small business income. A study conducted by Ernst & Young concluded that the Democrat tax hike could lead to the loss of over 700,000 jobs. That is the choice the Democrats have made—to raise taxes on families and small businesses and to destroy jobs.

As this chart illustrates, America is at a crossroads. The question is: Which path will our country take? The Democrats' path includes tax hikes that will cause small businesses to lose 700,000 jobs. The Republicans' tax reform path will make the Tax Code simpler and fairer, and it will lead to the creation of more than 1 million jobs in the first year.

What is even worse is that, in their quest to raise taxes on the so-called “wealthy,” several of my Democrat colleagues have made it clear that they are willing to hold low- and middle-income Americans hostage by threatening to let all income tax rates rise as scheduled at the end of the year if they don't get their way. These massive and imminent tax hikes are part of the fiscal cliff, or “jobs cliff” as I often refer to it, that we face at the end of this year. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that going over the fiscal cliff could cost America 2 million to 3 million jobs. This would be a devastating blow to almost 13 million Americans who are unemployed, as well as to middle class Americans who have been struggling in the Obama economy.

Mr. Speaker, the choice, to me, is obvious. Let's pass this bill. Let's work toward comprehensive tax reform that creates a simpler, fairer Tax Code for all Americans and, most importantly, that creates the jobs that we so badly need.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reconsider their choice to increase taxes and destroy over 700,000 jobs. Now is not the time to dig the hole we are in any deeper. Instead, Democrats should take the advice of people like President Bill Clinton and former economic adviser to President Obama, Larry Summers, and join Republicans to stop the tax hike, work to strengthen our economy, and get our country back on track.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

There is a choice to be made here, and it isn't what the chairman has put forth for one second. Everyone in this body agrees that we should extend the middle class tax cut. The Senate passed a bill that does just that. The President is ready to sign it this week.

□ 1530

The middle class families of this country need certainty, not some

vague promises about something to be done in the future. The question is: If everybody agrees that we should continue the middle class tax cut, why don't we come together? The answer is this: The Senate bill continues all of the tax cuts for every American household on their first \$250,000 of income; 114 million families would see their tax cuts extended in full; 97 percent of small businesses would keep all of their tax cuts, according to the Joint Taxation Committee. Why don't the Republicans join us in acting?

I think the answer is clear. This chart shows it. They're insistent. Their priority is cutting taxes for the very wealthy. They want to give households that earn more than \$1 million a year a tax cut on average of \$160,000. This chart shows it. What we have here for middle class families, \$2,200; for the very wealthy, \$160,000. That's over 70 times more of a tax cut for millionaires than for typical families. What makes it worse, if possible, is it would add \$49 billion to the deficit.

This Republican bill also would raise taxes on 25 million families. Those who benefited from the EITC, the child tax credit, and a higher education tax credit, that they would eliminate altogether. It's still worse. The bill we're going to discuss tomorrow, the so-called "tax reform," essentially would provide someone earning more than \$1 million a \$331,000 tax cut.

This debate is not about tax reform. It's about whether or not we protect the very wealthy at all costs—at all costs at the expense of middle-income families, and everybody except the very wealthy. This talk about 700,000 jobs being lost, that study was financed by special interest friends, and it's been discredited by every fact checker.

They're talking about 70 times more for the millionaire than for middle-income families on average, when in 2010, 93 percent of income growth went to the top 1 percent of wealthy households. And they come here and say that their first priority is protecting the very wealthy.

This isn't about tax reform. We need to work on this. This is about whether the first priority of the Republicans is protecting the very wealthy, holding hostage middle-income families. Let the middle-income family hostages be released. Join together for what everybody says they're for. Let's pass today our substitute and give a middle-income tax cut to everybody, including 97 percent of small businesses.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Health Subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, this House must act to stop the midnight tax hike that threatens to hit all American taxpayers on December 31. This midnight menace includes a 50 percent cut in the value of the child tax credit, higher taxes on dividends

for seniors living on fixed incomes, the return of the infamous marriage penalty for working families, and the alternative minimum tax, ensnaring middle-income taxpayers.

An average family of four with an income of \$50,000 could see a tax increase of almost \$2,200 a year. The President says he wants to stop the midnight tax hike for some taxpayers, but not all. He claims that he merely wants the wealthy to pay more. The truth is that his tax increase proposal would especially hit small business owners. As someone who comes from a small business background myself, I understand that many small businesses pay taxes as individuals. Their income includes money that they reinvest in the business to expand and hire more workers. A big tax increase could harm the very businesses we are relying on to create more jobs. In fact, a new study by Ernst & Young suggests that the President's tax proposal would cost more than 700,000 American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, what lane will you choose? I urge the House to pass H.R. 8 and prevent a tax hike for all Americans.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

When you look at Mr. HERGER's district, he's standing up to protect 180 people who have income over \$1 million, sacrificing a middle-income tax cut for 285,000.

I now yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished former chairman and a gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I've never been so fortunate in this House to have the Republicans state the argument as clearly as they have this afternoon, and I think WALLY HERGER said it. It is possible that we're not talking about a tax cut. People working every day trying to make ends meet, they don't know the wonderful tax cut that they are enjoying, but you bet your life if we don't come together, if we don't reach agreement, they'll understand what a tax hike is. That's exactly what's going to happen to 98 percent of the tax-paying people of this great country.

Taxpayers, who work every day, who raise their families, who buy from the local merchants that keep small business alive, are going to find out, probably too late, that the Republican Party says you don't deserve the lower tax rate. Then they may ask: What's holding this up if everyone agrees that they should have it?

We're going to have to explain to the middle class what the Republicans are explaining to us: that somehow we are to believe that less than 2 percent of the population is creating the jobs and really supporting the economy. I don't know where they've been or how they're going to come back, but they haven't been creating jobs, and they haven't been spending and investing money. Even if there was a controversy, why the heck are we holding hostage 98 percent of the people?

If Republicans agree and Democrats agree and liberals and conservatives and even Tea Party people agree that these people who work hard every day should continue to have this tax cut, then why the heck don't we agree to give it to them? If it ever becomes that we're in a political debate, and it's only about less than 2 percent of 100 percent, then let's fight like the devil over that and see who prevails. But it's not going to be hard for us to explain this. If you do this to the hardworking American people, shame on you.

□ 1540

Mr. CAMP. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to pause and just listen and think through a couple of the arguments that we've been hearing over the past couple of weeks from our friends on the other side of the aisle and from the President of the United States, and one is that people should pay their fair share. Now, that's an interesting argument, Mr. Speaker, and let's look at that a little bit closer.

So, if the President's will were to prevail on this, in other words, if this tax hike goes into place, then the top tax rate for some small businesses would be over 44 percent. Now, contrast that to the top tax rate that President Obama is proposing, which would be 28 percent.

All afternoon you are going to hear a lot of things go back and forth, but you won't hear anyone contradict those numbers and that disparity, Mr. Speaker, because they are true. There is no sense in telling corporations, You get a 28 percent rate, and the top rate for small business is 44 percent. There's nothing fair about that.

All right. Well, let's look at another argument.

Another argument is that this somehow closes a budget gap and this is deficit reduction, and we're all about deficit reduction and let's have at it. Well, a little secret on the deficit reduction is, at best, the most generous estimate is this would take care of—what?—maybe 7, 8, 9, 10 days of spending, maybe. But who would pay the cost for that? I'll tell you who pays the cost for that. The job creators and the people that are looking for jobs right now, Mr. Speaker, according to Ernst & Young and others that have looked at this. Some estimates are that it would cost 700,000 jobs.

Now, I know nobody that is willing to say, You know what? We've just got too many jobs. Let's just thin the herd. There are too many people working. Let's thin the herd. There are too many people working. And let's do it because of Democratic dogma.

We have got leading Democrats on the other side of the rotunda who have said, Let's embrace the fiscal cliff. Let's just grab onto the dogma and go

right off the cliff, regardless of the outcome.

Well, you know what? That's ridiculous.

And we have an opportunity here to make some certainty to move to the next year—not to move to the next year just for the sake of another year, but to move to next year to fundamentally reform our tax system, to create a more competitive Tax Code that is broad and fair and wise and well thought out and that does what—that creates the most competitive Tax Code in the world right here in the United States. Mr. Speaker, it could be great. We could have a great Tax Code, but what we've got to do is create a year of certainty to move forward.

I urge passage of this.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 15 seconds. You know, it's ironical that the gentleman from Illinois minimizes adding \$50 billion to the deficit over 10 years, if continued, which is your policy, continued the high income. A trillion dollars, that's something you just shrug your shoulders at?

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, EARL BLUMENAUER, another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is an interesting question: Which lane are we going to choose?

The study that has been offered by our friends on the other side of the aisle is bogus, and I invite people to actually look at it and look at the critiques that have been offered up.

But we've had a real-life experiment because these tax rates that are being talked about were exactly what we had in the Clinton years, at which time some of our good friends on the other side of the aisle predicted calamity, job loss, and that the economy would crash. What, in fact, happened is that we created 22 million jobs.

What has happened is that, when they had a chance to experiment with their vision in the Bush years, where they put in place these tax reductions, if they would have worked, what would have happened? Did employment even match what happened in the Clinton years? No. In fact, it was less than 5 percent of what happened in the 8 years of Bill Clinton.

In fact, the Obama administration—after the first few months when it was in office and could be credited with responsibility for the economy—has produced more private sector jobs than the entire Bush administration in 8 years. The job loss that's gone negative has been slashing in the public sector, primarily teachers and firefighters and police officers at the State and local levels.

Mr. Speaker, the strategy here is to continue punting. My Republican friends are punting on the farm bill. My Republican friends are punting on SGR. They are now proposing a budget solution that gets us past the election because they can't face up to their own Tea Party extremists, and they're split.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. That's what is at stake here.

I would suggest that we take what we ought to be able to agree on, the 98 percent of this tax reduction, agree on that, not punt, give some real certainty, and then have an honest debate about their proposal to increase taxes on the middle class at the expense of being able to provide for the richest of Americans. Let's have that debate. Let's not hold people hostage in the short term.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the distinguished chairman of the Trade Subcommittee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Chairman CAMP's leadership on this important jobs issue.

For America, this recovery is the weakest since World War II. It's dead last. Millions of Americans can't find work. Millions of Americans have given up looking for work. Businesses along Main Street are struggling. Business confidence is down. Consumer confidence is down. This economy is not working, but yet the President has a plan. He gave it to us a couple of weeks ago. He said, I want to raise taxes on small businesses and professionals.

But here is the cost in real terms for our economy: 700,000 more Americans will be kicked to the unemployment line; the economy will grow slower, in fact, it will shrink; paychecks will shrink; there will be less investment in America.

What kind of plan is that for a recovery?

And also, seniors are going to write more checks in capital gains and dividends to Uncle Sam, the dividends they live on. Small businesses will be able to expand less often because of this.

Republicans think there is a different choice for America's economy. We want to stop the tax hikes. We want to grow this economy by 1 million new jobs. We want to make sure that when you, as a senior, save your whole life, you invest in dividends in a home and land, that you keep it to survive in your retirement years. We want to make sure the death tax doesn't come back to life.

Think about this: You work your whole life to build a family-owned farm or business, and when you die, Uncle Sam swoops in and takes more than half of everything you've worked a lifetime to earn.

That's the choice between the Republican plan to stop the tax hikes and grow this economy and the President's plan to raise taxes and hurt this economy. It is a clear choice. The House is going to act. And more importantly, we're going to make sure America has the best tax system in the world again so that we can compete and win so that our kids and grandkids have the oppor-

tunity for the strongest economy in the world. It's a clear choice.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), another member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes it as clear as day just what the priorities of the majority are. Instead of working with us to shift the tax burden away from the middle class—who haven't gotten a raise in a long time—and small businesses, this bill does the exact opposite.

And for you to continue to say that this is going to be a burden across the board on small businesses is delusional. Ninety-seven percent of small businesses won't be affected by our bill.

To the antitax crusaders, this bill will raise taxes on the middle class—your bill—and working poor—your bill—by an average of \$1,000. In New Jersey, this bill will make 3.2 million middle class and working poor families pay more taxes so that 231,400 millionaires can get a bigger tax cut.

□ 1550

It's as simple as that. You can shake your head all you want; those are the facts. This bill would add almost \$1 trillion more to the deficit than the Democratic bill. My Lord, I don't hear you talk about that. I don't hear you say that. I wonder why? Just so that 0.3 percent of the taxpayers can get an average tax cut of over \$74,000?

At least the last time the Republicans took this shortsighted, trickle-down approach, we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus, thanks to Bill Clinton. In 2008, we were \$11 trillion, over \$11 trillion in debt. We quite simply can't afford to give millionaires another tax break and make our children and our grandchildren foot the bill.

The proof is in the pudding. In 2000, when we first tried this supply side voodoo, unemployment was 4.2 percent. By 2008, it had doubled.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. To those Members concerned with tax fairness: today, wealth concentrated with the top 1 percent is at the same level as the period immediately preceding the Great Depression. So you shrunk the middle class with your great economic ideas between 2001 and 2008, and what you did was made the rich richer. I salute you if that's what you think America is about. We are all job creators, not just the rich.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my friend for yielding, and remind my colleagues that for the last 18 months when we've been in the majority, we have focused on jobs. Now, the American people are

still asking the question: where are the jobs? And that's why we've got over 30 jobs bills now pending over in the United States Senate. And after today, we'll have another bill sitting over in the Senate that will help create more jobs in America.

Two years ago, the President said we shouldn't raise taxes in this time of a slow economy. I agreed with the President. The Congress agreed with the President. All of the Republicans and 119 Democrats voted to extend all of the current tax rates. And here we are some 18 months later, economic growth is actually slower than it was when President Obama made those remarks, and yet the President wants to go out and raise the taxes on the so-called rich.

Well, let me tell you who the so-called rich are. About a million of those people who you want to increase taxes on are small business owners, small business owners who pay their business taxes through their personal tax return. I know all about this. I used to be one of them. I had a subchapter S corporation, and whatever the company's so-called profits were, I had to pay taxes on those, whether I actually got the money or not.

So when you look at what the President wants to do, you want to tax a million small business owners. Ernst & Young has come out and made it clear that if you do this, 750,000 jobs are going to be destroyed, at a time when the American people are asking: where are the jobs?

It's time to put the rhetoric aside. It's time to put the politics aside. I know we're in an election year, but my goodness, raising taxes at this point in this economy is a very big mistake. Extend all of the current tax rates, which our bill does, for 1 year, so we've got time to revise our Tax Code. Lower rates, fairer rates for all Americans, which is what needs to happen if we're truly going to make America more competitive. Put more Americans back to work. And bring some of those jobs that have been shipped overseas back home. We all know that we need to revise our Tax Code and reform it from top to bottom. But that's not going to happen overnight. So extending all of these rates for 1 year will provide certainty. Certainty for whom? Certainty for small business owners, people who can make decisions about what they want to invest in terms of new plant, new equipment, whether they want to hire new employees. This is the most commonsense thing that we can do, and there's no reason that we shouldn't.

When we look at the proposal coming from our colleagues across the aisle, it raises taxes on dividends. Probably not a smart thing to do. When you look at senior citizens, many of them who depend on their dividend income, they're going to get whacked by your proposal. And under your proposal, not only do we tax small business people, but, oh, yeah, the death tax comes back in full

force because it fails to address one of the most penalizing parts of our Tax Code.

I believe that the proposal that my colleague Mr. CAMP and his committee have brought forward is a reasonable, responsible approach, and I would urge its passage.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 15 seconds.

Look, no one here should distort the facts. From Joint Tax: 97 percent of small business people would keep all of their tax cuts. And in the Speaker's district, there are 144 people with income over a million, compared to the 300,000-plus. He's sacrificing the middle class for a few with over a million dollars.

I now have the pleasure of yielding 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LEVIN for yielding me this time, and for his leadership on this very important issue, and I rise in strong opposition to this legislation.

South Carolina, my home State, is home to many military installations—Fort Jackson in Columbia; Shaw Air Force Base and the 3rd Army Headquarters in Sumter; the Joint Air Base in Charleston; Parris Island; and the Marine Air Station in Beaufort. I proudly work to represent these military communities, and I oppose H.R. 8 because of the hurt it would visit upon middle-income and military families.

A new report out today by the Center for American Progress documents the harsh impact that H.R. 8 would have on many military families. For example, a private in the United States Army in his first year of service who is married with an infant child would have a \$273 increase under H.R. 8. That's real money to a young soldier.

A marine corporal with 4 years of service who is married with two children would see a tax increase of \$448 under H.R. 8. That family is already struggling to make ends meet.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, a military police sergeant in the Air Force with 8 years service, a spouse, and three young children would get a whopping tax increase of \$1,118 under H.R. 8.

Mr. Speaker, these are just three examples of how the Republican bill would negatively impact our military families. The Senate has passed a middle class tax cut, and the President has told us he will sign it. The only thing standing between the middle income and their tax cut is the Republican leadership in this House.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we come together and extend to the middle class in this society an income tax cut that is fair, that will create jobs, that will offer security to families and stability to communities. I urge a vote against this bill.

□ 1600

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would just say that the gentleman's remarks refer to the stimulus bill, a

failed stimulus bill that was promised to create unemployment of under 8 percent. Frankly, it's never been there. For 40 months, we've been over 8 percent. These are spending items that were failed, that failed in the stimulus program. That program did not work.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this very important legislation.

The administration and congressional Democrats seek to raise taxes on America's families, small businesses, and job creators. There's a very clear choice here: either we can let small business owners, the job creators, America's entrepreneurs, create jobs, or we can follow the path they're advocating over here and tax small businesses.

I stand in strong support of creating American jobs. Over 940,000 business owners will see higher taxes if the President and Washington Democrats are allowed to raise the top two rates. This means over half—over half—of our Nation's small businesses will see higher taxes at a cost of over 700,000 fewer jobs for Americans—over 700,000 fewer jobs for Americans.

Allowing these tax cuts to expire will hurt middle class families. If we pass this, the average taxpayer in my State of Louisiana will see tax relief of almost, on the average, about \$1,800. The average family of four earning \$50,000 per year can face tax increases of over \$2,200 per family if these cuts expire. A single parent earning \$36,000 per year could see tax increases of \$1,100 if these provisions expire.

Mr. Speaker, this administration continues its assault on the American family and American businesses with its tax-and-spend policies. Our country can't afford it. Certainly, America's families and businesses can't afford it.

What we need is this: a 1-year extension to allow us to move forward with a real comprehensive approach to tax reform.

We have a real opportunity to do what's right for America, to promote American competitiveness. This is the moment. Let's seize it. Let's do it. We need to take this step today to get us where we can move to that next step, that next point.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let's quit dilly-dallying around with this. Let's show some leadership for the American people. They want us to step up and be leaders and solve these problems. Let's step up and be leaders. Let's extend these provisions and move forward with a 21st century Tax Code.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished member of our committee, Mr. CROWLEY, from the great State of New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my good friend from Michigan for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8. The reason I oppose this bill is because this bill will impose taxes on hundreds of thousands of U.S. military families, our heroes. That's right, of the millions facing a tax hike, hundreds of thousands are U.S. military families. Let's call this bill what it is, the "Republicans' Tax Hike on Our Heroes Act."

Now, I know those on the other side of the aisle will come down here one by one and claim they are extending tax cuts for everyone, but you're extending cuts for people earning over \$1 million a year and raising taxes on families earning under \$45,000 a year. This bill scales back tax breaks put in place by President Obama and directly aimed at benefiting working families.

Let's take a moment to put a face on the 25 million Americans whose taxes will go up, including hundreds of thousands of U.S. military families.

If you're an Air Force Staff Sergeant with 8 years of service, a spouse and three young children here stateside at home, the Republicans' Tax Hike on Our Heroes Act will raise their taxes by \$1,100. A new recruit, a private in the U.S. Army in their first year of service earning a little over \$18,000 a year—\$18,000 a year, men and women on the front line defending our freedom—if they're married with an infant child at home, they will see an increase under this bill of \$273, a tax increase under the Republicans' Tax Hike on Our Heroes Act.

It begs the question, how are my colleagues who represent Fort Hamilton in Brooklyn going to vote on the Republicans' Tax Hike on Our Heroes Act? Are you going to stand with your military family constituents or with the 2 percent?

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CROWLEY. How are my colleagues who represent Fort Dix in New Jersey going to vote on the Republicans' Tax on Our Heroes Act? My colleagues who represent Fort Bragg in North Carolina? Fort Detrick in Maryland? Fort Monroe in Virginia? Rock Island Arsenal in Illinois? Beale Air Force Base in California?

Today, the choice is clear. Stand with Democrats and the President who have put forward a plan that simply asks America's wealthiest to support this great land.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, last week, I took part in a roundtable conversation in my district with over 20 small business leaders. They discussed the devastating impact that these looming tax hikes would have on job creation, not only across the country, but in Minnesota.

The sentiment that was echoed throughout that entire conversation was that Washington should not be raising taxes when our economy is still struggling to recover.

These job creators understand all too well what our country is facing as we approach, on January 1, this tax cliff, this fiscal cliff and this jobs cliff. The message from all of these entrepreneurs was simple: Job creators and business leaders alike were saying, very directly, stop the tax hike.

Studies have shown that this looming tax hike would negatively impact half of all small business income, a loss of 700,000 jobs, potentially, and 14,500 of those jobs are in my home State of Minnesota, Mr. Speaker. But if we extend these rates and we move toward tax reform, we can have a positive impact on our economy of 1 million new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the choice is clear. With the national unemployment rate of over 8 percent for 41 consecutive months, we must stop the tax hike.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 15 seconds.

Look, I want to repeat, Joint Tax says 97 percent of small businesses would keep all of their tax cuts. And in Mr. PAULSEN's district, there are 1,345 people with income over 1 million compared with over 325,000 households. That's the equation at stake here. That's the equation.

I now have a real pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the very active gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

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

Mr. NEAL. There's one indisputable fact in this debate today, and that is that the Bush tax cuts used borrowed money.

How much sense did that make to borrow the money to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in America, the top 2 percent? The argument at the time was simple, that we should give tax cuts to the people at the top because they create jobs for the people in the middle and at the bottom. Fact: the slowest economic growth at any time since Herbert Hoover was President of the United States.

The argument, or the assault on the Clinton Presidency was that he raised taxes of the top bracket, 39.6 percent—22 million jobs; the greatest economic growth spurt in the history of America; a reminder to our friends, an unemployment rate of 3.8 percent.

So borrow the money during the Bush years for tax cuts so that we can give the wealthy—and, my goodness, what a ride they've had for these 12 years. It is unbelievable when you look at what those rate cuts did to people at the top.

We have a responsibility here to protect the middle class from a big tax hike next year. Last week, the Senate passed a bill that would extend tax cuts for 98 percent of the American people, the middle class, and now it's up to the House to provide some cer-

tainty to the middle class that their taxes are not going to go up next year. But instead of doing so, what are we doing today, once again? We are having an argument about what to do for that top 2 percent of income earners in America whom our Republican friends can never seem to do quite enough for.

Even more troubling, this tax package ends President Obama's tax cuts that make college more affordable and help working families with children. So not only are we attempting, with their package today and proposal, to hold the middle class hostage to extending tax cuts for the wealthiest, but they want to raise taxes on 25 million families, with an average increase of \$1,000.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. NEAL. We need to extend the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit, and that's what we should be doing today for middle income Americans and provide them with some sense of security and support.

And, my God, can we do any more to help the wealthy in America than what our Republican friends have done?

□ 1610

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT).

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Job Protection and Recession Prevention Act of 2012.

Businesses in my district in Texas and across the country are reluctant to hire and make investments due to an uncertain economy and an impasse over taxes. This bill is a thoughtful step to bolster our economy and bridge the gap to tax simplification. This bill provides a serious game plan and a timetable that shows the American economy how to move forward.

If we don't act, the looming tax hike could destroy an estimated 700,000 jobs, according to an Ernst & Young study. And it's no surprise, then, that the Institute of International Finance said there was a strong case to extend lower Bush-era taxes due to expire at the end of the year in order to avert a fiscal cliff.

I'm proud to support—and urge my colleagues to support—this bill that helps U.S. job creators and gives businesses more confidence to put Americans and Texans back to work.

Mr. LEVIN. Could the Speaker indicate how much time there is on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 13³/₄ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished

member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the bill that we are facing here today. It's been an interesting debate that we've had now for some time.

I learn a lot traveling around my district, but it was especially compelling when I was at a manufacturing plant, less than 40 employees, and they told me—unprovoked—they said the estate tax going up to 55 percent would devastate their business. Those were their words, "devastate their business." It's not just farmers and ranchers that would pay the estate tax, it would also be small businesses—and very thriving small businesses who put people to work, who provide benefits, health care, and otherwise.

Truly, the 35 percent rate is a compromise. I would prefer to see no estate tax, given the fact that it is double taxation—and certainly 55 percent is what many folks would consider confiscatory in nature. So I rise in favor of the bill that we are debating here today. I think that it is better policy—certainly better for our economy that we would not raise taxes on the American people.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, when the Wall Street banking crisis of 2008 hit, causing the worst recession since the Great Depression, it was the middle class that took it on the chin. More than 8 million Americans lost their job through no fault of their own. And as millions of Americans were losing their jobs and their homes, the big banks received bailouts and CEOs continued to receive million-dollar payouts.

While too many middle class Americans are still out looking for work, this Congress is voting again to give over \$160,000 a year in tax breaks to the richest 2 percent of Americans while the average American will be lucky to get about one-100th or maybe two-100ths of that. Can anyone in this Chamber blame the middle class for thinking the system is rigged against them?

Mr. Speaker, we all admire financial success, but when we give away trillions in tax cuts that we cannot afford to those who need them the least, it's the middle class who has to make up the difference. To pay for these tax cuts, our Republican colleagues have voted to end Medicare and would force seniors to pay \$6,400 more for their own care. On top of that, Republicans propose changing Social Security, slashing its budget by over \$800 million. It's an ideological agenda that chooses millionaires over the middle class. Regular folks pay more so that folks like Donald Trump and Mitt Romney can get yet another tax break.

Einstein is credited with saying that the definition of insanity is doing the

same thing over and over again and expecting different results. Eleven years after the Bush tax breaks became law and drove us deeper into deficits, let's not repeat these mistakes. Rather than having these debates about whether the richest 2 percent of Americans deserve extra breaks, we should stand with the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, this should be an all-hands-on-deck moment. America works best when the middle class in America is working. Let's start talking about how we can get all Americans back to work and strengthen our economy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and support the Democratic alternative, which is focused on the middle class.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield myself 15 seconds.

We have a note here from Stan's Two from Rowland Heights, California, a small business. They were asked: How would increased taxes impact your business? "Less hiring, more struggle to pay for expenses and payroll." If rates were allowed to increase, would that affect your ability to hire new employees? "Absolutely. We've done nothing except cut staff for 4 years now. A tax increase could spell disaster."

At this time I yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, most Americans think that the economy is moving in the wrong direction. And most of them think it's Congress' fault, and that we've not done enough to help them take care of their families and give them financial security. They don't want political rhetoric today. They don't care who's wrong or who's right. They want to know what we're doing now, what we're doing today to make buying groceries and gas and paying the electric bill affordable.

Mr. Speaker, if we don't act, a family of four that earns \$50,000 a year will have an increase in their taxes of \$2,200 every year. That's real money, Mr. Speaker. That's the difference between buying an extra box of Cheerios and paying the gas bill and saving for college. And for the job creators, the mood is even worse.

We all know that small businesses create jobs—every one of us in this House knows small businesses create jobs—but the Democrats would raise taxes on them, killing 700,000 jobs. I refuse to raise taxes on small businesses while they struggle to bring our country out of this recession. I refuse to destroy over 700,000 jobs that support families who need and want breadwinners, not handouts.

We must ask ourselves every day: What else can we do for these families? We can offer them some long-term security so that when they die, their families, their farms, and their small businesses will survive and thrive. But tax increases don't even stop when you

die. If we do nothing, the death tax increases to 55 percent. We pay tax when we earn the income; we pay when we invest our income; and we pay again when we leave it to our kids. You want to talk about a fair Tax Code, Mr. Speaker? So today, I'm voting for a clear path forward.

After 41 months of unemployment above 8 percent, we must stop the tax hike. I'm committed to tax reform that will create jobs, grow our economy, and support families. I am voting today for working families, for small businesses, for entrepreneurs, and for family farms, Mr. Speaker. This bill puts America back on the right track.

Mr. LEVIN. Could you tell us, please, again how much time there is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 9¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to another active member of our committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Now is not the time to let the Republicans raise taxes on thousands of Texas families in order to provide more tax breaks for a privileged few. Republicans would hike the taxes by almost \$500 for a married marine corporal with 4 years of service and two children living in Schertz.

□ 1620

That's wrong. Nor is this the time for Republicans to tax opportunity. A single mom, working as a nurse, helping a daughter attend the Alamo Colleges or Texas State or ACC, would be denied the \$2,500 higher education tax credit that I authored, all of this, in the very same bill that would give a Republican who earns \$1 million a tax cut that is larger than that marine or that nurse will earn in an entire year.

If there were an Olympic medal out there for protecting those sitting atop the economic ladder at the expense of those trying to get a foothold on one of the first rungs, these Republicans would have no competition for going for the gold.

Nor has this trickle-down Republican approach grown our jobs and our economy. Extending tax breaks for those at the very top, it was done in 2010, over my objection; it hasn't grown jobs in the past year anymore than it helped to avoid the Bush/Cheney recession.

And as for this much ballyhooed Ernst & Young report, it was bought and paid for by the same millionaires that would get a tax break bigger than what the nurse or the marine earns all of next year, along with a few large corporations who paid for the report. It is not credible.

It is not just to see many Americans pay higher taxes in order to help the few gain even more tax breaks.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee,

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, you know, when nearly 23 million Americans are struggling to find full-time employment, President Obama and his Democrat allies seem to think that now is the time to raise taxes on small businesses.

And the President may be satisfied with an 8 percent or more unemployment rate for 41 straight months, but I'm not and, more importantly, the American people are not. The American people don't need to settle for a country with fewer and fewer opportunities and a diminished future.

So the House today will vote to stop the tax hike for all taxpayers, and tomorrow we will vote to move forward with a comprehensive tax reform. This is a critical step in providing the certainty that our small businesses desperately need to grow and create jobs.

Now, the Democrats' proposal to raise taxes on nearly 1 million small businesses will cost more than 700,000 jobs, and they have not even offered a plan on tax reform. This is more of the same failed leadership that has given us the weakest economic recovery since the Great Depression.

Democrats think that we are just one more tax increase away from prosperity. But when has a nation ever taxed its way to prosperity? Prosperity is built by the American people, not the government. American entrepreneurs and small business owners are the lifeblood of our American Dream, and they're the backbone of our economy.

It is clear that we must stop this tax hike and reform our broken Tax Code to revive our struggling economy and keep the American Dream alive.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), our ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, it's very important everyone understand the choice that's facing the House today. The Democrats will offer an amendment that will immediately extend tax relief to 100 percent of American people. The Senate has already passed that proposal; and if our Republican colleagues vote for it today, we can send it down to the White House, the President will sign it today.

Someone asked what we're going to do today. We could provide immediate tax relief to 98 percent of the American people.

Now, let's be clear. The Democratic proposal provides tax relief to everybody up to \$250,000. What our Republican colleagues are saying is they will deny tax relief to 98 percent of the American people, unless people making over \$250,000 get a bonus, an extra tax cut. In other words, unless the top 2 percent get an extra tax cut, nobody else gets anything.

It gets worse. We've heard a lot of talk here about small businesses, that we need to adopt the Republican plan in order to support small businesses. It's just not true.

The Democratic proposal, according to the nonpartisan Independent Joint Tax Committee, provides tax relief to 97 percent of the businesses that we're talking about here. In fact, they point out that the other 3 percent of businesses include about 20,000 pass-through businesses that make over \$50 million a year.

Now, they may be good businesses, but these are not mom-and-pop businesses. The language we're hearing from our Republican colleagues would use small businesses as a cover to providing breaks for firms like Fortune 100 Pipeline Company Enterprise Products Partners; PricewaterhouseCoopers, good business, not a mom-and-pop; KKR Investment Banking; and guess what, Bain Capital, Bain Capital, the kind of small business that our Republican colleagues are trying to protect.

This is all really in service to the trickle-down ideology. We tried it in the Bush administration. At the end of 8 years we actually saw a net job loss.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. We tried trickle-down. We lived it; we saw a net job loss. But who picked up the tab? The rest of the country because it drove a huge hole in our deficit; and in order to deal with that, if we don't ask folks at the top to pay a little bit more, the rest of the country ends up picking up the tab. That's just not right, and it doesn't help the economy.

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would just say that my friend's proposals just aren't bold enough. The economy isn't growing. Unemployment is still above 8 percent for 40 consecutive months.

We need to get on a plan for comprehensive reform, not just raising taxes on a segment, not just pitting one group of Americans against another. But let's get a comprehensive reform so we can get certainty, we can get job growth, we can get economic prosperity and get Americans back to work.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the proposed legislation to make sure that we do not increase taxes on any Americans come the end of this year. I think it's prudent, it's responsible, and it's the right message to send to America, that we are going to stand with every American and every small business owner across the country and say, end of the year, no tax increases.

And I appreciate my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and their passion and their commitment to raising taxes. They get to choose which threshold, 200, \$250,000 or more. But it's clear to me that there's a clear distinction that the American people will have an opportunity to decide come

this November between my Democratic colleagues across the aisle and this side of the aisle.

