Gabe Zimmerman was a young man who dedicated himself to the betterment of his community, and lived a life of service to others. This led him to work for Representative Gabrielle Giffords—first as a field organizer and constituent services director, and later as a community relations director.

We all know of the tragedy that occurred on January 8, when Gabe and 5 other individuals were forever taken away from this world.

But what many of us don’t know is the type of life Gabe Zimmerman lived.

Gabe was integral in working with local charities, like Child and Family Resources, the YWCS, and the Comstock Foundation.

He was a loving son, brother, and fiancé—and a dedicated public servant.

I urge all my colleagues to honor the life and service of this tremendous young man, and vote “yes” on H. Res. 364.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 364, a resolution to name a meeting room in the Capitol Visitors Center after Gabe Zimmerman, the only Congressional staff member killed while on duty.

Gabe Zimmerman, a staff member for my friend and colleague Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, was one of six people killed in the January 8, 2011, attack in Tucson, Arizona.

The entire Capitol Hill community mourned the senseless deaths and the loss of one of our own. Those of us who serve in Congress know that the work we do to represent our constituents would not be possible without the support of our hard-working and dedicated staff. Working early mornings and late nights, on weekends and throughout holidays, these outstanding men and women bring energy to engage citizens and make Congress accessible to them.

Gabe Zimmerman died while helping Congressional staff as she engaged in one of the most important functions of a Member of Congress, communicating with her constituents. It is fitting that the House of Representatives is today considering legislation to dedicate a space to the memory of Gabriel Zimmerman and all Congressional staff including my own, I rise today to pay tribute to the men and women who dedicate themselves to public service.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, the role of Congressional staff is an important one in helping all Members carry out our responsibilities, but it is a role too often not acknowledged. It is fitting that we pause today to honor one such staffer, Gabe “Gabe” Zimmerman, who made the ultimate sacrifice during this Congress and this nation. Gabe was the first, and hopefully the last Congressional staffer to be murdered in the performance of his official duties when he was shot staffing Representative Gabrielle Giffords at a constituent event in her district.

Six other people were killed and 13 were wounded, including Representative Giffords and two other Congressional staff members.

By all accounts, Gabe was a kind and dedicated young man who worked tirelessly to improve the lives of the people in the 8th Congressional District of Arizona. He was a former social worker who assisted troubled youth, an athlete who loved the outdoors, a beloved son and brother, and he was engaged to be married. His life was cut far too short. I am pleased that we are making this small tribute to him today.

Our hearts go out to Gabe’s family and friends, to Ranking Member of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, Gabrielle Giffords, during her recovery, and to all those impacted by these senseless tragedies.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, on January 8, 2011, the nation was shocked and saddened by a senseless act of violence against a member of the House, Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords. That attack injured her and killed six innocent bystanders, including a Congressional staff, Gabe Zimmerman.

Gabe, a 30-year-old social worker, began work for Congresswoman Giffords in 2007, supervising the constituent services operation and helping the people of Arizona’s Eighth Congressional District resolve problems with Federal agencies and obtain government services. He was promoted to Director of Community Outreach, using his considerable talent and energy to engage citizens and make Congress accessible to them. In that capacity, he planned Congresswoman Giffords’ Congressional town hall on January 8 and was at her side that day.

We continue to mourn his loss and pray for his family and friends. Gabe Zimmerman’s life is a testament to the selfless work performed by Congressional staff every day for the American people. Today, we designate a room in the Capitol as the “Gabriel Zimmerman Meeting Room” to honor his work and recognize the dedication that he and all staff show to their country.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of H. Res. 364, Designating Room HVC–215 of the Capitol Visitor Center as the “Gabriel Zimmerman Meeting Room.” Adoption of this resolution would be a fitting tribute to Gabe Zimmerman’s commitment to public service and the courage of our colleague Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords of Arizona.

Gabe Zimmerman’s devotion to public service knew no bounds and he made the supreme sacrifice in service to the public when he was killed on January 8, 2011, in Tucson, Arizona. Among his many friends, who left Congresswoman Giffords gravely wounded. Like many Americans, the tragic events which unfolded on that day in January left me in a state of shock, anger, and tremendous sadness.

