



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2012

No. 146

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, November 15, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BLAKE FARENTHOLD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 6118. An act to amend section 353 of the Public Health Service Act with respect to suspension, revocation, and limitation of laboratory certification.

H.R. 6131. An act to extend the Undertaking Spam, Spyware, And Fraud Enforcement With Enforcers beyond Borders Act of 2006, and for other purposes.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, a group of Members from both parties are going to meet together to discuss the possible legislative options to start a process of bringing our troops home from Afghanistan in 2013.

Yesterday I was on the floor speaking about Army Specialist Joshua Nelson, from my home county, who was killed by the very Afghans he was sent to train. Specialist Nelson is just one of 60 U.S. servicemembers who have been killed this year by the Afghans that they were sent to train.

I don't know where the outrage is by the United States Congress. I am very disappointed in both parties and their leadership to allow our young men and women to stay in a war that has no end to it. This makes no sense to the American people. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the American people have said time after time, in poll after poll, that they want to bring our troops home now—not in 2014, but now.

On October 7, there was a national article written, and the title was, "A Mother Mourns a Grim Milestone," referring to the 2,000th American casualty from the Afghan war. Lisa Freeman, who was interviewed in the article, lost her son Captain Matthew Freeman in 2009. He was shot by a sniper in Afghanistan. Ms. Freeman said:

I just sat here, reliving the pain and wondering: Where is America's outrage? Where is America's concern that we're still at war.

And, Mr. Speaker, I made reference to this yesterday. The October 14 New York Times editorial, "Time to Pack Up," with the subtitle, "It should not take 2 more years for the United States to leave Afghanistan."

"It should not take 2 more years for the United States to leave Afghanistan." Since I strongly agree with that statement, I have started an online petition to start bringing our troops home in the summer or fall of 2013. The

petition can be signed through my Web site at jones.house.gov. And, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell you that in just 3 weeks, we have over 2,000 Americans that have signed this petition. Our goal is to reach as many people as possible to put the pressure on our leadership to stop the loss of life and treasure in Afghanistan.

Congress, let's get together and work on legislation to bring our troops home before the current timeline of December 2014.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, this is one of the many posters that I have that I bring to the floor. There's a flag-draped coffin. There's a group of Army officers. There's a woman holding the hand of a child. And you can see in the face of the child, Why is my daddy in that flag-draped coffin?

Congress, let's wake up. Let's come together. Let's start the process of bringing our troops home in 2013. Please, God, continue to bless our men and women in uniform. Please, God, continue to bless America.

BEYOND "BIKE-PARTISANSHIP"

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. For years, I have traveled the country preaching "bike-partisanship," using bicycle and pedestrian facilities to help people burn calories, not fossil fuel, improve their health, have fun, and enrich the community. Red State, blue State, Republican, Democrat, Independent, it doesn't matter; the public gets it and has been part of an amazing renaissance. Let's redouble our efforts at creating a stronger Federal partnership to help more communities realize this vision.

But let's not stop with bike-partisanship. Are there other areas that are low or no cost that enjoy broad public support, solve problems, and bring people

□ 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.

H6371

together rather than divide them? What about rebuilding and renewing America? Certainly the need is there.

Until recently, the T&I Committee was an island of congressional consensus. Since we merely extended the last transportation reauthorization and the new Congress must act in about 97 weeks, let's work on a bolder vision of investing in America, one that puts people to work, improves the economy, the environment, and saves money in the long run. Congress can begin on this now.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy, Congress can't ignore the near bankrupt flood insurance program. While we fix the short-term problems, however, let's make it more effective, efficient, and actuarially sound so that it will spare lives, property, and the Federal Treasury. Overhauling the flood insurance program would solve the most immediate challenges caused by extreme weather events likely due to global warming. We may even be able to discuss climate change in a more thoughtful and rational way.

Based on the work I've done in the past with Congressman PAUL RYAN and Senator-elect JEFF FLAKE, I know agricultural reform is a ripe opportunity. Taxpayers cannot afford to lavish unnecessary subsidies on large agribusiness while harming the environment and shortchanging small farmers and ranchers.

Surely Tea Party Republicans and members of the Progressive Caucus can come together to improve nutrition, wildlife habitats, hunting, and fishing while strengthening family farms.

And since Big Bird dodged a bullet during the Presidential campaign, maybe it's time to address the vital role that the Federal support for public broadcasting plays, which we all rely on—not just for news and information, but education for our kids and, as illustrated by Hurricane Sandy, emergency communication.

With incredibly broad public support from Americans regardless of political party, Congress should make a long-term financial commitment to funding the most trusted brand in broadcasting so it can plan for the future.

The last 10 years have been characterized by bipartisan cooperation to promote access to safe drinking water and sanitation around the globe. My 2005 legislation, cosponsored by Henry Hyde, Bill Frist, HARRY REID, saved lives and made friends for America.

In this Congress we have another bipartisan bill, Water for the World, which is cosponsored by my friend TED POE, which would build on that foundation and accelerate progress. It's all teed up and ready to go and could be easily passed next week.

Mr. Speaker, 86 percent of Americans think getting full information about their situation as a loved one faces the end of life should be a top priority for health care. Before the 2009 political "lie of the year" about "death panels," this provision in the health care reform enjoyed broad bipartisan support.

There is new legislation to personalize people's health care so that they get the information they need to make these difficult, sometimes painful, decisions and make sure their decisions, whatever they are, are respected by doctors and hospitals. This refined legislation could easily be achieved now that we're implementing health care reform.

These are all bipartisan, cost-effective initiatives that are overwhelmingly embraced by the public. Is it perhaps time to have a Legislators' Caucus, where Members in both parties who just want to get something done can come together with ideas like these? Who knows? Working together to get something done might become habit-forming.

LOOK OUT FOR OUR FINANCIAL FUTURE

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to share a plea from home, from Tony, about the impending fiscal cliff.

Tony writes:

We are going to have to go over the fiscal cliff and see the economy crumble before the majority of the people realize how much trouble we are really in.

I have end-stage renal failure, am on Medicare, and receive disability each month. I do dialysis three times a week. That said, I will willingly and gladly take a reduction in my benefits if it means we can reduce our deficit. I have two young nieces, and I am looking out for their financial future. In fact, if I knew that taking away all my benefits would get rid of our debt, I would do that today.

Mr. President, hear Tony's plea. Don't take us over the fiscal cliff. Tony and his nieces need you to lead. They need it now.

□ 1010

AMERICA'S LATINOS

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I'm here today to make an introduction. I would like the Republican Party to meet America's Latinos. There are more than 53 million of us. But let me tell you a little bit about who we are and what we do.

First of all, most Latinos are citizens; and, in fact, most of us have been here for many generations. We live all over the United States, and our population is growing fast. In fact, every single year, 500,000 young Latino citizens turn 18 and become eligible to vote. Of Latinos under the age of 18, 93 percent are already citizens of the United States of America. In this last election, one in 10 voters were Latino. In another decade, we will be 25 percent of the voting age population in this great Nation of ours.

Here's a key fact about the more than 16 million Latino immigrants.

They work; and they work hard, often in jobs that are the hardest to fill, picking grapes and garlic, caring for young children in day care centers, sweeping and cleaning as janitors, and, yes, digging ditches and making sure our dishes are washed. You know what else they do? They pay taxes, regardless of their legal status.

But here's one last fact you should know about Latinos. They love America. And, my Republican friends, I promise you, in time, you'll love us, too.

I hope this introduction is helpful, but I know it's a little late. The Republican Party really met Latinos on Election Day. At about 11 p.m., when the race was over, pundits, political strategists, and Republican candidates opened their eyes to discover who really lives and votes in the U.S. It looked like we were watching Columbus stumble across America. Latino voters, who knew? Demographic changes moving as slow as glaciers, but this one seemed to sneak up on the news media like a sudden thunderstorm.

I've been trying to introduce my colleagues to real Latinos and immigrants for some time. I've worked on bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bills and stayed at the table to work out a compromise even after all Republicans had left the table. But the Republican Party seemed much more interested in the imaginary Latinos they tried to use as a wedge issue, so they crafted messages aimed at the very few Americans who are not offended when immigrants are referred to as criminals, gang-bangers, freeloaders, and lawbreakers whenever they are spoken about in America.

The party nominated a Presidential candidate who carried around a to-do list of creative ways to offend Latinos. It called for the deportation of more than 10 million families and say to self-deport, check; celebrate the extreme Arizona post-immigration laws, check; threaten to veto the DREAM Act and let hundreds of thousands of young people who have applied for deferred action fear for their future, check; stand with other Republicans and begged for their endorsement when they have called for electrified fencing to keep out immigrants because "that works on livestock," check, check, check.

I believe Election Day was a checkmate for extreme, unfair, and intolerant anti-immigrant policies. Now, we need to come together to make progress.

In truth, some Democrats did not seem to really see this new electorate either or see the change coming. Too many Democrats did not see immigration reform as an urgent issue or recognize the need for change in a country that deports 1,000 people a day.

We need to set aside the mistakes of both parties and do what is right for the American people, including Latino immigrants. We need to invite Democrats and Republicans to sit at a big

table to work out immigration reform as soon as possible.

I have suggested that President Obama set up that big table at Camp David and invite leaders from both parties to discuss how we forge the coalition to pass comprehensive immigration reform. I think after the Election Day wake-up call, there are more and more of us willing to come to that table and negotiate, including friends in the Republican Party.

We have heard from Republican leaders who want to be at that table. I know some Republicans want to come to the table because they want the immigration issue off the table. They want it off the table because they are worried about Democrats running the table in statewide and national elections for the foreseeable future.

But listen, whatever your reason for coming to the table, please come. Together, we can fight for justice for immigrants. Together, we can reestablish the rule of law. Together, we can make immigration one of the greatest and most defining aspects of American society instead of something that divides us. Together, we can make Americans see that we can work together—Republicans and Democrats—as Americans first. So, please, join us and do what's right for this great Nation of ours.

THANKSGIVING

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

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, in just about a week or so, we're going to be sitting down at tables celebrating Thanksgiving and eating turkey and getting a little sleepy maybe afterwards. But as we think about Thanksgiving and we think about the holiday of Thanksgiving Day, it may be interesting and it may add a little richness to that holiday if we remember how it came about and what we have to be thankful for.

There were originally a group of people that came to this country on the Mayflower, and a number of them onboard had the dream of building a new kind of country, something that Europe had never seen before. They believed that they would take principles that they found in the Bible and that they would apply them in a new way and create a new structure of what a country could look like.

So they came to America. And after landing, within the first 4 months, half of them had died. And you would think they would pretty much give up on a dream at that point. The Mayflower had stayed to give them some protection and shelter, so it was in the early springtime that this group of the people that were left—about 55 of the Pilgrims—had to make a decision. You could think of it as actually voting, only voting with their feet.

They were approached by the captain of the Mayflower, and the captain of the Mayflower said, Things aren't going so well. I've lost half my crew,

and half of you are dead, and we are going to be heading back to England. And I recommend that you get on the Mayflower because you don't have adequate supplies, and you don't have really a knowledge of how you're going to be able to deal with the wilderness that you are living in.