My Democratic colleagues across the aisle raise taxes as part of the solution going forward. This side of the aisle, I'm proud to stand, Mr. Speaker, to say "no" to raising taxes on any American moving forward.

Now, the gentleman had recognized and said that some of these tax increases that we're talking about in regards to businesses are not the mom-and-pop shop.

Well, I'll tell you something. I just had a conversation with Dick Clark from my district, an owner of Villager Construction. That's a mom-and-pop shop. Sterilator Company out of Cuba, New York, in my district. That's a mom-and-pop shop. Those are people that have told me that one of their greatest concerns as small business owners is the tax burden that they're going to face next year.

Let's not stand for rhetoric. Let's do the responsible, prudent thing and say "no" to tax increases. And I leave it up to the American people who I believe are hardworking taxpayers who are not stupid. They know what the distinction will be by the end of this year and next year when they come to the voting booth in November, that we stand for no tax increases, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going down the path of let's raise taxes.

Now is not the time to raise taxes in an economic climate when people are struggling and we're trying to have the job creators have the capital so that they can put people back to work for today and tomorrow.

□ 1630

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), who is the ranking member on the Committee on Small Business and who has toiled in the vineyards and beyond on behalf of the small businesses of this country.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Thank you, Ranking Member, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill before us today.

Republicans love to focus on small businesses when it's convenient for them. They claim it is imperative to pass today's bill because, if we don't, small firms will be harmed. However, today's bill is only good for millionaires and billionaires, not the Nation's job creators.

The argument that a partial extension of tax cuts hinders small business hiring relies on distorted facts. Republicans are using a warped definition of a "small firm" that counts Mitt Romney as a small business owner. I don't think the average person considers 237 people whose incomes average more than \$200 million as small business owners.

Contrary to Republican claims, this is not what the American taxpayers

think of when they hear “small business.” When most people think of entrepreneurs, they envision small manufacturers, architects, Main Street restaurants, and hardware stores—those Americans who risk their savings to create jobs in our communities. Tax cuts should go to real small businesses that are creating jobs, not to people who are simply moving money around for their own profits.

Instead of addressing the top concern of small business owners—a lack of demand for their goods and services—this bill simply gives more tax cuts to the very rich. The numbers don't lie. Over 80 percent of the value of these cuts goes to millionaires. That is an average tax cut of \$164,000.

Let's call this bill what it really is—a tax cut for the rich, not for small businesses. That is not what our economy needs. Vote “no.”

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. I certainly thank the chairman for his leadership on this.

Mr. Speaker, I'm confused. I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle haven't read what H.R. 8 is. They keep talking about how my colleagues and I are looking to try to raise taxes on a segment of the population. Actually, what this does is extend current tax rates for everyone—for every single American. I can tell you that, for people all across the country right now, foreclosures are up. They're concerned about how they will send their kids to school. We've got energy prices that are on the rise. We want to make sure that the government is not taking more from them.

I have to tell you that I think what we're talking about right now is trying to empower the American people. We want to make sure that we have upward mobility. We want to try to create growth in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, in 2010, the President of the United States came before the American public and said that our economy was too fragile. The President said that our economy is fragile and that we should extend these tax rates. That's when the economy was growing at 3½ percent, Mr. Speaker. The Commerce Department just came out with statistics that we are growing at 1½ percent today. There is no way in the world that we should be taking more out of the pockets of the American public. It's just not feasible.

Two-thirds of all net new jobs are created by small businesses, but this isn't just for small businesses—this is for every single American. We're running the experiment today. If you want to talk about higher taxes—more taking in the State of Illinois—if you want

to take a look at what's going on in the State of Illinois, we are dead last in too many categories. We are not creating jobs. Jobs are picking up and they're going to neighboring States. They're leaving because we've decided to take more from hardworking taxpayers in the State of Illinois.

What we want to do is to make sure that we extend these for an additional year so that we can have real tax reform. That's what this is about. We want to talk about pro-growth tax policies so that we can get the American public back to work. This is about jobs and the economy.

Frankly, I tip my hat to my colleagues because, when I talk to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they also indicate to me that the number one issue is jobs and the economy.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOLD. Let's come together. Let's not talk about how we want to raise taxes on the middle class because, frankly, that's just inaccurate, not true. We are looking to try to make sure these get extended for an additional year so that we can talk about pro-growth tax reform and get people off of the unemployment lines and back to work.

So I applaud you for trying to get up there and plead your political point, but we need to come together. We need to make this happen for the American public.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time is left on this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. We have one more speaker on this.

Mr. CAMP, do you have more than one?

Mr. CAMP. I have one more speaker and then myself.

Mr. LEVIN. Why don't you call on the one, and then Mr. HOYER is going to wrap up on this bill.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. There has been a tremendous amount of rhetoric and hyperbole in the conversation today—all this energy about how we are trying to raise taxes on different groups. Let's clear this up.

This is about keeping the rates the same for another year for all Americans. Really, this debate is not about tax rates. What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to identify as the problem is that some people in America have too much money and that the solution to fix this problem is for people to go down the street and find someone with a bigger house and take some of their stuff and bring it to the other house. Then the problems in America would be solved. Things would be fair.

The issue is not whether we should tax one group more and then distribute that to another group. That doesn't create more jobs, and that doesn't create more stability. That doesn't pull us out of a recession. That only makes one group feel better that they took money from another group and gave it to another.

There are really two philosophies that are at work here. We want to make this debate about taxes, but it's really a philosophical issue. One group says that the purpose of taxation is to take from one group and redistribute to another one to make America fair. The other group, that of the Republicans, says the purpose of taxation is to collect as little as possible in order to efficiently run the government so that individuals are able to keep their money. We became the most powerful, prosperous nation on Earth because Americans were able to keep what they earned, were able to invest it into other things and were able to grow it.

Here is the real proposal: one, keep tax rates the same for another year; two, fix the broken Code.

There are 70,000 pages—3.8 million words—in this Tax Code. It needs to be fixed. It's miserably complicated. No Americans feel confident that when they file their taxes they got it all right. We've got to fix this Code and be able to simplify it dramatically. It's going to take time to do that. So let's extend rates for another year, and then let's spend next year fixing the Code. Let's get this right for all Americans, not just for some.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield the balance of my time on this bill to the distinguished whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for the remaining 2¾ minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Designed to fail. That's what this bill is. It is designed to fail. Very frankly, you made sure that it was going to fail when you passed the amendment that added the reform bill and this bill together.

Designed to fail. How sad.

I don't think you want to raise taxes on anybody. I understand that. I'll accept that premise. What we ought to do is to make sure, in the agreement that we have with the Senate and the House, that at least the 98 percent of Americans who make less than \$250,000 have no increase in their taxes. At least we ought to do that. America knows we have agreement on that. They're wondering why, when you have agreement, you don't take that agreement and give the assurance and certainty to 98 percent of the American working people that they won't have an increase in their taxes so that they'll have the confidence that they'll have that money in their pockets or, perhaps, purchase that refrigerator that they need or that oven that they need or perhaps a new car or so that they can help their kids go to college.

Why don't we give them that confidence, I say to my friends. Mr. Speaker, I wish we would do so.

Today, we could embrace the agreement that the Senate has come to and tell the 98 percent, "You're safe." In addition to that, by rejecting this bill, we will reject taking money out of 25 million people's pockets that they rely on to support themselves and their children.

□ 1640

That's what the Senate bill does. It protects the wealthiest in America while telling some of the poorest in America, the least well-off in America, you're going to pay more, you're going to get less. How perverse. How undermining of our economy. How undermining of the confidence of our people. Ladies and gentlemen of this House, we're better than this.

Newt Gingrich talked some years ago in 1998 about the "Perfectionist Caucus." Mr. Speaker, he said embrace agreement. He was agreeing with President Clinton and Newt Gingrich at that point in time on a budget which adopted PAYGO one more time, which is one of the reasons why we balanced the budget 4 years in a row. The House Ways and Means bill leaves 98 percent of our people at risk, while our bill gives 100 percent of the people a tax cut.

Let us reject the House bill. Let us adopt the substitute. Let us send it to the Senate and make it law. The President will sign it, and it can become law and give confidence and help to those 98 percent of Americans.

This Republican proposal, is not the straight-forward tax cut extension middle-class families and small business owners are asking for.

Instead it extends tax cuts to even the highest incomes, a plan already rejected by the Senate and which the President has said he would veto.

Moving forward with this legislation will only prolong the uncertainty the American people have asked us to end.

What we ought to do—before the August district work period—is pass the extension where we have agreement—for earnings under \$250,000, which is a tax cut for 100 percent of Americans.

Ninety eight percent of families and 97 percent of small businesses will see no change to their taxes.

Let's pass what we agree on now and afterward debate what we disagree on.

Instead, we've seen Republicans insist on an all or nothing approach, which has held middle-class tax relief hostage to tax cuts for the top 2 percent.

Now, they are doing so once again, with a rule on this bill that makes it harder for us to reach an agreement to prevent a tax hike on the middle class.

This is not the regular order or open process Speaker BOEHNER and Republicans campaigned on and pledged to uphold in this House.

At the same time, this bill would impose an average tax hike of \$1,000 on 25 million working families by allowing the expanded Child

Tax Credit and Earned Income Tax Credit to expire while eliminating the American Opportunity Tax Credit.

That lies in stark contrast to the \$160,000 tax cut this bill would deliver to the average millionaire, according to the National Economic Council.

Mr. Speaker I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating this bill, and I call on Republicans to work with us to pass the tax cut extension for the middle class on which we all agree.

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

I would just say this isn't just about taxes. I would agree with my friend from Maryland, Republicans do not want to raise taxes on small businesses, job creators, or investors because it's also about the economy.

This has been a dismal recovery, the worst since the Great Depression; and unemployment has been above 8 percent for 40 consecutive months. Their answer is to raise taxes on the small business sector, the area where we need to have those jobs to begin to be created. What we're saying is let's keep the law the same for 1 year. We're the only Nation in the world that has all of these tax provisions expiring year in and year out. Let's leave this the same for 1 year, then let's move and adopt comprehensive tax reform in an expedited procedure to do that so we can finish that next year.

If we go down their path of raising taxes on small businesses, 700,000 jobs will be lost. If we go down our path of extending current law for a year, bringing certainty, extending that law for a year, moving forward on comprehensive reform, addressing some spending problems we know this Nation has had, 3 years of trillion-dollar deficits, if we do that, we create a million jobs.

Vote for H.R. 8.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8, the Job Protection and Recession Prevention Act of 2012. In August of 2009, President Obama told NBC News, "You don't raise taxes in a recession." Quite frankly, I agree with the President and would take it a step further. We should never raise taxes at all, period.

Unfortunately, if we do nothing before the end of the year, we risk raising taxes on Americans by \$384 billion over the next ten years according to the Joint Committee on Taxation. For my home State of Georgia alone, this would represent a tax increase of \$3,010 per tax return. At a time when we have had 41 straight months of unemployment, it would be irresponsible to place an additional burden on working families and job creators, particularly when Ernst & Young recently released a study stating that this tax increase would destroy 700,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have a simple solution. H.R. 8 will prevent this looming tax increase on all Americans, especially the 1 million small business entrepreneurs that would likely feel the pain the most.

To all of my colleagues, we have a clear choice today. You can either support H.R. 8 to prevent a \$384 billion tax increase, or you could oppose this legislation, endorse these tax increases and destroy 700,000 jobs in the process. The choice is yours.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican tax proposal. Their plan will give more tax breaks for the richest 2 percent, providing \$160,000 for the average millionaire—on top of the \$1 million that they received over the last 9 years.

A hundred and sixty thousand dollars means different things to different people. For 464 Rhode Island veterans, it means access to employment and job training services; for 2,340 Rhode Island parents, it means immunizations for their children against Measles, Mumps, and the flu; and for Rhode Island's youth, it means 25 more students get a leg up through Head Start. But for millionaires, \$160,000 simply represents the additional gift they receive under the Republican tax proposal.

A hundred and sixty thousand dollars is a lot of money, and it can go a long way towards improving the lives and opportunities of Rhode Islanders. While every program I mentioned is on the chopping block, Republicans seem complacent to mortgage our children and grandchildren's future to preserve these tax cuts for the wealthiest top two percent at a cost of \$1 trillion. These are tax cuts we simply cannot afford. In fact, if we want to talk about responsible deficit reduction, this would be an excellent place to start.

Democrats and Republicans do agree on one thing;—the need to extend tax cuts for the middle class and small businesses, which is exactly what the Democratic proposal will do. Under the Democratic plan, every single taxpayer will receive a tax cut on income earned up to \$200,000 if you are single, and \$250,000 if you are married.

For our middle class families, this translates to an extra \$2,200 in their pockets. And even high-income households will continue to receive a tax cut averaging more than \$10,000 on their first \$250,000 of income.

No one thinks raising taxes on the middle class is a good idea. Right now, my top priority is giving middle-class families and our small businesses the security and certainty they deserve by extending tax cuts they desperately need. This should be an issue where Republicans and Democrats can work together to do what is right for hard-working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican plan that continues down the same fiscally irresponsible path. Give our small businesses and working families the certainty they deserve, and support the Democratic plan to cut taxes for everyone and help move the economy forward.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8. I cannot support legislation that prioritizes millionaires over middle class families. By bringing this legislation to the floor, Republicans hold hostage the middle class tax cuts in order to help those who need it least. If enacted, this bill would give millionaires an average tax cut of \$160,000 next year. Hedge fund managers and corporate CEOs who make up the wealthiest 2 percent of this country do not need a massive tax break. The Republican tax plan on the floor today not only favors millionaires, it takes away tax programs that help working families. Under this legislation, 25 million families and college students in this country will lose as much as \$1,000 because of cuts to the Earned Income Tax Credits, the Child Tax Credit, and the American Opportunity Tax Credit. It is these lower and

middle income families that deserve our help. It is time to start creating a tax code that reflects our values by ensuring that every individual pays their fair share.

I stand with the House Democrats, the Senate and the President in supporting an extension of the middle class tax cuts. Working Americans are facing high unemployment and stagnant wages. They should have the certainty to know that they will not face a tax increase next year. Extending the middle class tax cuts means helping 114 million middle class families, including 13.2 million in California. If the House extends the middle class tax cuts—already passed by the Senate—these families will save an average of \$2,200 on next year's taxes.

This country cannot afford to keep giving out tax breaks to the wealthy and large corporations. This Republican bill adds another \$50 billion to our deficit in just one year. This is the wrong approach and is just plain irresponsible. We need to strengthen the middle class, put people back to work, and grow our economy. The first step is introducing fairness to our tax code and helping the middle class Americans who work hard and play by the rules. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the Republican giveaway to the most wealthy and to instead support the Democratic substitute which protects the middle class.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). All time for debate has expired.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN

Mr. LEVIN. I now call up the substitute amendment.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; ETC.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Middle Class Tax Cut Act”.

(b) **AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.**—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; etc.

**TITLE I—TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF
TAX RELIEF**

Sec. 101. Temporary extension of 2001 tax relief.

Sec. 102. Temporary extension of 2003 tax relief.

Sec. 103. Temporary extension of 2010 tax relief.

Sec. 104. Temporary extension of election to expense certain depreciable business assets.

**TITLE II—ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX
RELIEF**

Sec. 201. Temporary extension of increased alternative minimum tax exemption amount.

Sec. 202. Temporary extension of alternative minimum tax relief for non-refundable personal credits.

**TITLE III—TREATMENT FOR PAYGO
PURPOSES**

Sec. 301. Treatment for PAYGO purposes.

**TITLE I—TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF TAX
RELIEF**

**SEC. 101. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF 2001 TAX
RELIEF.**

(a) **TEMPORARY EXTENSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 901(a)(1) of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 is amended by striking “December 31, 2012” and inserting “December 31, 2013”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this subsection shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001.

(b) **APPLICATION TO CERTAIN HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.**—

(1) **INCOME TAX RATES.**—

(A) **TREATMENT OF 25- AND 28-PERCENT RATE BRACKETS.**—Paragraph (2) of section 1(i) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) **25- AND 28-PERCENT RATE BRACKETS.**—The tables under subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) shall be applied—

“(A) by substituting ‘25%’ for ‘28%’ each place it appears (before the application of subparagraph (B)), and

“(B) by substituting ‘28%’ for ‘31%’ each place it appears.”

(B) **33-PERCENT RATE BRACKET.**—Subsection (i) of section 1 is amended by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4) and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) **33-PERCENT RATE BRACKET.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012—

“(i) the rate of tax under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) on a taxpayer's taxable income in the fourth rate bracket shall be 33 percent to the extent such income does not exceed an amount equal to the excess of—

“(I) the applicable amount, over

“(II) the dollar amount at which such bracket begins, and

“(ii) the 36 percent rate of tax under such subsections shall apply only to the taxpayer's taxable income in such bracket in excess of the amount to which clause (i) applies.

“(B) **APPLICABLE AMOUNT.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘applicable amount’ means the excess of—

“(i) the applicable threshold, over

“(ii) the sum of the following amounts in effect for the taxable year:

“(I) the basic standard deduction (within the meaning of section 63(c)(2)), and

“(II) the exemption amount (within the meaning of section 151(d)(1) (or, in the case of subsection (a), 2 such exemption amounts).

“(C) **APPLICABLE THRESHOLD.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘applicable threshold’ means—

“(i) \$250,000 in the case of subsection (a),

“(ii) \$225,000 in the case of subsection (b),

“(iii) \$200,000 in the case of subsections (c), and

“(iv) ½ the amount applicable under clause (i) (after adjustment, if any, under subparagraph (E)) in the case of subsection (d).

“(D) **FOURTH RATE BRACKET.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘fourth rate bracket’ means the bracket which would (determined without regard to this paragraph) be the 36-percent rate bracket.

“(E) **INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.**—For purposes of this paragraph, with respect to taxable years beginning in calendar years after 2012, each of the dollar amounts under clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (C) shall be adjusted in the same manner as under paragraph (1)(C), except that subsection (f)(3)(B) shall be applied by substituting ‘2008’ for ‘1992’.”

(2) **PHASEOUT OF PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS AND ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.**—

(A) **OVERALL LIMITATION ON ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.**—Section 68 is amended—

(i) by striking “the applicable amount” the first place it appears in subsection (a) and inserting “the applicable threshold in effect under section 1(i)(3)”,

(ii) by striking “the applicable amount” in subsection (a)(1) and inserting “such applicable threshold”,

(iii) by striking subsection (b) and redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively, and

(iv) by striking subsections (f) and (g).

(B) **PHASEOUT OF DEDUCTIONS FOR PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (3) of section 151(d) is amended—

(I) by striking “the threshold amount” in subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting “the applicable threshold in effect under section 1(i)(3)”,

(II) by striking subparagraph (C) and redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C), and

(III) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F).

(ii) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Paragraph (4) of section 151(d) is amended—

(I) by striking subparagraph (B),

(II) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by indenting such subparagraphs (as so redesignated) accordingly, and

(III) by striking all that precedes “in a calendar year after 1989,” and inserting the following:

“(4) **INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.**—In the case of any taxable year beginning”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

(d) **APPLICATION OF EGTRRA SUNSET.**—Each amendment made by subsection (b) shall be subject to title IX of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 to the same extent and in the same manner as if such amendment was included in title I of such Act.

**SEC. 102. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF 2003 TAX
RELIEF.**

(a) **EXTENSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 303 of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 is amended by striking “December 31, 2012” and inserting “December 31, 2013”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this subsection shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

(b) 20-PERCENT CAPITAL GAINS RATE FOR CERTAIN HIGH INCOME INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 1(h) is amended by striking subparagraph (C), by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (E) and (F) and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

“(C) 15 percent of the lesser of—

“(i) so much of the adjusted net capital gain (or, if less, taxable income) as exceeds the amount on which a tax is determined under subparagraph (B), or

“(ii) the excess (if any) of—

“(I) the amount of taxable income which would (without regard to this paragraph) be taxed at a rate below 36 percent, over

“(II) the sum of the amounts on which a tax is determined under subparagraphs (A) and (B),

“(D) 20 percent of the adjusted net capital gain (or, if less, taxable income) in excess of the sum of the amounts on which tax is determined under subparagraphs (B) and (C).”.

(2) MINIMUM TAX.—Section 55 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) 20-PERCENT CAPITAL GAINS RATE FOR CERTAIN HIGH INCOME INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any individual, if the taxpayer’s taxable income for the taxable year exceeds the applicable amount determined under section 1(i) with respect to such taxpayer for such taxable year, the amount determined under paragraph (2) shall be substituted for the amount determined under subsection (b)(3)(C) for purposes of determining the taxpayer’s tentative minimum tax for such taxable year.

“(2) DETERMINATION OF 20-PERCENT CAPITAL GAINS RATE.—The amount determined under this paragraph is the sum of—

“(A) 15 percent of the lesser of—

“(i) so much of the adjusted net capital gain (or, if less, taxable excess) as exceeds the amount on which tax is determined under subsection (b)(3)(B), or

“(ii) the excess described in section 1(h)(1)(C)(ii), plus

“(B) 20 percent of the adjusted net capital gain (or, if less, taxable excess) in excess of the sum of the amounts on which tax is determined under subparagraph (A) and subsection (b)(3)(B).”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The following provisions are each amended by striking “15 percent” and inserting “20 percent”:

(A) Section 531.

(B) Section 541.

(C) Section 1445(e)(1).

(D) The second sentence of section 7518(g)(6)(A).

(E) Section 53511(f)(2) of title 46, United States Code.

(2) Section 1445(e)(6) is amended by striking “15 percent (20 percent in the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 2010)” and inserting “20 percent”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

(2) WITHHOLDING.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1)(C) and (2) of subsection (c) shall apply to amounts paid on or after January 1, 2013.

(e) APPLICATION OF JGTRRA SUNSET.—Each amendment made by subsections (b) and (c) shall be subject to section 303 of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 to the same extent and in the same manner as if such amendment was included in title III of such Act.

SEC. 103. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF 2010 TAX RELIEF.

(a) AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 25A(i) is amended by striking “or 2012” and inserting “2012, or 2013”.

(2) TREATMENT OF POSSESSIONS.—Section 1004(c)(1) of division B of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Tax Act of 2009 is amended by striking “and 2012” each place it appears and inserting “2012, and 2013”.

(b) CHILD TAX CREDIT.—Section 24(d)(4) is amended—

(1) by striking “AND 2012” in the heading and inserting “2012, AND 2013”, and

(2) by striking “or 2012” and inserting “2012, or 2013”.

(c) EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.—Section 32(b)(3) is amended—

(1) by striking “AND 2012” in the heading and inserting “2012, AND 2013”, and

(2) by striking “or 2012” and inserting “2012, or 2013”.

(d) TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF RULE DISREGARDING REFUNDS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS.—Subsection (b) of section 6409 is amended by striking “December 31, 2012” and inserting “December 31, 2013”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

(2) RULE DISREGARDING REFUNDS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—The amendment made by subsection (d) shall apply to amounts received after December 31, 2012.

SEC. 104. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF ELECTION TO EXPENSE CERTAIN DEPRECIABLE BUSINESS ASSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Section 179(b)(1) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C),

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E),

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

“(D) \$250,000 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2013, and”, and

(D) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, by striking “2012” and inserting “2013”.

(2) REDUCTION IN LIMITATION.—Section 179(b)(2) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C),

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E),

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

“(D) \$800,000 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2013, and”, and

(D) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, by striking “2012” and inserting “2013”.

(b) COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—Section 179(d)(1)(A)(ii) is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(c) ELECTION.—Section 179(c)(2) is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

TITLE II—ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX RELIEF

SEC. 201. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF INCREASED ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX EXEMPTION AMOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 55(d) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$72,450” and all that follows through “2011” in subparagraph (A) and inserting “\$78,750 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2012”, and

(2) by striking “\$47,450” and all that follows through “2011” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “\$50,600 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2012”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 202. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX RELIEF FOR NONREFUNDABLE PERSONAL CREDITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 26(a) is amended—

(1) by striking “or 2011” and inserting “2011, or 2012”, and

(2) by striking “2011” in the heading thereof and inserting “2012”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

TITLE III—TREATMENT FOR PAYGO PURPOSES

SEC. 301. TREATMENT FOR PAYGO PURPOSES.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 747, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

Mr. LEVIN. Could the Chair be clear as to who has the right to close on this amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has the right to close.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to another Member of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. LEVIN for yielding.

After 2 years of talking about spending cuts and deficit reduction, Republicans somehow believe it is wise to fill the pockets of each and every millionaire in America with an additional \$160,000 tax cut. We’ve been here before. This is the same picture. Mr. Speaker, we all know what this is about. This is about two competing visions of America. The Democratic vision is opportunity for all Americans to prosper, while the Republican vision reserves prosperity for the select few.

That is not right, Mr. Speaker. That is not fair. That is not just. American hardworking families need tax relief, and they need it now. Not tomorrow, not next week, not next month, not next year, but now. If you believe in a strong, solid middle class, vote “no” on this bill. If you believe in American opportunity, vote “no” on this bill. If you’re serious about reducing the deficit, vote “no” on this bill. I urge all of my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill and to vote “yes” on the Levin amendment. It is simply the right thing to do.

We can do much better by voting for the Levin amendment. It is the right thing to do. It is the fair thing to do. It is the just thing to do. We should do it and do it now.

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

Let me just say that this substitute increases taxes, and it increases taxes

on small businesses, the very sector that we need to be growing to bring us out of this recession. It does not include tax reform. There's no path to tax reform. Our Tax Code has had 5,000 changes in the last decade. The complexity is making it difficult for Americans to know what their responsibilities are. They suspect others get a better deal under the Tax Code because of the complexity. If we can take that away and move to a system that has a lower rate, revenue neutral, that closes off some of these 5,000 changes that have been made in the last few years, we can create a million jobs in the first year alone.

One of the things that led us into this recession is the housing crisis. Here we have a letter from the National Association of Home Builders saying that housing can be a key engine of job growth that this country needs. However, the recovery we're seeing remains fragile. As the rest of the economy is experiencing softening conditions, now would be the worst time to raise taxes.

The National Association of Home Builders believes that lower rates, simplification, and a fair system will spur economic growth and increase competitiveness. That's good for housing, because housing not only equals jobs, but jobs mean more demand for housing. This is just one area that if we raise taxes, as this substitute attempts to do, we're going to really close off what little recovery we've been seeing, and obviously it's been very anemic. Economic growth is just over 1 percent.

We need to be the best country in the world. We need to have the strongest country in the world. We need to have the best Tax Code in the world. Raising taxes on one segment, one group of Americans against another is not the way to get America's greatness back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Democratic substitute on this tax provision.

I have tremendous respect for Chairman CAMP and the members of the Ways and Means Committee, but I would like to note that not a single one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuted what I spoke about before, about the fact that if the Republican tax bill were to pass, as opposed to the Democratic tax bill, there would be an increase in taxes on 225,000 military men and women, many of whom are in Active Duty overseas as we speak.

I mentioned in my remarks that under the Democratic bill, the EITC rate, the earned income tax credit under the bill would afford a sergeant in our Army today with 8 years of service, married and with three children, and has a basic pay of \$34,723, would receive under the Democratic plan an EITC benefit of \$3,508.

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

□ 1650

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CROWLEY. I want to be very clear about this, Mr. Speaker. The earned income tax credit under the Republican bill would only be \$2,390. Now when I do the math, that means that under the Republican bill, that sergeant and his or her family would have a \$1,118 tax increase. You can't get around it. Those are the facts. Those are the numbers. They speak loud and clear. And not a single one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuted that.

We have refuted the \$250,000 issue as it pertains to small business owners. The reality is, the men and women on the front lines defending this democracy, defending our freedom, defending our way of life, allowing for small businessmen and -women to prosper in this country, they're not worth a tax break.

Your bill increases taxes on our military men and women. There's no getting around it. A vote for the Republican bill is a vote to increase taxes on military men and women. A vote for the Democratic substitute is a tax cut for our military men and women.

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

I don't have to refute what the Member from New York said because the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation has already done that. They've said the matters the gentleman is talking about are not tax increases. Those are spending through the Tax Code. That spending was put into the stimulus bill. We know how unsuccessful that was in lowering our unemployment rate below 8 percent, as was promised.

So at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment that we're debating here, Mr. Speaker. The reason why is, it's clear the Democratic substitute amendment that we're discussing is a further expansion of tax increases that the Senate passed recently. I'm opposed to those tax increases.

We're dealing with a situation where the proposed amendment will raise the estate tax and take 55 percent of our hardworking Americans' assets when they pass away. They are raising taxes on dividends and capital gains at a time when senior citizens rely on those most in these dire economic times. They also seek to raise taxes on those making \$200,000 to \$250,000 and above. Raising taxes on those individuals goes right to the heart of our small businesses across America, coast to coast, North to South.

In this dire economic time, I actually agree with President Obama when he signed the tax rates in December 2010, when he said, In dire economic times, we don't raise taxes on Americans.

I just ask my colleagues to join me and say, Reject this substitute, freeze

the Tax Code, and deal with the issue of comprehensive tax reform over the next 12 months, and put no Americans in harm in having their tax bill increased at the end of this year.

Mr. LEVIN. It's now my real pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) who is the chair of our caucus and an active member of our committee.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the distinguished ranking member.

This debate today is extraordinarily informative. This isn't about Democrats or Republicans. This is about saving and preserving our middle class.

Lauren Mishkin from Connecticut, a mother who recently came up to talk to me about student loans, said, "When only the rich can follow their dreams, we have a problem."

So here today, we face a very clear choice that I think all Americans understand. We should be able to come together as Democrats and Republicans and provide a tax break for everyone up to \$250,000. Lauren was right: we have a problem.

A constituent of mine said, "How is it that the Congress doesn't understand that what they're doing is throwing all of us into the deep abyss of uncertainty?" It's that deep abyss of uncertainty that all Americans are concerned about. And what they want is for us to come together.

We know that we have a bill that has passed the Senate, a bill that the President will sign, a bill that we virtually agree on on both sides of the aisle. So what really frustrates the American citizens and the people in my district is that we can't come together.

I implore my colleagues on the other side, don't plunge us further into this dark abyss. Do the things that the wealthy amongst us have more than the ability to shoulder and make sure that we all come together, as Americans, and do the right thing on behalf of our constituents. That's what the Lauren Mishkins want, that's the kind of dream that we need to provide for all American citizens, and that's what this country desperately needs—a Congress that will take leadership.

There are times when you need to step aside, and there are times when you need to step up. We need to step up as a Congress and pass this Democratic substitute.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, as I have been back in the district talking to my constituents and visiting many of the businesses and the job creators in the district, I have continued to hear from them that if we place one more tax increase on them, they're just not sure that they can survive.

Now these are good people that I go to the grocery store with, that I go to church with. I know how hard they're working, and I know how hard their families are working in order to keep

businesses going within our community. And when we know that two out of every three jobs are created by a small businessman or -woman, we impact those very folks who are creating the jobs for so many people in the district.

I hear this over and over again. And they look at me and say, Diane, please go back to Congress and please relay this to the Members of Congress, that we need to make sure that we have the certainty and that we don't impact them and their businesses so that they have to close down and, once again, increase the amount of unemployment.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BLACK. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not have a plan. Their plan is to increase the taxes on this group of people.

Second to that are those who continue to say to me—especially those who are looking at planning for their families for the future, of what they're going to leave for them—they're not going to be able to leave those things that they've worked so hard for because the estate taxes are going to go up.

We cannot do this to the people in my district. I'm going to be here to fight for that.

Mr. LEVIN. I would ask my colleague from Michigan how many further requests for time do you have left?

Mr. CAMP. I am prepared to close.

Mr. LEVIN. It's now my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California, our distinguished leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also thank him for his legislation on the floor today, to strengthen the backbone of our democracy, the great American middle class.

Today we can do just that by passing President Obama's middle-income tax cut, which is on the floor today as the Levin substitute. It has already passed the Senate and could be signed into law by the President before the weekend.

We have an opportunity. We have an opportunity to give a tax cut to 100 percent of the American people. We have an opportunity to relieve some of the uncertainty that exists in our economy as to how we are going to pay the bills and how America's working families are going to pay the bills.

We have an opportunity for fairness, which is an all-American value, for fairness for our families, for our businesses, and for our budget. We must not—as some people always accuse Congress of doing—miss an opportunity.

□ 1700

We have to take advantage of the opportunity that is here today. The bill provides for fairness for the middle class and certainty, as I mentioned.

The Republican alternative says not only do we want to give 100 percent of the American people a tax cut; we want

to give a bigger and better tax cut to people making over \$250,000 a year, 2 percent of the American people. In order to do that, we greatly increase the deficit which would incur borrowing from other countries, including China. And to top it all off, in order to give a tax cut to the wealthiest people in our country, we have to increase taxes for the middle class in order to pay for that. If you make over \$1 million a year, the Republican tax proposal will give you a tax cut of \$160,000 on average. And on average, America's middle-income families would have to pay \$1,000 more in taxes.

You know, we work for the American people. You are our bosses. So as our bosses, what would you instruct us to do when it comes to reducing the deficit, giving a tax cut to 100 percent of the American people, which will inject demand into the economy and therefore create jobs. So we are reducing the deficit. We're creating jobs, and we're having fairness as a principle as to how we go forward.