As the weeks and months have passed, Americans have looked to each other for strength and have been encouraged by the tremendous progress that Congresswoman Giffords has made in her recovery. Nearly a year later, we pause to remember not only Gabe, but the many innocent victims of this tragedy who were gunned down while waiting to exercise their democratic right to have their opinions heard.

Madam Speaker, 19 people were shot on that tragic day in Tucson—six of whom suffered fatal wounds. While this tragedy focused national discourse on the need to reassess current gun restrictions and the responsibility of public institutions in reporting potentially dangerous behavior, we were also reminded of the value of maintaining civility in our public discourse.

Gabe Zimmerman, Congresswoman Giffords’ director of community outreach, personified the spirit of public service and patriotism that has made America great. His work with the people of Tucson made him a popular member of the community, and his passion for social justice transcended his official role as a member of Congresswoman Giffords’ staff and left an indelible impact on everyone around him.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 364.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 364.

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

Mr. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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


Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 477 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 477
Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3463) to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions and by terminating the Election Assistance Commission. 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 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 House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Sec. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House reconvened into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 527) to amend chapter
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6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes. The bill as read shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business. After general debate the bill shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendment shall be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion or question. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. WOODALL. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 477 is a structured rule for the consideration of three bills:

H.R. 527, the Regulatory Flexibility Act;

H.R. 3010, the Regulatory Accountability Act;

H.R. 3463, a measure to terminate the Election Assistance Commission and end taxpayer financing of presidential elections and campaigns.

Not only do these bills show this House’s commitment to small businesses, but they also demand that agency rulemaking be held accountable, reclaiming that authority that is vested here in this House.

H.R. 527, the Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act, requires agencies to analyze the impact that a new regulation would have on small businesses before the regulation is adopted. By requiring all Federal agencies to obtain input and develop and conduct regular regulatory reviews, the statute directs agencies to review their regulations and solicit public input.

H.R. 3010, the Regulatory Accountability Act, makes further positive changes. It reforms and modernizes the Administrative Procedure Act. It modernizes and strengthens rulemakings and regulations more cost effective. In a recent study, Madam Speaker, that the Small Business Administration commissioned, they estimated the cost of the U.S. Federal regulatory burden at $1.1 trillion. Now I say there aren’t benefits that outweigh that burden; but when the burden is that substantial, Madam Speaker, to have a process in place that balances those benefits and those burdens, and that’s all H.R. 3010 asks to do.

Madam Speaker, time and time again the American people have demanded more accountability from their Congress, more accountability from their Government. This collection of bills today not only provides that accountability of Congress, but requires that accountability of our executive branch agencies.

As we talk about accountability, Madam Speaker, it’s important to note that these bills are paid for by terminating the Election Assistance Commission. You will remember, Madam Speaker, that was a commission created by the 2002 Act. We are committed to end this mission that is not providing useful reforms to the American people. By terminating that, we’re going to save the American taxpayer more than $600 million over the next decade. This collection of bills today not only provides that accountability of Congress, but requires that accountability of our executive branch agencies.

As we talk about accountability, Madam Speaker, we hear from our Secretaries of State that they no longer need that commission, that this mission is not providing useful reforms to them. By terminating that, we’re going to save the American taxpayer more than $600 million over the next decade.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, my friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. McGovern. I rise in very strong opposition to this restrictive rule—and
Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consider it right. I look at the clock above your head. I think it’s been about 11 minutes since my colleague DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ called for a toning down of the rhetoric and focusing more on policy. I don’t think we were able to make it to minute 15.

I will quote my friend as he referred to Republicans: Either they don’t care about the economy, or they are just acting for political gain.

Is that all there is? Either folks don’t care, or they’re just acting for political gain. It could be that their principles are different. It could be that their principles are different, but I don’t actually believe that. I believe our principles are the same, because what these folks don’t do is one but one thing: Let’s balance the regulatory burden with the benefits that it provides.

Madam Speaker, who is it in America that does not believe that balance is important, not what they do here in Congress? I heard it back home all the time: ROB, balance. I want you to get things done, but I don’t want you to get things done that are the wrong thing for the wrong reasons. I want you to come together and work on these issues, on our air and water.

Who is it, Madam Speaker, that does not believe that regulation to protect health and safety is important? I do. I come from one of the farthest right districts in the country. I believe health and safety are important things to regulate, but I believe we should balance those regulations.