So it was that the Mayflower's captain gave the commands, the old seaweed-covered anchor cable was hauled onboard, the yardarms were trimmed to the wind, and first large and then small, the Mayflower disappears over the horizon. The wind is blowing through the trees, and 55 courageous men, women, and children stood on the beach.

Why did they stay? They stayed because they believed in the dream that they had in their hearts, of making a new nation. And by staying, they gave us some things that we should be thankful for, not just the Thanksgiving turkey.

First of all, they came with the idea that civil government and church government were separate types of governments, and the civil government shouldn't run the church or the other way around.

□ 1020

So they were what was called in those days "separatists" because they wanted to separate from the King of England who was running the Church.

So the first thing they gave us was the concept of separating civil and church governments. But the second thing that happened was, when they arrived in Massachusetts, they were blown off course by the storms; and so they had no government. So a group of free people, under God, wrote a document called the Mayflower Compact. It starts: "In the name of God," and it goes on to say to frame just and equal laws.

So what happened was a group of free people, under God, created a civil government, and that of course was the foundation of our Declaration of Independence. And all of American civil government we can trace back to these courageous 55 people who stayed on the beach.

So as you're having your turkey, think about how they gave us the idea of separating civil and church governments, and also how it was that they gave us the idea that our Creator gives us life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Have a great Thanksgiving. God bless you.

OLD REPUBLICAN REFRAIN

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, the Republican refrain is quite familiar: these tax increases will cause economic devastation, a recession, millions of lost jobs. Is that today's fiscal cliff? No. Actually, that's the Republicans in oppos-

ing the Clinton-era tax increases, 1993, opposed by every Republican.

Did their predicted doom and gloom come true? Well, kind of not, actually. We balanced the budget, we paid down debt, and we had 3.8 percent unemployment while the millionaires and billionaires were paying a slightly higher rate of taxes.

Fast forward to today's debate: restore the Clinton-era tax rates to millionaires and billionaires. Republicans have dusted off the nineties rhetoric—economic collapse, devastation, at least 700,000 jobs. The job-creator millionaires and billionaires, they're living on the edge. They have no discretionary income. Any modest increase in taxes to them will stop them from making productive, job-creating investments, like the hundreds of millions of dollars they spent on super PACs in the last election to try and elect a President and a Congress that will bend to their will and lower their taxes even further while cutting middle-income families' programs that are essential, like Social Security and student financial aid.

Now, after their impassioned defense of tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires, Republicans do have a second priority—they're not a one-note party, so you've got to give them credit for that—and that is to somehow kill Social Security, which they've never supported. They think it makes people lazy. Well, there are millionaires and billionaires that don't ever expect they will need it, so they don't care.

And under the guise of deficit reduction, the Republicans are saying, well, we've either got to privatize Social Security, got to increase the retirement age, or we've got to reduce the already inadequate COLA that seniors get. Let's chain the CPI. That's their refrain: we must cut entitlements. Well, guess what, Social Security has never contributed one penny to the deficit or the debt of the United States of America. It is a program which pays for itself.

So why this single-minded focus on cutting Social Security? Yeah, it does have a projected problem of about 23 percent to pay full benefits starting in 2036. So, yeah, there's a long-term problem; but, actually, that's quite easily fixed. All we have to do is close the tax loophole. And maybe we agree there.

Here's a loophole I'd like to close: Why does a millionaire pay one-tenth the rate of taxes to Social Security of a cop on the beat, or a soldier in the field, or a teacher in the classroom? I don't know. That's what the law says. Well, how about we lift the cap and have the millionaires and billionaires pay the same percent of their income to Social Security as cops and teachers and soldiers in the military. Seems fair to me. There's a loophole we could close. And that would give Social Security assets adequate to pay 100 percent of benefits for at least 75 years into the future, as far as the actuaries will

guarantee. So there's a loophole we can agree on closing, hopefully.

But they are going to have to give up on this lame argument that somehow making millionaires and billionaires pay taxes at the rate of the Clinton era, when we had record low unemployment, will hurt our economy.

GRANTING PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TO RUSSIA

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of a district that recorded more than \$2 billion in exports last year, I know full well the significance of expanding market access for American companies and ensuring that our businesses are competing on a level playing field. That's why I believe it's important to support passage of H.R. 6156, which will grant permanent normal trade relations to Russia.

This past August, Russia joined the World Trade Organization, giving its members full access to Russia's rapidly growing market, reduced tariffs, and ensured transparency when implementing trade measures. However, while foreign competitors are currently benefiting, the U.S. will not receive any of these benefits until Congress authorizes the President to grant Russia permanent normal trade relations. Simply put, American companies, workers, and farmers are being put at a competitive disadvantage.

Last year, my home State of Michigan exported \$225 million worth of goods to Russia, despite many of its best products facing tough competition from foreign competitors. With this agreement in place, farmers and producers in my district will be assured of more predictable market access for their crops and agricultural goods, while manufacturers will enjoy reduced tariff rates for Michigan-made vehicles and equipment.

As a World Trade Organization member, Russia has agreed to comply with the rule of law. Though these reforms won't happen overnight, Russia's accession to the World Trade Organization requires their compliance with all of the organization's rules and duties. This includes addressing discriminatory practices, enforcing intellectual property rights, and increasing transparency. If it does not comply, members can enforce them through dispute mechanisms.

Of further importance, this legislation includes critical human rights provisions which will hold foreign officials accountable for gross human rights abuses and prevent them from entering the U.S. or accessing our financial systems.

House Republicans have worked tirelessly during the 112th Congress to advance pro-growth legislation which provides greater certainty for American companies and helps our Nation's businesses hire more American work-

ers. We've made great gains in advancing trade interests for the U.S. and promoting new market opportunities for our companies.

An ambitious trade agenda must continue for us to successfully lower the unemployment rate and restore our place as the global economic leader, and I'm glad we have the opportunity to pass another part of that plan today. If we're going to jump-start our economy and get Americans back to work, we have to find ways to increase global market access for American companies and to advance economic freedom.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation today.

CALLING FOR AN END TO WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues here in Congress from both sides of the aisle to call for an end to the war in Afghanistan. After more than a decade of war, with now more than 2,000 lives lost and hundreds of billions of American tax dollars spent, it's time for our troops to come home to their families.

I represent the military communities of Travis Air Force Base, and come January I will represent the community of Beale Air Force Base as well. I can tell you from firsthand experience that the men and women who serve in our Nation's military and their families are America's finest. They are not afraid of sacrifice. They joined the armed forces because they love our country and they are willing to give everything to keep our Nation safe, but their sacrifice must be for a reason. If we're going to ask them to risk life and limb on the other side of the world, it must be for a mission that is vital to our Nation's security. We can no longer say that about the mission in Afghanistan.

Our brave soldiers are continuing to die in Afghanistan for what is now a war of choice. We sent them to eliminate the terrorists responsible for the terrible 9/11 tragedy, and they did it with remarkable courage and competence. The al Qaeda training camps have long been eliminated; most of al Qaeda's top leaders have been killed or captured; Osama bin Laden is long dead.

□ 1030

Terrorism remains a global threat, and we must combat it. But keeping tens of thousands of troops in a country the size of Texas is no way to achieve this objective. Rather, we must continue to use our superb intelligence capabilities and our special operation forces to root out the terrorist networks and destroy their leaderships wherever they may be.

When we do bring our troops home, we must ensure that our returning he-

roes receive the support that is their due when they get back. We must make sure that they have access to housing, medical care, employment, educational opportunities that they deserve, and we must take care of all of our veterans.

The war in Afghanistan has lasted 11 long years, and it must not last another. It's time to bring our troops home. And as we do so, we must turn our attention to rebuild America's economy. One way to do this is to focus on enhancing our green energy sector.

The American wind energy industry is in jeopardy. The production tax credit will end December 31, 2012. It must be extended or else 30,000 jobs will be lost and 450 manufacturing businesses will close.

Two additional measures must also be considered. First, we could apply the master limited partnership and the real estate investment tax programs to the green energy sector and, thereby, bring significant financing opportunities along with the production tax credit.

AVOIDING THE FISCAL CLIFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, while the President returned from the campaign trail last week with a slightly more conciliatory tone, his insistence on a year-end tax hike on small businesses is unchanged, and frankly, that is completely unacceptable.

It is unacceptable for more than 23 million Americans struggling for work right now. It's unacceptable for millions of middle class Americans struggling to support their families with rising gas prices and higher health insurance costs. And it's unacceptable because it will destroy jobs and hurt our economy.

Yesterday, the President said that his reelection victory is a mandate to help the middle class. He can start with helping the middle class by stopping his job-killing tax hike on small businesses.

The President continues to call for increased tax rates for the top two brackets, which hit more than 1 million small businesses and 53 percent of all small business income. That's a big problem, considering that small businesses create two out of every three jobs in America.

According to the Ernst & Young report, the President's plan will result in the elimination of 700,000 jobs.

The position of the congressional Republicans on extending current income tax rates for all Americans is far from extreme. It is actually the same exact position that President Obama espoused 2 years ago when he agreed to extend all Bush-era tax rates for 2 years on the basis that raising tax rates would hurt our weak economy.

That logic still stands. In fact, our economy is even weaker today than it

was in 2010. GDP growth is lower than in 2010, in large part due to the looming cost of the President's health care law and his administration's dramatic increase in regulations.

With more than 23 million Americans struggling to find work, that is not the time to be raising taxes on anyone, period.

We must also find common ground on the defense sequester to ensure that spending cuts are implemented, but in a way that does not weaken our military or threaten our national security.

Both the tax and spending issues we face in lame duck are a microcosm of our Nation's massive fiscal and economic long-term challenges. Entitlement reform and comprehensive, pro-growth tax reform in the 113th Congress are key to addressing our Nation's greatest challenges.

The policy outcome and the narrative that transpire from this lame duck session will set the stage for what is possible in 2013 and beyond. We have a critical opportunity right now to avert the fiscal cliff and lay the groundwork for bipartisanship with policies that reflect our economic and our fiscal realities.

DELIVERING ON VOTERS' DEMAND FOR BOTH PARTIES TO COMPROMISE

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Those of you watching on C-SPAN just heard from my friend from Tennessee the unwillingness of the Republican side of the aisle to even recognize that elections have consequences, that, in fact, the President won reelection decisively. Democrats made gains in the Senate and gains here in the House.

It's time to put aside the talking points. It's time to come together for this country.

Mr. Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER actually said it well. He said the mandate from the election of last week is "for us to find a way to work together on solutions to the challenges we face as a Nation."

I can't agree more. Elections have consequences, and our ability to avert the fiscal cliff, in which expiring tax cuts and across-the-board spending cuts are on a collision course to derail this economy, requires us to respect that directive from voters.