Make no mistake, by refusing to vote for the Senate-passed bill, House Republicans are giving more tax breaks to the richest 2 percent, tax breaks they don't need and we can't afford. At the same time they cut taxes for the rich, as I said, they would raise an average of \$1,000 on 25 million American families, families who rely on that money for day-to-day needs to pay their bills. That isn't fair, and Democrats will fight to prevent these tax increases on middle-income families in order to give a tax break to the wealthiest people in our country.

Today is a day when we can end some uncertainty. People talk about the cliff. We are going to go over the cliff come January. Let's not even go anywhere near the edge of that cliff. Let's pass this bill today. It will save just under \$1 trillion because we're not giving those tax cuts to the high end. That is almost all the money that is needed to avoid the sequestration come January. So again, we are addressing the uncertainty not only in the lives of the American people, but in the life of our economy.

Or today is the day that Republicans will continue to hold the middle class hostage to tax cuts for the wealthiest people in our country.

I urge my colleagues to join Mr. LEVIN, join the President of the United States, join all of us. There isn't a person in this room, in this body, I think, who doesn't support tax cuts for the middle class. Why can't we just do that, do what we can agree upon right now, tax cut by the weekend, alleviating uncertainty for our economy as we go forward, and then we can have a debate about what a Tax Code should look like that has fairness, simplification, and again keeps us competitive, innovative, and, number one, allows the private sector to create jobs. Again, jobs, jobs, jobs.

We will reduce that deficit by having additional revenue, by creating growth,

by addressing spending so we are investing in those initiatives that grow our economy. Pretty soon when we end this debate, it will be around the time when America's families will sit down for dinner at the kitchen table or wherever, and they will have these discussions about how they pay the bills, the bills to stay in their home or their apartment, wherever. Discussions on how they will pay for their children's education, how their pensions are affected by all of this. The list goes on and on.

With one vote, we can alleviate that uncertainty. We're not going to eliminate it, but we can lessen it. We have that responsibility. Let's not miss an opportunity to do just that.

So I thank you, Mr. LEVIN, for your leadership and members of the committee for all of your hard work.

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

There are a few undisputed facts. Small business—97 percent of small businesses will receive all of their tax cut. Don't listen to the propaganda to the contrary. Everyone will receive their tax cuts up to \$250,000 of income. Don't listen to propaganda that says otherwise. And income over \$1 million, for those who have that, would receive under the Republican bill 70 times more than the typical family. And when the two bills are combined, 150 times more than the typical family.

Let me say just a word about tax reform, which I favor. It's being used as an argument for inaction. But, look, let's be realistic. No matter who controls the Congress next year, there won't be tax reform until maybe the spring or the summer. So are you going to use that same argument for tax reform, say, in a lame duck against middle-income tax cuts? Or in January, are you going to use the same argument? Are you going to use tax reform as a shield to protect the high-income taxpayer? In a word, the Republican bill is a path to nowhere for middle-income taxpayers.

Our substitute is a sure path. Pass it. The Senate already has. The President will sign it. Act now. Vote for the substitute.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I travel around Michigan and my district, the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I often hear from many families that they think America is at a crossroads. They really question is the American Dream, is that dream that their children and grandchildren are going to have the opportunities that they had, is that dream still alive for their kids and their grandkids? The reason they ask that is because we've been on the economic path that the majority has established for the last 3 years, and we've seen the slowest recovery from any recession since the Great Depression. Unemployment is still too high. I

think maybe being from Michigan, I'm particularly sensitive to that because we've had tough times for more than a decade. We need to get people back to work. We need to get jobs growing in this country.

There's really a choice: Which path are we going to be on? Which road are we going to take? Which lane are we going to be in? Are we going to be in the lane where we just simply raise taxes? No matter what segment it is, I don't care, just name the segment, but one that we know will cost us 700,000 jobs?

Or will we go down a path where we extend current law for 1 year, as many bipartisan experts have called for. Even President Bill Clinton has called for it. The President's former economic adviser, Larry Summers, has said let's extend current law for a year. Let's take the uncertainty out. And in the 20 hearings we've had on tax reform this year in the Ways and Means Committee, so many employers, so many tax experts, so many independent groups have come forward and said the uncertainty of all of this expiring tax policy is causing a huge problem.

And my friends would say, well, if only we'd raise taxes on people and small businesses and others who make \$250,000, that'll solve our problems. Well, it won't. It's just a piece of it. The Tax Code is so complex, with 5,000 changes over the last decade. I often say it's 10 times larger than the Bible, with none of the good news.

The burden that this Tax Code is placing on our economy, it's a huge wet blanket. Our GDP growth is just barely over 1 percent, the gross domestic product. Our economy is not growing enough; and if we don't grow our economy, we can't create the jobs that we need so desperately.

□ 1710

Let's work together. Let's pass this 1-year extension. Tomorrow, we have a package that will lay out our principles for comprehensive tax reform that will also lay out a process to expedite this next year in the House and Senate. We've been working with the Senate to establish these procedures. They will go through regular committee in an open and transparent way, not just roll a bill out on the floor and say, oh, if we only ding that one segment, things will be okay. Let's do this the right way.

This is the greatest country in the world. Let's make this the greatest economic power in the world. Let's reform our Tax Code for the first time in 26 years. Let's make it a pro-growth, modern code that lets our U.S. companies compete around the world, lowers its rates and makes it simpler for people to file their taxes, lessens that burden, lessens that uncertainty and creates 1 million jobs in the first year alone.

It's very clear which path we need to choose. Reject this substitute. Support H.R. 8. Get on the right path. Get on the path to job creation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of H.R. 15, and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together in support of H.R. 15, the Democratic alternative offered by our colleague from the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. LEVIN.

I have consistently supported and voted for middle class tax cuts, as I did two years ago when I voted for the Middle Class Tax Relief Act of 2010, and the extension of unemployment benefits.

The intelligent Democratic substitute offered by my Ways and Means colleague temporarily extends for one year, through 2013, the reduced tax rates and other tax benefits enacted in 2001 and 2003 that expire on Dec. 31—but only for income levels below \$250,000 for joint tax returns and \$200,000 for individuals. This is smart tax policy which acknowledges the deficit problem but does not squelch tax benefits for those most in need.

It also extends the expanded education tax credit, child tax credit and earned income tax credit benefits that were included in the 2009 stimulus law and extended in the 2010 tax extension law; those provisions unfortunately are not included in H.R. 8.

On the other hand, the Democratic proposal does the following:

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF TAX RELIEF

One-year extension of marginal individual income tax rate reductions for middle-class taxpayers.

One-year extension of repeal of the overall limitation on itemized deductions ("Pease") and the personal exemption phase-out ("PEP") for middle-class taxpayers.

One-year extension of EGTRRA and ARRA improvements to child tax credit.

One-year extension of marriage penalty relief for middle-class taxpayers.

One-year extension of earned income tax credit simplification and increase.

One-year extension of education tax incentives.

One-year extension of tax benefits for families and children.

One-year extension of reduced maximum rate for capital gains and qualified dividend income for middle-class taxpayers.

One-year extension of the American Opportunity Tax Credit ("AOTC"). One-year extension of enhanced small business expensing.

The measure provides a one-year "patch" to prevent the alternative minimum tax (AMT) from affecting millions of additional taxpayers and allows small businesses to deduct an increased amount of their capital expenditures for another year. It does not extend current estate tax provisions, which set a maximum estate tax rate of 35% with an exemption amount of \$5 million.

I am deeply saddened that the fate of unemployed, low and middle income Americans has been held hostage by the insistence by Republicans that this legislation include a giveaway to the wealthiest 2% of Americans that is going to irresponsibly expand the already large deficit.

I have spoken to and heard from many fine, patriotic, hardworking middle income Americans from Houston, from the great state of Texas, and all across the nation. Middle class American families and small businesses are deeply concerned about our troubled economy, the skyrocketing national deficit, high unemployment rates, job creation, and sorely

needed extension of the tax relief and unemployment benefits set to expire at the end of this month.

The Republican bill temporarily extends for one year, through 2013, all the reduced tax rates and other tax benefits enacted in 2001 and 2003 that are scheduled to expire on Dec. 31. The measure maintains the maximum estate tax rate of 35% while retaining the exemption amount of \$5 million, provides a two-year "patch" to prevent the alternative minimum tax (AMT) from hitting over 27 million taxpayers and allows small businesses to deduct an increased amount of their capital expenditures for another year.

I feel like we have been down this path before and I recall many of my colleagues staking a claim to fiscal responsibility. Well, I ask in all sincerity, which bill is more fiscally responsible: H.R. 8, which blows a hole in the deficit, or H.R. 15, the Democratic alternative which keeps the Bush Tax rates in place for the people who truly need tax relief.

This is the same Republican Congress which has asked for a balanced budget amendment. It has codified the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, which is possibly unconstitutional, and has had no impact on jobs and the unemployment problem. Yet today they want us to vote on a tax increase for the top 2 percent. This illustrates what happens when Congress does not work together in a bipartisan manner, laboring for the American people. We must work together and compromise.

The Senate gave us a layup by producing a bill last week which is virtually identical to the Democratic Substitute. All we have to do is act like Olympians and pass it.

The American people are asking the President and Members of Congress to move swiftly and take decisive action to help restore our economy in a fiscally responsible manner. I am disappointed that Republicans have insisted on holding tax cuts for working and middle class families hostage in order to benefit the wealthiest 2% of Americans.

I would like to thank President Obama for his determined leadership, support and commitment to protecting important tax relief issues for middle-income Americans and the nation's small businesses and farmers during these challenging economic times. I would also like to thank all the Members and their staff who worked diligently to bring this essential legislation to the House floor today in an attempt to do all that we can to protect the American people and move this nation toward fiscally responsible economic recovery.

I support those provisions of H.R. 8 which provide relief for middle-class families and small businesses who will see their taxes go down and get much needed certainty. But I cannot in good conscience support tax relief for millionaires and billionaires at a time when others need help just to make ends meet.

Unlike those provisions of H.R. 8 which benefit America's struggling middle class, I do not support the provisions of this legislation which condition that desperately needed relief upon the unconscionably high cost of providing an unnecessary, expensive giveaway to the wealthiest Americans by providing a two year extension of Bush-era tax cuts for the wealthiest 2% of Americans while keeping their estate tax rate at 35% on estates valued at more than \$5 million for individuals and more than \$10 million for couples.

These giveaways to the wealthiest Americans during these dire economic times needlessly add billions of dollars to our skyrocketing deficit yet create no value for our ailing economy since these tax cuts are not tied to job creation and preservation.

ESTATE TAX AMENDMENT

I offered an amendment that would have set the Estate Tax at reasonable levels. My amendment would have allowed estates valued at \$3.5 million or less to pay 35 percent, estates valued between \$3.5 million and \$10 million to pay a 45 percent rate, and estates over \$10 million to pay a 55 percent rate. This commonsense amendment would have restored a sense of fairness to H.R. 8. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the 2009 estate tax rules already are extremely generous, tilting in favor of the wealthy. The Tax Policy Center estimates that if policymakers reinstated the 2009 rules:

The estates of 99.7 percent of Americans who die would owe no estate tax at all in 2013. Only the estates of the wealthiest 0.29 percent of Americans who die—about 7,450 people nationwide in 2013—would owe any tax.

Moreover, under the 2009 rules, the small number of estates that were taxable would face an average effective tax rate of 19.1 percent, far below the statutory estate-tax rate of 45 percent. In other words, 81 percent of the value of these estates would remain after the tax, on average. An estate tax that exempts the estates of 99.7 of every 1,000 people who die and leaves in place an average of 81 percent of the very wealthiest estates is hardly a confiscatory or oppressive tax.

Moreover, only 60 small farm and business estates in the entire country would owe any estate tax in 2013, under a reinstatement of the 2009 rules, and these estates would face an average effective tax rate of just 11.6 percent. Failing to tie tax cuts to job creation is irresponsible since it exacerbates our growing deficit without bolstering job creation.

My amendment does not address the step-up in basis. The exemption level and rate are consistent with parts of the estate tax proposal included in the President's FY2010 and FY2011 Budgets and H.R. 16, the intelligent estate tax proposal being put forth by my colleague Mr. LEVIN of the Ways and Means Committee.

CLASSROOM EXPENSE DEDUCTION AMENDMENT

My second amendment would have provided tax relief to school teachers by providing them a deduction for qualified out-of-pocket classroom expenses of \$250 dollars, whether or not they itemize their deductions. You may recall Mr. Speaker that the President included this proposal in his Budget for Fiscal Year 2013.

I understand the tremendous personal costs incurred by educators with little or no classroom budget. According to a 2006 National School Supply and Equipment Association Retail Awareness Study, teachers spend an average of \$493 out of pocket on school supplies for their own classrooms.

7 percent of teachers surveyed said they plan to spend more than \$1,000 of their personal finances on supplies. As education budgets face major shortfalls in the recession, that amount is expected to increase significantly.

Beginning in 2002 the IRS allowed for an above-the-line deduction for classroom ex-

penses of up to \$250. The educator expense deduction allows teachers to write off some expenses that they incur to provide books, supplies, and other equipment and materials for their classrooms. I introduced this amendment and would like to acknowledge the work of my colleagues who have put forth legislation advocating this deduction. America's teachers from Texas to Maine to Florida to Washington deserve our renewed appreciation for their commitment to educating future generations.

Our children should not have to suffer because our teachers are given a Hobson's Choice, forced to choose between using their own finances to effectively teach a class or forced to cut corners due to budgetary restrictions. We promote an increased quality of education by lessening the financial burden on them when they are trying to go above and beyond their responsibilities is certainly warranted.

While I am opposed to the portions of H.R. 8 that amount to an expensive giveaway to the wealthiest 2% of Americans, I want to emphasize that I fully support job-creation and job creators. I also support President Obama's vision for change. I share his commitment to fighting for low- and middle-income Americans who are the backbone of this country and our economy.

However, this legislation, H.R. 8, especially as it pertains to tax cuts for the top 2% of Americans and estate tax provisions that are regressive and inflate the deficit, does not comport with this vision. I have serious misgivings about extending tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans at the expense of our deficit, especially if these tax cuts are not targeted towards job creation.

DEFICIT AND TAXATION

You may recall that in the Budget, the Administration calls for individual tax reform that: cuts the deficit by \$1.5 trillion, including the expiration of the high-income 2001 and 2003 tax cuts. As a matter of sound fiscal policy, I am supportive of this 15 effort. I recognize the putative economic benefits that many attribute to the Bush Tax Cuts, but we must ask ourselves are they affordable? There is no amount of dynamic scoring that will help penetrate the deficit.

The President's budget also eliminated inefficient and unfair tax breaks for millionaires while making all tax breaks at least as good for the middle class as for the wealthy; and observes the Buffett Rule that no household making more than \$1 million a year pays less than 30 percent of their income in taxes.

The individual income tax is a hodgepodge of deductions, exemptions, and credits that provide special benefits to selected groups of taxpayers and favored forms of consumption and investment. These tax preferences make the income tax unfair because they can impose radically different burdens on two different taxpayers with the same income. In essence, Congress has been picking winners and losers.

There is absolutely no justification for huge tax cuts. The wealthiest tax brackets should not profit at the expense of programs keeping struggling families from poverty.

Bear in mind, the Republican's 2012 budget cut \$2 trillion dollars more than President Obama's Debt Commission advised, and those cuts come from vital social services and safety nets for low income families, children and seniors.

Tax expenditures also reduce the economy's productivity because decisions on earning, spending, and investment are driven by tax considerations rather than the price signals that a well-balanced, and fair free market economy produces. These expenditures, whether for individuals or corporations, are really no different than the much ballyhooed entitlement programs, but they have cute names and fancy lobbyists.

Moreover, tax expenditures make the tax system excessively complex for honest taxpayers who are trying to comply with the law while seeking the benefits to which they are legally entitled.

The system is so complex that most taxpayers even those with low incomes now use either a professional tax preparer or tax software. A one-page form shouldn't require a tax preparer who earns a percentage of the return, or a fee. It is not justifiable, especially when some commentators like to point out that a number of taxpayers pay no tax—well they somehow conveniently forget to mention that these tax scofflaws making \$30,000 dollars a year more than make up for it with a long list of regressive taxes at the state and local level.

The alternative minimum tax, or AMT, was initially designed to ensure that all high-income taxpayers paid some income tax, has become the poster child for the tax system's failure, requiring Congress to enact increasingly expensive temporary patches to prevent the AMT from encroaching on millions of middle class households particularly those with children, in a web of pointless high tax rates, complexity, and unfairness.

On the deficit reduction front it is important to remember the economic crisis that the President inherited. I remember back in 2008 and 2009, when we experienced the worst recession since the Great Depression. The economy actually contracted, it shrunk, at a rate of almost 9 percent in the fourth quarter of 2008.

We lost 800,000 private-sector jobs in January of 2009 alone, and unemployment was surging. Those are the conditions the President inherited—the car was swerving into the ditch. He was not the driver, but he was asked to come in on literally his first day of office, roll-up his sleeves and figure out how to prevent the car from rolling farther down the hill. If you'll recall we also faced a housing market that was in crisis, and we faced a financial market crisis as well that threatened to set off a global financial collapse. We have come a long way since then yet there is more work to be done.

The cloud looming over this Congress is an unintended "triple-witching hour" of tax increases and Sequestration measures that will take effect at the beginning of 2013.

The expiration of the Bush Tax Cuts, the end of the recently extended Payroll Tax Cut, and increases in capital gains and dividends taxation will shock the conscience and wallets of the American people. That is why Congress needs to enact bi-partisan legislation that helps lower the deficit but does not wreck havoc on the financial soul of the middle class.

But again, tax reform that lowers the rate, reduces the deficit, and does not pick winners and losers is not easy, but let's not forget, if President Reagan and then-Speaker Tip O'Neill could do it in 1986, anything is possible.

The so-called “99ers” have been sincerely looking for work for a very long time and have run out of resources to provide for their families and pay their mortgages, pay their bills and buy food. They simply want and need a job to pay for these obligations. H.R. 8 proposes to give tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans, yet fails to provide for the so-called “99ers.”

H.R. 8 unfortunately is not ready for prime-time. Let us come together for the American people and pass the Levin Substitute—a bill which has already passed in the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 170, nays 257, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—170

Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Moran
Andrews	Fudge	Murphy (CT)
Baca	Garamendi	Nadler
Baldwin	Gonzalez	Napolitano
Barber	Green, Al	Neal
Bass (CA)	Green, Gene	Olver
Becerra	Grijalva	Pallone
Berkley	Gutierrez	Pascarell
Berman	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Heinrich	Peters
Bonamici	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Boswell	Himes	Polis
Brady (PA)	Hinchev	Price (NC)
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Brown (FL)	Hirono	Rahall
Butterfield	Hochul	Rangel
Capps	Holden	Reyes
Capuano	Holt	Richardson
Carnahan	Honda	Richmond
Carney	Hoyer	Rothman (NJ)
Carson (IN)	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Chu	(TX)	Rush
Ciçilline	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (MI)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	T.
Clay	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kind	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kucinich	Schiff
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	Schwartz
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Costello	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Critz	Levin	Sewell
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Cummings	Lipinski	Sires
Davis (CA)	Loeback	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Loftgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lowe	Speier
DeGette	Luján	Stark
DeLauro	Lynch	Sutton
Deutch	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	Markey	Tierney
Dingell	Matsui	Tonko
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Doyle	McCollum	Tsongas
Edwards	McDermott	Van Hollen
Ellison	McGovern	Velázquez
Engel	Meeks	Vislosky
Eshoo	Michaud	Wasserman
Farr	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Fattah	Miller, George	Waters
Filner	Moore	

Watt	Welch	Woolsey
Waxman	Wilson (FL)	Yarmuth
NAYS—257		
Adams	Gohmert	Owens
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Palazzo
Alexander	Gosar	Paul
Altmire	Gowdy	Paulsen
Amash	Granger	Pearce
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Pence
Austria	Graves (MO)	Peterson
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Barletta	Grimm	Platts
Barrow	Guinta	Poe (TX)
Bartlett	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barton (TX)	Hall	Posey
Bass (NH)	Hanna	Price (GA)
Benishek	Harper	Quayle
Berg	Harris	Reed
Biggert	Hartzler	Rehberg
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Reichert
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Heck	Ribble
Black	Hensarling	Rigell
Blackburn	Herger	Rivera
Bonner	Herrera Beutler	Bonyer
Bono Mack	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Boren	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Brooks	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Issa	Rokita
Buchanan	Jenkins	Rooney
Bucshon	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buerkle	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ross (AR)
Burton (IN)	Jones	Ross (FL)
Calvert	Jordan	Royce
Camp	Kelly	Runyan
Campbell	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Canseco	King (NY)	Scalise
Cantor	Kingston	Schilling
Capito	Kinzinger (IL)	Schmidt
Cartner	Kissell	Schock
Cassidy	Kline	Schrader
Chabot	Labrador	Schweikert
Chaffetz	Lamborn	Scott (SC)
Chandler	Lance	Scott, Austin
Coble	Landry	Sensenbrenner
Coffman (CO)	Lankford	Sessions
Cole	Latham	Shimkus
Conaway	LaTourette	Shuler
Cooper	Latta	Shuster
Costa	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Cravaack	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Long	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Cuellar	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Culberson	Lummis	Stearns
Dunham	Lungren, Daniel	Stivers
Dent	E.	Stutzman
DesJarlais	Mack	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Terry
Dold	Marchant	Thompson (CA)
Donnelly (IN)	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Dreier	Matheson	Thornberry
Duffy	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Turner (NY)
Ellmers	McHenry	Turner (OH)
Emerson	McIntyre	Upton
Farenthold	McKeon	Walberg
Fincher	McKinley	Walden
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Walsh (IL)
Flake	Rodgers	Walz (MN)
Fleischmann	McNerney	Webster
Fleming	Meehan	West
Flores	Mica	Westmoreland
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Miller, Gary	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Galleghy	Myrick	Woodall
Gardner	Neugebauer	Yoder
Garrett	Noem	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Nugent	Young (FL)
Gibbs	Nunes	Young (IN)
Gibson	Nunnelee	
Gingrey (GA)	Olson	

NOT VOTING—3

Akin Cardoza Jackson (IL)

□ 1737

Messrs. JONES and JOHNSON of Ohio changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Messrs. ELLISON, HINCHEY, and MORAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Yes, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DeFazio moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 6. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Section 2 of this Act (H.R. 8) extends tax cuts for millionaires instead of helping small businesses with tax cuts to invest in the future and create jobs.

(2) Small businesses would be better served by ending tax breaks for millionaires and instead using that revenue to expand the small business expensing provision, which fosters investment in new plants and equipment.

(3) This Act (H.R. 8) fails to extend expansions to the Child Tax Credit and the Earned Income Tax Credit, and it fails to extend altogether the American Opportunity Tax Credit. This tax relief encourages work, has lifted millions of Americans into the middle class, and helps middle class families pay for the costs of higher education.

SEC. 7. APPLICATION OF EXTENSION OF 2001 AND 2003 TAX RELIEF TO CERTAIN HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) APPLICATION OF EXTENSION OF 2001 TAX RELIEF.—

(1) TREATMENT OF 25-, 28-, AND 33-PERCENT RATE BRACKETS.—Paragraph (2) of section 1(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(2) 25-, 28-, AND 33-PERCENT RATE BRACKETS.—The tables under subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) shall be applied—

“(A) by substituting ‘25%’ for ‘28%’ each place it appears (before the application of subparagraph (B)),

“(B) by substituting ‘28%’ for ‘31%’ each place it appears, and

“(C) by substituting ‘33%’ for ‘36%’ each place it appears.”

(2) 35-PERCENT RATE BRACKET.—Subsection (i) of section 1 of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4) and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) 35-PERCENT RATE BRACKET.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012—

“(i) the rate of tax under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) on a taxpayer’s taxable income in the highest rate bracket shall be 35 percent to the extent such income does not exceed an amount equal to the excess of—

“(I) the applicable amount, over

“(II) the dollar amount at which such bracket begins, and

“(ii) the 39.6 percent rate of tax under such subsections shall apply only to the taxpayer’s taxable income in such bracket in excess of the amount to which clause (i) applies.

“(B) APPLICABLE AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘applicable amount’ means the excess of—

“(i) the applicable threshold, over

“(ii) the sum of the following amounts in effect for the taxable year:

“(I) the basic standard deduction (within the meaning of section 63(c)(2)), and

“(II) the exemption amount (within the meaning of section 151(d)(1) (or, in the case of subsection (a), 2 such exemption amounts).

“(C) APPLICABLE THRESHOLD.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘applicable threshold’ means—

“(i) \$1,000,000 in the case of subsection (a), (b), and (c), and

“(ii) ½ the amount applicable under clause (i) (after adjustment, if any, under subparagraph (E)) in the case of subsection (d).

“(D) HIGHEST RATE BRACKET.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘highest rate bracket’ means the bracket which would (determined without regard to this paragraph) be the 39.6-percent rate bracket.

“(E) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of this paragraph, with respect to taxable years beginning in calendar years after 2012, the dollar amount in subparagraph (C)(i) shall be adjusted in the same manner as under paragraph (1)(C), except that subsection (f)(3)(B) shall be applied by substituting ‘2008’ for ‘1992’.”

(3) OVERALL LIMITATION ON ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.—Section 68 of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “the applicable amount” the first place it appears in subsection (a) and inserting “the applicable threshold in effect under section 1(i)(3)”,

(B) by striking “the applicable amount” in subsection (a)(1) and inserting “such applicable threshold”,

(C) by striking subsection (b) and redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively, and

(D) by striking subsections (f) and (g).

(4) PHASEOUT OF DEDUCTIONS FOR PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 151(d) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “the threshold amount” in subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting “the applicable threshold in effect under section 1(i)(3)”,

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C) and redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C), and

(iii) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F).

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Paragraph (4) of section 151(d) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking subparagraph (B),

(ii) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by indenting such subparagraphs (as so redesignated) accordingly, and

(iii) by striking all that precedes “in a calendar year after 1989,” and inserting the following:

“(4) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning”.

(b) APPLICATION OF EXTENSION OF 2003 TAX RELIEF.—

(1) 20-PERCENT CAPITAL GAINS RATE FOR CERTAIN HIGH INCOME INDIVIDUALS.—Paragraph (1) of section 1(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (C), by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (E) and (F) and

by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

“(C) 15 percent of the lesser of—

“(i) so much of the adjusted net capital gain (or, if less, taxable income) as exceeds the amount on which a tax is determined under subparagraph (B), or

“(ii) the excess (if any) of—

“(I) the amount of taxable income which would (without regard to this paragraph) be taxed at a rate below 39.6 percent, over

“(II) the sum of the amounts on which a tax is determined under subparagraphs (A) and (B),

“(D) 20 percent of the adjusted net capital gain (or, if less, taxable income) in excess of the sum of the amounts on which tax is determined under subparagraphs (B) and (C).”.

(2) MINIMUM TAX.—Section 55 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) 20-PERCENT CAPITAL GAINS RATE FOR CERTAIN HIGH INCOME INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any individual, if the taxpayer’s taxable income for the taxable year exceeds the applicable amount determined under section 1(i) with respect to such taxpayer for such taxable year, the amount determined under paragraph (2) shall be substituted for the amount determined under subsection (b)(3)(C) for purposes of determining the taxpayer’s tentative minimum tax for such taxable year.

“(2) DETERMINATION OF 20-PERCENT CAPITAL GAINS RATE.—The amount determined under this paragraph is the sum of—

“(A) 15 percent of the lesser of—

“(i) so much of the adjusted net capital gain (or, if less, taxable excess) as exceeds the amount on which tax is determined under subsection (b)(3)(B), or

“(ii) the excess described in section 1(h)(1)(C)(ii), plus

“(B) 20 percent of the adjusted net capital gain (or, if less, taxable excess) in excess of the sum of the amounts on which tax is determined under subparagraph (A) and subsection (b)(3)(B).”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The following provisions are each amended by striking “15 percent” and inserting “20 percent”:

(i) Section 531 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(ii) Section 541 of such Code.

(iii) Section 1445(e)(1) of such Code.

(iv) The second sentence of section 7518(g)(6)(A) of such Code.

(v) Section 53511(f)(2) of title 46, United States Code.

(B) Section 1445(e)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “15 percent (20 percent in the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 2010)” and inserting “20 percent”.

(c) APPLICATION OF SUNSETS.—

(1) APPLICATION OF EGTRRA SUNSET.—Each amendment made by subsection (a) shall be subject to title IX of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 to the same extent and in the same manner as if such amendment was included in title I of such Act.

(2) APPLICATION OF JGTRRA SUNSET.—Each amendment made by subsection (b) shall be subject to section 303 of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 to the same extent and in the same manner as if such amendment was included in title III of such Act.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

(2) WITHHOLDING.—The amendments made by subparagraphs (A)(iii) and (B) of sub-

section (b)(3) shall apply to amounts paid on or after January 1, 2013.

SEC. 8. ADDITIONAL INCREASE IN SMALL BUSINESS EXPENSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 179(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 3, is further amended—

(1) by striking “\$100,000” in paragraph (1)(D) and inserting “\$1,000,000”,

(2) by striking “\$400,000” in paragraph (2)(D) and inserting “\$5,000,000”, and

(3) by striking paragraph (6).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

Mr. DEFAZIO (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the motion be suspended.

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

Mr. CAMP. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. DEFAZIO (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that further reading be suspended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, the reading is dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This is the final amendment to the bill. It won’t kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will be immediately amended and will proceed to final passage.

It’s a pretty simple amendment. It would create a tax break for the real job creators in America, which are small businesses and middle-income families. A middle-income person with a job or a small business and enough money to go out and invest and buy products made in America for his business—that’s a key component of this—would be allowed an expensing.

The Republican version of the bill would limit the expensing to small businesses to \$100,000 a year for the purchases of new equipment made in America. If this amendment is adopted, those same small businesses would be allowed to expense up to \$1 million to purchase products made in America, which would put people back to work.

Now, I know we’re going to hear of the millionaires and billionaires because this tax increase, or restoration of the Clinton era rates, would only apply to incomes over \$1 million. So a millionaire still gets the break on the first \$1 million. It’s only on income over \$1 million that would go to the Clinton era rates.

They’ll say they’re the job creators and that it would depress job creation. Let’s think back to the Clinton administration. We had a 39.6 percent top bracket on the millionaires and billionaires. We had 3.8 percent unemployment in the United States of America,

and we paid down debt for the first time since the Eisenhower administration. I'd like to go back to those bad old days.

Now, we've been doing the Bush tax cuts for 12 years. Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs from cutting taxes on people's incomes of over \$1 million? They aren't creating those jobs. Let me give you two quick examples from my district, and they're typical.

□ 1750

I have Palo Alto Software, a small business. They make software for business start-ups. We contacted them, and they said, Yes, we could invest way more both in new hardware, new software, and other things that would enhance our business than \$100,000 if we were given this expensing privilege, and we would put more people back to work.

Bulk Handling Systems, they make recycling systems in my district. They had the same answer: If you gave us a million dollars of expensing, we would spend every penny of that on products made in America and put people back to work.

The bottom line is the Republicans want to limit these small businesses, these real job creators, to a \$100,000 deduction when they could use a million dollars in expensing and put more people back to work, because their premise is that the millionaire, the person who got hundreds of millions or more in income, that having them not pay more taxes on their income over \$1 million will create more jobs than the small business. I don't buy that. I don't think the American people buy that.

There's no limit on what they can do with their huge tax breaks, their very expensive tax breaks. They can buy another vacation home in the Caribbean. They can buy a Lamborghini. Paris Hilton can go on a shopping spree in London or Paris.

This bill limits the expensing and the purchase of equipment to products made in the United States of America. I want to see things made in this country again. I want to put Americans back to work, not people overseas.

It's time that we admitted that we can't afford to continue the tax cuts over \$1 million of income.

It would also reduce the deficit over 10 years by \$29 billion after we create jobs, after we give this expensing privilege to small businesses.

The choice is yours. You can stick with those who have income over \$1 million or you can side with small businesses and American workers. You decide.

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

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

Mr. CAMP. It's clear that my friends on the other side are committed to raising taxes at any cost. Does anyone believe that they're going to use that

to reduce the deficit? We'll just see more wasteful Washington spending. This isn't a solution. America is at a crossroad. We've had 40 months of 8 percent unemployment. What do we get from them? Not a solution. We get a political ploy.

I appreciate my friend from Oregon touting the benefits of the Clinton administration when we had a Republican Congress. Let me just say I've welcomed the advice of former President Bill Clinton. He said extend all of the current tax rates. Let me just say that this would gut tax reform.