When we doubled the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency between 2008 and 2009, where do you think the money went? Madam Speaker? The environment that I live in in Georgia was clean and thriving in 2008. But when you double the amount of money that you give to regulators, they have only one thing that they can do with it, and that’s regulate more, regulate more.

We need balance, and that’s all these bills are asking for. I have all the committee reports here, Madam Speaker, if any of my colleagues would like to come and look at them. There is not a bill in any of these that says: Thou shalt not regulate. Not one. What they say is: Thou shalt regulate with balance—where that balance is.

A friend of mine was walking through the Occupy Atlanta protest the other day, Madam Speaker. A fellow came up and shook his fist at him. One of the protesters shook his fist at my friend and said, It’s all about jobs. And my friend looked him in the eye and said, You know, you’re exactly right. You should work, and hire somebody. You should go out and hire somebody. The fellow said, I’m not talking about providing jobs. I’m talking about I want a job myself.
Well, that’s right. Every single bill that this Congress considers that helps job creators helps jobs.

We’ve got to end the rhetoric of loving jobs and hating job creators, Madam Speaker. There’s only one opportunity the American people have for employment, and that is finding an employer. And line after line after line of these bills say, before you punish American industry, make sure the balance is there, because, let’s be clear, Madam Speaker, it’s not that these jobs don’t have to be performed.

Time and time again I hear my colleagues bemoaning the fact that we’re not creating jobs. I, too, bemoan the fact that this administration has not created jobs. But that’s not our only problem. Our problem is jobs that are leaving this country, Madam Speaker. Our problem is destroying even more jobs.

Industry is going to continue to operate around this planet. We can either embrace this country in a balanced way or we can run them all overseas.

There’s something that I believe we sometimes do disagree about here in this Congress, and that is that government creates jobs. Government can create an environment in which job creators can create jobs. I cannot pass a bill in this Congress, no matter how hard I try, Madam Speaker, no matter how hard I work, that will make everybody in this country try rich. I cannot do it. But this Congress has succeeded all too often at passing bills that can make everybody poor.

Balance, Madam Speaker, is what these bills contain. What this rule does—and it’s important because it’s a new operation that we’re doing here in this House; and I’m very proud of it, and I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle are proud.

This is not an open rule today. I don’t want to claim that it is. It’s not on open rule. What we did, though, as the Rules Committee, is we asked all of our colleagues, anyone who has a proposal that they believe will make these bills better, send those amendments to the Rules Committee for consideration. Anybody—Democrat, Republican—send those amendments to the Rules Committee for consideration. This is what we did in the Rules Committee.

We received six Democratic amendments for H.R. 527, six ideas from the 435 Members in this House, six ideas for making these bills better. They all came from the Democratic side of the aisle, and we made every single one of those ideas available for debate here on the House floor. You didn’t have to see that. You didn’t use to see it under Republican administrations. You didn’t use to see it under Democrat administrations. That’s what we’re doing here today in a bipartisan way.

H.R. 3010 sent out a notice to the entire Congress. Send your ideas for making H.R. 3010 better. Send them to the Rules Committee so that we can consider them for consideration on the House floor. There were 12 ideas that were submitted, Madam Speaker—one Republican idea, 11 Democrat ideas. Three of those Democrat ideas were later withdrawn, said, we don’t want to bring those ideas to the floor. So that leaves us with eight, and we brought all but one.

My colleague from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), his amendment was not made in order because my colleague from Texas (Mr. Olson) had an amendment that was substantially similar, and knowing that time is valuable on the House floor, we wanted to consider all ideas, but not all ideas from everybody, each idea only once.

Seven Democratic amendments, one Republican amendment made in order because we invited the entire United States House into this process.

This is the time on the rule, Madam Speaker. I’m not here to debate the underlying provisions. We’ve provided time to debate the underlying provision that we believe will make these bills better, send those amendments to the Rules Committee, and that is we asked all of the aisle are proud.

This is the time on the rule, Madam Speaker. It’s not a little more convoluted than I would have liked? Yes, it is. Is it a little outside of my issue areas? Yes, it is. But does it make in order all of the amendments that our colleagues want to submit? It provides for time for debate on every single idea submitted.