Yet, once again, lines are being drawn—you just heard it—over what types of revenue will be considered or what cuts are considered too steep. I hope I was not the only one astounded by the comments of the CEO of the American Petroleum Institute, who recently said, "the oil and gas industry will not be singled out for punitive treatment."

How fascinating. Perhaps I could introduce him to the Federal workforce, our Federal employees who are, so far, the only group to be singled out for pu-

nitive treatment, to the tune of \$75 billion of deficit reduction. They understand the principle of shared sacrifice and have patiently been waiting for everybody else to actually share in it.

Mr. Speaker, our chances for success in fending off the fiscal cliff become even slimmer if we start removing options from the table, as my friend from Tennessee just did, before we've even sat down at that table. America voted for and deserves a divided government that actually works.

The last time I checked, divided government doesn't mean it's going to be my way or the highway, or your way or the highway, or Grover Norquist's way or the highway. Divided government can and has succeeded in the past when leaders have done that thing which we have not been able to achieve very often in these last 2 years: compromise.

That is the singular message from our voters this year, compromise. Work together to move the economy, our families, and our Nation forward. I've repeatedly heard that mantra from across my community, whether it's from seniors, teachers, small businesses or my own neighbors.

And now the Nation's business leaders are starting to echo that call. In fact, the head of the Business Roundtable, the former Republican Governor of Michigan, and other top CEOs are asking Congress to do just that, compromise.

In addition, the Task Force of American Innovation, comprised of our Nation's top technology companies, is urging us to preserve Federal investments in education and R&D, which are the bedrock of future innovation and competitiveness. And this week even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce said it was open to a compromise that included revenue.

These are the constructive voices I hope my colleagues listen to as we approach negotiations on the fiscal cliff. Politics is the art of compromise and, working together, we can reduce our Nation's deficit and preserve strategic investments in those programs that fuel economic growth and competitiveness.

Even in the midst of the Civil War, President Lincoln and the 38th Congress authorized the Transcontinental Railroad, the Homestead Act, and the land grant college and university system. They understood we had to invest in the future, while also dealing with the crisis of the present.

No doubt, we all have something to lose if we do not succeed. So perhaps, by each of us giving a little, we can revive this economic recovery, restore faith in our ability to govern responsibly, and deliver on that mandate we just got last week from the voters.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

□ 1040

POISONOUS PARTISANSHIP

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I rarely come to the floor to make such comments is that it is so troublesome to me that we will have fact-free debates. One of the problems is that we are talking in a parallel universe. There are small businesses that will pay more taxes, but I think it is important to say to you that the top hedge fund managers last year earned \$22 billion and then paid a 15 percent tax rate as small businesses. So I am troubled when we are not being accurate and factual with the American public.

Mr. Speaker, my concern today—and I believe it is the concern of many Americans—is the situation in which we find ourselves. The American people have elected a government wherein only cooperation can bring progress. We have a House of Representatives that is predominantly Republican, and we have a Democratically controlled Senate. It would not take a 3-year-old a great deal of time to figure out that the only way we can do the work of the American people is if we stop this ridiculous partisanship—this poisonous partisanship—that is damaging the country and creating a level of anger. There are State legislators in at least 13 States who have introduced legislation for secession from the Union based on the fact that they didn't particularly like the President who was elected. One of the reasons, I think, is that we are exporting hate. If it's not hate, it's certainly anger, and "anger" is just one letter short of "danger."

The American people gave us a mandate to do the simple things, and that is to lead. We understand that the challenge before Congress in the coming weeks is no simple task. I would be wrong if I said that what we need to do is simple. We have some major challenges:

The Postal Service is losing \$25 million a week, and we are running around here acting as if the most important thing in the world is remaining faithful to our ideology. Ideology, tragically, has trumped logic in this place, and that cannot continue. Right now, we are facing hundreds of billions of dollars in expiring tax cuts. It might be important, Mr. Speaker, for all of us to keep in mind that, if we fail to deal with the sequestration issue, 90 percent of the people in this country will have their taxes raised.

But there is another problem.

We have three major credit rating agencies in this country—actually, for the world, essentially—Standard & Poor's, Moody's and then Fitch. We have been warned as a Congress and as a Nation that if we walk up to this precipice again as we did two Augusts ago that we will suffer another downgrading of our credit rating. The

United States of America—the most technologically powerful and economically powerful Nation on the planet—will have a credit downgrading.

This should cause every American to be angry enough to put aside petty partisanship and understand that this body will not function and that our government will not function unless we work together. We've got to come to the conclusion that compromise does not equal capitulation.

POVERTY

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

Ms. LEE of California. As the founder of the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus, I rise today to continue talking about the ongoing crisis of poverty in our country.

Yesterday, unfortunately, with the supplemental poverty report, we learned that poverty continues to impact nearly 50 million Americans, including 16 million children all across our country and in every congressional district. My home State of California tops the list, followed by our Nation's capital—the District of Columbia—Arizona, Florida, and Georgia.

On this election day, low-income Americans, the working poor, middle-income Americans—every American—spoke loudly and clearly. They voted for strengthening the middle class and for putting people back to work, and they voted for Congress to get back to doing the work of the American people: to strengthen our economy for all Americans and to create economic opportunities that will lift millions of families out of poverty and into the middle class. Most importantly, the American people voted to reject job-killing cuts and a tax on Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

What they don't want is for our country to be rushed into urgent budget decisions by the false threat of a so-called "fiscal cliff." Mr. Speaker, I don't buy it, and the American people don't believe it either.

This economic and political gridlock is just another political cliff created by the hostage-taking obstructionism of the Tea Party-controlled Congress. The real cliff that anyone is facing today is a human cliff, and far too many American families are standing on the edge as I speak. If we don't strengthen our economy for all Americans, millions will be cut off from the only lifeline keeping them from falling off that human cliff and into poverty—unemployment compensation. Far too many people will be cut off from vital programs like employment insurance, the Child Tax Credit and the Earned Income Tax Credit if this Congress fails to act.

It is long past time to come together, to work to find a balanced approach and, as Chairman CLEAVER just said, to get past the partisan obstructionism that has kept us from moving our econ-

omy and our country forward. We have got to stop this. Just 10 years ago, in the year 2000, our Nation had a balanced budget, projected surpluses, and a robust economy. The passage of a serious tax cut rapidly ended those surpluses and began to, quite frankly, explode the debt. The Bush-era tax cuts have already cost over \$2.2 trillion in Federal revenue since they were enacted, and we cannot afford to allow them to be made permanent. Let's not forget, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress has already voted to cut \$1.5 trillion in discretionary spending enacted through the 2011 Budget Control Act.

Low-income Americans are already hurting from multiple rounds of cuts to programs and benefits that they rely on. Our middle class and our working poor have already done their part, and we cannot continue to attempt to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans—our poor, our seniors, our children, and our disabled.

So I hope all Members of Congress will follow the President's lead and support his call for ending the Bush tax cuts above \$250,000, ending the billions in subsidies for Big Oil, and closing the countless loopholes that allow huge corporations and the super rich to avoid paying what they owe. In addition, we can find billions in additional savings by making smart and targeted cuts to our defense budgets. Our military leaders have already outlined cuts that will not put at risk our brave men and women in harm's way or weaken the national security of our Nation. We know that there are billions in waste, fraud, and abuse in the defense budgets that can be saved if we can just account for the hundreds of billions in spending by ensuring the Pentagon can pass an audit.

□ 1050

Mr. Speaker, we face many challenges, but we must not allow our political crisis to create an economic crisis for millions of Americans who are struggling. Now is not the time to turn our backs on struggling families just to preserve tax giveaways to millionaires and billionaires. We must come together to wage a war on poverty and end the war on the poor.

Finally, as 350 economists have said, we need jobs first. With recovery, deficit reduction will come by its own accord thanks to increased revenues in an improving economy. They went on to say that public outlay for jobs and recovery come first, growth is restored, and revenues follow. Budget cuts only lead to a deeper slump.

CENSUS: FULLER POVERTY PICTURE FINDS 49.7M ARE POOR, FACTORING IN MEDICAL AND WORK EXPENSES

(By Associated Press, November 14, 2012)

WASHINGTON—The ranks of America's poor edged up last year to a high of 49.7 million, based on a new census measure that takes into account medical costs and work-related expenses.

The numbers released Wednesday by the Census Bureau are part of a newly developed

supplemental poverty measure. Devised a year ago, this measure provides a fuller picture of poverty that the government believes can be used to assess safety-net programs by factoring in living expenses and taxpayer-provided benefits that the official formula leaves out.

Based on the revised formula, the number of poor people exceeded the 49 million, or 16 percent of the population, who were living below the poverty line in 2010. That came as more people in the slowly improving economy picked up low-wage jobs last year but still struggled to pay living expenses. The revised poverty rate of 16.1 percent also is higher than the record 46.2 million, or 15 percent, that the government's official estimate reported in September.

Due to medical expenses, higher living costs and limited immigrant access to government programs, people 65 or older, Hispanics and urbanites were more likely to be struggling economically under the alternative formula. Also spiking higher in 2011 was poverty among full-time and part-time workers.

As a result, the portrait of poverty broken down by state notably changes. California tops the list, hurt by high housing costs, large numbers of immigrants as well as less generous tax credits and food stamp programs to buoy low-income families. It is followed by the District of Columbia, Arizona, Florida and Georgia.

In the official census tally, it was rural states that were more likely to be near the top of the list, led by Mississippi, New Mexico, Arizona and Louisiana.

"We're seeing a very slow recovery, with increases in poverty among workers due to more new jobs which are low-wage," said Timothy Smeeding, a University of Wisconsin-Madison economist who specializes in poverty. "As a whole, the safety net is holding many people up, while California is struggling more because it's relatively harder there to qualify for food stamps and other benefits."

Broken down by group, poverty was disproportionately affecting people 65 and older—about 15.1 percent, or nearly double the 8.7 percent rate calculated under the official formula. That's because they have higher medical expenses, such as Medicare premiums, deductibles and drug costs, that aren't factored into the official rate.

While poverty rates for older Americans as a whole are higher, the new measure does show improvement in their income levels—about 15.1 percent were poor last year, down from 15.8 percent in 2010. Smeeding attributes that to a wave of more affluent, still-working baby boomers in dual-income households who are beginning to turn 65 and, as a result, are slowly raising overall income levels for seniors.

Working-age adults ages 18-64 saw an increase in poverty from 13.7 percent based on the official calculation to 15.5 percent, due mostly to commuting and child care costs.

In contrast, the new measure showed declines in poverty for children, from 22.3 percent under the official formula to 18.1 percent. Still, they remained the age group most likely to be economically struggling by any measure.

"These new numbers only reinforce what AARP and AARP Foundation hear from real people every day: older Americans are struggling to make ends meet," said Deb Whitman, executive vice president of AARP, an advocacy group. "Policymakers need to understand that not every senior is well off and the critically important role Social Security or Medicare plays as providing a safety net to keep even more older Americans out of poverty. As Washington debates what should happen during the lame duck, we cannot afford to undermine the current safety net that allows many to live with dignity."