Say "yes" to tax reform. Say "no" to raising taxes. Say "no" to this motion to recommit.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 8, if ordered, and the motions to suspend with regard to House Resolution 750 and H.R. 4365.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 246, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

AYES—181

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

Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (LI)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden

Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond

Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speler
Stark

NOES—246

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodeli
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buchson
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxo
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley

McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry

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

NOT VOTING—3

Akin Cardoza Jackson (IL)

□ 1811

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 171, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

AYES—256

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

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

Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers

Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner (NY)
 Turner (OH)
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Walz (MN)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

IRAN THREAT REDUCTION AND SYRIA HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 750) providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1905, with an amendment, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 6, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

YEAS—421

Ackerman	Cicilline	Gardner
Adams	Clarke (MI)	Garrett
Aderholt	Clarke (NY)	Gerlach
Alexander	Clay	Gibbs
Altmiere	Cleaver	Gibson
Amodei	Clyburn	Gingrey (GA)
Andrews	Coble	Gohmert
Austria	Coffman (CO)	Gonzalez
Baca	Cohen	Goodlatte
Bachmann	Cole	Gosar
Bachus	Conaway	Gowdy
Baldwin	Connolly (VA)	Granger
Barber	Conyers	Graves (GA)
Barletta	Cooper	Graves (MO)
Barrow	Costa	Green, Al
Bartlett	Costello	Green, Gene
Barton (TX)	Courtney	Griffin (AR)
Bass (CA)	Cravaack	Griffith (VA)
Bass (NH)	Crawford	Grijalva
Becerra	Crenshaw	Grimm
Berkeley	Critz	Guinta
Berman	Crowley	Guthrie
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Gutierrez
Blumenauer	Culberson	Hahn
Bonamici	Cummings	Hall
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Hanabusa
Braley (IA)	Davis (IL)	Hanna
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Harper
Butterfield	DeGette	Harris
Capps	DeLauro	Hartzler
Capuano	Denham	Hastings (FL)
Carnahan	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Carney	DesJarlais	Hayworth
Carson (IN)	Deutch	Heck
Castor (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Heinrich
Chu	Dicks	Hensarling
Cicilline	Dingell	Herger
Clarke (MI)	Doggett	Herrera Beutler
Clarke (NY)	Dold	Higgins
Clay	Donnelly (IN)	Himes
Cleaver	Doyle	Hinchee
Clyburn	Dreier	Hinojosa
Cohen	Duffy	Hirono
Conyers	Duncan (SC)	Hochul
Cooper	Edwards	Holden
Costello	Ellison	Holt
Courtney	Ellmers	Honda
Crowley	Emerson	Hoyer
Cummings	Engel	Huelskamp
Davis (CA)	Eshoo	Huizenga (MI)
Davis (IL)	Farr	Hultgren
DeFazio	Fattah	Hunter
DeGette	Finer	Hurt
DeLauro	Frank (MA)	Israel
Deutch	Fudge	Issa
Dicks	Garamendi	Jackson Lee
Dingell	Gonzalez	Flake
Doggett		(TX)
Doyle		Jenkins
Edwards		Johnson (GA)
Ellison		Johnson (OH)
McHenry		Johnson, E. B.
McIntyre		Johnson, Sam
McKeon		Jordan
McKinley		Foxx
McMorris		Frank (MA)
McNeerney		Frank (AZ)
Meehan		Franks (AZ)
Mica		Frelinghuysen
Miller (FL)		Fudge
Miller (MI)		Kildee
Miller, Gary		Kind
Mulvaney		King (IA)
Murphy (PA)		
Myrick		
Neugebauer		
Noem		
Nugent		
Nunes		
Nunnelee		
Olson		
Owens		

NOT VOTING—3

Akin Cardoza Jackson (IL)

□ 1819

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

King (NY) Neugebauer Schrader
 Kingston Noem Schwartz
 Kinzinger (IL) Nugent Schweikert
 Kissell Nunes Scott (SC)
 Kline Nunnelee Scott (VA)
 Labrador Olson Scott, Austin
 Lamborn Oliver Scott, David
 Lance Owens Sensenbrenner
 Landry Palazzo Serrano
 Langevin Pallone Sessions
 Lankford Pascrell Sewell
 Larsen (WA) Pastor (AZ) Sherman
 Larson (CT) Paulsen Shimkus
 Latham Pearce Shuler
 LaTourette Pelosi Shuster
 Latta Pence Simpson
 Lee (CA) Perlmutter Sires
 Levin Peters Slaughter
 Lewis (CA) Peterson Smith (NE)
 Lewis (GA) Petri Smith (NJ)
 Lipinski Pingree (ME) Smith (TX)
 LoBiondo Pitts Smith (WA)
 Loeb sack Platts Southerland
 Lofgren, Zoe Poe (TX) Speier
 Long Polis Stark
 Lowey Pompeo Stearns
 Lucas Posey Stivers
 Luetkemeyer Price (GA) Stutzman
 Luján Price (NC) Sullivan
 Lummis Quayle Sutton
 Lungren, Daniel E. Terry
 Lynch Rahall Thompson (CA)
 Mack Rangel Thompson (MS)
 Maloney Reed Thompson (PA)
 Manzullo Rehberg Thornberry
 Marchant Reichert Tiberi
 Marino Renacci Tierney
 Markey Reyes Tipton
 Matheson Ribble Tonko
 Matsui Richardson Towns
 McCarthy (CA) Rigell Turner (NY)
 McCarthy (NY) Rivera Turner (OH)
 McCaul Roby Upton
 McClintock Roe (TN) Van Hollen
 McCollum Rogers (AL) Velázquez
 McDermott Rogers (KY) Visclosky
 McGovern Rogers (MI) Walberg
 McHenry Rohrabacher Walden
 McIntyre Rokita Walsh (IL)
 McKeon Rooney Walz (MN)
 McKinley Ros-Lehtinen Wasserman
 McMorris Roskam Schultz
 Rodgers Ross (AR) Waters
 McNerney Ross (FL) Wolf
 Meehan Rothman (NJ) Waxman
 Meeks Roybal-Allard Webster
 Mica Royce Welch
 Michaud Runyan West
 Miller (FL) Ruppertsberger Westmoreland
 Miller (MI) Rush Whitfield
 Miller (NC) Ryan (OH) Wilson (FL)
 Miller, Gary Ryan (WI) Wilson (SC)
 Miller, George Sánchez, Linda Wittman
 Moore T. Wolf
 Moran Sanchez, Loretta Womack
 Mulvaney Sarbanes Woodall
 Murphy (CT) Scalise Woolsey
 Murphy (PA) Schakowsky Yarmuth
 Myrick Schiff Yoder
 Nadler Schilling Young (AK)
 Napolitano Schmidt Young (FL)
 Neal Schock Young (IN)

NAYS—6

Amash Johnson (IL) Kucinich
 Duncan (TN) Jones Paul

NOT VOTING—3

Akin Cardoza Jackson (IL)

□ 1826

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THRIFT SAVINGS FUND CLARIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the mo-

tion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4365) to amend title 5, United States Code, to make clear that accounts in the Thrift Savings Fund are subject to certain Federal tax levies, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 6, answered “present” 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

YEAS—414

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

Latta Pascrell Scott (VA)
 Lee (CA) Pastor (AZ) Scott, Austin
 Levin Paulsen Scott, David
 Lewis (CA) Pearce Sensenbrenner
 Lewis (GA) Pelosi Serrano
 Lipinski Pence Sessions
 LoBiondo Perlmutter Sewell
 Loeb sack Peters Sherman
 Lofgren, Zoe Peterson Shimkus
 Long Petri Shuler
 Lowey Lucas Pingree (ME)
 Lucas Pitts Shuster
 Luetkemeyer Luetkemeyer Platts Simpson
 Luján Poe (TX) Sires
 Lummis Polis Slaughter
 Lungren, Daniel E. Pompeo Smith (NE)
 Lynch Price (GA) Smith (NJ)
 Mack Price (NC) Smith (TX)
 Maloney Quayle Price (NC) Smith (WA)
 Manzullo Quigley Stark
 Marchant Rahall Stearns
 Marino Rangel Stivers
 Markey Reed Stutzman
 Matheson Rehberg Sullivan
 Matsui Reichert Sutton
 McCarthy (CA) Renacci Terry
 McCarthy (NY) Reyes Thompson (CA)
 McCaul Ribble Thompson (MS)
 McClintock Richardson Thompson (PA)
 McCollum Richmond Thornberry
 McDermott Rigell Tiberi
 McGovern Rivera Tierney
 McHenry Roby Tipton
 McIntyre Roe (TN) Tonko
 McKeon Rogers (AL) Towns
 McKinley Rogers (KY) Tsongas
 McMorris Rogers (MI) Rogers (MI)
 Rodgers Rohrabacher Turner (NY)
 McNerney Rokita Turner (OH)
 Meehan Rooney Van Hollen
 Mica Ros-Lehtinen Velázquez
 Michaud Miller (FL) Ross (AR)
 Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Ross (FL)
 Miller (NC) Miller (NC) Rothman (NJ)
 Miller, Gary Miller, Gary Roybal-Allard
 Miller, George Miller, George Royce
 Moore Moore Runyan
 Moran Moran Ruppertsberger
 Mulvaney Mulvaney Rush
 Murphy (CT) Murphy (CT) Ryan (OH)
 Murphy (PA) Murphy (PA) Ryan (WI)
 Myrick Myrick Sánchez, Linda
 Nadler Nadler T.
 Napolitano Napolitano Sanchez, Loretta
 Neal Neal Sarbanes
 Jones Meeks
 Paul Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

NAYS—6

Ackerman Jones Paul
 Bass (CA) Meeks Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Johnson (IL)

NOT VOTING—9

Akin Jackson (IL) Wasserman
 Cardoza Kaptur Schultz
 Dicks Lamborn
 Hastings (FL) Southerland

□ 1833

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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will now resume

on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

GOVERNMENT CHARGE CARD ABUSE PREVENTION ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (S. 300) to prevent abuse of Government charge cards, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE OF RELINQUISHMENT OF RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY NEAR PIKE NATIONAL FOREST, COLORADO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 4073) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept the quitclaim, disclaimer, and relinquishment of a railroad right of way within and adjacent to Pike National Forest in El Paso County, Colorado, originally granted to the Mt. Manitou Park and Incline Railway Company pursuant to the Act of March 3, 1875, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS ON GOVERNANCE OF THE INTERNET

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 127) expressing the sense of Congress regarding actions to preserve and advance the multistakeholder governance model under which the Internet has thrived.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 127

Whereas given the importance of the Internet to the global economy, it is essential that the Internet remain stable, secure, and free from government control;

Whereas the world deserves the access to knowledge, services, commerce, and communication, the accompanying benefits to eco-

nomics development, education, and health care, and the informed discussion that is the bedrock of democratic self-government that the Internet provides;

Whereas the structure of Internet governance has profound implications for competition and trade, democratization, free expression, and access to information;

Whereas countries have obligations to protect human rights, which are advanced by online activity as well as offline activity;

Whereas the ability to innovate, develop technical capacity, grasp economic opportunities, and promote freedom of expression online is best realized in cooperation with all stakeholders;

Whereas proposals have been put forward for consideration at the 2012 World Conference on International Telecommunications that would fundamentally alter the governance and operation of the Internet;

Whereas the proposals, in international bodies such as the United Nations General Assembly, the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development, and the International Telecommunication Union, would justify under international law increased government control over the Internet and would reject the current multistakeholder model that has enabled the Internet to flourish and under which the private sector, civil society, academia, and individual users play an important role in charting its direction;

Whereas the proposals would diminish the freedom of expression on the Internet in favor of government control over content, contrary to international law;

Whereas the position of the United States Government has been and is to advocate for the flow of information free from government control; and

Whereas this and past Administrations have made a strong commitment to the multistakeholder model of Internet governance and the promotion of the global benefits of the Internet: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, in consultation with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State and United States Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy, should continue working to implement the position of the United States on Internet governance that clearly articulates the consistent and unequivocal policy of the United States to promote a global Internet free from government control and preserve and advance the successful multistakeholder model that governs the Internet today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from California (Ms. ESHOO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on H. Con. Res. 127.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 127, a resolution that

opposes international regulation of the Internet.

The resolution was introduced by Mrs. BONO MACK in May and passed the House Committee on Energy and Commerce with bipartisan support from more than 60 Members, including Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman UPTON, Ranking Member WAXMAN, and my colleague on the Communications and Technology Subcommittee, Ranking Member ESHOO. I, too, am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this important resolution.

Nations from across the globe will meet in December for the World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai. There, the 193 member countries of the United Nations will consider whether to apply to the Internet a regulatory regime that the International Telecommunications Union created for old-fashioned telephone service, as well as whether to swallow the Internet's nongovernmental organization's structure whole and make it part of the United Nations. Neither of these are acceptable outcomes.

Now, among those that are supportive of such regulation is Russian President Vladimir Putin, who spoke positively about the idea of "establishing international control over the Internet." Some countries have even proposed regulations that would allow them to read citizens' email in the name of security. H. Con. Res. 127 rejects these proposals by taking the radical position that if the most revolutionary advance in technology, commerce, and social discourse of the last century isn't broken, well, we shouldn't be trying to fix it.

The Internet is the greatest vehicle for global progress and improvement since the printing press; and despite the current economic climate, the Internet continues to grow at an astonishing pace. Cisco estimates that by 2016 roughly 45 percent of the world's population will be Internet users, there will be more than 18.9 billion network connections, and the average speed of mobile broadband will be four times faster than it is today.

The ability of the Internet to grow at this staggering pace is due largely to the flexibility of the multi-stakeholder approach that governs the Internet today. Nongovernmental institutions now manage the Internet's core functions, with input from private and public sector participants. This structure prevents governmental or nongovernmental actors from controlling the design of the network or the content that it carries.

□ 1840

Without one entity in control, the Internet has become a driver of jobs and information, business expansion, investment and, indeed, innovation. Now, moving away from that multi-stakeholder model, Mr. Speaker, would harm these abilities and would prevent the Internet from spreading prosperity and freedom.

In May, the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology invited a panel of witnesses, including Federal Communications Commissioner Robert McDowell, to discuss the effects an international regulatory regime would have on the Internet. All agreed that such a regime would not only endanger the Internet, but would endanger global development on a much larger scale. House Concurrent Resolution 127 expresses the commitment of Congress to do all that it can to keep the Internet free from an international regulatory regime.

I'm pleased to report that earlier today, Ambassador Kramer, the leader of the U.S. delegation to the WCIT, gave a speech outlining the position of the United States that seems to be embracing the very principles contained in this resolution. Now, my hope is that the administration stays on this very course.

As the U.S. delegation continues to work in advance of the WCIT, House Concurrent Resolution 127 is an excellent bipartisan demonstration of our Nation's commitment to preserve the multistakeholder governance model and to keep the Internet free from international regulation. The House Committee on Energy and Commerce strongly supports House Concurrent Resolution 127, and I urge the rest of my colleagues in the House to join us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I'm very pleased to join with all of my colleagues. This is an unusual happening on the floor, and I hope there are lots of people tuned in from C-SPAN listening and watching, because it is one of the few times that we've come together in a true bipartisan, 100 percent bipartisan way.

I want to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from California, Representative BONO MACK, for her leadership on this. And I'm very, very pleased to join her and all of the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee on H. Con. Res. 127.

As I said, this is bipartisan and it's bicameral, and it demonstrates the bipartisan commitment of the Congress to preserve the open structure and multistakeholder approach that has guided the Internet over the past two decades.

The distinguished chairman of our subcommittee said that he hopes the administration will remain on this. The administration was there before the Congress took action. There is no light between the administration, the executive branch, the Senate or the House, and that's the way it should be.

Through this open and transparent structure, Mr. Speaker, the Internet has literally transformed into a platform supporting thousands of innovative companies, applications, and services, not just in the United States, but in communities around the world.

I'm very, very proud, because my congressional district is very much a

part of Silicon Valley, and many of these companies helped to launch these innovations. In fact, since 1995—this is really stunning—venture capital funds have invested approximately \$250 billion—with a B, dollars—in industries reliant on an open Internet, including \$91.8 billion on software alone.

But later this year, the World Conference on International Telecommunications—at the committee, we call it WCIT, that's a lot easier—will take up proposals that represent a really fundamental departure from the International Telecommunications Regulations adopted in 1988. Nearly 25 years ago, this treaty provided a framework for how telecommunications traffic is handled among countries, but much has changed since that time.

In addition to proposing new regulations on broadband services, several nations, including Russia, are set on asserting intergovernmental control over the Internet, leading to a balkanized Internet where censorship could become the new norm. While there's no question that nations have to work together to address challenges to the Internet's growth and stability, such as cybersecurity, online privacy, and intellectual property protection, these issues can best be addressed under the existing model.

It's absolutely essential that the United States defend the current model of Internet governance at the upcoming Dubai conference this December because the very fabric of the free and open Internet is at stake.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution which reflects, as I said a few months ago, a viewpoint already shared by the Obama administration, the Federal Communications Commission, and the U.S. delegation to the WCIT, and unite in opposition to proposals that threaten the innovation, openness, and transparency enjoyed by Internet users around the world.

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

Mr. WALDEN. I'm now honored to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK), the sponsor of this legislation, the chairman of the Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and a very active and effective member of the subcommittee I chair, the Communications and Technology Subcommittee, who has put a lot of time into making sure the Internet remains free and open. This is her resolution. We thank her for her work.

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague for yielding me the time.

Today, if you browse the Internet and enter the search words "Russia, China, human rights violations," you'll get back nearly 300 million hits. Think about it. Five simple words, 300 million hits.

In the future, how many of these stories will you actually be able to read if

Russian President Vladimir Putin and China's Communist Party are allowed to exert unprecedented control over Internet governance?

Here are two words you should Google: "Good luck."

As the United States prepares to take part in the World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai, we need to provide the delegation with a clear and unmistakable mandate: Keep the Internet free of any and all government control.

At the WCIT discussions, a new treaty on Internet governance will be debated. Most worrisome to me are efforts by some countries to provide the U.N. with extraordinary new authority over the management of the Internet.

That's bad enough. But unlike the U.N. Security Council, the U.S. will not have veto power to prevent censorship or despotic actions which could threaten freedom everywhere. To prevent this from happening, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 127.

I want to thank my cosponsors, Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman UPTON, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Communications and Technology Subcommittee Chairman WALDEN, and my good friend and the Ranking Subcommittee Member ESHOO for their strong bipartisan support in this effort. I also want to commend Senator RUBIO for championing this critically important cause in the Senate.

In many ways, this is a first-of-its-kind referendum on the future of the Internet. For nearly a decade, the United Nations has been angling quietly to become the epicenter of Internet governance. A vote for our resolution is a vote to keep the Internet free from government control, and to prevent Russia, China, India, and other nations from succeeding in giving the U.N. unprecedented control over Web content and infrastructure.

Last year, e-commerce topped \$200 billion in the U.S. for the first time and is up 15 percent so far this year. We also continue to lead the world in online innovation, creating millions of jobs and bolstering our economy at a time when we really need it.

These proposed treaty changes, which have been going on in secret, could have a devastating impact worldwide on both freedom and economic prosperity. If this power grab is successful, I'm concerned that the next Arab Spring will instead become a Russian Winter where free speech is chilled, not encouraged, and the Internet becomes a wasteland of unfulfilled hopes, dreams, and opportunities.

We cannot let this happen. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for this resolution, and say "no" to online censorship by foreign governments.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), a highly regarded member of our committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my support for this important resolution to safeguard the Internet from government control.

I'd like to thank my friend and colleague, MARY BONO MACK, and my other colleagues from the Energy and Commerce Committee for introducing this measure, and I was delighted to become an original cosponsor.

□ 1850

This bipartisan resolution sends a clear message to the United Nations. It tells the International Telecommunication Union, which is the U.N. arm handling telecommunications issues, not to adopt regulations that would make it easier for governments to exercise tracking, surveillance, or censorship online.

The Internet has developed into the revolutionary medium it is today because decisions over the structure of the Internet have been made by non-governmental, expert organizations. These groups invite the participation of a number of stakeholders from academia, the private sector, public interests, and other experts, and they've done a good job of avoiding a lot of the political interference.

At a time when some governments have actively been blocking users from accessing certain Web sites online, I am glad to see my colleagues unite against such repressive actions and in support of Internet freedom. Opposition to Internet censorship has always been a very bipartisan issue. I want to make that clear because sometimes this issue gets confused with other policy issues like net neutrality. Some of my colleagues have argued that net neutrality supporters somehow favor Internet censorship. I believe that users should be able to surf the Internet however they want to without being blocked from certain Web sites or services, which is what net neutrality is all about as well, so I think opposing censorship and favoring net neutrality go hand in hand.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see this resolution move forward in a bipartisan fashion. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WALDEN. I now yield 3 minutes to a member of the Judiciary Committee who chairs the Intellectual Property, Competition, and the Internet Subcommittee and who has been one of our terrific leaders on the Republican side on the Internet with regard to keeping it free and open, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I would like to thank Chairman WALDEN for his great work in this area and for his leadership on this issue.

I rise to strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 127.

Mr. Speaker, several hostile countries continue to pursue a U.N. takeover of the Internet through an organization known as the International Telecommunication Union, or ITU, which is an agency within the United Nations. In fact, a push is being made to negotiate international control of the Internet in Dubai this December.

The U.N. is the absolute last entity that should have anything to do with managing the functioning of the Internet.

Currently, the private, nonprofit ICANN, which is the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, performs this function. While ICANN is far from perfect, having this responsibility rest with a private entity helps foster market principles and is the most efficient way to administer the Internet's domain name system and root servers.

We must remain vigilant against efforts by foreign governments to consolidate the control of the Internet into a U.N.-centered body, which would lead to free speech and access restrictions and abuses. House Concurrent Resolution 127 will show Congress' unity behind this concept, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), who has been a recognized intellectual leader on telecommunications and the Internet for a long time in the Congress.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentlelady for her great leadership.

I have served 36 years on the Telecommunications Subcommittee. No Member of Congress has ever done this.

I know that this is an important moment. This is an important resolution because the Internet today is indispensable to our economy, intricately linked to innovation worldwide, and initiates the free flow of ideas around the planet. It is the most successful communications and commercial medium in the history of the world.

In testimony before the Telecommunications Subcommittee in May, Vint Cerf, known to many as the "Father of the Internet," explained:

To allow any rules that would sequester this innovation and inhibit others would damage the future of the Internet dramatically.

I could not agree more. That is why I strongly support this bipartisan resolution with Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WALDEN, and Ms. BONO MACK. This is why we have to be out here together. It is why we must send a bipartisan signal to the rest of the world that the United States will defend an open Internet.

The World Wide Web is essential to our economy. Companies large and small rely on the Web regardless of whether their commercial aspirations are local or global. The Internet's worldwide scope has also helped to foster community and cultural communications across the planet. We have recently witnessed the power of social media in toppling dictators and in promoting democracy across the globe.

What makes the Internet so special is the decentralized, open system that currently governs it. It is chaotic; it is impossible to control; and the multi-stakeholder process that is in place

today ensures the Internet's vibrancy will continue into the future.

Here, domestically, we have to ensure that the broadband barons don't close down this cacophony of voices which are heard and stifle innovation. But globally, yes, a number of countries, including China and Russia, are now proposing measures that strike at the core of what makes the Internet great. Their proposals could stifle innovation, cripple job growth, muzzle democratic principles. These proposed measures include bringing the Internet under intergovernmental control and imposing fees for relaying Internet traffic or termination rates for delivering Internet traffic to its end destination.

We have to resist and reject these regressive ideas. It would undermine the essence of the Internet. It would take us back to the days when, in the satellite world, it was the controlling governmental officials in countries that actually decided what ideas could go into that country and made people pay exorbitant rates in order to get access to those ideas. The Internet—this packet switch system that was invented in the United States—breaks down those barriers. We must ensure that we keep Internet freedom. Thank you all for bringing this great resolution out to the floor here this evening.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from California, Representative ZOE LOFGREN, who is respected in the House for her knowledge, not only of technology, but of all the wraparound issues that are a part of it.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Thank you, Representative ESHOO, and thank you to all who have brought this important bipartisan resolution forward.

I remember, as the Internet was beginning to take off commercially, that we had a discussion here in the government. Again, it was bipartisan, and there was an understanding that the Commerce Department was not going to be able to run the Internet. We did something that was a risk, but it worked out pretty well. We created ICANN, which basically allowed a multistakeholder, nongovernmental organization to do the technology, to assign the names and numbers. They've not been perfect but not half bad.

What is before us today is a threat to what has been, as my colleague Mr. MARKEY has said, the greatest force in modern times for communication, for growth, for low-barrier entry into innovation—the Internet. Whether it is to tax it or to censor it for political or cultural reasons, we are aware that there are those around the world who wish to burn the Internet. We need to take a stand in this body and with our administration to say "no" to that.

Whether the attempts to control the Internet from the top down come from

an international body like the International Telecommunication Union or from international trade agreements and treaties—and there have been many threats to the Internet that have been included in our international treaties or even sometimes from our own government—we need to stand up and protect the Internet and the freedom that it embodies.

We know that the multistakeholder approach is critical to the continued robust growth of the Internet. We also know that the transparent, multistakeholder model has made the Internet such a hugely successful global platform for economic growth, human rights, and the free flow of information.

□ 1900

I'm proud to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to say that America is going to stand up for freedom, we're going to stand up for technology, and we're not going to allow anyone, whatever their intentions may be, to threaten the freedom of the Internet to succeed.

I appreciate Mrs. BONO MACK's efforts in this regard, along with Ms. ESHOO's, and the entire committee. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of the measure. I look forward to its resounding success in a vote tomorrow.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 8 minutes remaining.

Ms. ESHOO. I'll just make some closing comments because I don't have anyone else who is here to speak to this.

Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone who has spoken has really spoken beautifully about this issue, about what the Internet represents not only to individuals, businesses, students, how it has changed how we live, how we work, how we learn, and the jobs that it has produced, what it has done for our national economy, but also what it has done relative to exporting democracy. Of course, the United States is front and center in this.

It's a very interesting thing to me to examine those countries that are thinking another way and want to impose that thinking on the Internet. There are far more closed societies where freedom of thought, freedom of expression is not valued the way we do and other democracies do. So we need to form partnerships with other countries around the world to make sure that the democratizing effect that the Internet actually holds will continue.

I'm proud to join again with my colleagues, with Mr. WALDEN, the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, and Representative BONO MACK, who led the effort with this resolution. I'm proud that we're all together. And I always want to thank our staff, both on

the majority and the minority side of the aisle, for the work that they do on the committee. I thank you all, and I salute you. I look forward to a unanimous vote of the United States House of Representatives in support of a free and open Internet.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Tonight, the U.S. House of Representatives will send a clear and distinct message not only to our negotiators but to the world that we stand for liberty and we stand for freedom. When it comes to the Internet, both of those are incredibly important.

The Internet has brought us economic prosperity not here alone but all over the globe. The Internet has allowed for political discourse as never imagined by the great scholars of Greece and Rome. It's brought us intellectual capabilities. If you think about what you can do on the Internet today to research something, to evaluate something, there are an unlimited number of sources of data. It's improved our lives. It's improved our lives through our political systems. It's allowed people who thought they had no opportunity to effect change to have an overwhelming effect by communicating together. This really is a vote for liberty. It's a vote for freedom. It's a vote for free speech. It's a vote for the things that our Founders believed in when they gave us the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It's our version of that.

We know that there are forces out there in the world that are opposed to all of those things, because they want command and control of their people, and that's not right. We have an opportunity tonight to send a clear and convincing message that we stand in America for freedom of the Internet, for no government anywhere in the globe taking charge of it and shutting it down and denying that great human spirit that we believe in so much here in America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join us in a unanimous show of support. I thank my staff and the staff of Representative ESHOO and Ranking Member WAXMAN for their good work on this, and especially to my colleague from California, MARY BONO MACK, who raised this with us early on and worked closely to write a piece of legislation, that, as you can see in a sometimes otherwise controversial House, has brought us all together. That's a real tribute to Congresswoman BONO MACK's work.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 127.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RESOLVING ENVIRONMENTAL AND GRID RELIABILITY CONFLICTS ACT OF 2012

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4273) to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4273

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Resolving Environmental and Grid Reliability Conflicts Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL POWER ACT.

(a) COMPLIANCE WITH OR VIOLATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS WHILE UNDER EMERGENCY ORDER.—Section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(c)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) With respect to an order issued under this subsection that may result in a conflict with a requirement of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, the Commission shall ensure that such order requires generation, delivery, interchange, or transmission of electric energy only during hours necessary to meet the emergency and serve the public interest, and, to the maximum extent practicable, is consistent with any applicable Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation and minimizes any adverse environmental impacts.

"(3) To the extent any omission or action taken by a party, that is necessary to comply with an order issued under this subsection, including any omission or action taken to voluntarily comply with such order, results in non-compliance with, or causes such party to not comply with, any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, such omission or action shall not be considered a violation of such environmental law or regulation, or subject such party to any requirement, civil or criminal liability, or a citizen suit under such environmental law or regulation.

"(4)(A) An order issued under this subsection that may result in a conflict with a requirement of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation shall expire not later than 90 days after it is issued. The Commission may renew or reissue such order pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) for subsequent periods, not to exceed 90 days for each period, as the Commission determines necessary to meet the emergency and serve the public interest.

"(B) In renewing or reissuing an order under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consult with the primary Federal agency with expertise in the environmental interest protected by such law or regulation, and shall include in any such

renewed or reissued order such conditions as such Federal agency determines necessary to minimize any adverse environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable. The conditions, if any, submitted by such Federal agency shall be made available to the public. The Commission may exclude such a condition from the renewed or reissued order if it determines that such condition would prevent the order from adequately addressing the emergency necessitating such order and provides in the order, or otherwise makes publicly available, an explanation of such determination.”

(b) TEMPORARY CONNECTION OR CONSTRUCTION BY MUNICIPALITIES.—Section 202(d) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(d)) is amended by inserting “or municipality” before “engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on H.R. 4273.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4273, Resolving Environmental and Grid Reliability Conflicts Act of 2012.

My colleagues and I carefully drafted this bill to resolve a conflict between the Federal Power Act and environmental laws and regulations that, if left unresolved, could create serious problems for the reliability of our Nation’s electric grid.

Every year, as the heat of summer settles in across our country and demand surges for electricity, the potential for dangerous power outages grows. Some States, such as California, and my home State of Texas, are being warned by electricity regulators that reserve margins could dip dangerously low.

Texas is expected to have a 2,500 megawatt shortfall in generating capacity—equivalent to five large power plants—as early as 2014. This shortfall could cause rolling blackouts across Texas that have the potential to impact more than 25 million people.

□ 1910

As we’ve seen happen before in our country, and as we are watching it unfold in India this week, an unexpected loss of power can result in significant harm to human health and the environment.

Prior experience shows that in rare and limited circumstances, emergency actions are needed to ensure the reliable delivery of electricity. In these circumstances, the Department of Energy has a tool of last resort to address

the emergency. That tool is an emergency order issued under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act. DOE can order a power plant to generate electricity when outages occur due to weather events, equipment failures, or when the electricity supply is too low and could cause a blackout. As they should, DOE can force a company to comply with a 202(c) order even if it means a technical violation of environmental law. Unfortunately, under current law, a company or individual can be held liable for this technical violation even when they are acting under a Federal order to avoid a blackout.

In recent years, these conflicting Federal laws have resulted in lawsuits and heavy fines for electricity providers who were complying with DOE orders. A power generator in San Francisco had to pay a significant sum as a settlement after they were ordered by DOE to exceed their emissions limits to avoid a blackout. Unless Congress passes legislation to resolve the potential conflict of laws, the effectiveness of this tool is in jeopardy.

As testimony this year before the House Energy and Commerce Committee confirms, the next time DOE invokes 202(c), the power generator may choose to fight the order in court if it conflicts with an environmental law. Conflicting Federal laws put a power generator in a no-win situation—either sue DOE to comply with environmental laws or be sued by third parties for compliance with DOE orders.

H.R. 4273 eliminates the legal conflict facing power generators and their customers by providing a needed safety valve, which clarifies that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation.

Emergency orders are not issued lightly and only under extreme power reliability scenarios. In the last 30 years, this authority has only been used six times. But when the need arises, my legislation will ensure that DOE works to minimize any adverse environmental impacts, meaning they must balance environmental interests with reliability needs.

While I believe DOE may need to use its emergency authority more often in the future given the strain EPA’s new power sector rules will put on the electric grid, I still expect DOE emergency authority orders to be the exception, not the rule.

In those rare instances when the authority is invoked, we should not punish generators that are simply following orders from the Federal Government. That’s why we must amend the Federal Power Act so that generators are not forced to choose between compliance with an emergency order and environmental regulations.

This conflict is why I introduced this bipartisan legislation to allow America’s power companies to comply with Federal orders to maintain grid reli-

ability during a power emergency without facing lawsuits or penalties.

I am extremely pleased with the bipartisan support this bill has received. This is proof that we can find common ground when working to address a critical glitch in Federal law and provide reliable energy supply to all Americans.

I want to thank committee Chairman FRED UPTON, Ranking Member HENRY WAXMAN, and Subcommittee Chairman ED WHITFIELD and Ranking Member BOBBY RUSH for their support and assistance in moving this bill forward. I also want to thank my colleagues on the committee, GENE GREEN and MIKE DOYLE, for working with me to fix this problem and to keep power running for all Americans in an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation that protects energy consumers, the environment, and those who provide the power.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The bill before us today is the result of efforts from both sides of the aisle to find a solution that really works for industry, government, and our environment.

Currently, the Department of Energy has the authority to issue a “must-run” order to a power provider in emergency cases to protect grid reliability. At the same time, environmental laws and regulations could prohibit a company from complying with a DOE must-run order. So a company is left in the position of choosing which law it violates—environmental rules or an emergency order from the Department of Energy.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, this has happened in the past. During the California energy crisis, and as recently as 2005 in Virginia, a company was issued emergency orders by the Department of Energy. To comply with those orders, the company was temporarily in noncompliance with environmental law. Therefore, after complying with an emergency must-run order, the company was both fined and forced to settle a citizen lawsuit. If it happens once, twice, or 50 times, it will never be proper for the Federal Government to put a company in the position of choosing which law to violate.