That’s an important change in this House. I’m grateful that we’ve been able to do it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want my colleagues to understand that one of the amendments they didn’t make in order was the amendment offered by our colleague, Congressman JOHNSON, which basically stated that if the experts conclude that the rule would result in a net job creation, the rule shouldn’t be delayed and blocked by all the stuff that’s in this bill because we need jobs right now. It’s interesting that that’s the one that my Republican friends chose to block because it has to do with jobs.

Another amendment that they blocked was one that I had offered. I’ve offered it many, many times in the Rules Committee, and that is to basically bring to the floor an amendment that would subsidize loan programs for the small and strip big oil companies that make it easier for unsafe people to carry concealed weapons from State to State.

That’s the time on the rule, Madam Speaker. I’m going to somehow continue taxpayer subsidies to these big oil companies, yet, when you look at the Republican budget that they passed, they find ways to balance the budget on every single program that impacts middle-income and low-income people in this country.

What they do is they choose to balance the budget by lowering the quality of life and the standard of living for everyday people and for those struggling to get in the middle. There’s no balance here. There’s no balance here, Madam Speaker. The President of the United States came to this Chamber and he gave a speech in which he outlined his jobs bill, which included a number of initiatives, all of which had in the past enjoyed bipartisan support. But I guess because he’s the President, he’s a Democrat, Republican leadership doesn’t want to have those debates here on the floor, give him any victories, because that might not be politically advantageous to them.

Let’s be frank about what’s going on here. In my opinion, this is about political opportunism. This is about the leadership of this House blocking important legislation to put people back to work just because they can, just because it’s been proposed by the President of the United States.

We need to focus on jobs in this Congress. We need to be focused on helping people get back to work. I don’t care what part of the country you’re from, people are hurting, people are struggling, and they’re looking for us to do something, something meaningful, not to bring bills to the floor like this that, in the scheme of things, mean nothing or to have these great debates over re-affirming our national motto or on bills that make it easier for unsafe people to carry concealed weapons from State to State.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, as we stand here today, I would like to pause for a moment and think about an American family who is not here. The husband works in a Home Depot, the wife works as an administrative assistant in a hospital, and they make together about $50,000 a year. And they’re among the fortunate Americans who have jobs, but they’re frankly very worried because it seems like the harder they work, the less ground they gain. They’re going backwards the harder they work.

The House needs to understand that a month from tomorrow, unless this House acts, that family’s taxes will rise by $1,000. A month from tomorrow,
Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I’d be happy to yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would just ask the gentleman, this is preparing to tell us whether the majority will put on this floor before the 31st of December a bill that suspends this tax increase on middle class Americans.

Mr. WOODALL. My friend flattens me by thinking I have the answer to that information as a young freshman on the House floor, but I’ll tell you this. I’ll tell you that two things are true, and it is a puzzler for me on the payroll tax holiday that’s gone on this year.

On the one hand I will tell you that Republicans are absolutely the party of lower taxes and not higher taxes and that actually speaks to this issue. We’re also the party of making sure that we’re paying for those commitments that we’re making. Social Security is different from any other tax, and when I go and talk to my grand-father, he’ll say, ‘Rob, I want that Social Security. I paid into it all my life.’

Well, we’re not paying into it right now. The proposal is not to pay into it next year, the proposal was not to pay into it last year. I’d be interested to ask my friend if he’s prepared to support lowering those Social Security benefits because, again, this is something we’re paying into.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I’d be happy to yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I am most certainly not in favor of that. I would frankly make up the lost revenue with a surtax on people making more than a million dollars a year to cover it.

Let me ask the gentleman another question.

I understand that there are differing views in his party, and frankly ours, as to whether an extension of the cut for middle class families should continue.

And I’m not asking him to say it would pass. That’s beyond the reach of any Member, even the Speaker.

But I’m majority prepared to make a commitment to the American people to at least get to vote on it, that it will let the majority work its will and either vote “yes” or “no” on avoiding this tax increase on middle class Americans.

Mr. WOODALL. I would say to my friend that the majority, again speaking out of school as a young freshman here on the House floor, but I know enough about my leadership to know the majority is absolutely committed to protecting and preserving Social Security not just for this generation but the next generation and beyond. And the question is going to be can we find a proposal, because the one that was passed last year was not a proposal that both lowered tax burdens and protected the solvency of Medicare and Social Security.

We must be sure not to further bankrupt a program that is already bankrupt. I look forward to that debate, Madam Speaker, between now and the end of the year.