Hispanics and Asians also saw much higher rates of poverty, 28 percent and 16.9 percent, respectively, compared with rates of 25.4 percent and 12.3 percent under the official formula. Their poverty levels rose after the government took into account safety-net programs such as food stamps and housing, which have lower participation among immigrants and non-English speakers.

In contrast, African-Americans saw a modest decrease in poverty, from 27.8 percent under the official rate to 25.7 percent based on the revised numbers. Among non-Hispanic whites, poverty rose from 9.9 percent to 11 percent.

Economists long have criticized the official poverty rate as inadequate. Based on a half-century-old government formula, the official rate continues to assume the average family spends one-third of its income on food. Those costs have actually shrunk to a much smaller share, more like one-seventh.

The official formula also fails to account for other expenses such as out-of-pocket medical care, child care and commuting, and it does not consider noncash government aid, such as food stamps and tax credits, when calculating income.

In reaction to some of the criticism, the government in 2010 asked the Census Bureau to develop a new measure, based partly on recommendations made by the National Academy of Sciences. It released national numbers based on that formula for the first time last year. This year's release features a 50-state breakdown on poverty, prompted in part by local officials such as New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg who have argued that the official measure does not take into account urban costs of living and that larger cities may get less federal money as a result.

The goal is to help lawmakers to better gauge the effectiveness of anti-poverty programs, although it does not replace the Census Bureau's official poverty formula.

Among the findings:

—If it weren't for Social Security payments, the poverty rate would rise to 54.1 percent for people 65 and older and 24.4 percent for all age groups.

—Without refundable tax credits such as the earned income tax credit, child poverty would rise from 18.1 percent to 24.4 percent.

—Without food stamps, the overall poverty rate would increase from 16.1 percent to 17.6 percent.

“These figures are timely given the looming expiration of two key measures that account for part of these programs' large anti-poverty impact: federal emergency unemployment insurance and improvements in refundable tax credits” such as the Earned Income Tax Credit, said Arloc Sherman, a senior researcher at the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, a liberal-leaning think-tank. “Letting these measures expire at year's end could push large numbers of families into poverty.”

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Alan Keiran, Office of the United States Senate, offered the following prayer:

Father God, as the Psalmist says, “I will extol the Lord at all times; His praise will always be on my lips. My soul will boast in the Lord; let the afflicted hear and rejoice. Glorify the Lord with me; let us exalt His name together.” (Psalm 34:1-3)

We depend on You, King of Heaven's armies, to reveal to our Nation's leaders Your plans to prosper our Nation and its people, Your plans to give us hope and a bright future. Inspire every public servant to seek Your wisdom and pray for Your daily favor to fall upon our country and our world.

And may You, Lord, be with those who are in harm's way and their families. This I ask in the Name above every name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BIGGERT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ISRAEL TO THE RESCUE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as waves crashed across the east coast a few weeks ago, taxpayer dollars were still being funneled as foreign aid around the globe. And while families watched as superstorm Sandy washed away their homes and the livelihoods they had built for many years, over 158 countries were still busy cashing checks from America.

Mr. Speaker, out of all the countries we give aid to, I understand Israel to be the only country to send a lifeboat in the wind and rain and flood to help our victims in America. Israel took the initiative to help the victims during this natural disaster. The Israel Flying Aid

organization has been giving gas to hospitals and batteries, food, and generators to superstorm Sandy victims.

We've been there for many countries in the world. We send them our money, but it's no secret that many of them hate us. They betray us, and yet we still write them checks. While the United States needs to reevaluate giving foreign aid to nations that hate us, thanks should be given to our faithful ally Israel.

And that's just the way it is.

COMBAT DRONE PROGRAMS

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

Mr. KUCINICH. American drones in Pakistan have killed as many as 3,378 people. Drones in Yemen have killed as many as 1,952 people. Drones in Somalia have killed as many as 170 people. We've not declared war on any of these nations, but our weapons have killed innocent civilians in all of them. Highly reputable research shows that the number of high-level targets killed as a percentage of total casualties is estimated at about 2 percent.

According to The Washington Post, the Obama administration is working on efforts to institutionalize the practice of targeted killings by unmanned drones abroad. The volume of these killings challenges the morality and the legality of the attacks. We are creating a precedent for other nations that are developing the same technology. China has just unveiled a new drone.

The drone program has thus far been conducted with no oversight from Congress or any judicial body. Congress has a constitutional responsibility to ensure that programs that are being conducted in the name of our Nation are legal, transparent, and accountable. We are holding a briefing tomorrow about this exact matter.

NICHOLAS DOMINGUEZ, A TRUE HOMETOWN HERO

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to applaud a true hometown hero—Nicholas Dominguez of Lockport, Illinois—for saving a woman who nearly drowned in Lake Michigan.

Earlier this year, Nicholas was enjoying time with his mother on a beach on the Indiana shore when he noticed an empty raft and swimmers in distress. Thanks to his quick thinking and selfless instincts, Nicholas was able to rescue Evelyn Hernandez, pulling her safely to a sandbar.

Several years ago, I had the privilege of nominating Nicholas to the U.S. Naval Academy, and I was pleased to congratulate him on his recent graduation. Today, as a second lieutenant in the Marines, he has already put on full

display his commitment and dedication as a U.S. officer. His actions in Lake Michigan reflect the marine motto "Semper Paratus"—or "always faithful." I applaud Lieutenant Dominguez for making his country and his Corps proud.

ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO DEFEND HERSELF

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, in the past 24 hours alone, terrorists along the Gaza Strip have launched more than 250 rockets into southern Israel. That's 250 rockets in 1 day since Hamas began its strikes.

Imagine 250 rockets raining down in 1 day on your community anywhere in the United States. We would expect our government to act to protect our citizens. Israel is acting to protect her citizens. Israel has the right to protect her citizens from terrorist attacks. In the early hours of this morning, three Israeli civilians died when a rocket from Gaza struck the top floor of an apartment building. Later in the day, a rocket hit just 10 miles from Tel Aviv.

The United States mourns the loss of life at the hands of Hamas terrorists. We will not waver in our support of Israel's right to defend herself against these and other attacks. The right of any nation to defend its citizens can never be called into question. Mr. Speaker, at this challenging time for our great ally, the United States stands with Israel.

ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF

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

Mr. DOLD. I rise today to address the recent events in the Middle East. Our ally Israel, like every nation, must have the right to defend itself and its citizens against ongoing acts of terror.

We know now that the international community frequently looks for opportunities to delegitimize Israel's actions, which is why it is essential that we here in the United States of America loudly and publicly express our support for Israel's right to defend itself in the face of Hamas' terror.

Hamas is responsible for over 800 rocket attacks on Israel in 2012—with over 250 rockets indiscriminantly fired on Israel's citizens in the past 5 days alone. Because of this escalation, 1 million men, women and children in southern Israel have been forced to live under the threat of attacks and must now know where the nearest rocket shelter is located. As I speak, thousands of Israelis are sleeping in bomb shelters out of fear for their lives and the lives of their children.

Mr. Speaker, no nation would sit back and tolerate its population living

under such threatening conditions. Certainly, we here in the United States would not.

PASS THE FARM BILL

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, it's time to get to work. When Congress recessed for the election, we left much undone, including the farm bill, which is critical to the economy of my district and to our country.

Just this weekend, The Fresno Bee got it right when they wrote:

There are some in Congress who suggest delaying the farm bill until after new Members begin serving in January. That's the easy way out, but it does not serve the interests of the Nation's farmers.

It also doesn't serve the families in need and children who depend upon the nutrition programs in the farm bill. It's time to get back to representing the interests of our constituents, not partisan politics. Dairymen are having a tough time in California. Our farmers need certainty, and only a 5-year farm bill can provide that. Both versions of the farm bill also save billions of dollars.

We have bipartisan agreement on this bill. We need to pass this bill so that we can go to conference committee to resolve the differences.

□ 1210

WE CAN AVOID THE FISCAL CLIFF

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are breathing a cautious sigh of relief now that the long election season is finally over. The House and Senate are both in session, and the American people are watching. We have much work to do and not much time to do it.

With unemployment hovering near 8 percent, our economy is still struggling. To get America back on track, we must work together, Democrats and Republicans, to find solutions to our economic challenges.

We all know it's not until small businesses begin growing and creating jobs that our economy will recover. The key to our future lies in new start-ups, innovators, and entrepreneurs.

Working together in a bipartisan way, we can avoid the fiscal cliff, provide certainty to these small businesses, remove barriers to success, and help renew the prosperity of the American people.

Last week our constituents spoke, and the mandate they gave us was a mandate to work together. We must listen to them and work with open ears and open minds to arrive at bipartisan solutions to the very serious issues facing our country.

THE COUNTRY NEEDS TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, we are indeed back here in a lame-duck session with the most important issue facing us, which is a deadline on taxes and revenue. By previous action, we have to act or certain conditions will be created that will cause us to lose jobs and hurt our economy and raise taxes on everybody.

The President, the Senate, the Democrats, and the House are all in agreement that 98 percent of the country needs tax relief that has been given through the Bush tax cuts, and they should be extended.

I think everybody agrees that we don't need to make draconian cuts to services for people, Social Security or Medicare, or defense. The only issue is my colleagues on the other side, the Republicans in the House, who seem to continue to want to give tax relief to the upper 2 percent. That's what divides this Nation and this Congress right now, tax cuts for the richest 2 percent.

I call on my Republican colleagues to work with Speaker BOEHNER and allow him to lead this country in working with President Obama and to resolve this situation.

RECOGNITION OF DAVE WHITE, CHIEF OF THE NATURAL RE- SOURCE CONSERVATION SER- VICE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Dave White, chief of the Natural Resource Conservation Service at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. After a career with NRCS that spanned nearly four decades, this week he announced his plans to retire.

Chief White has spent his career working to improve the Nation's land management policies and practices. Over the years, Dave has been an indispensable resource of experience and knowledge, from helping to craft the 2008 farm bill conservation title, to his leadership in implementing and improving these programs at NRCS.

Dave's work has helped the Nation achieve our shared objectives for sustaining agriculture and the natural resources upon which we all depend.

One area in particular is voluntary incentive-based conservation programs where Chief White has delivered a demonstrated track record in leveraging resources to maximize limited resources. In my home State of Pennsylvania, these efforts are helping to improve the health of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, while also keeping farms profitable and ensuring that these farms remain in agriculture over the long term.

I want to thank Dave White for his dedicated service. Best of luck in your retirement, Chief.

A TRAGIC MARKER: 2,000-PLUS U.S. FATALITIES IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on October 2, while Congress was campaigning, the Pentagon registered the 2,000th fatality in Afghanistan, the longest war in American history. Today, that number has risen to 2,026.

It is imperative that we all remember the terrible human price that has been paid, is being paid, and will continue to be paid by our troops in Afghanistan and their families.

This year there have been 60 so-called "blue on green" killings of U.S. troops by Afghan soldiers that we're training. Veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan kill themselves at a rate of one every 80 minutes. More Active Duty U.S. military personnel have died by suicide since the war in Afghanistan began than have died fighting there. Nearly 18,000 have been wounded in Afghanistan alone.