Reliability concerns for our electric grid are real, and power plant retirements are being announced nearly every week. In June, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation issued their summer reliability assessment. They told us that reserves in Texas are coming up short to meet peak demand and that the California reserve margin will be extremely tight.

So this bill will fix a clear conflict in Federal laws with a narrow, targeted approach. This bill will ensure that the Department of Energy will have the ability to keep the lights on while still protecting the environment.

The bill before us simply clarifies that if an emergency order issued pursuant to section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may result in such a conflict with an environmental law or regulation, it shall expire not later than 90 days after issuance. This is to ensure that DOE continues to have the necessary authority to “keep the lights on” in true emergencies.

It then gives DOE the opportunity to renew or reissue such an order for an additional 90-day period after consulting with the appropriate Federal agencies and including conditions submitted by such agencies to mitigate adverse environmental impacts. DOE may exclude a recommended condition from the order if it determines the condition would prevent the order from adequately addressing the emergency.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the result of many months of work with members on both sides of the Energy and Commerce Committee. It is supported by both the chairman and the ranking member of the committee. And I ask my colleagues to support it also.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON). It has been a pleasure to work with him on this piece of legislation. It is my hope that all our colleagues also support this legislation.

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

Mr. OLSON. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I see no colleagues on my side of the aisle looking to speak, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), a valuable member of our Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank both my colleague from Pennsylvania and also my neighbor in Texas, Congressman OLSON, for making sure we get this bill to the floor today.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 4273, the Resolving Environmental and Grid Reliability Conflicts Act of 2012. This bipartisan legislation addresses a long-standing conflict in Federal law where a company or individual can be held liable for violating environmental laws when complying with a Federal order to generate power to avoid blackouts.

Section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act gives the Department of Energy the authority to order an electric-generating facility to operate to avoid a reliability emergency. At the same time, environmental laws and regulations may restrict the operation of power plants or transmission lines.

So if a company or publicly owned utility is ordered by the DOE to operate under section 202(c) and at the same time is prohibited from operating in accordance with the DOE order due to environmental limitations, the operator must choose which legal mandate to follow. These conflicting legal man-

dates should not complicate an electric reliability crisis.

As a long-time member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and someone who has worked on both reliability and environmental legislation during that time, I can honestly say it was never our intention to put electric-generating facilities in the position of having to choose between compliance with one law over another.

And while there have only been a couple of instances to date where a generator has been in this situation, the potential for conflict will only grow as several coal-fired plants are scheduled to be taken offline in the coming years.

And as my Pennsylvania colleague noted, we have potential reliability issues in my and Mr. OLSON's home State of Texas. Even though we are under a separate grid—ERCOT—it's important that we have this distinction corrected.

□ 1920

That's why Congress needs to address this issue, right here, right now or else we risk threatening our electrical reliability. H.R. 4273 clarifies that if an emergency order issued pursuant to section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may result in a conflict with an environmental law or regulation, the order shall expire no later than 90 days after issuance. This is to ensure that DOE continues to have the necessary authority to “keep the lights on” in true emergencies.

However, it then gives DOE the opportunity to renew or reissue the order for an additional 90-day period only after consulting with the appropriate Federal agencies and including conditions submitted by these agencies to mitigate the adverse environmental impacts.

This is not a messaging bill. This is not an anti-EPA bill or an anti air toxic standards bill. Instead, it's a commonsense bill that would address a very worrisome deficiency in current law that is only going to become more prominent in the coming years.

This is one of a handful of bills that actually was supported by both Democrats and Republicans in the Energy and Commerce Committee. It also has support from the utility industry. That's why I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the bill.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and at this time I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, in closing, H.R. 4273 is a bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation that ensures that during a power crisis, the lights will come on when it's dark, the heat will come on when it's cold, and the air conditioning will come on when it's hot. And lives will be saved.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 4273, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. I would like to make a few comments on the committee process for H.R. 4273.

As introduced, I had substantial concerns about H.R. 4273. The introduced bill gave the Department of Energy unprecedented and unchecked new authority to waive any federal, state or local environmental law if DOE determines there is an emergency with respect to electric power, and the only references to environmental safeguards in the bill were hortatory. This approach was unacceptable. I also believed that the bill was unnecessary, as federal agencies already have the tools necessary to resolve any conflicts between environmental requirements and emergency orders.

However, the bill's sponsors, the committee Chairman, and the affected industry were willing to engage in serious, substantive negotiations to improve the bill, which produced significant improvements. The version of the bill reported from Committee is narrower in scope and effect, and provides some environmental safeguards.

I would like to extend my thanks to all of the participants in the negotiations for a good-faith and productive process. In particular, I would like to thank Mr. DOYLE and Mr. GREEN for their leadership and hard work on making improvements and producing a bill that can be supported on a broad bipartisan basis. I also want to thank Chairman UPTON and Subcommittee Chairman WHITFIELD and Representative OLSON for working with us. The language of this bill represents a delicate compromise that was very carefully negotiated, and changes to the bill before us could well jeopardize that broad support.

H.R. 4273, as it is before us today, requires any emergency order that may result in a conflict with environmental requirements to require generation only during the hours necessary to meet the emergency and to minimize any adverse environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable. The reported bill also limits the length of such an order to 90 days, and requires any renewed order to include any conditions identified by the relevant federal environmental agency as necessary to minimize any environmental impacts.

In discussions and testimony on the bill, DOE officials informed the Committee that in any situation where time permits, they always consult with and rely on the relevant expert environmental agency with respect to minimizing environmental impacts of an emergency order, and they assured the Committee that they would continue this practice. This assurance is important to my support for the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4273, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIDENTIAL AND COMMUTER TOLL FAIRNESS ACT OF 2011

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 897) to provide authority and

sanction for the granting and issuance of programs for residential and commuter toll, user fee, and fare discounts by States, municipalities, other localities, and all related agencies and departments, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 897

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Residential and Commuter Toll Fairness Act of 2011”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Residents of various localities and political subdivisions throughout the United States are subject to tolls, user fees, and fares to access certain roads, highways, bridges, railroads, busses, ferries, and other transportation systems.

(2) Revenue generated from transportation tolls, user fees, and fares is used to support various infrastructure maintenance and capital improvement projects that directly benefit commuters and indirectly benefit the regional and national economy.

(3) Residents of certain municipalities, counties, and other localities endure significant or disproportionate toll, user fee, or fare burdens compared to others who have a greater number of transportation options because such residents—

(A) live in geographic areas that are not conveniently located to the access points for roads, highways, bridges, rail, busses, ferries, and other transportation systems;

(B) live on islands, peninsulas, or in other places that are only accessible through a means that requires them to pay a toll, user fee, or fare; or

(C) are required to pay much more for transportation access than residents of surrounding jurisdictions, or in other jurisdictions across the country, for similar transportation options.

(4) To address this inequality, and to reduce the financial hardship often imposed on such residents, several State and municipal governments and multi-State transportation authorities have established programs that authorize discounted transportation tolls, user fees, and fares for such residents.

(5) Transportation toll, user fee, and fare discount programs based on residential status—

(A) address actual unequal and undue financial burdens placed on residents who live in areas that are only accessible through a means that requires them to pay a toll, user fee, or fare;

(B) do not disadvantage or discriminate against those individuals ineligible for residential toll, user fee, or fare discount programs;

(C) are not designed to favor the interests or promote the domestic industry or economic development of the State implementing such programs;

(D) do not interfere or impose undue burdens on commerce with foreign nations or interfere or impose any undue burdens on commerce among the several States, or commerce within particular States;

(E) do not interfere or impose undue burdens on the ability of individuals to travel among, or within, the several States;

(F) do not constitute inequitable treatment or deny any person within the jurisdiction of the United States the equal protection of the laws; and

(G) do not abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to clarify the existing authority of States, counties, municipalities, and multi-jurisdictional transportation authorities to establish programs that offer discounted transportation tolls, user fees, and fares for residents in specific geographic areas; and

(2) to authorize the establishment of such programs, as necessary.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF LOCAL RESIDENTIAL OR COMMUTER TOLL, USER FEE OR FARE DISCOUNT PROGRAMS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE RESIDENTIAL OR COMMUTER TOLL, USER FEE, OR FARE DISCOUNT PROGRAMS.—States, counties, municipalities, and multi-jurisdictional transportation authorities that operate or manage roads, highways, bridges, railroads, busses, ferries, or other transportation systems are authorized to establish programs that offer discounted transportation tolls, user fees, or other fares for residents of specific geographic areas in order to reduce or alleviate toll burdens imposed upon such residents.

(b) RULEMAKING WITH RESPECT TO THE STATE, LOCAL, OR AGENCY PROVISION OF TOLL, USER FEE OR FARE DISCOUNT PROGRAMS TO LOCAL RESIDENTS OR COMMUTERS.—States, counties, municipalities, and multi-jurisdictional transportation authorities that operate or manage roads, highways, bridges, railroads, busses, ferries, or other transportation systems are authorized to enact such rules or regulations that may be necessary to establish the programs authorized under subsection (a).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to limit or otherwise interfere with the authority, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, of States, counties, municipalities, and multi-jurisdictional transportation authorities that operate or manage roads, highways, bridges, railroads, busses, ferries, or other transportation systems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 897.

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

There was no objection.

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

Because of the geographic area in which they live, many Americans don't have as many transportation options as others. As a result, these people are more directly impacted by highway and bridge tolls than others who live in areas with several transportation options.

This bill simply emphasizes that State and local governments have the authority to establish toll programs that offer discounted rates for residents in specific geographic areas. By exercising such authority, State and local governments can mitigate the impact of tolls on residents who have fewer transportation options.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the objective of the legislation before the House today—to clarify the existing authority of public authorities to offer discounts in transportation tolls to residents of communities faced with limited transportation access and heavy toll burdens.

Last Congress, the House passed similar legislation. That legislation, at the time introduced by Mr. McMahan of New York, reaffirmed the authority of States and local governments to provide discounted fare or toll rates to residents faced with undue financial hardships imposed by highway and bridge tolls.

We recognize that the residents of Staten Island are forced to endure some of the highest toll burdens in the country. The legislation passed by the last Congress would have provided a targeted approach to address the unique challenges facing communities like Staten Island.

Unfortunately, unlike Mr. McMahan's bill from last Congress, H.R. 897 as currently drafted is overly broad and raises some potentially serious legal issues.

A number of highway user organizations, including the American Highway Users Alliance, have raised concerns that H.R. 897 could lead to discrimination against interstate commerce, and be used in an attempt to preclude constitutional challenges to an individual toll or fare discount program.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has not held any hearings to examine the potential implications of this legislation. The Republican leadership has decided to bring this bill to the floor with no notice, at least not to this side of the aisle, under suspension of the rules prior to the important issues raised by this bill being examined and, if necessary, addressed.

Mr. Speaker, the House should be considering legislation to simply reinforce the existing right of communities to reduce the extreme toll burdens borne by captive toll payers. We should not be considering legislation that could be used to implement programs that impede interstate commerce by encouraging States and public authorities to find ways to shift the burden of tolls to out-of-State residents, or truckers, for that matter, or those making longer through trips.

Not all residential-based toll discounts are fair or necessarily appropriate, but some are. The context and how they are implemented are important to determining if they are appropriate.

Unfortunately, as currently drafted, H.R. 897 could be used to remove any case that could be made against a toll discount program. In that sense, it is overly broad and unreasonable.

I would hope that as we move forward, we can address the concerns of the highway user community and ensure that this legislation is not used to preclude challenges to toll discount programs.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Just to clarify the record, this bill, which I stand in strong support of—but actually before that, let me just say that I want to thank my colleague and friend, GREG MEEKS, for all of his work on this. It was a true bipartisan effort. But this bill, all it does is clarify what is already allowed by law. So to say that it is overly broad, it's almost ridiculous because again, all this does is clarify what is already allowed by law. States and cities already have. There were challenges in court that have failed, and the purpose of this legislation is to make sure that those frivolous challenges do not continue to go forward.

The Residential and Commuter Toll Fairness Act, I feel it is vital to toll discount programs, specifically for my constituents, but for all of New York and throughout this country.

I would like to also thank Chairman MICA, who traveled to my district, to Staten Island, for moving this bill forward and for seeing firsthand in Staten Island the devastating effects and the impacts that tolls can have.

Again, this bill, all it does is continue to clarify and allow the States and municipal governments to offer the discounted toll rates to residents for trips taken on roads, bridges, rail, bus, ferry, and other transportation systems.

I introduced the legislation for one purpose: it was in response to a 2009 case in which the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit questioned the constitutionality of discounts for residents of towns bordering the New York Thruway. In New York, we simply can't afford to lose our discounts.

The majority of my district in New York City is an island; it's Staten Island. And the only way to drive on or off the island is to cross a bridge and pay a toll, something many of my constituents do often as part of their daily commute. Without a discount, it costs \$13 to cross the Verrazano Bridge. Yes, I said \$13 without the Staten Island residential EZ-Pass discount. On the other side of Staten Island, going to New Jersey, the cash tolls on three bridges have just gone up to \$12, and that amount is slated to go up in 2015 to \$15. That's without the residential discount.

□ 1930

On Staten Island, we have fought long and hard to reach an agreement

on residential toll discounts, which is why this legislation is crucial to making sure we protect those new rates.

The Residential Commuter Toll Fairness Act provides clarification only of the existing authority of local governments to issue or grant transportation toll, user fee or fare discount programs based on residential status. It also provides congressional authorization for discount programs. Passage of H.R. 897 is nothing more than clarification of what can already be done, and I ask for the strong support of my colleagues.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I would just like to enter in the RECORD a letter from the American Highway Users Alliance dated August 1 expressing concerns about the legislation.

AMERICAN HIGHWAY USERS ALLIANCE,
August 1, 2012.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: This afternoon, under suspension of the rules, the House will consider HR 897, the Residential and Commuter Toll Fairness Act of 2011, sponsored by New York City Representatives Grimm and Meeks. We write to express serious concerns about this bill.

We are on record in support of greater tolling accountability and fairness for commuters. For example, we have endorsed HR 3684, the Commuter Protection Act, also authored by Congressman Grimm. We share particular concerns about the high costs of tolling for New York City residents. However the provisions of HR 897 are not narrowly constructed for New York's specific problems and have unintended consequences for other toll-payers throughout the country.

HR 897 broadly authorizes local tolling discount programs. If this bill were narrowly constructed to apply to places like Staten Island, New York; where residents are only able to access their homes and businesses via tolled bridges, our concerns would be minimal. But HR 897 allows my State or local jurisdiction to charge discriminatory toll rates for non-residents, even on the National Highway System, and regardless of circumstance or impact on interstate commerce.

In effect, this bill could actually encourage more tolls for all and higher tolls for selected users, authorizing locally popular tolling schemes that, in effect, overcharge interstate and long distance travelers who have no vote at the local ballot box.

If States and local governments widely adopt the practice of tolling non-residents to pay higher rates than locals, it could sharply increase the costs of interstate tourism and freight. These are national concerns requiring caution from Congress. The federal government has an obligation to regulate interstate commerce. As such, HR 897 should be revised to ensure that interstate and non-local traffic is not treated unfairly, by State and local tolling authorities.

Sincerely,

GREGORY M. COHEN,
President & CEO.

Second, I think the gentleman from New York makes a compelling case for why the bill should be more narrowly focused.

And third, Mr. Speaker, I may say things on the floor that people disagree with, but I do save my almost ridiculous statements for off the floor and not the floor of the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 897.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILLE LACS LAKE FREEDOM TO FISH ACT OF 2012

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5797) to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to Mille Lacs Lake, Minnesota, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5797

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Mille Lacs Lake Freedom To Fish Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. MILLE LACS LAKE, MINNESOTA.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the owner or operator of a vessel operating on Mille Lacs Lake, Minnesota, shall not, with respect to such vessel, be subject to any Federal requirement under subtitle II of title 46, United States Code, relating to licensing or vessel inspection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. CRAVAACK) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5797.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in March 2010, the U.S. Coast Guard ruled that Mille Lacs Lake was a federally navigable body of water based on historical interstate commerce.

Specifically, the Coast Guard justified their actions by using a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determination from 1981 that said because lumberjacks in the 1800s floated logs on Mille Lacs Lake and down the Rum River, Mille Lacs Lake should now be made a federally navigable water body. Currently, the Rum River is dammed in three places, and the same Corps of Engineers report said that the dams prohibit through navigation. In addition,

two previous Army Corps determinations in 1931 and 1974 also considered the river nonnavigable.

I would like to submit the U.S. Coast Guard determination for the RECORD.

MEMORANDUM

From: D. L. Nichols, CAPT, USCG, CGD Eight (dl).

To: S. L. Hudson, CAPT, USCG, CG Sector Upper Mississippi River (s).

Subj: Navigability Determination for Mille Lacs Lake, Minnesota.

Ref: (a) 33 C.F.R. §2.36; (b) 33 C.F.R.

§3.40-1; (c) 33 C.F.R. §3.45-1.

1. For the purpose of determining its jurisdictional authority, the Coast Guard has determined that Mille Lacs Lake is a "navigable waterway of the United States."

2. The geographic boundary between the Eighth Coast Guard District and the Ninth Coast Guard District currently runs through Mille Lacs Lake. This navigability determination is for the entirety of Mille Lacs Lake. The Ninth District Legal Staff has reviewed and agrees with this determination.

3. No federal statute addresses the navigability of Mille Lacs Lake, and no federal court has determined the navigability of the waterway. Furthermore, Mille Lacs Lake is not subject to tidal influence. This navigability determination is based on the historical use of the waterway. Specifically, Mille Lacs Lake has been used, in connection with other waters, as a highway for substantial interstate or foreign commerce.

4. Navigability determinations are administrative findings based on the criteria set forth in 33 C.F.R. 2.36. The precise definitions of "navigable waters of the United States" and "navigability" are dependent ultimately on judicial interpretation and cannot be made conclusively by administrative agencies.

5. This opinion solely represents the opinion of the Coast Guard as to the extent of its own jurisdiction to enforce laws and regulations, and does not represent an opinion as to the extent of the jurisdiction of the United States or any of its agencies.

MEMORANDUM

From: CGD Eight.

To: File.

Subj: Legal Support for Navigability Determination for Mille Lacs Lake, Minnesota.

Ref: (a) CGD Eight (dl) memo of 3 March 2010, *Navigability Determination for Mille Lacs Lake, Minnesota*; (b) 33 C.F.R. §2.36; (c) 33 C.F.R. §3.40-1; (d) 33 C.F.R. §3.45-1.

1. Purpose. This memorandum documents the legal basis for the Coast Guard's determination of navigability in ref (a).

2. Discussion.

a. Internal waterways of the United States not subject to tidal influence are "navigable waters of the United States" if they "[a]re or have been used, or are or have been susceptible for use, by themselves or in connection with other waters, as highways for substantial interstate or foreign commerce, notwithstanding natural or man-made obstructions that require portage." 33 C.F.R. §2.36(a)(3)(i)(emphasis added). The test is one of historic navigability. *U.S. v. Harrell*, 926 F.2d 1036 (11th Cir. 1991). In 1921 the Supreme Court discussed the issue of obstructions by stating that a waterway "capable of carrying commerce among the states is within the power of Congress to preserve for purposes of future transportation, even though it . . . be incapable of such use according to present methods, either by reason of changed conditions or because of artificial obstructions." *Economy Light & Power Co. v. U.S.*, 256 U.S. 113, 122 (1921); see also *U.S. v. Appalachian*

Power Co., 311 U.S. 377, 408 ("When once found navigable, a waterway remains so."). When logs are floated on a waterway in interstate commerce, the waterway is a highway for interstate commerce. See id. at 405; *Wisconsin Public Service Corp. v. Federal Power Commission*, 147 F.2d 743 (7th Cir. 1945); *United States v. Underwood*, 344 F. Supp. 486, 490 (M.D. Fla. 1972).

B. In April 1981 the ACOE conducted an historical analysis of commerce on Mille Lacs Lake and the Run River in Minnesota. See encl. (1). Historical accounts in the document reveal a history of interstate commerce on Mille Lacs Lake. Specifically, Mille Lacs Lake was "used in the transportation of logs" from 1848 to 1904, and evidence shows that at least a portion of the logs floated were transported to markets outside of the state. Encl (1) at 5.

3. Conclusion. Mille Lacs Lake has been used in the past as a highway for interstate commerce. The Coast Guard thus determines that Mille Lacs Lake is a "navigable water of the United States" and the Coast Guard may properly enforce applicable federal law on this waterway.

Enclosure: Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) memo of 2 April 1981: *Navigability Determination for Mille Lacs Lake and Rum River, Minnesota*

Now the U.S. Coast Guard is forcing all Mille Lacs Lake fishing guides to spend time and money to obtain a Federal boating license. This license and associated costs can run well over \$2,000, and according to testimony by the U.S. Coast Guard in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, they have to travel to Toledo, Ohio, or St. Louis, Missouri, in order to apply for these licenses in person and to take the tests.

This new U.S. Coast Guard regulation is killing jobs by making it impractical for some fishing guides to even stay in business and making it even more expensive for tourists to hire their services.

The Mille Lacs Lake Freedom to Fish Act removes this burdensome, administrative overreach from the U.S. Coast Guard and restores to the State of Minnesota the original authority to permit and inspect vessels.

I truly appreciate all the Coast Guard does, I truly do. But the State of Minnesota already patrols Mille Lacs Lake quite well and the Coast Guard's authority over the lake is an unwanted intrusion. It's duplicative, and it's currently nonexistent. This would be a new area of jurisdiction for the Coast Guard requiring additional assets and manpower.

The State has rules and inspection procedures in place to keep its residents safe and has been doing so for as long as anybody can remember. The State is perfectly capable of enforcing boating laws on Mille Lacs Lake, and ultimately Mille Lacs Lake belongs to Minnesotans and should not be controlled by the Federal Government.

We heard from the U.S. Coast Guard on the issue in a Coast Guard Subcommittee hearing on May 24, 2011. Rear Admiral Kevin Cook and Deputy JAG Calvin Lederer testified about the burden this would impose on Minnesota fishing guides. Additionally, they were

unable to provide adequate justification for the navigability determination beyond the Army Corps report.

My legislation would stop fishing guides from being forced to spend over \$2,000 on obtaining a fishing license they simply just don't need. Ultimately, it will allow Minnesotans to focus on what is most important—enjoying one of Minnesota's most beautiful lakes.

This has been fully vetted by the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe and National Association of State Boating Law Administrators. This legislation is also supported by the Minnesota Department of Labor and Industry, fishing guides and resort owners, Minnesota Anglers for Habitat and Minnesota Outdoor Heritage Alliance.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter of support from the Minnesota Outdoor Heritage Alliance.

MINNESOTA OUTDOOR

HERITAGE ALLIANCE,

June 31, 2012.

REPRESENTATIVE CRAVAACK: As president of the Minnesota Outdoor Heritage Alliance (MOHA), I am always interested in legislation that preserves our constitutional right to hunt and fish, improves sportsmen recruitment and retention or increases the economic viability of these pursuits for Minnesota's sportsmen and women. Because of these organizational goals, I am submitting this letter in favor of the Mille Lacs Freedom to Fish (HR 5797) legislation. Since many Minnesota guides are small, family owned concerns that have been in business for many years, additional regulations and fees are not only unnecessary but also cost prohibitive and dangerous to our time honored way of guiding and fishing. Moving this legislation forward will address these concerns and update the laws in a way that is not only safe but beneficial for our fishing industry and our fishing license holders.

Sincerely,

TIM SPRECK,
MOHA President.

Senator KLOBUCHAR also introduced companion legislation that has been cosponsored by Senator FRANKEN. In the committee markup, Representative TIM WALZ and Ranking Member RAHALL lent their support as well, making this truly a bipartisan and bicameral piece of legislation.

I'd like to thank Geoff Gosselin and John Rayfield of the Coast Guard Subcommittee staff for their working with me on the language of this amendment, as well as Tom Dillon from legislative counsel. I would also like to thank Joel Amato, the chief boiler inspector from the Minnesota Department of Labor and Industry for providing his guidance and expertise, as well as Mr. Kim Elverum from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, and George Nitti of Nitti's Hunters Point Resort.

Although the text of this bill is short, a lot of work went into making sure that this accomplishes the goals of restoring jurisdiction to Minnesota.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5797 exempts the owners and operators of small passenger vessels operating on Mille Lacs

Lake in central Minnesota from U.S. Coast Guard licensing and inspection requirements.

This bill provides rather narrow regulatory relief. However, because this bill was rushed to legislation, to mark-up without first having a hearing on the bill itself or having the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation consider the specific bill, no one can say for sure what consequences might arise in the future. My concerns are somewhat allayed by learning the State of Minnesota has an adequate program to regulate vessels operating on its inland lakes, including Mille Lacs.

Nonetheless, the Coast Guard has expressed concerns that the limitations imposed on its vessel safety authorities by this bill could create uncertainty and some confusion among the boating public, especially regarding marine casualty investigations and maritime liability.

Notwithstanding these objections, and because the bill, as reported, would no longer vacate the Coast Guard's 2010 determination that Mille Lacs Lake is navigable, I do not object to the bill moving forward today.

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

Mr. CRAVAACK. I thank my respected colleague for his kind remarks, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation to Minnesota.

I yield back the balance of my time, as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. CRAVAACK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5797, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to exempt the owners and operators of vessels operating on Mille Lacs Lake, Minnesota, from certain Federal requirements."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1940

FARMERS UNDERTAKE ENVIRONMENTAL LAND STEWARDSHIP ACT

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3158) to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3158

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship Act" or the "FUELS Act".

SEC. 2. APPLICABILITY OF SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in implementing the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to any farm, shall—

(1) require certification of compliance with such rule by—

(A) a professional engineer for a farm with—

(i) an individual tank with an aboveground storage capacity greater than 10,000 gallons;

(ii) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity greater than or equal to 42,000 gallons; or

(iii) a history that includes a spill, as determined by the Administrator; or

(B) the owner or operator of the farm (via self-certification) for a farm with—

(i) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity greater than 10,000 gallons but less than 42,000 gallons; and

(ii) no history of spills, as determined by the Administrator; and

(2) exempt from all requirements of such rule any farm—

(A) with an aggregate aboveground storage capacity of less than or equal to 10,000 gallons; and

(B) no history of spills, as determined by the Administrator.

(b) CALCULATION OF AGGREGATE ABOVEGROUND STORAGE CAPACITY.—For the purposes of subsection (a), the aggregate aboveground storage capacity of a farm excludes all containers on separate parcels that have a capacity that is less than 1,320 gallons.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following terms apply:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) FARM.—The term "farm" has the meaning given such term in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) GALLON.—The term "gallon" refers to a United States liquid gallon.

(4) SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.—The term "Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule" means the regulation promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency under part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3158.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Members from both parties who joined in cosponsoring this bipartisan bill that will provide regulatory relief to our family farmers, in particular, my colleague, Mr. BOSWELL. Thank you very much.

The EPA-mandated Oil Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure pro-

gram, or SPCC, requires that oil storage facilities with a capacity of over 1,320 gallons make costly infrastructure modifications to reduce the possibility of oil spills.

The regulations require farmers to construct a containment facility, like a dike or a basin, which must retain 110 percent of the fuel in the container. These mandated infrastructure improvements—along with the necessary inspection and certification by a specially licensed professional engineer—will cost many farmers tens of thousands of dollars. In some cases, compliance costs could reach higher than \$60,000 for a single farmer in my district.

The SPCC program dates back to 1973, shortly after the Clean Water Act was signed into law. In the last decade, it has strictly come down on agriculture, and the rules have been amended, delayed, and extended dozens of times, creating enormous confusion in the farming community. On top of that, the EPA has failed to engage in effective outreach to producers and cooperatives on SPCC application.

In 2009, the EPA lifted a 2006 rule that suspended compliance requirements for small farms with oil storage of 10,000 gallons or less. The rule applies to more than just fuel. In fact, it applies to hydraulic oil, adjuvant oil, crop oil, vegetable oil, and even animal fat. It was scheduled to go into effect this past November.

Last summer, I headed up an effort to send a bipartisan letter with over 100 cosigners to EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson highlighting problems with the program and requesting a permanent fix. At the very least, I requested a delay so farmers impacted by last year's natural disasters would have more time to comply. The EPA responded only a few weeks before the November deadline and issued a statement saying they would not begin enforcement until May of 2013. While we were thankful for the delay, this action still didn't do anything to fix the burden on small farms. It just kicked the can down the road.

The FUELS Act is simple. It revises the SPCC regulations to be reflective of a producer's spill risk and financial resources. The exemption level would be adjusted upward from an unworkable 1,320 gallons of oil storage to an amount that would protect small farms—10,000 gallons. The proposal would also place a greater degree of responsibility on farmers and ranchers to self-certify compliance if their storage facilities exceed the exemption level. To add another layer of environmental protection, the producer must be able to demonstrate that he or she has no history of oil spills.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is necessary because the existing regulations are not only burdensome to small farmers; they're unenforceable. According to USDA, the current regulations would bring more than 70 percent of farms into the SPCC regulatory net.

This is more than 1.5 million farms in the SPCC regulatory net next year alone.

The University of Arkansas, Division of Agriculture did a study recently concluding that the FUELS Act would exempt over 80 percent of producers from SPCC compliance. It could save, in my home State, up to \$240 million in costs. Over the entire country, it could save small farmers up to \$3.36 billion.

This year, the ag sector of the economy is facing a crisis. Over two-thirds of the Nation is being impacted by drought, and farm revenue has dropped substantially. Food costs are projected to skyrocket for consumers. On top of that, the fate of a multiyear farm bill is still unknown, creating long-term uncertainty for the agriculture community. The last thing the government should be doing right now is imposing a regulation on producers that could cost our Nation's family farmers up to \$3.36 billion during next year's planting season. There is absolutely no justification for such an expensive regulation, especially when the EPA cannot provide data or even anecdotal evidence of agriculture spills.

By nature of occupation, family farmers are already careful stewards of the land and water. No one has more at stake than those who work on the ground from which they derive their livelihood.

I urge adoption of H.R. 3158 and reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD, I believe that you pretty much covered the details of this. And I see the gentleman sitting beside you there and I'm sure he's going to add to it, so I don't think I'll spend a lot of time repeating what you said. But I want you to know that as a hands-on farmer producer, I appreciate the efforts you put into this to bring this forward because there are just too many times we see where the farmers in your State, my State, and across the country are burdened with these extra expenses and criteria that they don't really need. Because you know, I know, and I think those of us that are familiar with the farming industry, we are stewards of the land. We don't want to ruin the land; we certainly don't want to ruin the water.

So this is a good thing to come forth with this piece of legislation, to put a practical sense, practical application to the situation. It's been delayed and delayed and delayed.

It refers to American farmers. American farmers are very much dedicated to what they represent. And again, those that, as I do and as I'm sure you do and others, when we have fuel on the farm for whatever reason—to run the tractors, the combines, the irrigation pumps, or whatever—we're very careful. The cost of the fuel and the exposure of it being stolen or something is something we don't have a lot of excess sitting around these days anyway. Those that are large operators, seems

to me like quite a few of them have got a tank wagon.

So I appreciate what you've offered up here, and I'm very supportive of it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Again, thank you, Mr. BOSWELL, not only for your support, but your real-world common sense as an ag producer. I appreciate it.

I'd just like to yield 2 minutes to my esteemed colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and thank him for his patience.

Mr. LANKFORD. I may not even use all 2 minutes of that, but I do want to be able to just tell the story a little bit of an Oklahoma farm.

The things that they're up against right now are common to farms all across the Midwest. They're dealing with drought right now. They're dealing with the threat of new dust particulate rules coming down from the EPA. They just fought through a battle to try to be able to have family farms be able to function with their own kids working on their family farms or their grandparents' farms, or their cousin's farm down the road—is that permissible or not—point source pollution rules that are coming down on them. Farm truck distance rules, if they want to drive 151 miles in their farm truck and the new regulations they deal with on it. All these different regulations.

And then imagine the Federal Government contacting them and saying, on top of all those rules and all those threatened rules, now you need to go find a professional engineer to check out your fuel tank, and we want to send a regulator to be able to evaluate it. And we want you to have a whole new set of rules around your tank as well. It assumes family farms and farmers don't take care of their land. Nothing could be further from the truth.

A family farm, and farms all around the country, these are individuals that they farm that land, they take care of that land, that water is very important to them. Many of them live on well water itself, and so a spill into their groundwater is incredibly important to them for their own personal family as well. They're great stewards of the land; that's how they make their living.

In addition to that, they're careful guardians of their storage tank because that tank itself, if it spills, they lose a tremendous amount of money; and the margins on a farm are not very high.

I'd like to stand with my colleagues, as well, to say let's respect the farmer for what they're doing already on their land and not send someone from Washington to come check out their farm and check out their tank and be able to evaluate all those things. Let's allow some trust to the commonsense folks in the country that take care of our food and take care of the land and water every single day.

With that, I'd urge my colleagues to support this.

□ 1950

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, we have no other speakers.