And it’s not just that tax that’s expiring. I know my friend is also concerned about the Bush-Obama tax cuts that are extended into 2010 and wants to be sure that those will be extended in 2011 on into 2013.

Mr. WOODALL. I would say to my friend that I happen to support up-down votes on all sorts of things. I’m an open rules guy, and I’m very proud of our Speaker who believes that the House works best when the House works its will. That’s really one of the changes that I understand we’ve seen in this year that we haven’t seen in years past.

I think that’s important, Madam Speaker, for us to be able to bring those votes to the floor.

But it’s also important to make sure that folks have all of the information in the same way that folks might be tempted to mischaracterize these balancing provisions that we’re bringing forth today as some sort of Republican chicanery.

Folks might also be tempted to characterize something that is going to hasten the bankruptcy of Social Security as being something that has no consequence at all. There really are consequences to this decision. And to say to my friend I look forward to a robust debate on that because it’s an important issue for American families.

With that, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield. That’s really one of the Democratic amendments offered, six Democrat amendments made in order. The House works best when the House works its will. The rule today is providing that opportunity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend from Georgia for engaging in good spirit in this dialogue. I want to make it clear: I think it’s the position of our party very clearly the House should vote on whether to avoid this thousand-dollar
tax increase on the middle class. That's our position.

I think you can hear that the majority position is a little more nuanced than that. It is a yes-or-no question. We think there ought to be a vote on avoiding a thousand-dollar tax increase on the middle class. And we're ready to put our cards in the machine and do that.

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

My friend, the gentleman from Georgia, said that his party likes to pay for things. That statement startled me a little bit because they didn't think it was important to pay for the Bush tax cuts, mostly for the rich, which have now bankrupted us. They didn't think it was important to pay for the Medicare prescription drug bill, which was a lot more expensive than they had promised and was not paid for. They don't think about paying for the two wars that we're fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq.

We had balanced budgets when Bill Clinton left office. It was after that that everything got out of whack, and it was because of these tax cuts, which were mostly for the wealthy, and it was because of a prescription drug bill and two wars, all of which were not paid for. So I hope my friends on the other side have finally gotten religion on this issue in that it is important to try to pay for things as you go along and to embrace PAYGO as Democrats have done.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I just don't think Americans can wait, but here we are again today debating legislation that will do nothing to create jobs or to help families during these tough economic times.

I agree with my colleague from New Jersey that we think that there just needs to be a vote on the House floor on this payroll tax cut, which, so far, my friends on the other side are not agreeing to. There were 120 million American families that had $1,000 more in their pockets last year because of the payroll tax holiday that we passed. I believe we need to pass a new middle class tax cut, one that will save the typical family $1,500.

Now, I do agree with my friend from Georgia about job creators, I love job creators, but I think I have a different point of view on what helps our job creators and what helps our small businesses. I spent Saturday, November 26, Small Business Saturday, shopping in small businesses.

I went into every one of them, and I talked to them about what would help them: What can we do in Congress to help you as a small business? Almost every single one of them said, Do you know what we need? We need customers. We need Americans to have jobs, and we need them to have money in their pockets that they will spend in our small businesses. That will help us. I guarantee, if we were to get more customers, we would expand and we would hire more people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Poe of Texas). The time of the gentlelady has expired.

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

Ms. HAHN. We know that it's our small businesses that have hired almost 60 percent of the new jobs that we've had in this country. We know that $1,500 would go back into the economy, and we know that that $1,500, through this middle class tax cut, would help businesses in this country.

I know we've been called the do-nothing Congress; but in this instance, if we do nothing, Americans who can least afford it will be come out right after the holidays. I dare say, Americans who will see that kind of a tax increase in January might worry about how they're spending their money this December, and it may just be enough to make us think about paying our own taxes, for their own families, but to those who are in need in this country.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself such time as I may consume, Mr. Speaker, to say I'm always happy to find things that I agree on with those across the aisle.

I'll say to my friend from California that we're both new in this House and that I spent my Saturday doing those very same things. My small business owners told me that very same thing, though they told me one more thing.

They said, Do get the foot of government off the throat of my small business. They did say, Rob, you cannot help me by doing more, but you can help me by doing less. You can help me by getting out of the way and by letting me do what I do.