Let us bring them all home. Let us provide our veterans and active military the care and benefits that they have so bravely earned. Let's end the war in Afghanistan now.

DOING WHAT IS RIGHT FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, we have just a few short weeks left in the 112th Congress, but our work here is far from done.

Sadly, partisan games and gridlock have made this Congress one of the least productive in history; but with the election finally behind us, I hope we will put aside our differences and get back to work.

That means passing a bipartisan farm bill to support our farmers and ranchers. It means extending the production tax credit to create jobs in a growing wind industry and reduce electricity bills for consumers. It means passing the Violence Against Women Act to protect women from abuse. And it means extending tax cuts for middle class families and small businesses now and passing a balanced plan to avert sequestration.

We must address these critical issues, and the only way to do that is by coming together and doing what's right for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the election is over. It's time to get back to work.

LET'S GET THE PEOPLE'S WORK DONE

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, the election is over for this cycle, and it is time to do the people's work.

The President is reelected, and he is our President for the next 4 years. Our constituents are tired and upset with our dysfunction. They can't begin to comprehend how we've allowed the fiscal cliff to happen. Many of them don't even understand what the fiscal cliff is about. All they know is that things like unemployment can rise to 9.1 percent unless we act. It is time to put the elections behind us and work together.

Mr. Speaker, we must focus on the people, especially the constituents of our colleagues who are suffering from the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy. We have got to work together and do the people's work. Isn't that what we've been sent here to do?

Mr. Speaker, let's get the people's work done.

LET'S GET THIS THING DONE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, our President said something that I think this Congress needs to hear: the people of our districts sent us here to focus on their jobs, not our own.

We're racing towards a serious deadline, towards higher taxes on struggling families and slashed investments in things like food for mothers and infants, education, and our infrastructure. We're dragging people's jobs toward the brink and playing chicken with workers' and entrepreneurs' livelihoods.

I know I'm not the only one here who spent time with the families that missing this deadline will hurt. I know I'm not the only one who has visited the businesses that would collapse if this happened. The people in our districts need us to come together. They're counting on us to do the right thing, to leave our partisanship at the ballot box and to get to work.

So I say to all my friends and colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, let's get this thing done.

THE LEAST, THE LAST, AND THE LOST

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of talk about the consequences of the fiscal cliff on the wealthy, the well-off, the well-heeled, and the well-to-do. We don't hear a lot of talk about how it will impact the least, the last, and the lost. Permit me today to share just a bit of information.

Rental assistance for the poor would fall by \$2.3 billion. Nutrition programs for women, infants, and children would lose \$543 million. Those who provide services to persons who get Medicare—doctors—would lose about \$4 billion.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have an act of Congress, we have to have a Congress willing to act. It is time for us to act, to protect the least, the last, and the lost, as well as others.

□ 1220

AVOIDING THE FISCAL CLIFF

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge Congress to deal with the fiscal cliff. The majority of Americans cast their ballots in support of the President and a balanced solution to our fiscal challenges that protects the middle class by asking everyone to pay their fair share.

Our job is to act. We should extend the middle class tax cuts now while we work on a long-term solution. We must work together because failure would have dire consequences for middle class jobs, the military, and crucial programs that help the middle class and the poor.

FIXING OUR ECONOMY

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the election is over. The people of this country have spoken and said loudly and clearly that they want us to work together to create jobs and fix our economy.

I agree with economists who say that the threat of a fiscal cliff, like the need to immediately reduce the deficit, is being overblown. And it is done like the debt ceiling debacle to create a do-or-die situation where it is hoped that Democrats would agree to cuts in programs that would lose jobs and lock more people into poverty. That is unacceptable in this, the greatest country in the world, and we cannot agree to it.

We are being asked to cut the deficit by \$4 trillion over 10 years. Through cuts and caps put in place already, over the next 10 years we are projected to cut that deficit by \$1.7 trillion. That leaves \$2.3 trillion. If we allow the growth in the economy to continue, even at its present slow pace, that can help to reduce the need for that level of cuts even more.

The poor and the middle class are already doing their part through the cuts that are already in place. Now it is time for everyone else to do theirs. The rest of the deficit reduction must come primarily from eliminating tax cuts for the wealthy who have continued to do very well during the recession while everyone else suffered.

This Congress can avoid taking us to yet another fiscal cliff and avoid sequestration by working together in the balanced way that the American people have asked us to.

RESOLVING ISSUES AND WORKING TOGETHER

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say to our colleagues that it is very gratifying that in just a few minutes we are going to begin to address the first issue that will come before us as a lame-duck Congress, and it's an issue that is going to be addressed in a bipartisan way. I'm very happy to see my friend from Worcester here, who has joined with me in doing a "Dear Colleague" in support of passage of permanent normal trade relations for Russia and Moldova. Our commitment to economic growth and human rights is one which has led us to this point, Mr. Speaker.

And I think that the idea with the mandate from the election was for us to resolve issues and work together, and we are going to have a chance to do that. And so as I get ready to call up the rule in just a moment, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleagues that this is a great day for us to take on the very, very serious challenges. And I believe that the success we are going to have, with the bipartisanship that is going to be demonstrated on this issue, should lay the groundwork for the work of the rest of this Congress and I hope very much for the next Congress as well.

SUPPORTING WIND PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. TONKO, as well as all of the members of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, for being such strong advocates for a responsible and sustainable energy future.

Today I rise to speak in favor of the wind production tax credit and urge my colleagues to support its extension. Wind power and other sources of renewable energy are a vital and central part of a sustainable energy future, and they can be harvested right here in America.

In my own district, for example, I am very proud to say that there are currently six companies operating wind power plants. These power plants not only generate energy but also jobs and manufacturing right here at home.

I urge this Congress to support the extension here because it will put people to work in good paying jobs, help rebuild our manufacturing base, and help us achieve energy independence.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6156, RUSSIA AND MOLDOVA JACKSON-VANIK REPEAL AND SERGEI MAGNITSKY RULE OF LAW ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2012

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 808 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 808

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6156) to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to products of the Russian Federation and Moldova and to require reports on the compliance of the Russian Federation with its obligations as a member of the World Trade Organization, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-33 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from November 19, 2012, through November 23, 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. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say how great it is to see you in the Chair, and I wish you well.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend from Worcester, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say, as I just mentioned in my 1-minute, it is very gratifying that, as we look at this election, we have many people who have used the term "mandate" to describe what it is they have

gotten. The President says he has a mandate to increase taxes. Some Republicans say we have a mandate to not increase taxes. Lots of people throw this word "mandate" around.

I believe that the mandate is for us to focus on job creation and economic growth. And while we still embrace the Madisonian vision of the clash of ideas—it's a very, very important notion put forward by the author of the U.S. Constitution—at the end of the day, it's important for us to do something. And I think that the mandate from the election is that the American people want us to do everything that we can to create jobs, get the economy growing, and deal with many of the societal challenges that we face.

Mr. Speaker, that's why I say it is very gratifying that the first item out of the chute after the election is something we will be able to do in a bipartisan way. Not that it hasn't been controversial, and I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that there is controversy that surrounds this issue, and I'm going to talk about it, but I will say that it is great that we'll be able to do something, with Republicans and Democrats in the House, Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, and the President of the United States on the same page in support of Russia's accession to the WTO and, most particularly, the opportunity for the United States of America, our workers, to have access to 142 million consumers in that country.

So, Mr. Speaker, on August 22, Russia became a member of the World Trade Organization. Again, a huge economy. In fact, the last large economy to actually become a member of the WTO, and that's a good thing. It's a good thing because Vladimir Putin is not a good guy. It's a good thing because we are going to, not only with accession of the WTO but also with the multifarious provisions that are included in this measure, call on the United States Trade Representative, call on the State Department, and call on other entities to focus on things like intellectual property violations, negotiations, sanitary and phytosanitary agreements, the information technology agreement, and the government procurement agreement.

□ 1230

There are a wide range of provisions in here that will force Russia to live with a structure that it does not have today and will not have until we take this very important action.

Now one of the reasons that I have been such a strong proponent of this issue has to do with a name, and it's not the name we're going to be talking about in a minute. The name is Mikhail Khodorkovsky.

Mikhail Khodorkovsky is a businessman who was jailed and at this moment is incarcerated in the midst of a 7-year additional extension of his sentence for so-called "tax evasion."

Now I mention those two words in explaining why I'm here because I met

Mr. Khodorkovsky, who was the head of Yukos Oil and was widely respected. I'm sure he was a great businessman. But he was widely respected and was a great philanthropist in Russia. He was a critic of Vladimir Putin's. And as we all know, and as I said, he is incarcerated today for one thing and one thing only: being a critic of Vladimir Putin's. That's really why he's in prison.

Well, the reason I am standing here and am such a strong proponent of the action that we're about to take is that after I had met with Mr. Khodorkovsky in Moscow, he sat in my office right upstairs here in the Rules Committee. And in that meeting that I had with him, Mr. Khodorkovsky—a great philanthropist, one of the wealthiest people in Russia—said to me, I'm concerned about my safety and well-being. I think that there might be action taken against me.

Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed to say that my reaction was to laugh at him. I said, There's no way that a man of your stature, doing the kinds of good things that you've been doing in Russia, will face anything other than broad-based support.

Mr. Speaker, I was wrong. The human rights violations which have taken place against Mikhail Khodorkovsky and a wide range of other people are one of the other reasons that we are here, pushing very, very strongly for permanent normal trade relations to force Russia to do something that they might not want to do, and that is to live with a rules-based trading system.

The other name that leads us here, of course, is Sergei Magnitsky, a young lawyer who was simply raising questions, a so-called whistleblower, a whistleblower who was beaten to death 3 years ago tomorrow. Tomorrow marks the third anniversary of Sergei Magnitsky's death. And it is outrageous, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of action in this 21st century still exists in a country that claims to be a democracy. It is horrendous, and it is unacceptable. And that's why I believe coupling the permanent normal trade relations for Russia and Moldova along with the Magnitsky language—and I want to congratulate our Senate colleagues BEN CARDIN and JON KYL, and I know my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has been involved in pushing this. I strongly support the effort that we have had that will ensure that those who are responsible for Sergei Magnitsky's tragic, brutal beating, which led to his death 3 years ago tomorrow, will be followed and be brought to justice.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a great bipartisan effort. It's one that I think will inure to the benefit of the people of Russia and the people of the United States. And I would like to say that, remember, we're not giving up a thing. We're not lowering a single tariff. There is not a single sacrifice that's being made here in the United States of America. What we're doing is we're breaking down the barriers there.

Last year, we exported \$11 billion to Russia. The projection is that by 2017, our exports will be \$22 billion, twice what we have today. And there are a number who anticipate that they will go actually beyond that.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that this is a win-win all the way around. It's a win for the cause of human rights. It's a win for the cause of those of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—who want to create good American jobs so that we can have access to 142 million consumers. And it's a win for the people of Russia, who deserve better than they have gotten and, through the U.S. access to that market, will have an opportunity to see their standard of life and quality of life improve, because I believe passionately in the interdependence of economic and political liberalization.