In closing, I feel like we've defined what the need is. This will be very helpful to the Nation's producers, and it's a step in the right direction. So I will urge agreement and support of H.R. 3158. And thank you again for bringing this forth.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, again my thanks to the gentleman from Iowa and to those who spoke tonight. I just urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3158, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-644) on the resolution (H. Res. 752) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6233) to make supplemental agricultural disaster assistance available for fiscal year 2012 with the costs of such assistance offset by changes to certain conservation programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MARINE DEBRIS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2012

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1171) to reauthorize and amend the Marine Debris Research, Prevention, and Reduction Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1171

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Marine Debris Act Amendments of 2012".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment is expressed as an amendment to a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Marine Debris Research, Prevention, and Reduction Act (33 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.), as in effect immediately before the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. SHORT TITLE AMENDMENT.

Section 1 (33 U.S.C. 1951 note) is amended by striking "Research, Prevention, and Reduction".

SEC. 4. PURPOSE.

Section 2 (33 U.S.C. 1951) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

“The purpose of this Act is to address the adverse impacts of marine debris on the United States economy, the marine environment, and navigation safety through identification, determination of sources, assessment, prevention, reduction, and removal of marine debris.”

SEC. 5. NOAA MARINE DEBRIS PROGRAM.

(a) NAME OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 (33 U.S.C. 1952) is amended—

(A) in the section heading by striking “PREVENTION AND REMOVAL”; and

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “Prevention and Removal Program to reduce and prevent” and inserting “Program to identify, determine sources of, assess, prevent, reduce, and remove”; and

(ii) by inserting “the economy of the United States,” after “marine debris on”; and

(iii) by inserting a comma after “environment”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (7) of section 7 (33 U.S.C. 1956) is amended by striking “Prevention and Removal”.

(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—Section 3(b) (33 U.S.C. 1952(b)) is amended to read as follows: “(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—The Administrator, acting through the Program and subject to the availability of appropriations, shall—

“(1) identify, determine sources of, assess, prevent, reduce, and remove marine debris, with a focus on marine debris posing a threat to living marine resources and navigation safety;

“(2) provide national and regional coordination to assist States, Indian tribes, and regional organizations in identification, determination of sources, assessment, prevention, reduction, and removal of marine debris;

“(3) undertake efforts to reduce adverse impacts of lost and discarded fishing gear on living marine resources and navigation safety, including—

“(A) research and development of alternatives to gear posing threats to the marine environment, and methods for marking gear used in specific fisheries to enhance the tracking, recovery, and identification of lost and discarded gear; and

“(B) development of effective nonregulatory measures and incentives to cooperatively reduce the volume of lost and discarded fishing gear and to aid in its recovery; and

“(4) undertake outreach and education of the public and other stakeholders on sources of marine debris, threats associated with marine debris, and approaches to identify, determine sources of, assess, prevent, reduce, and remove marine debris and its adverse impacts on the United States economy, the marine environment, and navigational safety, including outreach and education activities through public-private initiatives.”

(c) REPEAL.—Section 2204 of the Marine Plastic Pollution Research and Control Act of 1987 and the item relating to that section in the table of contents contained in section 2 of the United States-Japan Fishery Agreement Approval Act of 1987 (33 U.S.C. 1915) are repealed.

(d) GRANT CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES.—Section 3(c) (33 U.S.C. 1952(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 2(1)” and inserting “section 2”;

(2) by repealing paragraph (5); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (5) and (6).

SEC. 6. REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISIONS.

Section 4 (33 U.S.C. 1953) is amended—

(1) by striking “(a) STRATEGY.—”; and

(2) by repealing subsections (b) and (c).

SEC. 7. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS.

(a) INTERAGENCY MARINE DEBRIS COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), section 2203 of the Marine Plastic Pollution Research and Control Act of 1987 (33 U.S.C. 1914) is redesignated and moved to replace and appear as section 5 of the Marine Debris Research, Prevention, and Reduction Act (33 U.S.C. 1954).

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 2203 in the table of contents contained in section 2 of the United States-Japan Fishery Agreement Approval Act of 1987 is repealed.

(b) BIENNIAL PROGRESS REPORTS.—Section 5(c)(2) (33 U.S.C. 1954(c)(2)), as in effect immediately before the enactment of this Act—

(1) is redesignated as subsection (e) of section 5, as redesignated and moved by the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section; and

(2) is amended—

(A) by striking “ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS.—” and all that follows through “thereafter” and inserting “BIENNIAL PROGRESS REPORTS.—Biennially”;

(B) by inserting “Natural” before “Resources”;

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (E) as paragraphs (1) through (5) of such subsection; and

(D) by moving such subsection 2 ems to the left.

SEC. 8. CONFIDENTIALITY OF SUBMITTED INFORMATION.

Section 6(2) (33 U.S.C. 1955(2)) is amended by striking “by the fishing industry”.

SEC. 9. MARINE DEBRIS DEFINITION.

Section 7 (33 U.S.C. 1956) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (9), and moving such paragraph to appear after paragraph (8); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) MARINE DEBRIS.—The term ‘marine debris’ means any persistent solid material that is manufactured or processed and directly or indirectly, and intentionally or unintentionally, disposed of or abandoned into the marine environment or the Great Lakes.”

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 9 (33 U.S.C. 1958) is amended—

(1) by striking “are” and inserting “is”;

(2) by striking “2006 through 2010” and all that follows through “(1)” and inserting “through fiscal year 2015”;

(3) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$4,900,000”; and

(4) by striking “; and” and all that follows through the end of paragraph (2) and inserting a period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1171.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1171, the Marine Debris Act Amendments of 2012, reauthorizes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s, NOAA, Marine Debris Program at currently appropriated levels through 2015. The program has played a crucial role in preventing and reducing the amount of trash on our beaches and in the ocean.

I think it’s important to note that this program is not regulatory in nature. It takes a voluntary approach to improving the conditions of our marine environment.

Failure to adequately address marine debris has major consequences on our economy. Large objects floating in our oceans threaten the safe navigation of cargo ships and recreational boaters. Derelict fishing gear costs commercial fishermen millions of dollars in lost revenue. And debris washing up on our shores forces the closing of beaches, a major blow to local economies reliant on tourism.

In Alaska, NOAA’s Marine Debris has worked with local partners to conduct more than 20 projects that have removed 750,000 pounds of debris from our shoreline since 2006. But the problem of marine debris is about to get worse for Alaska and other Pacific coast States. NOAA estimates there’s 1.5 million tons of debris headed our way as a result of the 2011 Japanese earthquake and the tsunami.

Alaskans are already finding Styrofoam, plastic, wood, and other lightweight debris washing up on our islands. In May, the Coast Guard was forced to sink an abandoned Japanese vessel laden with fuel oil before it broke open on the Southeast panhandle.

Reauthorization of the Marine Debris Program is critical to help Alaska and other coastal States protect our economies and ecosystems and ensure the safety of those transiting our waters.

I want to commend Representative SAM FARR from California for introducing this bill. As an original cosponsor of this important bipartisan effort, I urge all Members to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1171, bipartisan legislation that reauthorizes the Marine Debris Research Prevention and Reduction Act through fiscal year 2016.

Just this June, on the Pacific coast, an entire 70-foot dock washed up on the coast of Oregon. This is only one piece of the estimated 1.5 million tons of marine debris from the disastrous 2011 Japanese tsunami that will wash up on the west coast. Disasters like this are why it is so important that we reauthorize this legislation today.

Marine debris remains a persistent threat to maritime safety and to the health of our oceans and to our lakes.

Thanks to the enactment of the Marine Debris Research Prevention and Reduction Act in 2006, we now have a much better understanding of marine debris and its impact on our shorelines.

This law led to the establishment of effective partnerships between the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, and the United States Coast Guard. It has led to better coordinated research and debris removal activities, and it built greater understanding of the challenges we face in addressing this threat.

Marine debris is a much larger and growing problem than we first thought, and with the recent disaster in Japan, it will continue to grow. Cleaning up marine debris takes coordination between several agencies and States and requires expensive resources to clean up.

Earlier this week, NOAA provided a new analysis estimating that it now costs the agency, on average, more than \$4,300 to remove 1 ton of marine debris from the environment. NOAA also said that the dock that washed up on the shores of Oregon will cost \$85,000 alone.

Despite what we've learned, and despite the fact that States on the Pacific coast and Hawaii will have to contend with 1.5 million tons of marine debris from the 2011 Japanese tsunami for years to come, the majority has insisted on cutting authorized funding levels for this program in half. Cutting authorized funding for this program at this time seems shortsighted, and I'm confident that the Senate will insist on the higher authorized funding level in any final compromise bill.

But despite those reservations about the reduced funding levels in this bill as reported by the majority, it is imperative that we reauthorize the Marine Debris Act today to address this growing threat in our future.

I want to thank the sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), for his extraordinary leadership on this issue. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1171.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I truly appreciate the support we've seen in a bipartisan fashion here for this legislation known as the Marine Debris Act Amendments of 2012.

This bill was first carried and introduced in the United States Senate by Senator INOUE and the late Senator Ted Stevens. They recognized, Senator INOUE from Hawaii, the entire island surrounded by ocean, and so much washes up on the shores of the islands, and Alaska, with probably one of the longest coastlines in the United States, certainly impacts from the ocean on them. And that's why it's so nice and

wonderful to have my colleague DON YOUNG from Alaska, the only Representative in the House from Alaska, to be a strong proponent of this.

As he pointed out, Alaska has already seen the consequences of not having reauthorization when the Japanese tsunami has started to wash up. They've spent, in the first wave of the tsunami debris, Alaska's already spent over \$200,000 of State money in just aerial monitoring of the local debris from the Japanese tsunami.

What this legislation does in reauthorization is allow States to receive grants from NOAA so that the States can deal with their coastline debris problems.

□ 2000

It is important we do this for an even bigger purpose, which is that, frankly, life on land is dependent on the quality of life at sea. We know that we have over the years and decades been dumping everything we don't like on land—and can't figure out where else to dump it—into the ocean. At the same time, we take whatever we want out of the ocean. Dumping and taking can upset the system so badly that you have oceans die; and, certainly, we have big parts of the ocean that are dying because of all the debris and waste that are in the oceans.

What this bill does is allow the Coast Guard, in working with NOAA, which is the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to jointly look at, monitor and figure out ways to clean this stuff up. If we don't do that, we're going to suffer. It's like living in pollution in your own backyard. Eventually, there are consequences.

I think that those of us who have done ocean legislation over the years—and DON YOUNG has been one of the greater ones to understand it—realize that, in solving the problem, it's going to require local action and that it's going to require national and international coordination. It's not our ocean alone. It goes all over the world, and things in the ocean go all over the world. Just think of the old stories about bottles and where they wind up. Now we see with the tsunami that all this Japanese land mass stuff that was washed into the sea is now showing up in Alaska and is showing up in Oregon and has shown up on the beaches in California—in Capitola, where I live.

This problem is also going to require some partnerships between the private sector and the fishermen community, in that it knows where some of these drift nets are, and between the public sector. It's going to require innovative technology. You have to detect it. We have found nets that have been left in Monterey Bay that are too heavy to lift out with conventional craft. We're going to have to go back to the fishing boats and to the families who lost those nets and use their fishing boats, which is a private enterprise supported by the public know-how of how to retrieve those nets. I think it's very ex-

citing. It's certainly going to require education so that people don't keep dumping things they don't want into the ocean.

There are consequences for dumping. California is now addressing it in every local community by just storm water, the fact that all the water that falls on our streets and roads picks up oil and picks up other stuff that isn't compatible with ocean life and washes into it. We have done a lot to clean up sewers and to say we're not going to dump that stuff out into the ocean anymore, but we're still allowing other storm water to get out there. California is addressing this almost community by community, that being: How do we stop storm water and polluted storm water from getting into the ocean?

So this legislation of reauthorizing debris cleanup is much more than just giving NOAA some money to go out there and figure it out. It's really an entire program of figuring out how to keep oceans healthy.

I appreciate the bipartisan support. I appreciate the leadership of Mr. YOUNG, and I appreciate the leadership on the committees. This bill went to two committees—to the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and to the Natural Resources Committee. Both committees passed it out in bipartisan fashion, and now we have to pass it in the Senate. I hope it's not too late, and I hope Congressman YOUNG will work with me in getting bipartisan support in the Senate so that we can get this bill to the President and get it signed before the calendar year runs out.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from California. Mr. FARR has been one of the leaders who has been concerned with the oceans, and this debris bill is crucially important to the State of California and especially to Alaska. Mr. FARR came to me many months ago and said we've got to get this done. We've got to get this done. A lot of people weren't interested, and now we finally get to a point where we see what's occurring from the tsunami, although we may not have that recur again.

The crisis in the ocean, though, is detrimental, as I mentioned in my opening statement, to the fishermen whom I represent and to the recreational people whom I represent. So to get it out of the ocean even before it reaches the beaches is crucially important. The beaches sometimes are sort of fun to beachcomb, but if there is something bad that's in the ocean, we should try to retrieve it sooner, if possible; and when it gets there, we really want to be able to take care of it.

There should be more money—I won't disagree with the gentleman from Washington—but we're moving this down the road. We'll see what happens on the Senate side, and we'll see if we can't get a little more effort, because it's a partnership program that makes

this thing work. A lot of people have interest in Alaska and in trying to clean the beaches after it arrives, and we're trying to get more people interested in cleaning the ocean up before it does arrive. Hopefully, it will work together.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I have no more speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1171, the Marine Debris Act Amendments of 2012. I want to commend my colleague and friend Congressman SAM FARR from California for introducing this legislation and continually working for its passage.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, one of my top priorities was to take action on legislation to address our nation's ocean environment. I am pleased to say that this legislation, H.R. 1171, would continue to combat the adverse impacts of marine debris on the United States economy, the marine environment, and navigation safety through identification, determination of sources, assessment, prevention, reduction, and removal of marine debris.

This legislation will reauthorize NOAA's existing Marine Debris Program to support important projects throughout the country, including beach cleanups, derelict fishing gear location and removal, and educational campaigns. The program helps to identify, determine sources of, assess, prevent, reduce, and remove marine debris, with a focus on marine debris posing a threat to living marine resources and navigation safety. This reauthorizing language would serve to streamline these programs by avoiding any overlaps or conflicts with other federal agencies.

The legislation would help protect the environment and the economy of coastal communities throughout the Nation. Earlier this year, tsunami debris washed ashore the coasts of Oregon and Washington, calling attention to the need for a comprehensive plan to coordinate clean-up efforts. Indeed, the impacts of the March 2011 tsunami in Japan will continue to impact our shores over the coming months and years and this bill gives us the tools to respond to this situation. In particular, Guam would greatly benefit from the passage of the Marine Debris Act Amendments of 2012 as it would give states and local communities the additional tools needed to effectively care for our marine environments and wildlife.

Again, I applaud Representative FARR for introducing this legislation. I thank Chairman MICA, Chairman HASTINGS, Ranking Member RAHALL and Ranking Member MARKEY for their leadership in bringing this important bill which enhances our understanding of the marine environment to the House floor. I encourage my colleagues to continue supporting this important legislation that addresses one of the most serious threats to our oceans today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1171, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESPA HOME WARRANTY CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2011

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2446) to clarify the treatment of homeowner warranties under current law, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2446

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "RESPA Home Warranty Clarification Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF HOMEOWNER WARRANTIES.

Section 8 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2607) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) HOMEOWNER WARRANTIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section, section 2, or section 3 shall be deemed to include, or be deemed to have included, homeowner warranties or similar residential service contracts for the repair or replacement of home system components or home appliances.

"(2) NOTICE BY HOME WARRANTY COMPANY.—Any person that pays another person not employed by the person for selling, advertising, marketing, or processing, or performing an inspection in connection with, a homeowner warranty or similar residential service contract for the repair or replacement of home system components or home appliances shall include the following statement, in boldface type that is 10-point or larger, in any such warranty or contract offered or sold as an incident to or as part of any transaction involving the origination of a federally related mortgage loan:

"NOTICE: THIS COMPANY MAY PAY PERSONS NOT EMPLOYED BY THE COMPANY FOR SELLING, ADVERTISING, MARKETING, OR PROCESSING, OR PERFORMING AN INSPECTION IN CONNECTION WITH, A HOMEOWNER WARRANTY OR SIMILAR RESIDENTIAL SERVICE CONTRACT FOR REPAIRING OR REPLACING HOME SYSTEM COMPONENTS OR HOME APPLIANCES."

"(3) NOTICE BY REAL ESTATE AGENT OR BROKER.—Any person who has contracted to receive payment from a provider of the services described in paragraph (1) for recommending the purchase of a home warranty or similar residential service contract, and is not an employee of such provider, shall provide the potential purchaser, upon first recommending the purchase of a homeowner warranty or similar residential service contract, a written notice containing the following language in boldface type that is 10-point or larger (with the bracketed matter being replaced with the information described by such bracketed matter):

"NOTICE: THIS IS TO GIVE YOU NOTICE THAT [the provider of the notice] HAS RECEIVED OR WILL RECEIVE COMPENSATION FROM [the home warranty company] FOR [the residential service for which the notice provider is being compensated]. YOU ARE NOT REQUIRED TO PURCHASE A HOME WARRANTY OR A SIMILAR RESIDENTIAL SERVICE CONTRACT AND IF YOU CHOOSE TO PURCHASE SUCH COVERAGE YOU ARE FREE TO PURCHASE IT FROM ANOTHER PROVIDER."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 2446, the RESPA Home Warranty Clarification Act, and urge my colleagues to support the bill. H.R. 2446 is a bipartisan bill that Mr. CLAY of Missouri and I introduced last year. The bill has 40 cosponsors, including 13 Democrats and 27 Republicans, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) for managing this bill.

On March 27, the Financial Services Committee reported out the bill by voice vote. The RESPA Home Warranty Clarification Act would amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974, or RESPA, to clarify that, as long as a consumer or borrower receives specific disclosures about it, a fee paid to a real estate broker or agent related to the sale of a home warranty is not a RESPA violation.

When Congress passed RESPA in 1974, it intended for the law to provide consumers or borrowers with timely disclosures related to the cost of real estate settlement services. Title insurance, a flood elevation certificate and homeowners insurance are a few examples of services required at a mortgage settlement. Unlike these settlement services, a home warranty is not a required service. For a borrower or a consumer, the purchase of a home warranty is optional. It is a service contract under which a home warranty company provides repair or replacement coverage for a home's system components and/or appliances. A real estate broker or agent typically acts as a representative for the home warranty company that offers the home warranty, and the real estate broker or agent receives a commission from the home warranty company for presenting the home warranty to the home buyer if the homeowner chooses to purchase the warranty.

Congress originally delegated RESPA rulemaking and enforcement authority to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD. For nearly 20 years, from 1974 to 1992, HUD issued no rules or guidance related to the sale of a home warranty by a real estate broker or agent.

□ 2010

In 1992, HUD issued regulations adding homeowners warranties as a settlement service, but was silent on the matter until recent years. Citing evidence to demonstrate a problem with home warranty-related sale practices, commission arrangements, disclosures, or the product itself between 2008 and 2010, HUD issued an unofficial staff interpretive rule and the subsequent guidance. In short, after 34 years, with no apparent problem with a product that is not required for closing, HUD determined that, under RESPA, it is a violation for a real estate broker or an agent to be compensated by a home warranty company for offering a home warranty to a borrower in connection with the real estate transaction.

Mr. Speaker, HUD clearly is seeking to create a solution where there simply is no problem. HUD's unfounded interpretation doesn't follow the letter of the law as intended by Congress. According to witness testimony received by the Financial Services Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity, this misinterpretation of law has resulted in unnecessarily disrupting longstanding business practices that could increase the costs and decrease the availability of home warranties to consumers, as well as unintentionally harm small businesses. H.R. 2446 would clarify longstanding law and practice while restoring certainty related to home warranties in the real estate marketplace.

I'd like to thank my colleague, Mr. CLAY, for working with me on this bill, and I'd like to thank the gentleman from Georgia for managing this bill. I'd also like to thank the bill's 40 bipartisan cosponsors from across the country.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2446, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2446, the RESPA Home Warranty Clarification Act.

Before I explain exactly why this legislation is so important and vital, let me first take a moment to thank my friend and colleague, and my fellow Financial Services Committee member and the sponsor of this legislation, Mrs. BIGGERT, for her hard work on this bill. The fact that this bill passed both subcommittee and full committee by voice vote is a testament to not only the issue's importance, but also to Mrs. BIGGERT's dedication and openness in alleviating Members' concerns.

Regarding the bill, itself, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will help small businesses. It will help real estate professionals. Most importantly, it will help homeowners by clarifying the law on the sale of home warranties.

Congress enacted legislation many years ago to outlaw kickbacks paid in connection with services that must be performed to close a federally-related mortgage loan. An interpretive rule released by the Department of Housing and Urban Development has, unfortunately, created uncertainty about application of the law to home warranties which are not necessary to close a loan to purchase a home. To eliminate confusion and reduce uncertainty, our bill makes clear that the term "settlement services" does not include home warranties.

This legislation also provides new notice requirements applicable to home service contract companies and to real estate professionals so that prospective purchasers of home warranties are aware that a payment may have been made in connection with the selling, advertising, marketing, processing, or

performing an inspection in connection with the home warranty.

This simple clarification will allow members of the home warranty industry to pay modest sums to real estate professionals for direct marketing and related services in connection with the sale of a home warranty without a risk of running afoul of a law Congress never intended to be applicable for a completely optional product.

This is the simplification of this law that is very important. It's very simple, but it's very important so that our real estate industry and home mortgage industry can move more smoothly.

Please join me in voting for this commonsense legislation that will benefit consumers and the small businesses that repair and replace home systems covered by home warranties.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time if the gentleman is ready to close.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Likewise, I'm ready to close.

I just want to say in closing that, again, Mrs. BIGGERT has done a wonderful job on this, Mr. Speaker, and should be commended for it. This is a very important and simple piece of legislation, but it will help to iron out and smooth out confusion and allow for our real estate and our housing and our home mortgage industry to move more smoothly. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2446, "The RESPA Home Warranty Clarification Act." The Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974, or RESPA, was crafted by Congress to only cover those services necessary for closing the transaction of buying a home. A recent interpretive rule issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development broke this precedent by bringing home warranties under RESPA. This bipartisan act clarifies that home warranties fall outside the scope of RESPA because they are unnecessary for closing.

This bill was passed out of the Financial Services Committee on voice vote, and I am proud that the Committee also passed an amendment that I offered, which adds even more transparency to the bill.

This amended bill would require the real estate broker who recommends the purchase of a home warranty to a homebuyer to disclose that he or she may receive compensation for the recommendation; that the homebuyer is not required to purchase a home warranty contract; and that the homebuyer can purchase a home warranty contract from a provider not recommended by the real estate broker.

This is essential information for the homebuyer to make an informed choice when deciding whether to purchase a home warranty and I am proud to have added this disclosure

requirement to H.R. 2446. This bill makes clear that the term "settlement service" in RESPA does not include home warranties, something Congress never intended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2446, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR USE OF NATIONAL INFANTRY MUSEUM AND SOLDIER CENTER COMMEMORATIVE COIN SURCHARGES

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3363) to provide for the use of National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center Commemorative Coin surcharges, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3363

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

SECTION 1. NATIONAL INFANTRY MUSEUM AND SOLDIER CENTER COMMEMORATIVE COIN SURCHARGES.

Section 6(b) of the National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center Commemorative Coin Act (Public Law 110-357, 122 Stat. 3999) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "and for the retirement of debt associated with building the existing National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center".

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

MARCH OF DIMES COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT OF 2011

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3187) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the March of Dimes Foundation, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3187

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "March of Dimes Commemorative Coin Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) President Franklin Roosevelt's personal struggle with polio led him to create the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis

(now known as the March of Dimes) on January 3, 1938, at a time when polio was on the rise.

(2) The Foundation established patient aid programs and funded research for polio vaccines developed by Jonas Salk, MD, and Albert Sabin, MD.

(3) Tested in a massive field trial in 1954 that involved 1.8 million schoolchildren known as “polio pioneers”, the Salk vaccine was licensed for use on April 12, 1955 as “safe, effective, and potent”. The Salk and Sabin polio vaccines funded by the March of Dimes ended the polio epidemic in the United States.

(4) With its original mission accomplished, the Foundation turned its focus to preventing birth defects, prematurity, and infant mortality in 1958. The Foundation began to fund research into the genetic, prenatal, and environmental causes of over 3,000 birth defects.

(5) The Foundation’s investment in research has led to 13 scientists winning the Nobel Prize since 1954, including Dr. James Watson’s discovery of the double helix.

(6) Virginia Apgar, MD, creator of the Apgar Score, helped develop the Foundation’s mission for birth defects prevention; joining the Foundation as the head of its new birth defects division in 1959.

(7) In the 1960s, the Foundation created over 100 birth defects treatment centers, and then turned its attention to assisting in the development of Neonatal Intensive Care Units, or NICUs.

(8) With March of Dimes support, a Committee on Perinatal Health released *Toward Improving the Outcome of Pregnancy* in 1976, which included recommendations that led to the regionalization of perinatal health care in the United States.

(9) Since 1998, the March of Dimes has advocated for and witnessed the passage of the Birth Defects Prevention Act, Children’s Health Act, PREEMIE Act, and Newborn Screening Save Lives Act.

(10) In 2003, the March of Dimes launched a Prematurity Campaign to increase awareness about and reduce the incidence of preterm birth, infant mortality, birth defects, and lifelong disabilities and disorders.

(11) The March of Dimes actively promotes programs for and funds research into newborn screening, pulmonary surfactant therapy, maternal nutrition, smoking cessation, folic acid consumption to prevent neural tube defects, increased access to maternity care, and similar programs to improve maternal and infant health.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) **\$1 SILVER COINS.**—In recognition and celebration of the founding and proud service of the March of Dimes, the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the “Secretary”) shall mint and issue not more than 500,000 \$1 coins, which shall—

- (1) weigh 26.73 grams;
- (2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and
- (3) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(b) **LEGAL TENDER.**—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) **NUMISMATIC ITEMS.**—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) **DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the mission and programs of the March of Dimes, and its distinguished record of generating Americans’ support to protect our children’s health.

(2) **DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.**—On each coin minted under this Act, there shall be—

- (A) a designation of the value of the coin;
- (B) an inscription of the year “2015”; and
- (C) inscriptions of the words “Liberty”, “In God We Trust”, “United States of America”, and “E Pluribus Unum”.

(b) **SELECTION.**—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall—

(1) contain motifs that represent the past, present, and future of the March of Dimes and its role as champion for all babies, such designs to be consistent with the traditions and heritage of the March of Dimes;

(2) be selected by the Secretary, after consultation with the March of Dimes and the Commission of Fine Arts; and

(3) be reviewed by the Citizens Coin Advisory Committee.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE.

(a) **QUALITY OF COINS.**—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) **MINT FACILITY.**—For the coins minted under this Act, at least 1 facility of the United States Mint shall be used to strike proof quality coins, while at least 1 other such facility shall be used to strike the uncirculated quality coins.

(c) **PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.**—The Secretary of the Treasury may issue coins minted under this Act only during the 1-year period beginning on January 1, 2015.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) **SALE PRICE.**—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

- (1) the face value of the coins;
- (2) the surcharge provided in section 7(a) with respect to such coins; and

(3) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) **BULK SALES.**—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) **PREPAID ORDERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) **DISCOUNT.**—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—All sales of coins minted under this Act shall include a surcharge of \$10 per coin.

(b) **DISTRIBUTION.**—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the March of Dimes to help finance research, education, and services aimed at improving the health of women, infants, and children.

(c) **AUDITS.**—The March of Dimes shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, with regard to the amounts received under subsection (b).

(d) **LIMITATION.**—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code. The Secretary may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the United States Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, shall be disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 9. BUDGET COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous materials on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3187, the March of Dimes Commemorative Coin Act of 2011. I’m proud to have introduced this bill and to have worked closely with my friend and colleague from New York, Congresswoman NITA LOWEY.

This legislation authorizes the minting and issue in 2015 of a commemorative coin honoring the 75th anniversary of the March of Dimes and recognizes their landmark accomplishments in maternal and child health. Surcharges on the sales of these special coins will fund critical research and programs to support healthy mothers, healthy infants, and healthy families nationwide.

□ 2020

Mr. Speaker, it’s summertime across our Nation, and back home in our districts, children are playing outside with friends or are going swimming at the pool. But more than 75 years ago, children stayed indoors during the summer. Their parents wouldn’t let them go to the park or to the pool because of outbreaks of polio. Polio back then could strike any child, and no one knew what the cause was.

The March of Dimes is a nonprofit organization that was founded in 1938 by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, with a mission to eradicate polio. In FDR’s day, polio was an epidemic disease that paralyzed or killed up to

52,000 Americans, mostly children, every year. Even the President had polio.

So during the Great Depression, citizens sent dimes—4 billion of them—to the White House to fund polio research. That effort funded the research by Doctors Salk and Sabin that produced the vaccines that have eradicated polio in the United States and in much of the world.

In the quest for a vaccine, the March of Dimes supported many other research milestones in newborn and child health. For example, in 1953, Francis Crick and March of Dimes grantee Dr. James D. Watson identified the double helix structure of DNA and, in 1962, won the Nobel Prize for mapping the human genome.

Another research breakthrough came in the 1960s when the March of Dimes supported research that developed the first screening test for PKU, a rare metabolic genetic disorder that causes intellectual disabilities. Since that time, the March of Dimes has led the effort to expand newborn screening. Now every baby born in the United States receives screening for dozens of conditions that have the potential to cause catastrophic health problems or death if not detected or treated promptly at birth.

Today the March of Dimes is leading the national effort to reduce premature birth. Every year, nearly 500,000 infants are born far too soon. In my home State of Illinois, almost 13 percent of all infants are born prematurely. Preterm birth is the leading cause of death among newborns. Many of those who survive face a lifetime of serious health problems, including cerebral palsy, intellectual disabilities, chronic lung disease, and vision and hearing loss. Preterm delivery can happen to any pregnant woman, and in nearly half of the cases, no one knows why.

The March of Dimes National Prematurity Campaign funds a robust portfolio of research and education programs designed to unveil the causes and address the risk factors of preterm birth. For example, the March of Dimes is working with hospitals to implement best practices that discourage early elective deliveries before 39 completed weeks of pregnancy. Thanks to the dedication of the March of Dimes and others, the United States has seen a decline in the prematurity rate for 4 consecutive years.

Mr. Speaker, the March of Dimes has an extraordinary history of achievement. More than 4 million infants are born every year in the United States, and the March of Dimes helps each and every one through research, education, vaccines, and breakthroughs. The commemorative coin will help fund these vitally important activities.

H.R. 3187 has broad bipartisan support in both Chambers of the Congress, with 304 cosponsors here in the House and 68 in the United States Senate. This legislation complies with all statutory requirements for the commemo-

rative coin program, and the coins will be produced at no cost to the American taxpayer. To claim the surcharges, the March of Dimes will raise matching funds from private sources.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have sponsored this bipartisan bill, and I would like to thank the Congresswoman from New York, Representative LOWEY, for her steadfast leadership and hard work to see this day become a reality. I would also like to thank Chairman SPENCER BACHUS and Ranking Member BARNEY FRANK for helping to get this bill to the floor today. I also want to thank my friend from Georgia, for him managing time on the other side today and for his leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, for 75 years, the March of Dimes has dedicated itself to helping all infants get a healthy start in life, which is what I think is very, very important. I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 3187, the March of Dimes Commemorative Coin Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to lend my support to this extraordinary and wonderful piece of legislation, an expression of strong bipartisan support.

I certainly want to thank my friend, Congressman DOLD from Illinois, for his leadership on this. It's a pleasure to join with him on the floor today to manage time on this bill.

This bill, H.R. 3187, as was pointed out, is the March of Dimes Commemorative Coin Act. For 75 years now, the March of Dimes organization has worked to prevent infant mortality, premature births, and birth defects in our children in the United States and in other parts of the world. And I can think of no better time and place to honor this wonderful organization than right here and right now in the Halls of Congress.

This organization was originally founded by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt to help treat and prevent polio. The March of Dimes would meet with tremendous success and, through their funding of the work of Dr. Jonas Salk, would contribute greatly to curing that disease.

Having accomplished their original goal, the March of Dimes would turn their attention to promoting healthy women, healthy pregnancies, and healthy babies. The March of Dimes Foundation works not only here in the United States in local communities around the country but, as I mentioned, also around the world to educate and inform women, doctors, and policymakers on the prevention of birth defects and premature birth. This work is so vital, so very important, and really so very precious, Mr. Speaker. And a healthy pregnancy and a healthy birth can mean so much and start the child off on the right foot that will last the rest of their entire life.

This bill is simple, Mr. Speaker. It would allow for the minting, the mak-

ing of a commemorative coin, which basically will be a silver \$1 coin, for this wonderful organization. These coins would then be sold to the general public with a portion going to pay off the cost of minting the coin, but the rest going to support the very, very important work of this foundation.

So I ask, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues join me in voting in favor of this bill, and in so doing, we'll be sending a big thank-you to the March of Dimes for their hard work and for their dedication over the last 75 years.

Mr. Speaker, I will also mention the fact that we support them each year in our special cooking and preparation for their major fundraiser that many Members of Congress and our families and our wives take part in. What an extraordinary organization doing an extraordinary thing for those who are most precious to us, that is, the children of the United States of America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, before I yield, I do want to just thank my good friend from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) for his leadership and support of the March of Dimes.