The question then becomes how we get those customers in that store, and there are absolutely two visions for making that happen. We can either try to dispense more favors from Washington, DC, Mr. Speaker. We can try to pump more money that we don't have out of Washington, DC, money that we're borrowing from our children and grandchildren; or we can try to get folks higher- and better-paying jobs—more jobs—which is what this rule is about today.

We are running jobs out of this country. We are forcing jobs out of this country. The new report came out of over 150 nations, Mr. Speaker. We are number 69 in how easy it is for businesses to comply with their tax burdens, for example. Number 69. We should be the best place on Earth to do business.

What is it that raises salaries? Sometimes my friend on the left suggests that we could just raise the minimum wage and just guarantee every-

body money, but I don't believe we can. What we can do is give folks an opportunity to increase their productivity. No worker on the planet works harder than the American worker. No worker on the planet has more productivity than the American worker, and regulations that slow down regulation slows the American worker down. If you want to put more money in the American worker's pocket, you let the American worker be more productive by providing some balance.

Again, nothing was talking about today, Mr. Speaker, says thou shalt not regulate. We know we're going to regulate. What we're saying is, let's regulate with balance. Then my friend's small businesses and my small businesses will have those customers that they need to get this economy moving again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just want to underscore that, if we were to extend the payroll tax cut, according to Mark Zandi, who is a Republican economist who advised JOHN MCCAIN in his Presidential campaign, it would create 750,000 jobs. He also says that we're likely to go into a recession if the payroll tax cut expires, if my Republican friends don't allow us to have a vote up or down on it. I am going to ask people to vote 'no' on the previous question so that we can have an up-or-down vote on this and so that people will have an opportunity to make their views on this issue known.

The other thing is we've heard all this talk about what the cost of regulation is. Again, some of the numbers that have been touted here I question very seriously. OMB's calculations demonstrate that regulation has a positive net effect on the economy and not by a little. In 2008, the Bush administration's OMB put regulatory costs for major rules were between $16 billion and $54 billion and that the benefits of those regulations were between $122 billion and $656 billion.

So it goes back to the point I was making earlier, which is what we should be doing on this floor today—debating a bill to put people back to work. We should be extending the payroll tax cut. We should also be talking about initiatives that the President put forward that year: bipartisanship initiatives. We should be doing things that will make a real difference in people's lives.

My friend talks about the American worker. There is no Congressman no Republican leader in my lifetime that has been more hostile to the American worker than the leadership that runs this House right now, bringing bill after bill after bill to this floor to take away the rights of workers at every single level.

Do you want to know what one of the problems is with jobs moving overseas? It's that some of the incentives in our
tax laws have made it easier and even attractive for companies to pack up and go overseas and hire cheaper labor. One of the problems with these series of bills that we’re dealing with here today is that it will result in a rush to the bottom by regulating the lowest common denominator in terms of clean water and clean air standards—because, among other things, this legislation says that we should take into consideration the standards in other countries.

So China is going to now set our clean water and our clean air standards? Give me a break. Let’s get real. Let’s bring something to the floor that will make a difference in the lives of the American people, especially those who are unemployed. Let’s bring a real jobs bill to the floor. Let’s do something meaningful.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I could likely go back and forth all day long with my friend from Massachusetts believing that he loves workers more, with my believing that I love workers more, and with his believing that to define “loving of workers” means we have to regulate them different from Washington, D.C. For me, “loving workers means we’re going to free them to do things that they do best, which is to produce. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Judiciary Committee whose was not made in order by the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Johnson).

Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bills. Instead of creating jobs, the Grover Norquist/Tea Party Republicans are assaulting the very fabric that ensure we have clean air, safe water and food, along with safe prescription drugs and other products that Americans consume. They want us to create so many barriers and obstacles that it would essentially make it impossible for Federal agencies to do their jobs, all in the name of simply increasing the profits of big business.

The Regulatory Accountability Act would require agencies to perform 60 additional and other regulatory procedures within the rulemaking process, further slowing down an already burdensome process. I am talking about bureaucratic red tape. They want to take it to the next level. They want to duct tape and blindfold and put a straitjacket on Federal agencies issuing regulations that help Americans. This would also make it much easier for large corporations to evade their obligations to protect the public by giving special interests multiple points in the process to tie up the process in knots.

The Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act is no better. It’s a wolf in sheep’s clothing. Don’t be fooled. This is not about helping small businesses. It’s about halting regulations and increasing the profits of big business. Under the guise of small business protection, it would subject any regulation that could conceivably have any direct or indirect adverse affects to a more lengthy process, thereby delaying the implementation of virtually any action any agency proposes and wasting agency time while doing so.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and this bill.

Mr. WOODALL. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like to insert in the Record the Statement of Administration Policy, which is opposed to this legislation.

* * *

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 3010—REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2011

(Rep. Lamar Smith, R–Texas, and 36 cosponsors, Nov. 29, 2011)

The Administration is committed to ensuring that regulations are smart and effective, that they are tailored to advance statutory goals in the most cost-effective and efficient manner, and that they minimize uncertainty. Accordingly, the Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 3010, the Regulatory Accountability Act. The Regulatory Accountability Act would impose unprecedented procedural requirements on agencies that would prevent them from performing their current responsibilities. It would also create needless regulatory and legal uncertainty and increase costs for businesses, as well as state, tribal, and local governments.

In these ways and others, the Regulatory Accountability Act would impede the ability of agencies to provide the public with basic protections, and create needless confusion and delay that would prove disruptive for businesses, as well as for state, tribal and local governments.

If the President were presented with the Regulatory Accountability Act, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. Speaker, jobs, jobs, jobs. That’s what we should be focusing on today—not guns, not abortion, not reaffirming our national motto—jobs. We need to put people back to work. But that doesn’t seem to be part of the Republican agenda, and it’s hurting our country.

At the end of this year, as you have already heard during this debate, the payroll tax cut goes away by President Obama will expire. Without action, middle class Americans will see their taxes go up by a thousand dollars next year. Without action, GDP growth will fall by half a percent and will cost the economy 400,000 jobs according to the economic forecasting group Macroeconomic Advisers. Extending this tax cut is not just good for American families, it’s good for the American economy. According to Ameriprise Financial, extending the payroll tax cut could add more than 1 million jobs to the economy.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of legislation that we need to be debating, not right-wing, hot-button social issues or bills that, when you add it all up, don’t mean anything to anybody in this country.

But where is this extension of the payroll tax? It’s not in this rule? It’s not in the majority leader’s schedule. In fact, the Republicans seem to be ignoring this issue.

It’s said that the Republican leadership would rather raise taxes on middle class Americans basically to protect tax breaks of millionaires. If there was a vote right now on a bill that was going to cut one penny, it was going to cost Donald Trump one penny more in taxes, the other side would be overfilled with speakers. But we’re talking about middle-income Americans, struggling Americans, that if we don’t act by the end of this year they will see a $1,000 increase in their taxes. We can change that here today. We can change that here today and actually bring to the floor something that is meaningful. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to require that we vote on a payroll tax holiday extension. If the rule next year has an extension, all working Americans will get a little less in their paychecks beginning in January.

[Continued...]

H7955

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE
Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous materials prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, again I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so we can make sure that working families do not see their payroll taxes go up while we're still struggling to recover from a recession. This is exactly the type of action that people all over the country are hoping this Congress will move on. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I'm proud to be here with you today, Mr. Speaker. When we talk about jobs, we talk about why I came to Congress, and that is exactly what we're talking about in this rule today. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, you have seen with great concern what I have seen here today, and that is a complete disconnect. It appears, with my colleagues on this side of the aisle, with the understanding that increasing regulation, needlessly increasing regulation, burdens the American worker, undermines the American economy, thwarts jobs. And I say, Mr. Speaker, this is one of those things that I wish we were just going to have to agree to disagree, because it is as clear to me as it is that the sky is blue that when you increase the regulatory burden you make the American family poorer for it.

I know I can't ask for a show of hands here, Mr. Speaker, but if I did and said, Who is it, who wants dirtier drinking water back home in their district? Who is it that doesn't drink from the same spigot as the rest of us? Who is it that doesn't shop at the same grocery stores as the rest of us? Who is it who doesn't drive on the same roads as the rest of us? We're all in this boat together.

We're all this boat together.

I come from the Deep South, and whenever we start talking about environmental issues, it always gets me so personal liberty. But we have decided that we are going to give up individual liberty so we can exist collectively. We agree, because it is as clear to me as it is that the sky is blue that when you increase the regulatory burden you make the American family poorer for it.