This accession to the WTO will enhance economic liberalization, and it will create an opportunity. I hope and pray for the kind of political reform that is desperately needed.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California, the honorable chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I want to thank him for his eloquent statement, and I want to thank him for bringing this to the floor. As he mentioned, he and I both coauthored a Dear Colleague and supported the underlying legislation. And it was a pleasure to work with him on this important bill.

And I know that there will be other opportunities to say this before he departs. But I want to thank him for his service to this House of Representatives, which I know he loves very deeply. And I want to thank him for his service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6156 joins together two pieces of legislation that deal with trade and human rights in the Russian Federation. The distinguished chairman has provided a clear description of the provisions in this bill that grant permanent normal trade relations, or PNTR, to the nations of Moldova and the Russian Federation. It is fairly straightforward.

Simply put, after 18 years of negotiations, Russia joined the World Trade Organization in August. That membership will require Russia—for the first time—to play by the same rules of trade as the United States and virtually every other nation in the world.

But under WTO rules, the United States cannot take advantage of Russia's WTO membership unless and until Congress grants Russia permanent normal trade relations, replacing the 1974 special bilateral agreement with Russia known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

The United States is not required to change any U.S. law as a result of Rus-

sia's WTO membership other than this change to the 1974 trade law. This is in contrast to bilateral free trade agreements where the United States is required to provide duty-free treatment.

If that were all there was to H.R. 6156, it would pass or fail along familiar lines of trade-related legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6156 will become known as a landmark piece of trade legislation not because it grants PNTR for Russia and Moldova but because it includes title IV, the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012.

Let me share with my colleagues just a little bit about the life and death of Sergei Magnitsky, in whose honor this section of the bill is named.

After exposing the largest tax fraud in Russian history, tax lawyer Sergei Magnitsky was wrongly arrested and tortured in a Russian prison. Six months later, he became seriously ill. He was denied medical attention despite 20 formal requests. On the night of November 16, 2009—3 years ago tomorrow—his condition became critical. Instead of being treated in a hospital, he was taken to an isolation cell, chained to a bed, and beaten by eight prison guards for 1 hour and 18 minutes, which resulted in his death.

Sergei Magnitsky was 37 years old. He left behind a wife and two children. Those responsible for his abuse and murder have yet to be punished. And sadly, he is not alone. His story is emblematic of corruption, human rights abuses, and impunity in Russia.

Since the death of Sergei Magnitsky, the human rights situation inside the Russian Federation has continued to deteriorate.

Russia's parliamentary elections last December were marked by mass protests over alleged electoral fraud. Since Vladimir Putin was reelected president in May of 2012, his government has taken a harsh and confrontational approach to ongoing protests, cracking down on the Russian people's growing discontent with corruption and creeping authoritarianism. Russian authorities have used excessive force to break up peaceful demonstrations and detained and raided the homes of opposition leaders.

Russian civil society has also been a target of increasing repression. Beginning in June and with astonishing speed, the Russian Duma passed a series of draconian laws that restrict freedom of expression, freedom of association, and freedom of assembly. Many observers fear that these laws will be used as a political weapon to stifle criticism of the government. They make it harder for Russian civil society to operate effectively and create a climate of fear and self-censorship. Civil society's sense of isolation is only compounded by the Russian Government's recent decision to expel organizations like USAID from the country.

□ 1240

In addition, journalists and human rights activists continue to face grave

dangers in pursuing their work. Just last month, Tanya Lokshina with the Moscow office of Human Rights Watch received a series of threats to herself and her unborn child, most likely in connection to her efforts to expose impunity for human rights abuses. Her experience is not unique. While Russian authorities have tried to silence critics, NGOs, and independent media, the world is still awaiting justice for many violent attacks on dissidents and journalists.

I would like to note for my colleagues that today at 2 p.m. the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission will be holding a hearing on human rights in the Russian Federation, and Ms. Lokshina will be one of the witnesses.

In this context, the story of Sergei Magnitsky remains especially important. At a time when the human rights situation in the country is going from bad to worse, it is all the more important to hold Russian human rights violators accountable.

Mr. Speaker, the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act, which is title IV of H.R. 6156 as reported by the Rules Committee, places an asset freeze and visa ban on those individuals responsible for Sergei Magnitsky's torture and death, as well as on Russian officials engaged in corruption and gross violations of human rights. This is beyond just Sergei Magnitsky. These measures provide a degree of accountability and reinforce the administration's toolkit to respond to crimes by individual government officials.

Passage of the Magnitsky act sends a clear message to the Russian people that we support their fundamental human rights. Importantly, it also sends a strong message to those Russian officials who support the rule of law and who reject corruption and human rights abuses. It lets them know that their efforts and their achievements are valued by the United States and the international community. Only individuals within the Russian Government who abuse their office and engage in corruption and human rights crimes will find their assets and visas under scrutiny and subject to U.S. sanction.

So let me be clear, Mr. Speaker. I would not be supporting PNTR for the Russian Federation if it did not include title IV, the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me just close by again thanking not only the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, but I want to thank the Republican leadership, the Speaker of the House; the Democratic leadership, the minority leader and our minority whip; as well as the chairwoman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for working together to come up with an agreement here that I think deserves bipartisan support.

So I urge all my colleagues to support the Magnitsky act by voting for

the underlying legislation, H.R. 6156, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me again express my appreciation to my good friend from Worcester, and it's been a great honor and privilege to work in a bipartisan way with him on this, as I've been privileged to work with many Democrats in this House on many different bipartisan issues over the years.

And I'm getting ready to leave this place, Mr. Speaker. I'll be in January, as you will, moving on to another life. For me, it's after nearly three-and-a-half decades, and we've got lots of work ahead in the next 4 weeks. To have this trade issue as one there is something that is very gratifying for me.

As I mention that I'm leaving, for his first speech since being named chairman of the Rules Committee for the next Congress, I'm very happy to yield such time as he may consume to the very thoughtful, dedicated, and hard-working gentleman from Dallas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that there are lots of hard workers in this House, and we all learned as kids there is a differentiation between a workhorse and a show horse. And I've got to tell you something, Mr. Speaker—and you know this very well—there is no Democrat or Republican in the United States House of Representatives who works any harder than PETE SESSIONS, and I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that he is going to be succeeding me as chairman of the House Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, to my dear and distinguished friend, the gentleman, the young chairman of the Rules Committee, DAVID DREIER, thank you very much.

It is DAVID's leadership, not just in the Rules Committee but, I believe, to all of us here in the House of Representatives, that DAVID has led us to be a more open, thoughtful body; a person who used his time and position, power of the Rules Committee in the committee that's upstairs, to speak with all the Members of this body about their ideas that they represent and to make this a more open body. This institution is better because of DAVID DREIER. And I am very aware of what lies ahead for me, but, DAVID, you have done a great job, and thank you. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today really to support what Chairman DREIER and the gentleman, Mr. MCGOVERN, have been speaking for, and that is a rule and the underlying legislation.

There are over 23 million Americans right now looking for work that are either over- or underemployed in our country, Mr. Speaker. So today is a jobs bill, another jobs bill that is important, and permanent normalized trade relations with Russia and Moldova will provide that much-needed boost, just a little bit. But a boost to the direction of adding jobs and making sure that the jobs we have here in this country to provide goods and serv-

ices to another country are on an equal basis is important.

This PNTR vote will mean that we're expected to double exports to Russia in just 5 years and to help create and strengthen jobs in this country while providing Russia with a great product at the right price, whether it's in manufacturing, agriculture, or the service industry. I believe this is an important bill for us to move on a bipartisan basis.

Russia is the ninth largest economy and has a population of about 142 million people. It has a large and growing middle class. And Russia holds outstanding potential for the United States, not just in the business interests, but also for goods and services to make the lives of the Russian people even better.

My home State of Texas is the top exporter to Russia among U.S. States, and Texas imports to Russia are growing faster than its exports for the rest of the world. Specifically, Texas exported \$1.6 billion worth of goods to Russia in 2011. We, in Texas, value this relationship, the jobs, the exporting, and the ability to have better products and services in Russia, with the Russian people making those decisions to buy these products and services. This legislation today will only help us build on that success, growing not just more jobs, but, really, the American economy.

So I will say this on behalf of all of us. This is an important bill. We need to work together. We need leadership of this body, all the Members, as well as the Senate and the President to make this happen.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

And, Mr. Speaker, as I was sitting here listening to the very thoughtful remarks of my successor as chairman of the House Rules Committee, it reminded me of what really got him onto the Rules Committee and got him engaged with me, and interesting enough, Mr. Speaker, it was this issue. It was the issue of breaking down barriers to allow for the free flow of goods and services and capital.

When he first came to this body, Mr. Speaker, we were in the midst of our battle on China's accession to the World Trade Organization and establishing PNTR at that juncture, which has been a great thing; not that it's been problem free—I acknowledge that—but it's been a great thing to be able to take the steps that we have. And it was PETE SESSIONS, Mr. Speaker, who came to me and said, I want to help you with this. I actually gave him an assignment, and it was to talk to a half dozen Members about how important this was.

Mr. Speaker, in less than an hour he came back to me, having done the job right then, and that's why I describe

him as the person—as I say, there are a lot of hardworking people here, there are a lot of hardworking people on both sides of the aisle, but no one has been more diligent and worked harder than my friend PETE SESSIONS, and I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman.

And reclaiming my time, this is the kind of energy and leadership that DAVID DREIER expects from Members as he gives them not just tasks but opportunities, and the young chairman gave me that opportunity, and I took full advantage of that. As I recall, we were 10 out of 10. All of them voted for it. So I didn't just make up "all of them."

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill we're doing today. This is worthy of our time, and I'm delighted that we're joined by our friends.

□ 1250

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume first of all to thank the gentleman from Texas for his statement, but also to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate him on his new appointment. I look forward to working with him. So congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to again point out that trade bills oftentimes are very controversial. There's often a resistance to attach any additional language, whether it be human rights language or labor rights language, to trade bills. But in this case, again, working in a bipartisan way, I think the attachment of the Sergei Magnitsky bill to this trade bill is probably the most significant piece of human rights legislation attached to any trade bill since I've been here in Congress.

This is a big deal. This sends a message to human rights violators in Russia, those who are guilty of corruption, that there's a consequence. And even if that consequence is not bringing you to justice within Russia, the United States—and we will be joined, hopefully, by our allies—will make sure that there are visa bans that are put in place and that assets are frozen, that there is a consequence. Again, our hope is that this language will prop up those in Russia who want to push for reform, who believe in accountability and believe in tackling issues like impunity.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), who is the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, who was incredibly helpful to me in making sure that these two pieces of legislation were brought together and I think in a way that makes it possible for me to be able to support this bill.