He talked a little bit about the recent fundraiser that the March of Dimes held, where Members of Congress actually were cooking for this fundraiser. What he failed to mention was that I believe Mr. SCOTT—and Mrs. Scott, for that matter—actually won the cooking contest. So thank you again. It was one of the few places I know we went back for seconds. I really appreciate that.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding, and I commend him for his hard work on this important bill.

I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 3187, the March of Dimes Commemorative Coin Act of 2011.

This legislation recognizes the tremendous achievements of the March of Dimes in protecting the health of infants and mothers across the United States.

Founded by President Franklin Roosevelt, as was noted, in 1938, the March of Dimes was instrumental in eradicating polio. The organization then turned its sights on birth defects, premature birth, and infant mortality.

For decades, the March of Dimes has been on the forefront of medical research. It educates parents and medical professionals about healthy pregnancies and has helped significantly expand access to neonatal intensive care for premature and sick infants.

□ 2030

H.R. 3187 recognizes the accomplishments of this great American success story of goodwill and public service, and it celebrates the 75th anniversary

of the March of Dimes through a commemorative coin.

I'm pleased to have been an original cosponsor of this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to join us in paying a fitting tribute to an organization known as the "champion for all babies."

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, so I will just close my remarks.

Again, it is a pleasure working with you on this bill, Mr. DOLD. And what a noble occasion this is for such a worthy cause.

Thank you for mentioning about my wife. I give all credit to my wife for that cooking she did. I think it was shrimp and grits and let's see, and gumbo, her mother's gumbo, and it won first prize at that event. It is such a wonderful occasion, and to have all Members of Congress who participate with this fund-raising effort every year is just wonderful. I just urge a unanimous vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to again commend my colleague. This is a bipartisan bill, broad bipartisan support, talking about the Commemorative Coin Act for the March of Dimes, truly a wonderful organization that really helps protect our nearest and dearest, our children. I just want to thank my colleagues for their leadership and support, and urge swift passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2012.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BACHUS: I am writing concerning H.R. 3187, the "March of Dimes Commemorative Coin Act of 2011," which is scheduled for floor action the week of July 30, 2012.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means maintains jurisdiction over matters that concern raising revenue. H.R. 3187 contains a provision that establishes a surcharge for the sale of commemorative coins that are minted under the bill, and this falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

However, as part of our ongoing understanding regarding commemorative coin bills and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation in the future.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3187, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2012.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Longworth House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: I am writing in response to your letter regarding H.R. 3187, March of Dimes Commemorative Coin Act of 2011, which is scheduled for Floor consideration under suspension of the rules on Wednesday, August 1, 2012.

I wish to confirm our mutual understanding on this bill. As you know, section 7 of the bill establishes a surcharge for the sale of commemorative coins that are minted under the bill. I acknowledge your committee's jurisdictional interest in such surcharges as revenue matters and appreciate your willingness to forego action by the Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 3187 in order to allow the bill to come to the Floor expeditiously. Also, I agree that your decision to forego further action on this bill will not prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation. Therefore, I would support your request for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction should this bill be the subject of a House-Senate conference.

I will include this exchange of letters in the Congressional Record when this bill is considered by the House. Thank you again for your assistance and if you should need anything further, please do not hesitate to contact Natalie McGarry of my staff at 202-225-7502.

Sincerely,

SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROOKS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3187, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRO FOOTBALL HALL OF FAME COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4104) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4104

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pro Football Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Pro Football Hall of Fame's mission is—

(A) to honor individuals who have made outstanding contributions to professional football;

(B) to preserve professional football's historic documents and artifacts;

(C) to educate the public regarding the origin, development, and growth of professional

football as an important part of American culture; and

(D) to promote the positive values of the sport.

(2) The Pro Football Hall of Fame opened its doors on September 7, 1963. On that day a charter class of 17 players, coaches, and contributors were enshrined. Among the group were such legends as Sammy Baugh, Red Grange, George Halas, Don Hutson, Bronko Nagurski, and Jim Thorpe. Through 2012, there are 273 members who have been elected to the Pro Football Hall of Fame. Three distinct iconic symbols represent an individual's membership in the Hall of Fame: a bronze bust, a Hall of Fame gold jacket, and a Hall of Fame ring.

(3) The Pro Football Hall of Fame has welcomed nearly 9 million visitors from around the world since opening in 1963. The museum has grown from its original 19,000-square-foot building to an 118,000-square-foot, state-of-the-art facility as result of expansions in 1971, 1978, 1995, and most recently in 2011–2013. In addition, major exhibit renovations have been completed in 2003, 2008, and 2009.

(4) The Pro Football Hall of Fame houses the world's largest collection on professional football. Included in the museum's vast collection are more than 20,000 three-dimensional artifacts and more than 20 million pages of documents including nearly 3,000,000 photographic images.

(5) The Pro Football Hall of Fame reaches a world-wide audience of nearly 15,000,000 people annually through visitors to the museum, participants in the annual Pro Football Hall of Fame Enshrinement Festival, three nationally televised events, the Hall of Fame's Web site, social media outlets, special events across the country, and through the museum's Educational Outreach videoconferencing programs.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall mint and issue the following coins:

(1) \$5 GOLD COINS.—Not more than 50,000 \$5 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 8.359 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(2) \$1 SILVER COINS.—Not more than 400,000 \$1 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 26.73 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(3) HALF-DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—Not more than 750,000 half-dollar coins which shall—

(A) weigh 11.34 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and

(C) be minted to the specifications for half-dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(b) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the game of professional football.

(2) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—

(A) a designation of the value of the coin;

(B) an inscription of the year "2016"; and

(C) inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(b) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts and the Pro Football Hall of Fame; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) MINT FACILITY.—Only 1 facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins minted under this Act only during the 1-year period beginning on January 1, 2016.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins;

(2) the surcharge provided in section 7(a) with respect to such coins; and

(3) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge of—

(1) \$35 per coin for the \$5 coin;

(2) \$10 per coin for the \$1 coin; and

(3) \$5 per coin for the half-dollar coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f)(1) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the Pro Football Hall of Fame, to help finance the construction of a new building and renovation of existing Pro Football Hall of Fame facilities.

(c) AUDITS.—The Pro Football Hall of Fame shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, with regard to the amounts received under subsection (b).

(d) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the United States Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, shall be disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses,

marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 9. BUDGET COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge approval of H.R. 4104, the Pro Football Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act. Since being introduced on February 28, 2012, we have gathered 294 cosponsors.

I would like to give a special thanks to Representatives STIVERS and SHULER for helping me collect such a large and bipartisan group of cosponsors. I would also like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the House Financial Services Committee, Representative BACHUS and Representative FRANK, for their support.

The bill before us celebrates the 50th anniversary of the Pro Football Hall of Fame, the pride of Canton, Ohio. The Hall opened its doors on September 7, 1963. Six legends were enshrined that day: Sammy Baugh, Red Grange, George Halas, Don Hutson, Bronko Nagurski, and Jim Thorpe. These titans were the first of the 273 men who are now enshrined in the Hall of Fame. And I must add that 23 of those members are from Ohio.

Americans from all walks of life have enjoyed the game of football for decades, and the Pro Football Hall of Fame ensures the achievements of the gridiron's greatest will be remembered and preserved for generations of future fans.

Since its opening almost 50 years ago, the Pro Football Hall of Fame has attracted more than 9 million visitors to Ohio from across the world. Through its media and Internet outreach, nearly 15 million more participate in Hall-related activities.

The Pro Football Hall of Fame's efforts go beyond preserving the history of the gridiron. Two of the Hall's core

missions are educating youth and promoting positive values.

A few highlight programs exemplify its missions: Camps for Kids, designed to promote good nutrition and physical fitness; the Hall's Black History Month program, which details the African American experience in professional football; the Hall of Fame Reader, a kindergarten through 12th grade summer literacy program; and teacher workshops for graduate and continuing education studies.

These educational programs are designed to strengthen core curriculum knowledge and skills across key learning areas: the arts, geography, health, history, language arts, math, and science.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation recognizes and celebrates the accomplishments of our sports heroes, but it also will help support those exceptional philanthropic efforts. Each coin will be sold for an amount that recovers all real and imputed cost plus a surcharge, so there is absolutely no cost to the taxpayer. Once the Hall raises matching funds from the private sector, it may claim the surcharges that will be available to help finance the expansion and renovation of its facilities and carry out its mission.

We are now at the goal line and prepared to put this legislation into the end zone. I urge all Members to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the sponsors of this bill. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for sponsoring this bill and bringing this bill to the floor.

Indeed, the Pro Football Hall of Fame is the pride of Canton, Ohio. It is also the apple of the eye of all Americans.

When we think of the National Football League, we immediately think of the grand names in football history. The gentleman from Ohio named the initial inductees. Initially coming into my mind are individuals such as Jim Brown or Jerry Rice or Johnny Unitas or Joe Montana, Walter Payton. These are household names that are housed now forevermore in the Hall of Fame and the National Football League.

But we forget that the National Football League and the Hall of Fame says: We're giving back. We're not going to just be involved in keeping the fame and the records of the NFL. We understand that we are an American sport, and so we're going to give back to the American people. Especially our young people, our children who, like me, growing up, idolized many of the players that are now in the Hall of Fame.

So what the Hall of Fame does is to make sure that it gets involved in programs that the gentleman from Ohio just talked about, Camps for Kids, to help promote nutrition and physical fitness.

We often hear in this society that we're talking about, people are too obese. Well, the NFL recognizes that, and the NFL Hall of Fame, the Pro Football Hall of Fame, as a result, makes sure there are programs promoting good nutrition, eating good foods, exercise.

Particularly it has been very important to me when I look at the Hall of Fame's Black History Month program, which details the African American experience. I can recall growing up with my father talking about Marion Motley with the Cleveland Browns at the time and the history that he played in helping and promoting others. And this gives us all-around history about every American.

Kindergarten through 12th graders, a literacy program. We talk about the need to make sure that our young people are able to compete. You can't compete if you're not literate. The Pro Football Hall of Fame makes sure that every child that it can touch will also be a reader.

We want to be competitive in health and history and language and arts and math and science. The Pro Football Hall of Fame has a program that it takes throughout America to help make that happen.

And so this Commemorative Coin Act will help them, at no cost to the taxpayers, run these programs and preserve its facilities so that it can continue to build a legacy of a strong American game, but of also making sure that all of America's children and all of America's people have an opportunity to grow up, to be literate, to be healthy, and to be competitive globally with anyone.

□ 2040

So indeed, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "aye" for the Pro Football Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his inspiring comments.

I would agree that the Pro Football Hall of Fame is a great asset not only to the city of Canton, the State of Ohio, and America, and the accomplishments that it provides other than just enshrining inductees are a great asset to this hall.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 4104, and I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2012.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BACHUS: I am writing concerning H.R. 4104, the "Pro Football Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act," which is scheduled for floor action the week of July 30, 2012.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means maintains jurisdiction over matters that concern raising revenue. H.R. 4104 contains a provision that establishes a surcharge for the sale of commemorative coins that are minted under the bill, and this falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

However, as part of our ongoing understanding regarding commemorative coin bills and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation in the future.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4104, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2012.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: I am writing in response to your letter regarding H.R. 4104, Pro Football Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act, which is scheduled for floor consideration under suspension of the rules on Wednesday, August 1, 2012.

I wish to confirm our mutual understanding on this bill. As you know, section 7 of the bill establishes a surcharge for the sale of commemorative coins that are minted under the bill. I acknowledge your committee's jurisdictional interest in such surcharges as revenue matters and appreciate your willingness to forego action by the Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 4104 in order to allow the bill to come to the Floor expeditiously. Also, I agree that your decision to forego further action on this bill will not prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation. Therefore, I would support your request for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction should this bill be the subject of a House-Senate conference.

I will include this exchange of letters in the Congressional Record when this bill is considered by the House. Thank you again for your assistance and if you should need anything further, please do not hesitate to contact Natalie McGarry of my staff at 202-225-7502.

Sincerely,

SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4104, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, procedures

will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER FOR THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 3706) to create the Office of Chief Financial Officer of the Government of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LA PINE LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (S. 270) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Deschutes County, Oregon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALLOWA FOREST SERVICE COMPOUND CONVEYANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (S. 271) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a property conveyance with the city of Wallowa, Oregon, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADAM WALSH REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the

bill (H.R. 3796) to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECODIFICATION OF EXISTING LAWS RELATED TO NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 1950) to enact title 54, United States Code, "National Park System", as positive law, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDENT VISA REFORM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 3120) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require accreditation of certain educational institutions for purposes of a non-immigrant student visa, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN AND ECONOMIC ESPIONAGE PENALTY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 6029) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for increased penalties for foreign and economic espionage, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 6063) to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to child pornography and child exploitation offenses.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOPPING TAX OFFENDERS AND PROSECUTING IDENTITY THEFT ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 4362) to provide effective criminal prosecutions for certain identity thefts, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 6062) to reauthorize the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program through fiscal year 2017.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2050

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL AND RESOURCES ALLOCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 1550) to establish programs in the Department of Justice and in the Department of Homeland Security to help States that have high rates of homicide and other violent crime, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Attorney General to give priority in the allocation of Federal law enforcement personnel and resources to States and local jurisdictions that have a high incidence of homicide or other violent crime."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) is recognized for 35 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, you know, they say that he who pays the piper plays the tune; but unfortunately in today's campaign finance system, it's just like one Johnny One Note, and it's about millionaires and billionaires.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to speak on an important issue. The fact is that our democracy is for sale to the highest bidder. Super PACs, millionaires and billionaires are taking over our election. They're doing what ordinary individuals don't have any capacity to do, and the impact on policymaking and on elections is debilitating. It makes voiceless the very people, Mr. Speaker, who most need a voice in these very troubling times. Our seniors, young people, poor people, working people, women, middle-income families, and small business owners, all of them have just been shut down because of this system. But it's worse now than it was even in the dark days of Watergate.

Now, before coming to Congress, Mr. Speaker, I spent nearly 15 years of my career actually working on issues related to campaign finance reform, election law, voting rights, and government ethics, from my time as a lawyer

to my service as executive director of several nonprofit organizations; and I just can't think of a worse time than this time that we're living in now.

The complexity of balancing important constitutional considerations is really important, but appropriate public policy is also important; and we're just not striking that balance. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you think about it, in the days following Watergate and the reforms that came thereafter, much of the way that we thought about our campaign finance system and that we thought about the role of money in politics and its relation to policymaking was almost completely circumscribed by pretty much one decision and a couple of others, the *Buckley v. Valeo* decision and all the cases that followed.

During that time, we could not have imagined a more desolate campaign finance landscape, in fact, than the one we have here today, Mr. Speaker. Here we are facing the Supreme Court's 2010 decision in *Citizens United v. The Federal Election Commission*. Now, you would think that a lot of people would not really be familiar with any one Supreme Court decision, but in fact all across this country people are outraged by that decision because it has been devastating to the political system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my congressional district is in the metropolitan Washington area, in the Maryland suburbs, and so we get the benefit in this area of hearing advertising that comes on television from Virginia. Now, Virginia is a battleground State in the Presidential elections, and so that means that we get to experience in Maryland, where we wouldn't ordinarily, all of the election advertising. What we see is ad after ad. And you can't even read the small print on the ad. You don't know who's paying for it. You don't know where it's coming from. You don't know what's behind it because none of that is disclosed. You hear hammering one candidate or hammering another candidate.

And so here you sit, as an ordinary person at home just wanting to get up and take care of your family and make sure that your kids are okay, and this political system has gone amuck and awash in campaign dollars, money coming from all sorts of sources.

But what *Citizens United* did was it upended the role of the people in the process and took away our voice in the face of unlimited, undisclosed sources of money that did not, in the past, have a place in the campaign finance mix. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this can't continue. We can't allow it to go unchecked. It's just been too debilitating to people at home. It has an impact all across the board on participation, on whether people feel that they have a voice in policymaking, on the candidates who choose to run for elected office or not. I can understand why the American people feel like, you know what, I just want to shut down because the system simply isn't working for me.

So here we are, Mr. Speaker, and I'm glad to have this opportunity to say a few words this evening because we're 97 calendar days away from the November 2012 election, but we're 16 legislative days away. That means that Congress—every elected Member of the House and the Senate—has 16 legislative days, 16 days of opportunity to restore sanity to the campaign finance system, to let the people know that we actually care about whether their voice is important, versus the voices of the millionaires and the billionaires who get to set the agenda. Sixteen days. There's a lot that you can do in 16 days—or you can do nothing. That's the choice that we have today.

So there can't be any doubt that in fact we've entered a really unprecedented era in our political system, where super PACs rule. I didn't even know what a super PAC was, most Americans probably didn't, but we sure do now, where one person, one vote has been more appropriate for a history lesson than a description of the electoral process.

How did we get to this framework that allows a free rein to outside organizations, to corporations and their treasuries, to the wealthy, allowing them to raise unlimited amounts of cash to influence American elections? The question really is that we got here because of *Citizens United*.

So, 2 years ago, the Supreme Court, in a 5-4 ruling, said, you know what, we're going to invalidate everything we've known about the campaign finance system; the Federal Election Campaign Act—which has been rendered pretty much useless; the bipartisan—and I'll repeat that, bipartisan, Mr. Speaker, Campaign Reform Act that was a way that Republicans and Democrats came together for things like disclosure and limiting contributions and circumscribing the role of money in politics, and in a 5-4 decision, the United States Supreme Court threw it all out. In doing so, what the Court did was it struck down long-time prohibitions against corporate use of general treasury funds for independent expenditures and for communicating in elections.

Now, what the American people need to understand, Mr. Speaker, is that means that no matter what corporation you are, maybe you represent insurance companies or the financial sector or the energy sector or any number of sectors that certainly hire a lot of employees, and they have shareholders, but what the Supreme Court said is we're going to reach into the corporate piggy bank and we're going to allow corporations—for the first time ever, really, in our modern-day politics—to spend their money directly on campaigns.

Now, Mr. Speaker, corporations have name-brand identity, so they don't do this willy-nilly. So what do they do? They pass it through an organization that's a shadow organization so we don't know where that money is com-

ing in directly until after the fact. Maybe we see three-point type on a television screen that flashes right by, Mr. Speaker; but the fact is the American public doesn't know.

□ 2100

Now, there had been long-settled cases in this country that said that corporations actually didn't have the ability to spend out of their corporate treasuries when corporations are formed for all kinds of reasons, but not really to spend out of their treasuries like people, real people can and should in the political process. But *Citizens United* changed all of that.

Then came another case. Now keep in mind, this is just in the last 2 years that our system has been completely upended. Then came another case called *speechnow.org v. the Federal Election Commission*. And what the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia decided was that contributions to political action committees that only make supposed independent expenditures can't be limited. That's right: unlimited contributions from political action committees. These have come to be known as super PACs.

And why are they so super? Because it's unlimited money, and it's just gushing into the political system. In States all across the country that are the favored battleground States, people in those States, and States like North Carolina and Virginia and Ohio and other States, can actually see that money firsthand because it's just being spent like crazy.

And you know what? With 97 days, Mr. Speaker, left until the election, there will be more.

In fact, I think that the American people will be so sick and tired of the advertising and not knowing who's behind it and the cross-messaging and things that may or may not be true, but you have no way of checking it, the American people are going to be so sick and so outraged that they will continue to demand, as they have been, that we return some sanity to the system.

These court decisions, of course, have said that corporations have equal rights to those of an individual. Can you imagine that your local corporation that does a great job of hiring people in your community is on par with an individual when it comes to making a political contribution? But that is, in effect, the land that we live in right now.

The result has been a stunning influx of money that threatens to erode our democratic process and leads us to even lower voter participation rates. The danger of *Citizens United* and the cases that followed was actually heralded by Justice Stevens in his dissenting opinion in the case. And he couldn't have been more prescient. Here's what he said. He warned that it would “undermine the integrity of elected institutions around the Nation.”

Well, you don't have to look very far, Mr. Speaker, to know that the American people understand and believe that our institution is about as low as you can go. I mean, all of us have seen the numbers; and it can't be separated, the way that the American people feel about our elected officials, feel about our elected institutions, feel about the ability of our institutions to respond to their everyday needs. We must know that that is deeply connected to the role, the perverse role of money and politics.

I don't have to tell the American people. Mr. Speaker, you don't have to tell the American people because they know. They know in their gut that it's actually wrong for corporations to reach in their treasuries and spend on campaigns. They know in their gut that it's wrong for a handful of millionaires and billionaires to control the agenda, to control the policy, to control the message. They know it's wrong.

Now, Justice Kennedy, in his majority opinion—and, remember, the majority won in *Citizens United*—stated that “independent expenditures simply do not give rise to corruption or the appearance of corruption.”

Clearly, the Justice has not really participated in politics because you don't have to look very far to know that, in fact, the corruption is actually rampant. Now, there is the appearance of corruption, maybe not out right. Nobody's buying or selling a vote. That's not the point.

But the point is that it appears to be just really dirty. Most people look at our politics, they look at the nastiness, and you know what, Mr. Speaker? They just want to wash their hands.

Now, it's possible that this flow of super PACS into elections would allow for independent expenditures; but the fact is there's nothing independent about it. It's not independent when a family member starts a super PAC. It's not independent when a former business partner starts a super PAC. It's not independent when former colleagues and coworkers start a super PAC and then begin spending on elections not very far from the candidate. And the American people understand this.

Now, we can try to pretend that it's something different, but it's not different. The operations of these super PACs provide a stark contrast to the flawed assumptions that the Court made in its ruling.

It's up to us in the Congress, in 16 legislative days, 97 days before this important election, to change that dynamic, to say that for the future, that for going forward, we understand that there is no role for this kind of money in our politics. There's no role for it in our elections.

And so, although these organizations have been supposedly declared independent by the courts, the reality is that they flout the coordination rules that have set up, that supposedly

would keep them independent, staffers, family, friends of a particular candidate that the super PAC is supporting.

No great secret. In fact, coming out of the Republican primary elections, it was no secret at all who the millionaires and the billionaires were putting their money behind. And so, while the official campaign and the candidate are allowed to keep their hands clean, and I use that term loosely, clean, these shadow arms of a campaign are used to launch unrelenting attacks against an opponent that they pretend or that are unaffiliated with a particular candidate or an election strategy. It's almost laughable. And in fact I think people at home, when they're not tuning out, in fact they're laughing at us.

Justin Stevens' warning materialized initially in the 2010 election. I know that I recall that because for the first time in our history, corporate and wealthy individuals really began to flood the airwaves. And here we are in 2012, and in that 2-year interim, boy, have they figured out this system, Mr. Speaker. And it's all over the place, flooding the entire electoral process.

In the 2010 election cycle, the spending by corporations and outside groups actually multiplied fourfold from the 2006 election, going to nearly \$300 million, astonishing at that time. But you know what? You haven't seen anything yet.

Let's take a look at where we are today. From 2008 to 2010, the average amount spent for a House seat, that is, for a winning candidate, increased 32 percent, from about \$2 million to over \$2.7 million. But as we know, the worst really was yet to come.

At the start of the 2012 Republican Presidential primaries, we really began to see the creep and the crawl and the impact and the danger of *Citizens United*. And the results, as I said, were on full display in Iowa. Super PACs there actually outspent candidates 2-1. That's right, the so-called independent expenditure groups outspent the actual candidates. The super PACs had a bigger voice than the actual candidates for the Republican primary.

Republican Presidential hopeful and former Speaker of this House, Newt Gingrich, who, at the time, actually supported the Supreme Court's decision, what did he see? He saw his poll numbers plummet after a barrage attack of about \$4 million in negative advertising that was paid for by *Restore Our Future*, a super PAC supporting former Governor Mitt Romney and run by his former staffers.

The same group then poured nearly \$8 million into the Florida primary, with *Winning Our Future*, a super PAC supporting former Speaker Gingrich spending a \$6 million ad buy.

Let's look at the numbers. And I'm sure the American public, Mr. Speaker, must be saying, I can't believe they spend that much money on politics. But surely they do.

And after being targeted by *Restore Our Future*, former Speaker Gingrich,

who, keep in mind, said that he had supported *Citizens United*, concluded, “I think,” referring to the anonymous ads, “that it debilitates politics.” He said, “I think it strengthens millionaires and it weakens middle class candidates.”

I couldn't agree with him more. I could not agree with him more.

□ 2110

Mr. Speaker, the landscape has continued to darken as we march toward the general election with groups that are collecting and planning to spend enormous sums of money.

American Crossroads and Priorities USA reportedly plan to raise and spend \$240 million and \$100 million respectively on the election. Just recently, National Public Radio reported that Republican super PACs and other outside groups, including Karl Rove, the Koch brothers, and Tom Donohue of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—supposedly independent—plan to spend a combined \$1 billion before election day. That's right. The American people need to understand that. \$1 billion. Unless we think that this is just about Republicans, Democrats are trying to play, too. It doesn't matter who is playing. It's wrong.

According to the Center for Responsive Politics, as of August 1—that's today—705 groups have organized as super PACs and have reported receipts of over \$318 million and independent expenditures already of more than \$167 million in the 2012 election cycle. That's as of today and here we are. They've got 97 more days to raise more money, to spend more money and to do all of that undercover. I want to put it into stark contrast because just a couple of weeks ago, just 2 weeks ago, the numbers stood at 678. Today, it's 705—who knows what it will be next week?—with receipts of \$281 million. Now those receipts are \$318 million. Can you do a little math on a multiplier? Because this thing is like rapid fire all across the country in this election cycle. The growth is really out of control.

Citizens United will continue to allow super PACs to permeate the airwaves with distortions and with half-truths, all of it in an attempt to alter the political discourse. This is not about what candidates are saying individually. It's hard to even hear directly from them because we're hearing so much from the super PACs.

I can recall many years ago when I began working on issues of campaign finance reform, it was the Republicans who said, Do you know what, we don't want all that other regulation, but we love disclosure. It turns out that now, in the day when the majority opinion in *Citizens United* declared that the one thing that wasn't off limits is actually disclosure, Democrats have put forward a disclosure bill called DISCLOSE, introduced by my colleague from Maryland, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN. Many of us have signed onto it. That

disclosure bill was brought up in the Senate. It has been brought up over here in the House. And do you know what? It has gone nowhere. It's the same people who over the last 20 years or more, even since *Buckley v. Valeo*—certainly more—said we support disclosure. We are robust supporters of disclosure, but not today. Not today, Mr. Speaker. Not today. They don't want to disclose anyone—any individual, any corporation—that's behind these contributions.

Why is that?

It's about politics, Mr. Speaker. It's because maybe it's working in the favor of those who don't want disclosure, who don't want their names out there, who don't want the American public, whether it's in my district or in any other district, to know who they are and to know what's being spent.

Of course, I envision that, like many Members of Congress, you could run the risk as a Member of Congress, to be sure, in speaking out against this nasty, dirty, unlimited money in our politics, and they'll all gang up on you. I'm going to take that risk, Mr. Speaker, because I happen to believe that the American people are sick and tired of it. They want us to do something about it. It's important for us to speak out about that because otherwise we lose everything. We lose participation. We lose people wanting to be involved and engaged in politics and wanting to run for elected office. Those who pay the piper just get to carry on in the process. We can't allow that to happen.

So I believe in disclosure, but I don't think we can end at disclosure. I think we have to go a step farther. We want to promote that kind of transparency, though, in the political process. We want to enhance the public reporting by corporations and unions and all outside groups. I'm happy to let anybody know who is funding my elections. All of us should be pleased to do that because we know that it contributes to the public confidence in us as elected officials. I want to stand by any ad and say I approve of this message. Well, a corporation should stand by and say that it approves of that message, too. I want to know who is behind those ads.

I think we still have 16 legislative days left in this Congress. Bring DISCLOSE to the floor. It's time to do the right thing. Now, I don't control the agenda on the floor, Mr. Speaker. The Republican majority does. They do have the capacity to bring reforms to this floor before we do anything else.

I also think this campaign finance problem requires some other things, too, which is why I've supported the Fair Elections Now Act. It's in the Senate as S. 750, and here in the House it's H.R. 1404. It's modeled after successful programs in the States. There are some people who believe the States are the laboratories for democracy. I share that belief. The States have experimented with ways in which you could fund campaigns to encourage different and more diverse people to run

for elective office and with ways that you could clean the dirty money out of the system so that we're not governed by making phone calls and asking people for money to fund our campaigns. I think that the Fair Elections Now Act actually does that, and it's why I've supported it.

What would happen is we would create a voluntary program where congressional candidates could actually qualify for funding to run for competitive elections and campaigns. In exchange, what those participating candidates would do—and what I would do as a candidate—is agree to strict campaign limits and to forgo all private fundraising.

To the American public, Mr. Speaker, what I would say is, If you don't own your elections, then who does?

Right now we know that we don't own our elections. We need that kind of reform. So I believe those interim reforms are really necessary. Yet as an attorney and as somebody who has spent decades working on campaign finance, I think that we have to go farther.

I think that what the Court says is, Congress, you don't have any authority to regulate except by doing disclosure. To me, what that means is that it requires the serious consideration of an amendment to the Constitution. I don't take that lightly. In fact, as an advocate and as a donor long before I came to Congress, I spent the better part of my career shunning attempts by reform groups who would come to me and who wanted me to work on reforms that required us to amend the Constitution. I always said no.

The reason is that I think amending the Constitution is a serious step and requires serious consideration, but here the Supreme Court really hasn't left us any choice. In fact, in a couple of cases from *Citizens United*, they inasmuch have said so. They said pretty directly, Congress, you don't have the authority to regulate campaigns except to the extent that you do disclosure.

So I have made a proposal to amend the Constitution. I worked with Laurence Tribe, a noted constitutional professor. I worked with colleagues here in the Congress, including the then-House chairman of the Judiciary, JOHN CONYERS in the last Congress. I reintroduced that amendment in this Congress because I think that the time is now. I've always questioned the rationale for the Court's decision, but I've done a reality check because writing this decision requires us to start in the Halls of this Congress. It requires us to continue on to the States with a constitutional amendment. So I've introduced this amendment.

I know that, since then, there have been a number of other constitutional amendments introduced. Just last week, I testified over in the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution where there is the consideration of a constitutional amendment in the Senate. Now is the time.

The other thing that we could do in these legislative days, in addition to bringing the DISCLOSE Act to this floor, is to convene serious hearings among serious people about amending the Constitution so that we can restore sanity to our system and to make sure that our citizens' voices count more than those voices of those just digging into corporate treasuries.

I don't think there is even one way to do this, but I think it's important to put something on the table. I urge the consideration by this House of House Joint Resolution 78, which is an amendment to the Constitution. It goes on the very limited track of saying that Congress, indeed, has the authority that it needs under our Constitution to make the changes that we need to of the campaign finance system in order to make sure that elections are owned by the American people.

□ 2120

It's a really simple thing to do, and let's take it to the legislatures.

Because so many of my colleagues have introduced constitutional amendments also, many of us have actually joined with people all across this country. In fact, millions of people across this country are calling for us to be on the side of democracy, and we've signed on to a declaration for democracy. I'm a proud declarant for democracy. We have 275 cities and towns from New York to Boulder, to Los Angeles, all across the country, big cities, small cities, who have called on a declaration for democracy to pass anti-Citizens United resolutions. We might differ on the subtleties on what this resolution might be, but that's the job of the United States Congress, to hear it out, to hear all sides, to hear from constitutional scholars about how we need to do this, but to do this together for the American people.

Over 1,854 public officials across the country, including 92 Members of the House, 28 senators, and over 2,000 business leaders across the country have said it's time for us to take a stand for democracy. They've signed their name to our declaration for democracy. I would encourage all of our colleagues, before you leave town, sign your name to the declaration for democracy. Show the American people that we stand on their side.

There's no doubt that it's a bold step to amend a document that's only been amended 27 times, and some would question the need to fix the problem with a constitutional amendment. But the Supreme Court pretty much answered that question unequivocally. The Supreme Court has also said, You know what, if Congress wants to do something, then Congress has to act in this way. I don't question that the Supreme Court made this decision. I accept that. It was a 5-4 ruling. That's the way our system works. The other part of our system is that free thinking Members of the United States House of Representatives and of the Senate

come together to do what's right for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, here's what I would say in closing. Millionaires and billionaires are really doing simply what ordinary citizens can't do anymore. They've got all the strings. I can understand, Mr. Speaker, that there are people at home who just really aren't sure where they fit in this system. They're not sure what it means for their elected officials to be responsive to them because they believe that there's somebody out there who has more money and, as a result, more power and, as a result, more influence than they do at home.

I've traveled all across this country, and I have to tell you that it doesn't matter whether you're in Maine or Montana, or you're all the way down through the South of this country and all across this great landscape, people really want to feel that they have some power, that they have some influence. Mr. Speaker, they just don't have that right now.

I just don't even know another way to say that there's a "for sale" sign on the doors. I see poor old Uncle Sam here. He's looking mighty sad, Mr. Speaker. I've never seen a more sad looking Uncle Sam. Part of the reason is because he's shackled. He's shackled by \$100 million from Priorities USA Action. Uncle Sam is shackled by \$300 million from Karl Rove and American Crossroads. Uncle Sam is shackled by \$61 million from only 26 billionaires. Uncle Sam is shackled by \$39 million from who knows who else. And poor Uncle Sam, sad with his hand out, is shackled by \$400 million from the Koch Brothers, shackled by \$100 million from Sheldon Adelson.