I know I can't ask for a show of hands here, Mr. Speaker, but if I did and said, Who is it, who wants dirtier drinking water back home in their district? Who is it that doesn't drink from the same spigot as the rest of us? Who is it that doesn't shop at the same grocery stores as the rest of us? Who is it who doesn't drive on the same roads as the rest of us? We're all in this boat together.

We're all this boat together.

I come from the Deep South, and whenever we start talking about environmental issues, it always gets me so personal liberty. But we have decided that we are going to give up individual liberty so we can exist collectively. We agree, because it is as clear to me as it is that the sky is blue that when you increase the regulatory burden you make the American family poorer for it.

I know I can't ask for a show of hands here, Mr. Speaker, but if I did and said, Who is it, who wants dirtier drinking water back home in their district? Who is it that doesn't drink from the same spigot as the rest of us? Who is it that doesn't shop at the same grocery stores as the rest of us? Who is it who doesn't drive on the same roads as the rest of us? We're all in this boat together.

We're all this boat together.

I come from the Deep South, and whenever we start talking about environmental issues, it always gets me so personal liberty. But we have decided that we are going to give up individual liberty so we can exist collectively. We agree, because it is as clear to me as it is that the sky is blue that when you increase the regulatory burden you make the American family poorer for it.

I know I can't ask for a show of hands here, Mr. Speaker, but if I did and said, Who is it, who wants dirtier drinking water back home in their district? Who is it that doesn't drink from the same spigot as the rest of us? Who is it that doesn't shop at the same grocery stores as the rest of us? Who is it who doesn't drive on the same roads as the rest of us? We're all in this boat together.

We're all this boat together.
Mr. Speaker, these bills do that today: balance benefits and burdens, provide that information to the American voter, and let’s make sure that what we’re doing is worth it.

Mr. Speaker, this is an example of how we do a rule, how we ought to open up the process, how one ought to encourage debate on all of the ideas that are brought to this House floor. I encourage strong support for this rule. I encourage strong support for the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 477 OFFERED BY MR. MCCOY OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 5. Not later than December 16, 2011, the House of Representatives shall vote on passage of a bill to extend the payroll tax holiday beyond 2011, the title of which is as follows: ‘Payroll Tax Holiday Extension Act of 2011.’

(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 rules on the previous question 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 April 29, 1929, 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 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 was asked to yield the floor to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. 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 on adopting the resolution: “(and) has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.”

WORKFORCE DEMOCRACY AND FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and in consideration of the bill, H.R. 3094.

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

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3094.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. George Miller) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3094, the Workforce Democracy and Fairness Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The legislation we are considering today is straightforward. It reaffirms workforce protections that have been in place for decades.

Across the country, the American people are asking: How can we get this economy moving again? What will it take to finally put people back to work? And Washington is grappling with a number of answers. Some think we should support more spending, more taxes, and more regulations. In essence, they are asking the country to double down on the same failed policies of the past.

My Republican colleagues and I believe we should chart a different course, one that includes removing regulatory roadblocks to job creation. The Workforce Democracy and Fairness Act is part of that effort. The legislation says we shouldn’t allow unelected bureaucrats to dictate policies that make our workplaces less competitive. Because the National Labor Relations Board proposed sweeping changes to the rules governing union elections. Under the board’s radical scheme, employers would have just 7 days to find an attorney and navigate a host of complicated legal issues before confronting an NLRB election official. Employees will have as little as 10 days to decide whether they want to join a union, denying them an opportunity to gain valuable information and make an informed decision.

The NLRB is already telling employers like Boeing where they can and cannot create jobs. Now the board wants to take away a worker’s right to make a fully informed decision in a union election. This proposal largely prohibits employers from raising additional legal concerns, denies answers to questions that can influence the vote, and turns over to union leaders even more personal and employee information.

Let’s get something straight: The board’s scheme isn’t about modernizing the election process. This is a draconian effort to stifle employer speech and ambush workers with a union election. Less debate, less information, and less opposition—that’s Big Labor’s approach to workers’ free choice, and it is being rapidly implemented by the activist NLRB.

For 4 years Democrats controlled this Congress. To my knowledge, not once did they try to streamline the union election process. Not once. They did champion a failed effort to strip workers of their right to a secret ballot, but they didn’t bother to offer any solutions to the alleged problems they now decried the election process.

Today, union elections take place in an average of 31 days, giving workers a month to consider the monumental