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

Mr. LEVIN. First, if I might, let me congratulate Mr. DREIER on your service of many years. You believe in this institution.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. When you said "many years," you are my junior colleague by one term.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. LEVIN. You believe in this institution, and I think that's been reflected.

So let me just say a few words—we'll debate it, perhaps, longer tomorrow—why this trade bill should be passed. I think we need to take each trade bill on its own merits. When you look at the need to move here today to grant PNTR, I think the answer is we clearly should.

First of all, Russia is now in the WTO, and it has gone in with certain requirements; for example, no export subsidies are allowed. That's a change, and that's beneficial to those of us who want to trade with them so they don't rig the deck against us and for them. And there are major reductions in tariffs.

Also, now that they're in the WTO, there is a dispute settlement system. So when they violate the requirements, there's a dispute settlement system that can be enforced. If we don't grant PNTR, we can't access that dispute settlement system.

Also, it's so important that there be strong enforcement. A number of my colleagues put forth some legislation that proposed that we beef up the enforcement provisions within this bill, and that's been done. Our staff on the Democratic side worked assiduously with the Senate, and the essence of those provisions are now in this bill. So that's another reason to vote for it, because strong enforcement is critical to good trade legislation.

Also, I would urge everybody to look at what are the exports from this country and the imports from Russia. When you look at those, it's a good reason for us to vote for this legislation, because the top three exports from the U.S. are machinery, motor vehicles, and aircraft—made in America by American workers. And so, in a sense, this is a "Make It in America" piece of legislation.

The dominant import from Russia is in petro, in oil, and in that sense, they're not directly competing with our workers. So we have, in terms of what flows, an advantage being a full partner.

But let me say one other thing, because I think those of you who have followed this know I don't believe that trade legislation is only about flow of goods. It also has to be embedded in a structure to make sure that there are benefits for our companies and for our workers and that there is a structure to try to make sure there's a rule of law, because if there isn't a rule of law in another country, it is not beneficial for their citizens or for our companies.

So here I want us to pay attention to the Magnitsky legislation, because no

one should think that it's easy to do business in any country where there isn't a rule of law. It isn't easy to do business—and we should hesitate to simply blindly do business—with a country which really imposes restrictions on the rights of their citizens. That's what Mr. MCGOVERN has done and what Mr. CARDIN and others have done. And there has been bipartisan cooperation on this point, strong bipartisan cooperation, to place in this bill the Magnitsky legislation that sends a clear signal to the Russian Government and to everybody in Russia that we care about the rights of the citizens there, and as we do business, we care about the rights of others. That's the strength of this legislation, in addition to opening their markets for goods made in America.

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. So I really urge that everybody look at this legislation on its own merits. Whatever the feelings are about other trade agreements, we need to take each of them on their own, the pluses and the minuses. In this case, I think—especially now that Russia is in the WTO—it works so much to our advantage in terms of the economy here, in terms of jobs here, in terms of our businesses and our workers. And also, I think we can vote for this legislation, if I might say so, with good conscience.

Mr. MCGOVERN, you have led. It's a tribute to your devotion to the human rights of people as we advance trade not only in this legislation, but in other legislation. I think it's also a recognition of our ability to work together.

So I urge passage, and tomorrow we speak together to urge passage of the legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. LEVIN, for his very thoughtful comments and to say I was very pleased to join with Mr. MCGOVERN—as Mr. MCGOVERN has mentioned and as I did earlier—a joint Dear Colleague to focus on the benefits of this legislation as we tackle this important challenge of human rights.

I happen to believe very fervently that economic liberalization is a key part of ensuring the ability of human rights to be recognized. That's why I think this legislation is very, very complementary in addressing not just job creation, economic growth, and improving quality of life for people, but I believe both aspects—the Magnitsky aspect and the permanent normal trade relations—together work to enhance the human rights situation that is as devastating as it is.

Mr. Speaker, I know I have talked about a number of other Members, but I'd like to say that for nearly a decade and a half I've been very privileged to work on a wide range of issues, but one of the most important has been the issue of trade liberalization with my friend from Hinsdale, Illinois. She is

going to be leaving this institution, as you, Mr. Speaker, are and as I will as well. But I've got to say that this institution is a better place. The issue of ensuring economic opportunity here in the United States and around the world is brighter for the work that has been done by JUDY BIGGERT. I'm happy to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), Mr. Speaker.

□ 1300

Mrs. BIGGERT. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, for your kind words, but also for what you have done for this country as far as trade and how you have really worked so hard to make sure that all of the Members of Congress realize the impact that trade has for our economy and for our place in the world. Either bilateral agreements, multilateral commitments, you were always there to make to sure that we moved forward on that, and I really thank you.

I do rise in support today of this rule and H.R. 6156, to grant permanent normal trade relations to Russia. This important legislation is a small step toward a big reward. Without it, the United States exporters and service providers will continue to lose business to our foreign competitors that already have trade relationships with Russia. And once we lose those markets, our competitors will only become stronger and better-positioned to surpass the U.S. in a critical marketplace of the 21st-century global economy.

According to the National Association of Manufacturers, Russia imported over \$500 billion in goods last year; and of that total, only 5 percent came from U.S. exports.

This bill will lift outdated policies that restrict American access to Russian markets. As a result, studies show that U.S. producers can expect to achieve double-digit increases over the next decade in exports of heavy machinery, agricultural machinery, chemicals and services. This is particularly critical for my home State of Illinois, where we have fallen behind Japan and Korea in these export categories.

Most importantly, granting Russia permanent normal trade relations gives the U.S. a level playing field on which we can compete from a position of strength in terms of intellectual property and agricultural exports, and it will provide a reliable forum for trade dispute resolution.

I would urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the bill, to grow American exports and create good jobs here in the United States by supporting this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I want to thank the gentleman for his great work on this legislation; and also my colleague, who will be leaving us, the chairman of the

Rules Committee, who's done some great work over his many years.

I rise in support of this legislation. I think it is important to see, as this continuum moves, our relationship with Russia change and now moving into a circumstance of additional trade and enhanced trade.

I'm one that's very focused on improving manufacturing here in the United States, and this is going to open up tremendous opportunities for our manufacturers. So I want to commend those who've worked together on this and the Obama administration for their continuing efforts to open up trade opportunities so that we can make it here and sell it everywhere, which I think should be our focus.

In addition to that, I think it shows how, over time, old wounds can be healed and new relationships can be built.

I spoke earlier today with the consulate general for the State of Israel in Philadelphia, offering my support and concern for the unfortunate circumstances that are taking place in the Middle East now, in which hundreds of bombs or rockets have been shot at Israel, some of its largest cities as the targets. This is a matter for obviously much higher levels in our government. There have been communications and the assurance that Israel has the right to defend itself.

But I think that we can see in this Russia trade agreement that if we can get to the point where there can be relationships that are built on self-interest and economic development, that we can put the weapons aside and move toward a circumstance in which people are focused on economic activity.

So we see in this crisis a circumstance that we hope will resolve itself. Obviously, we stand with our ally, but we also hope for a day in which peace will reign, and economic opportunities, I agree with DAVID DREIER, really is the way in which eventually we can create a circumstance in which people will not have the necessity to resort to violence.

So I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I thank the House. And I hope that we will favorably pass this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I just wanted to express to my very dear friend from Philadelphia, express my appreciation, Mr. Speaker, for his very kind words and to say that the recognition that economic liberalization is one of the greatest keys to our goal of enhancing human rights, the standard of living, and the quality of life for our fellow human beings is a very, very important point; and I just want to underscore that point that was made.

Yes, the Magnitsky legislation is important, but I'm going to talk in just a moment about what some leaders in

Russia have had to say specifically about PNTR and its impact on human rights.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, with that I'm very happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend from Huntington Beach, my fellow Californian, Mr. ROHRABACHER. And pending that, let me say that he and I have been great friends since he was a speech writer for Ronald Reagan. We've worked closely on a wide range of things. And I just told him, Mr. Speaker, since I'm leaving Congress, he's taught me one thing and one thing only and that is how to make margaritas.

So with that, I'm happy to yield to my friend, Mr. ROHRABACHER.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I rise in support of the rule and of this legislation, and note that the classified nature of that margarita formula should never be disclosed to an enemy of the United States, of course; but we will be glad to transmit that information to colleagues on the other side of the aisle in a spirit of bipartisanship.

I do rise in support of this rule and H.R. 6156, the legislation to grant permanent normal trade relations status to Russia.

During the 1980s, as it was just mentioned, I worked for Ronald Reagan in the White House and was part of a team dedicating ourselves to bringing down the Soviet dictatorship. I might add that Dave Dreier was an ex officio member of that team.

Today's Russia is not yesterday's Soviet Union. That's the most important message. Over 20 years of reform have created an imperfect country, yes, but also a new Russia with a relative free press and churches that were once closed by the Communists which are now filled with those who would gather to worship God.

Many here in the United States have not appreciated the dramatic change and continue to view Russia as if it were the Soviet Union 30 years ago.

Well, what we do today is long overdue. Our protracted refusal to grant Russia permanent normal trade relation status has been counterproductive and hypocritical. Counterproductive for years because it's been an unnecessary barrier to better bilateral relations between our two countries. Hypocritical because over a decade ago we had rushed to give most favored nation status to Communist China, which still continues to be the world's worst human rights abuser.

All the arguments made to refuse it to Russia have always applied one hundredfold to Communist China. However, I have not heard the critics of this bill calling for an end to our trade status with Communist China, which I might add, human rights in China is worse today than when we granted most favored nation status to them.

If we want to have a real debate about trade, the place to start is with Communist China and not be looking at a democratic Russia. PNTR for

China has cost millions and millions of jobs over the decade. Our trade relations with Russia will benefit both of us, both the people of the United States, as well as the Russian people.

So how then can we justify such a pro-Communist China policy, which has had no political reform, and not giving it to Russia, which has had dramatic political reform?

Two decades ago, while I was working in the White House, I was arguably one of the Soviet Union's worse enemies. But my boss, Ronald Reagan, never wanted the people of Russia and the people of the United States to be enemies. He envisioned, once the Communist Party had been discarded, that our two peoples would one day be friends and trading partners and, yes, even allies.

Russian society has moved far from the Cold War. It is past time that we do the same. We need to reach out to them, stand together against an alarming rise of power in Communist China and against radical Islamic terror, which targets Russians as well as Americans.

Thus, I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting and pass this legislation.

□ 1310

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts. I also want to praise my colleague from California. This is one of the last rules Mr. DREIER will be managing here on the floor.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I'd like to ask my friend if he has looked at the schedule that we have for the next 4 weeks. I think it's light years away until I deal with the last rule here if you look at our legislative schedule. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. When it comes to the fiscal cliff, I actually hope you're right. I hope you will be so busy that you will have no time to think of anything else. But I do want to congratulate you on this rule and on your tenure here in the House. You will be missed.

The Jackson-Vanik amendment, Mr. Speaker, was a product of the Cold War when the Communist threat was ever-present and when Communist countries had little or no emigration rights. As our friend from California, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, just said, we need to recognize that today's Russia, while hardly a perfect place when it comes to human rights and political expression, is not the Soviet Union. We need a positive framework—economic, political, social—to move forward.