We could put a lot more up there, Mr. Speaker, but it's time for the United States Congress to remove the shackles of money from Uncle Sam so that we don't continue to sell our democracy. It's time for us to remove the shackles. It's time for us to say to the millionaires and billionaires, You've got to play just like the person who gives \$5 or \$1. Not a lot of people give money to political campaigns. I can certainly understand that.

Mr. Speaker, I would close by urging us to use the 16 legislative days that are left to restore democracy, to restore sanity, by acting for the American people to restore the campaign finance system.

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

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF PRIESTS FOR LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 35 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Today, Mr. Speaker, we mark the 20th anniversary of Priests for Life, and I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to my colleague, JEAN SCHMIDT, of Ohio.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you for giving me 1 minute.

I do want to celebrate the 20th anniversary, and I want to celebrate three pro-life advocates in my own hometown. The first is Archbishop Dennis Schnurr, who has been unequivocally in the forefront of this movement. I have stood with Archbishop Schnurr in front of Planned Parenthood of Greater Cincinnati praying the rosary. I have walked with him in the Cross the Bridge for Life. I've watched him get on a bus with schoolchildren and come up here to Washington for the March for Life. Auxiliary Bishop Joseph Binzer is another pro-life advocate who has walked the walk and talked the talk. And most importantly, my own parish priest, Father Michael Cordier, who again has come up here to Washington with a group of students from St. Elizabeth Ann Seton and St. Andrew to March for Life, but most importantly in his own personal life has witnessed his brother and his sister-in-law with a very challenged girl, Sophia Cordier, who not only exemplified what the meaning of life is, but as she passed into her eternal reward earlier this year, has become an emblematic portion of the right-to-life movement in greater Cincinnati.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to Mr. WALBERG of Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the gentlewoman. I thank you for commanding this time to call attention to people, heroes of life like Father Frank Pavone.

Congressman RON PAUL, one of our colleagues, shared a poem with me on the floor one day. It caught my attention. It's called "The Anvil":

Last eve I passed beside a blacksmith door,
and heard the anvil ring the vesper chime;

Looking in, I saw upon the floor old hammers,
worn with beating years of time.

'How many anvils have you had,' said I, 'To wear and batter all these hammers so?'

'Just one,' said he, and then with twinkling eye,
'The anvil wears the hammers out, you know.'

And so, thought I, the anvil called the master's Word,
for ages skeptic blows have beat upon;

Yet, though the noise of falling blows was heard,
The anvil is unharmed, and the hammers gone.

Father Pavone and others who command the interest in life understand the power of truth, the truth that comes with the Creator, a Creator who has designed life itself for good and for the best interests of all.

In our great document, the Declaration of Independence, it said:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable, God given rights, among them, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

□ 2130

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would just refer back to the truth. Tonight, as we think about life and honor and organizations like Priests for Life and others who understand the truth that are contained in words like this, "Behold, children are a gift of the Lord, The fruit of the womb is a reward"; of the prophet Jeremiah, of whom it was said, "Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you. Before you were born, I set you apart," that's life before even the womb was open.

And then that beautiful psalm, Psalm 139, says:

For You formed my inward parts. You wove me in my mother's womb. I will give thanks to You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made. Wonderful are Your works, and my soul knows it very well. My frame was not hidden from You when I was made in secret and skillfully wrought in the depths of the Earth. Your eyes have seen my unformed substance. And in Your book were all written the days that were ordained for me, when as yet there was not one of them.

Father Frank, we thank you for your work and the Priests for Life. We thank all of those who stand for life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank this body for the opportunity to speak for the principle that God created life for a purpose, and we must adore it and continue it on.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to Representative CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, the leading voice for the pro-life cause and for the unborn across the United States.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding and thank her for calling this very important Special Order.

For two decades, I, along with countless others, have been moved, inspired, and motivated to defend the weakest and most vulnerable among us by the remarkable life and pro-life witness of Father Frank Pavone. Ordained to the Roman Catholic priesthood by Cardinal John O'Connor in 1988, Father Pavone celebrates 20 years since the founding of Priests for Life, the organization he so effectively leads.

A prolific writer and gifted speaker, Father Pavone takes the gospel message of love, forgiveness, truth, and reconciliation both to friendly audiences who draw encouragement from his messages and to those—especially post-abortive women—who suffer and are in deep pain.

I have heard Father Pavone challenge priests to more robustly defend the sanctity of life, especially in their homilies. In promoting the gospel of life, he insists no venue should be forsaken or ignored. Whether it be from the pulpit or in the public square, Father Pavone couldn't be more clear: Speak out with candor, clarity and

compassion—silence is not an option. Silence, I've heard him say, does a woman contemplating abortion no favor whatsoever. She needs pro-life options, real alternatives presented in a meaningful way. She needs understanding and genuine support. And others who might help her need to know that their willingness to assist might be the difference between life and death.

In like matter, Father Pavone and Executive Director Janet Morana are unceasing in their efforts to tangibly aid post-abortive women who often suffer not only physical damage from abortion but lifelong negative emotional, psychological, and spiritual consequences. The Silent No More Awareness Campaign provides a safe place for women who have had abortions to grieve and find peace.

Amazingly, Father Pavone also steadfastly reaches out to the actual purveyors of death in the abortion industry. This good priest sees not just the abortionist and their enablers committing violence against women and babies, but what might be if we genuinely care about their souls. Father Pavone reminds us that we are to pray for them, care for them, all while tenaciously opposing the deeds that they do.

Abby Johnson, a woman who ran a Planned Parenthood abortion clinic for 8 years in Texas, said of Father Pavone:

Father Frank Pavone has been a staple in my house for many years, even during my Planned Parenthood years. Every week, I would record and watch *Defending Life* on EWTN. I enjoyed watching him, even if I disagreed. I loved how outspoken he was and how he didn't seem to live in the gray. You know, everything seemed black-and-white for him. Right and wrong was clear.

I remember watching him during the Terri Schiavo tragedy. I was drawn to his gentle spirit. I had seen two sides to him—or was it? One side was so unabashedly, unapologetically, and passionately against abortion. The other was a man who had an incredibly compassionate heart and a kind spirit. This was the man who was helping a family grieve the loss of their daughter. But now I see they are the same. Father Frank is for life, all life. His compassion for life fuels his passion.

Mr. Speaker, Priests for Life turns 20, doing best what it has done so faithfully, defending the least of these as if it were the Lord, Himself.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank you, Mr. SMITH, for your important pro-life voice, and thank you for the years of steadfastness on this issue. And we do thank Father Pavone and also Priests for Life.

Now I would like to yield to a wonderful Member from Nebraska, Mr. JEFF FORTENBERRY, an important pro-life voice here in the United States Congress.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentle lady from Minnesota for yielding, and thank you for your stalwart and courageous stand for life tonight.

Women deserve better than abortion, and of course celebrating an extraor-

dinary organization such as Priests for Life who have tried to heal the wounded and protect those who are most vulnerable is, of course, an extraordinary cause.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues and I gather on the floor, I am going to turn the subject to another matter because we are marking what could possibly be considered one of the most significant turning points in the history of our Nation. But it is not a cause for celebration.

In America, where we have a legacy of principle that undergirds our Nation and makes it possible to create prosperity—not just material means, but a flourishing of the potential of each person—where does that principle come from? Well, we've all heard the line from the earliest of our founding documents, the Declaration of Independence, which goes like this:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

This is the operative philosophical paradigm of our culture, so much so we don't even think about it—that our rights are not conferred by a king or a government. They are inherent, based upon the dignity of each person.

And as we worked this out in the early stages of our development of our country, we wrote a Constitution which basically did one thing: It defined power, and it defined power as coming from the consent of the government, consistent with our operative philosophical paradigm of the inherent dignity and rights and responsibilities of each individual person.

Beyond that, the consent of the government turns that power over to representatives who then make prudential judgments about what is in the common good. We make the law and are held accountable by the people in elections.

We then spread that power out. We developed three branches of government: the Congress makes the law; the President enforces the law; and the judiciary interprets the law in order that we have even more balance of power to ensure that it is not abused.

But then we took it a step further. There were still concerns that we had defined where power is coming from—from the natural inherent dignity of the person—but we also wanted to define what government must not do, and so we wrote the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. And the First Amendment starts with these words:

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

Now, Mr. Speaker, the threats to religious liberty in our country are often more subtle than in other parts of the

world. But as a legislator, what has grieved me deeply is that, for the first time in the history of health care in the United States, Americans are being forced to choose to either obey the government or violate their personal convictions. Buried in the President's 2010 health care law was a provision empowering the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius, to issue rules on preventative services.

□ 2140

Who could have predicted that she would use her authority, sanctioned by President Obama, to force everyone to purchase drugs and procedures—including abortion-inducing drugs—that violate the fundamental ethical sensibilities of many Americans.

No American should be forced to choose between their conscience and their livelihood. No American should be forced to stand for their deeply held, reasoned beliefs, or stand convicted by government coercion. No American should be forced to choose between their faith and their job. This is wrong. It is a false choice. It is unjust. It is unnecessary. It is un-American, and it is an affront to the very purpose of our government derived from the consent of the governed.

America owes its unique character and strength to empowering, protecting, and upholding the inalienable rights of her citizens. Health care should be about the common good, caring for the sick, and healing the wounded. Health care policy should not be a vehicle to drive divisive ideology, forcing Americans to violate deeply held beliefs. The Health and Human Services mandate violates the fundamental principle of religious liberty and the rights of conscience so dear to this country. America owes its unique character and strength to empowering, protecting, and upholding those rights of her citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Karen McGiveny-Llechl, one of my constituents, sent me this email:

As a woman's health practitioner and a Catholic, I need the ability to stay within my faith boundaries. I would be unable to work if I was required to provide the services this mandate has imposed.

Indeed, it is sad that the Health and Human Services ruling seems most perniciously targeted at faith-based providers who are the backstop of compassionate care for our most vulnerable. Throughout our history, the U.S. health care service has in large measure owed its success to the doctors, nurses, and health care providers staffing faith-based institutions. These institutions, including hospitals and university clinics and nonprofit health institutions, serve the common good of all Americans. The government should celebrate the contribution of these faith-based entities, which fulfill the mission of helping the sick and serving the poor. Without them, we will see reduced access to high-quality care, especially for vulnerable persons who have

traditionally relied on these benevolent organizations of civil society. Several health care practitioners have told me personally that they would choose to leave their professions rather than compromise their beliefs. But undoubtedly, some will not obey the government. And our government has effectively condemned them.

Another man who was condemned for his beliefs had this to say:

I submit that an individual that breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, and willingly accepts the penalty by staying in jail to arouse the conscience of the community over its injustice, is, in reality, expressing the very highest respect for the law.

So wrote Dr. Martin Luther King from the Birmingham jail.

The purpose of our government is to create just structures for societal order, empowering liberty, beginning with the affirmation of the natural rights of the person, including the most basic right of conscience. In my office, there is a copy of a draft of the Bill of Rights. The rights of conscience were initially included in that draft. But by the final version, that right was formalized by the concept of religious freedom, perhaps given that the rights of conscience were such an ordinarily understood concept that its fullness did not need provision. James Madison, the architect of the Constitution, wrote that “conscience is the most sacred of all property,” linking conscience rights to the foundation of religious liberty.

In 1809, Thomas Jefferson stated that:

No provision in our Constitution ought to be dearer to man than that which protects the rights of conscience against the enterprises of civil authority.

The Health and Human Services mandate violates the fundamental principle of religious liberty and rights of conscience so dear to our country. No American should be forced to choose between violating their conscience in order to serve the public. From the faith-based hospital to the business person providing health care coverage in their insurance plan to their employees, to the school established for children with special needs, no American should be forced to choose between their faith and their job.

This is why so many people of goodwill, regardless of their religious traditions or their political affiliation, consider the Health and Human Services mandate to be a gross affront to the very essence of what it means to be an American. And all of us must choose our response. This is not simply a religious issue. It’s not a Catholic issue. It’s not an Evangelical issue. It’s an American issue. We all have a responsibility to decide, informed by our faith, what our country means to us, and what it demands of us in this moment.

Last Friday, there was a Federal judge who ruled in a court case in this regard, and I think Federal Judge John Kane in *Hercules v. Sebelius* got it right. He had this to say:

The government’s interests are countered, and indeed outweighed, by the public interest in the free exercise of religion.

I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for her leadership on this important issue, and so many others.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank you, Mr. FORTENBERRY, a father of five. And I’m a mother of five, and so I thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I will give just a few remarks on Priests for Life and on their 20th anniversary. Tonight is a very important night because, as we know, it has been 40 years since the infamous *Roe v. Wade* decision removed legal protection for those who are unborn, the youngest members of our society, those who still remain in the womb of their mother.

And since that time, numerous groups have risen up to restore that protection to the unborn and to educate the public about the issue that we all know as abortion, and to provide compassionate service, both to those who need alternatives to abortion and those who need healing after abortion.

I stand here today with my colleagues in the United States Congress to honor one extremely important institution known as Priests for Life as they celebrate 20 years of advocacy and service to the unborn. As many people across America know, Priests for Life is led by Father Frank Pavone. He is one of the strongest voices for the unborn throughout the world, as well as for children in America, and he stands strong because as we know, contrary to what its name might suggest, Priests for Life isn’t just for priests, and it’s not just for Catholics.

The work of Priests for Life has enabled Americans of every walk of life, every ethnicity, every faith background, every political affiliation, to awaken their consciences about the life issue, to speak up for the unborn. And here’s just a few of the outreach efforts, Mr. Speaker, that Priests for Life have been involved in.

Every year, Priests for Life holds nearly 1,000 retreats across America for men and women who have lost a child to abortion. Priests for Life also runs the very important Silent No More awareness campaign to mobilize men and women who have lost a child to abortion but who have gone on to experience healing through God and who now want to share their testimony.

One of the full-time members of Priests for Life is a very important voice in the United States, Dr. Alveda King. I was just with her this last weekend. Americans know her as the niece of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Alveda heads up the effort to reach the black community with the truth of abortion and how it disproportionately impacts unborn black children in the United States.

Priests for Life also sponsors a non-partisan voter registration drive, focused on saving innocent human life and helping to heal the hurt of men and women as they are post-abortive. Through churches, they distribute voter guides. They train clergy on what they can do within the limits of the law to foster political responsibility.

Now, it is very difficult to find any national initiative to the pro-life movement that either Father Frank Pavone or Priests for Life are somehow not deeply involved in. For example, in February of this year, 2012, Priests for Life launched a lawsuit against the Health and Human Services mandate, which we have heard much about this evening, that requires job creators to offer health insurance coverage for morally objectionable practices.

□ 2150

This mandate is an enormous affront to our First Amendment religious liberty rights in the United States and it needs to be stopped, because never before has this government, Mr. Speaker, required a job creator to provide insurance that includes contraception, abortion-causing pills and sterilization. No organization, no American, Mr. Speaker, should have to violate their religious beliefs because of this President’s health care dictates. I am a mom to 28 kids, five natural born children, 23 foster children. I believe with every fiber in my being that every child matters and that we should have a right to life for every American, because every life is precious, every life is sacred, and every life is made in the image and likeness of a holy God. Every life matters.

I’m extremely proud to be a part of the pro-life movement that is truly a voice for the voiceless and to have been affiliated with Priests for Life and Father Frank Pavone. As we take note of the 20th anniversary of one of the leading pro-life organizations in our Nation, I wish to thank this evening Priests for Life for everything they continue to do to protect and defend the sanctity of every human life.

I would now like to yield to one of the strongest pro-life voices in the State of Texas, well-known and beloved to Americans all across this Nation, Representative LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Minnesota, my very, very dear friend.

This is an important day, Priests for Life marking 20 years. As a Christian, as a Southern Baptist, it is an honor to pay tribute to the Catholic priests who have stood strong, stood for life, that precious one of the trilogy that was set out in the Declaration of Independence. But first life. Only if you have life can you then go to liberty and have a chance at a pursuit of happiness.

For those of us who believe the scripture written in the Old Testament, as did our founders, most all of them—in fact a third of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, over a third, were ordained Christian ministers—but certainly George Washington and even Ben Franklin, even though some history teachers mislead their students these days. They all believed in those scriptures.

When you look at the fall of the northern kingdom of Israel, it’s a little scary, because, as I’ve read, one of the

things that God was angry over was that people had fallen into such incredible idol worship that they were willing to sacrifice their own children. That is so abominable. How could anybody love such idols and idol worship such that they would sacrifice their own child and allow the taking of their own child's life?

And then I thought about abortion in this country, and we have no room to talk. For 20 years, Priests for Life have known that, and they have stood firm that the most essential right of our Creator is life, and you can't get to liberty until you start with life.

And then the irony of all ironies, today, the first day that the Catholic church and really all of us who are Christians, all of us who believe in freedom of religion, all of us that in fact actually believe the Constitution means what it says have been slapped down by this administration. Regardless of what the Supreme Court says, the First Amendment makes clear, as my friend from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) says:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

And we have friends, Christian friends, who believe with all their heart it is a right to practice their religion, and they have these religious beliefs, and this administration has demeaned them to the point that it would release a quote as was pointed out by Amy Payne with the Heritage Foundation today, when quoting the Health and Human Services Department:

The Obama administration will continue to work with all employers to give them the flexibility and resources they need to implement the health care law in a way that protects women's health while making common-sense accommodations for values like religious liberty.

Values nothing. It's a constitutional right that this administration is trodding on and trampling and stomping on. And if it will take this right, what's next? Can Jews not worship on the Sabbath because it's inconvenient? But maybe this administration will help try to accommodate that value.

Or how about communion? Maybe this administration will find at some point it's really not healthy, and so they'll try to accommodate the religious conviction, the freedom of religion, as a value. They'll try to work with people who believe this to the core of their hearts.

You go back to the founding. We didn't even have a Constitution. Ben Franklin sat for 5 weeks, virtually, listening to all the rancor back and forth. He finally rises, 80 years old, gout, trouble getting up, overweight, a couple of years or so from meeting his Judge, and he points out, We've been going for nearly 5 weeks. We've got more noes than ayes on virtually everything, and he asks:

How has it happened, sir, that we've not once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our under-

standing? In the beginning contest with Great Britain when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room. Our prayers, sir, were heard and they were graciously answered.

Now that's not a deist, and it's someone who does not believe in the accommodation of a religious value. He believed in religious freedom. Not only that, he believed in the power of prayer because in that same speech that we know is his speech, because he wrote it out in his own hand, he says:

I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it possible that an empire could rise without His aid?

Ben Franklin said:

We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writing—

Not that we're accommodating, but that we believe in—

We've been assured in the sacred writing that unless the Lord build it, they labor in vain that build it. I firmly believe this. I also believe without His, God's, concurring aid, we will succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel.

Now, here we are over 200 years later trying to accommodate what Ben Franklin said that stirred the hearts of those and even stirred Randolph to say, You know what: Let's take a break. Let's go listen to a preacher preach the word all together as a constitutional convention and then come back. And they did and they came back with a new spirit and they gave us a Constitution that this administration is now trodding and trampling upon.

God, the God of which Ben Franklin spoke, without whom we will succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel, is now being told by this administration that they'll accommodate as best they can, but make no mistake, they're trampling on the rights that Priests for Life have been preaching about for 20 years.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank our friend from Texas.

I just want to say, we've had so many Members of Congress that wanted to be down here on the floor this evening and there was only so much time.

I would like to thank also Congresswoman BLACK of Tennessee, Congressman HUELKAMP of Kansas, Congressman LANKFORD of Oklahoma, Congresswoman BLACKBURN of Tennessee. Also, I want to thank Congressman TRENT FRANKS of Arizona. We had many in addition to the Members that we have heard from this evening: Congressman FORTENBERRY of Nebraska, Congressman WALBERG of Michigan, and Congresswoman SCHMIDT of Ohio, in addition to Congressman SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank them, Congressman GOHMERT of Texas, and so many other pro-life Members of Congress. This is an important night. We thank Priests for Life for 20 years of standing firm for the cause of the unborn. We will get there yet. Thank you, Father Frank.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today the Obama Administration is following through on their HHS mandate that violates religious freedom as today begins the date where the rule goes into effect. 24 separate lawsuits across the country have been filed representing 76 plaintiffs.

On Friday, a Carter-appointed judge in Denver provided a preliminary injunction against the HHS mandate to the Newland family, the Catholic owners of a HVAC company in Colorado. This case, led by Alliance Defending Freedom, is a welcomed initial victory for religious freedom. We will need the courts or the Congress to reverse this tragic disregard for American's First Amendment right to freedom of religion without government interference.

Protecting the First Amendment has to be our First priority. The first words of the First Amendment read: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . ."

What happened to the promise that "if you like the health care you have you can keep it?"

The radical mandate makes it so religious-based institutions are forced to defy a Higher Order at the will of a Government Order. Religious liberty is a sacred and fundamental right. It's central to who we are as a country, a country founded by people who fled Europe for their religious beliefs.

If President Obama does not reverse his administration's attack on religious freedom, Congress, led by the People's House, will do it for him.

People who go to church on Sunday and who put money in an offering plate shouldn't have to worry that their donations will go to pay for things that they don't believe in their hearts to be good.

The House is going to address this matter fairly and deliberately, through the appropriate legislative channels in the House Energy & Commerce Committee.

The rule announced by the Obama Administration's Department of Health & Human Services would require faith-based employers—including Catholic charities, schools, universities, and hospitals—to provide services they consider immoral. Those services include sterilization, abortion-inducing drugs and devices, and contraception (FDA approved items).

The effect is government crowding out religious-based institutions. Government is using raw political force to impose a government view on society where religious institutions are not welcome to serve or practice their faith freely. It is government forcing private and religious institutions off the public square. They're forcing resources off the table that serve the public good. Since when was that a good idea?

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2012 AND 2013 BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 404 of H. Con. Res 34, the House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year 2012, deemed to be in force by H. Res. 287, and sections 503 of H. Con. Res. 112, the House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year

2013, deemed to be in force by H. Res. 614 and H. Res. 643, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates. The revision reflects the budgetary impact of H.R. 8, the Job Protection and Recession Prevention Act of 2012, which would extend for one year through 2013, certain tax policies enacted in 2001, 2003, and 2010 and would provide relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended (Budget Act). For the purposes of the Budget Act, these revised aggregates and allocations are to be considered as aggregates and allo-

cations included in the budget resolutions, pursuant to sections 101 of H. Con. Res. 34 and H. Con. Res. 112.

BUDGET AGGREGATES			
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)			
	Fiscal year		
	2012	2013	2013–2022
Current Aggregates:¹			
Budget Authority	2,858,503	2,793,848	2
Outlays	2,947,662	2,891,589	2
Revenues	1,890,365	2,293,339	32,472,564
The Job Protection & Recession Prevention Act of 2012 (H.R. 8):			
Budget Authority	0	0	2
Outlays	0	0	2
Revenues	0	-227,950	-383,203

BUDGET AGGREGATES—Continued
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year		
	2012	2013	2013–2022
Revised Aggregates:			
Budget Authority	2,858,503	2,793,848	2
Outlays	2,947,662	2,891,589	2
Revenues	1,890,365	2,065,389	32,089,361

¹ Sections 407 and 506 of H. Con. Res. 34 and H. Con. Res. 112, respectively, stipulate that adjustments to allocations and aggregates shall apply while the measure is under consideration and take effect upon enactment of that measure. The current aggregates reflect the original budget resolution levels adjusted only for those measures, which were provided an adjustment during consideration and that have been enacted into law. At present, the original aggregates in H. Con. Res. 34 have been adjusted by —\$42 million for budget authority; —\$254 million for outlays and —\$1,046 million for revenues for measures enacted into law. No adjustments to the aggregates in H. Con. Res. 112 have been enacted into law.
² Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2013 through 2022 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES
(Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee on Ways and Means	2012		2013		2013–2022 Total	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Current allocation:	1,030,960	1,031,280	985,036	982,582	11,683,572	11,672,931
Changes for the Job Protection and Recession Prevention Act of 2012 (H.R. 8)	0	0	0	0	+19,561	+19,561
Revised Allocation:	1,030,960	1,031,280	985,036	982,582	11,703,133	11,692,492

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 679. An act to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation.

S. 1959. An act to require a report on the designation of the Haqqani Network as a foreign terrorist organization and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 2, 2012, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7150. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report pursuant to Pub. L. 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7151. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a possible unauthorized transfer of U.S.-origin defense articles pursuant to Section 3(e) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7152. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-400, "Heat Wave Safety Temporary Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7153. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-399, "Walter Reed Army Medical Center Base Realignment and Closure Homeless Assistance Submission Approval Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7154. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Seventh Annual No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7155. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 111213751-2120-02] (RIN: 0648-XC083) received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7156. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada, Limited, Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0087; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-029-AD; Amendment 39-17091; AD 2012-12-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7157. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0600; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-017-AD; Amendment 39-17076; AD 2012-11-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7158. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Enstrom Helicopter Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0562; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-038-AD; Amendment 39-17068; AD 2012-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7159. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0645; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-009-AD; Amendment 39-17052; AD 2012-10-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7160. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0991; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-134-AD; Amendment 39-17110; AD 2012-13-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7161. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0040; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-121-AD; Amendment 39-17108; AD 2012-13-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7162. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1115; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-221-AD; Amendment 39-17111; AD 2012-13-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7163. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0673; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-091-AD; Amendment 39-17109; AD 2012-13-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7164. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0441; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-011-AD; Amendment 39-17106; AD 2012-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7165. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's report entitled, "The Year in Trade 2011"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7166. A letter from the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting notification of a public hearing held on "The Evolving U.S.-China Trade and Investment Relationship"; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

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. BONNER: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Laura Richardson (Rept. 112-642). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MICA: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3158, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms (Rept. 112-643). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 752. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6233) to make supplemental agricultural disaster assistance available for fiscal year 2012 with the costs of such assistance offset by changes to certain conservation programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-644). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COLE, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 6244. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to permit States to prohibit the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission from enforcing certain requirements of a license, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 6245. A bill to amend chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, to provide for the recovery of computer hardware and software patent litigation costs in cases where the court finds the claimant did not have a reasonable likelihood of succeeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 6246. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require the deposit in the National Software Reference Library of the National Institute of Standards and Technology of a copy of any election-dedicated voting system technology used in the operation of a voting system for an election for Federal office, to establish the conditions under which the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology may disclose the technology and information regarding the technology to other persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently deter-

mined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 6247. A bill to protect the Federal Columbia River Power System, Power Marketing Administration customers, and Bureau of Reclamation dams and other facilities and to promote new Federal and other hydropower generation; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 6248. A bill to provide for the transfer of excess Department of Defense aircraft to the Forest Service for wildfire suppression activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 6249. A bill to establish a Water Protection and Reinvestment Fund to support investments in clean water infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 6250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. CHU, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DICKS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 6251. A bill to amend the Marine Debris Research, Prevention, and Reduction Act to establish an expedited award process for grants to address marine debris emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BONO MACK (for herself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 6252. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 6253. A bill to authorize the Maritime Administrator to make grants to States or port authorities to cover the cost of repair and construction activities relating to certain commercial strategic seaports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed

Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 6254. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to establish a program to provide grant assistance to States for the rehabilitation and repair of deficient dams; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 6255. A bill to ensure that the United States promotes women's meaningful inclusion and participation in mediation and negotiation processes undertaken in order to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict and implements the United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. STARK, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 6256. A bill to ensure prompt access to Supplemental Security Income, Social Security disability, and Medicaid benefits for persons released from certain public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. REYES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WATT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 6257. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study regarding the proposed United States Civil Rights Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 6258. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance to uninsured newborns under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 6259. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require the Federal Election Commission to establish and operate a website through which members of

the public may view the contents of certain political advertisements, to require the sponsors of such advertisements to furnish the contents of the advertisements to the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 6260. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 211 Hope Street in Mountain View, California, as the "Lieutenant Kenneth M. Ballard Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H.R. 6261. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the continuance of pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, during lapses in appropriations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 6262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief to middle-class families, small businesses, and family farms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 6263. A bill to establish a commission to study how Federal laws and policies affect United States citizens living in foreign countries; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, House Administration, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MYRICK (for herself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 6264. A bill to authorize a pilot program for Federal agencies to enter into contracts with the private sector for property management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 6265. A bill to renew and modify the temporary duty suspensions on certain cotton shirting fabrics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 6266. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit increases in the certain costs of health care services under the health care programs of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 6267. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the tax on Olympic medals won by United States athletes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 6268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the phasedown of the credit percentage for the dependent care tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 6269. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to expand the eligibility of

certain veterans while they have disability claims pending under title 38 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 6270. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to require annual disclosure of crop insurance premium subsidies in the public interest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 6271. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain farmland and family-owned business interests from the value of the gross estate of decedents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H. Res. 750. A resolution providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1905, with an amendment; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina:

H. Res. 751. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H. Res. 753. A resolution recognizing that the occurrence of prostate cancer in African-American men has reached epidemic proportions and urging Federal agencies to address that health crisis by supporting education, awareness outreach, and research specifically focused on how prostate cancer affects African-American men; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. Res. 754. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the third week in October as National School Bus Safety Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

257. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 161 memorializing the Congress to explore funding opportunities for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

258. Also, a memorial of the Joint Interim Committee on Energy of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, relative to Interim Resolution 2011-008 urging the Administration and the Congress to enable the construction of one or more centralized interim fuel storage facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

259. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Maine, relative to Senate Joint Resolution requesting the President and the Congress to restore proper funding under the federal Clean Water Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

260. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Maine, relative to Senate Joint Resolution urging the President and the Congress to work together to enact the Social Security Fairness Act of 2011; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

261. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 12-003 memorializing the Congress to amend 26 U.S.C. sec. 6033; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representa-

tives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 6244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I: Section 8: Clause 3 The United States Congress shall have power

"To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 6245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8:

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 6246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution. This provision permits Congress to make or alter the regulations pertaining to Federal elections.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 6247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2; Article I, Section 8, clause 18; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 6248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 and Clause 18, and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 6249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding taxes. In particular, Article I of the Constitution clearly describes the Congressional authority to levy excise taxes, providing "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises . . ." (U.S. Const. Art. I, §8, cl. 1).

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 6250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art 1 §8 cl.1

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 6251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Mrs. BONO MACK:

H.R. 6252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 6253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 13 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 6254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1. "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 6255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1. "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 6256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 1.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 6257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 6258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;" and Article I, Section 8, 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."

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 6259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the US Constitution

The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but Congress may at any time make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Place of chusing Senators.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 6260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 6261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution sets forth the power of appropriations states "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states that "The Congress shall have the Power. . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12 and 13 state that Congress shall have the power "to raise and support Armies. . ." and "to provide and maintain a Navy."

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 6262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 6263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, 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.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 6264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 with respect to the power of Congress to make rules regarding the disposal of the property of the United States.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 6265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 6266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 6267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7 and Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 6268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 6269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 6270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 6271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 127: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 139: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 153: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.

H.R. 263: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 288: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 289: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 297: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 303: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 329: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 333: Mr. REHBERG and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 458: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 531: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 574: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 591: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 640: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 719: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 733: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 735: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 749: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 750: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 798: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 812: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 829: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 860: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 942: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.

H.R. 965: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 978: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 998: Mr. CARNEY and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1063: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1195: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1204: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1206: Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1236: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1244: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 1259: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 1265: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LATTA, and Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 1279: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1291: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1370: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RIVERA, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1464: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1509: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1513: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 1546: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. KELLY.

H.R. 1614: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1621: Mr. WOLF, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1639: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1653: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1781: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1936: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1964: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1993: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2016: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 2032: Mr. LANDRY and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2094: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2140: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 2168: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 2198: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 2239: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2364: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2382: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2402: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 2479: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2655: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2672: Mr. OWENS and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2695: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2721: Mr. BERMAN and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2746: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2794: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2827: Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2866: Mr. LANCE and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2925: Mr. LATTA, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2960: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2969: Mrs. BACHMANN.

- H.R. 2978: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. HURT.
H.R. 2989: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2992: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 3032: Mr. BARTLETT.
H.R. 3102: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 3151: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3187: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 3238: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3242: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 3264: Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 3269: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3423: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 3458: Mr. LOEBACK and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 3487: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 3612: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 3618: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3627: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3634: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 3656: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3661: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. KEATING, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 3767: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3769: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3798: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3849: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3861: Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 3978: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3993: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 4122: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4160: Ms. BUERKLE and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 4169: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4235: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4271: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4315: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4369: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 4373: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 4396: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 4405: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 5284: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 5542: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5684: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 5741: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 5746: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 5787: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5796: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROSKAM, and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 5817: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 5846: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 5864: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5903: Mr. OLVER and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 5911: Mr. BERG.
H.R. 5938: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 5943: Mr. PETRI, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 5948: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 5977: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 5990: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 6012: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 6025: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 6061: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6092: Mr. POLIS and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 6097: Mr. BARTLETT.
H.R. 6111: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 6112: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 6113: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 6128: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 6134: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 6138: Ms. HAHN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 6147: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 6150: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 6151: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 6164: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 6165: Mr. CARTER, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 6174: Mr. COLE, Mr. SCHOCK, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 6187: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 6188: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 6199: Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 6203: Mr. SCHILLING.
H.R. 6213: Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 6229: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 6241: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.J. Res. 106: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. COBLE.
H.J. Res. 110: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.J. Res. 115: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H. Con. Res. 101: Mr. TIERNEY.
H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H. Res. 298: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H. Res. 506: Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 583: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 671: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 676: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H. Res. 742: Mr. LEVIN.
H. Res. 745: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.