This PNTR, normalizing trade relations, allows us to wrangle with Russia

when we think they're wrong in trade disputes at the World Trade Organization. Absent this normalization, we don't have that leverage. Furthermore, the committee needs to be really commended, as does my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), for creating a statutory framework for addressing one of the most egregious human rights violations in modern Russian history. It involves Sergei Magnitsky.

Now, this framework could ultimately be a model, frankly, as we move forward in other parts of the world as well, but it certainly marries a positive trade relationship possibility with vigilant and vigorous human rights enforcement and vigilance. So I commend the committee for marrying the two, for allowing us positively to go forward in our relationship—troubles and all—with modern-day Russia. I urge the passage of the underlying legislation, H.R. 6156.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I have no further requests for time. If the gentleman would like to close, I will then offer some closing remarks.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert two articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—one of The New York Times, entitled, "Russia plans to retry dead lawyer in tax case," and the other from The Washington Post, entitled, "The Kremlin's blacklist."

Mr. Speaker, from the beginning, the Magnitsky Act has been a bipartisan and bicameral effort. The final Magnitsky language in title IV of H.R. 6156 is the result of genuine collaboration and compromise. I want to again thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER. I would like to thank Speaker BOEHNER, Majority Leader CANTOR, Majority Whip MCCARTHY, Democratic Leader PELOSI, Democratic Whip HOYER, House Foreign Affairs Committee chairwoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and our ranking member, Mr. BERMAN of California, as well as Mr. LEVIN, who has been so very helpful on the Ways and Means Committee, for all of their support in drafting the bill under consideration by the House this week. It has been a pleasure to work with all of these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Magnitsky provisions are strong, flexible enough to be well implemented and will allow us to have a cooperative relationship with Russia on trade and other issues while holding human rights violators accountable, including those responsible for the brutal treatment and death of Sergei Magnitsky. As I stated earlier, I would not be supporting PNTR for the Russian Federation if this bill did not include a Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act.

I agree with what has been said about the importance of increased trade in terms of promoting more positive reforms in countries like Russia, but

there is always a problem when you have a country that doesn't abide by the rule of law, where impunity rules the day. In cases like that, I think it is important to have a tool like the Magnitsky legislation to make it clear to those in Russia—not just those involved with the Sergei Magnitsky tragedy, but with other terrible human rights crimes, those who are involved in corruption—to make it clear to them that there is a consequence and that, even if within their own countries they are not brought to justice, the world will know who they are and take appropriate action. There will be visa bans, and we will go after their assets. To me, this is a very, very powerful tool that complements the benefits of PNTR for Russia.

I would say to my colleagues that this does represent a genuine compromise—the Sergei Magnitsky Act, which I am the author of in the House and Senator CARDIN is the author of in the Senate. In the House, we originally wanted this to be global in its approach, but in the spirit of compromise, it has been narrowed down to Russia. I think, if this proves to be a good tool and if it is implemented properly, hopefully, we can broaden it, because I do think that it is important for the United States to make it clear to the world that, if we stand for anything, we stand out loud and four-square for human rights.

With regard to the rule, I just want to say that I'm a little bit disappointed that this rule on a bipartisan bill includes lockdown provisions that restrict the rights of the minority in this body. I would have preferred that this rule have only included procedures for the bipartisan PNTR-Magnitsky bill, but in the spirit of bipartisanship, I'm not going to dwell on that. I'm just going to point it out for the record.

In conclusion, let me just make this one observation. This is an example of bipartisanship, of people coming together and of our supporting an important piece of legislation. I hope that some of this rubs off on some of the bills that we're going to be considering in the days and weeks to come, but this really is how this House of Representatives should be run.

Again, my compliments to the leadership of the Republican Party and to the leadership of my own party. It was not just gratuitous. I meant it. This was a process by which those of us who care about the issue of human rights felt that we were included. As a result, I think we've come up with a bill that deserves support. I think it will make a positive difference in the lives of a lot of people in Russia. In terms of trade, I think it will result in a situation where there is a more level playing field, where we have an agreement that just doesn't benefit the few at the expense of the many; we may have an agreement here that will help benefit the many.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 2012]
RUSSIA PLANS TO RETRY DEAD LAWYER IN
TAX CASE

(By Andrew E. Kramer)

MOSCOW.—The police in Russia plan to re-submit for trial a tax evasion case in which the primary defendant died in detention more than two years ago, his former employer said Tuesday.

The trial of the defendant, Sergei L. Magnitsky, would be the first posthumous prosecution in Russian legal history, according to a statement by the former employer, Hermitage Capital.

The death of Mr. Magnitsky, a lawyer, in November 2009 drew international criticism over Russia's human rights record, especially after accusations arose that he had been denied proper medical care. The State Department has barred officials linked to Mr. Magnitsky's prosecutions from entering the United States. Parliaments in nine European countries are considering similar bans.

Police officials reopened the case against Mr. Magnitsky last summer, saying it would provide a chance for relatives and supporters to clear his name.

Relatives, though, said they had not asked for that, and executives at Hermitage said the motive was something else entirely: to vindicate the officials Mr. Magnitsky had accused of corruption.

Hermitage Capital's executive director, William F. Browder, who lives in London, will be a co-defendant in the case; he will be tried in absentia, a procedure used only intermittently in the post-Soviet period but restored under a Russian law that took effect in 2006.

The statement from Hermitage said that even in the Soviet period, no defendant had been tried after death. But a Russian Supreme Court ruling last summer allowed the police to conduct posthumous investigations.

Calls to the press service of the Investigative Committee of the Interior Ministry, which is handling the case, were not answered on Tuesday.

Mr. Browder maintains that the posthumous case against Mr. Magnitsky, who died in pretrial detention when he was 37, is intended to intimidate his family and discourage them from pressing for the prosecution of the police and tax officials who they say orchestrated his imprisonment. A conviction of Mr. Magnitsky might also appear to vindicate the officials he had accused of wrongdoing.

The Hermitage statement said a police investigator had offered to drop the case in a letter to Mr. Magnitsky's mother last week, but only if relatives stated that they had no "desire to protect the honor and dignity of the deceased."

Mr. Browder said in the statement, "If the Russian Interior Ministry thinks that running a show trial against me and Sergei will stop our campaign for justice, they are dead wrong."

Mr. Magnitsky was detained in 2008 on suspicion of helping Hermitage Capital evade \$17.4 million in taxes. That accusation came after Mr. Magnitsky testified against Interior Ministry officials, saying they had used Hermitage companies to embezzle \$230 million from the Russian Treasury by filing false corporate tax returns.

Mr. Magnitsky's supporters say they believe that the prosecution was retaliatory, and that investigators assigned to his case, including individuals he had accused, denied him medical care before his death.

[From the Washington Post, July 26, 2012]
THE KREMLIN'S BLACKLIST

(By Vladimir V. Kara-Murza)

On July 12, as I stopped at the gate of the Russian Embassy compound in northwest

Washington, the on-duty officer had some unexpected news. "I cannot let you in," he said through an intercom. "You are forbidden to enter the embassy." Being a Russian citizen and a credentialed Russian journalist, and having been to my country's embassy on numerous occasions, I was naturally curious. Yevgeny Khorishko, the embassy's press secretary, whom I called for an explanation, was brief: The directive to "strike" my name from the list of credentialed Russian journalists came from Ambassador Sergei Kislyak. No reason was given. In an interview later with Slon.ru, a Moscow news Web site, the press secretary explained that the decision reflected the fact that I am "no longer a journalist."

The explanation would seem passable, except for one detail: The ambassador's directive came before it was publicly announced that I had been dismissed as Washington bureau chief of RTVi, as Russian Television International is known, effective Sept. 1. How Kislyak could have known this in advance remains a mystery.

Around the same time, two trustworthy sources in Moscow informed me that my name has been placed on a "blacklist," making me unemployable not only by RTVi but also by other, even privately owned, Russian media outlets. This was quickly verified, as one editor after another indicated that cooperation at this stage is impossible. From his own sources, opposition leader and former deputy prime minister Boris Nemtsov found out the name of the Kremlin official who has supposedly blacklisted me: Alexei Gromov, President Vladimir Putin's first deputy chief of staff. As for the reason for the Berufsverbot, my interlocutors were unequivocal: It was my advocacy for the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act, currently being considered by the U.S. Congress.

This bill, a rare example of congressional bipartisanship, proposes to introduce a targeted visa ban and asset freeze for Russian officials "responsible for the detention, abuse, or death of Sergei Magnitsky"—an anticorruption lawyer tortured to death in a Moscow prison in 2009—as well as for any "extrajudicial killings, torture, or other gross violations of internationally recognized human rights" (among them, "the freedoms of religion, expression, association, and assembly, and the rights to a fair trial and democratic elections"). The Magnitsky Act would bring a much-needed measure of accountability to corrupt Russian officials and human rights violators who prefer to rule in the manner of Zimbabwe or Belarus but opt for such destinations as the United States or Britain when it comes to storing and spending their ill-gotten gains.

Along with many other representatives of Russia's civil society, political opposition and independent media, I have been a vocal supporter of the legislation, urging its passage in public speeches and in private meetings with Washington policymakers. In authoritarian systems that maintain their power by stifling free initiative and free speech, the line between journalism and civic activism is not—and cannot be—as rigid as it is in democratic societies. Colleagues have long warned that my support for the bill would, sooner or later, catch the Kremlin's attention. The timing is not surprising, as the bill is nearing passage.

My case is just one in a series of "retaliatory" measures Putin's regime has taken against Russian supporters of the Magnitsky legislation. Other examples include the recent early-morning raids on the homes of opposition leaders and a series of new repressive laws directed against Russia's already-besieged civil society, including the 150-fold increase in fines for "violations" at public

rallies and the requirement that Russian nongovernmental organizations that receive funding from abroad be tagged as "foreign agents." That the targets of retaliation are Russian is hardly surprising: A "reciprocal" visa ban for U.S. sponsors of the Magnitsky Act would have drawn only laughter. Officials in Moscow had long promised that the response to the bill would be "asymmetrical."

The Kremlin's blackmail must not be allowed to succeed. The hysterical reaction from Putin's regime shows beyond doubt that the legislation hits precisely where it hurts. The prospect of losing access to the West and its financial systems (initiatives similar to the U.S. bill are already being considered in European Union parliaments and in Canada) may well be, for now, the only serious disincentive to corruption and human rights violations by Russian officials. Symbolically, the adoption of the Magnitsky Act has been tied to the repeal of the antiquated Jackson-Vanik Amendment, thus replacing trade sanctions against a nation with personal sanctions against specific criminals. Perhaps the most pro-Russian piece of legislation ever put before the U.S. Congress, the Magnitsky Act offers Washington an opportunity to speak with a unified voice and with unquestioned moral clarity. I hope that it will be signed into law before the end of the year.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me offer some closing remarks and say that, as I reminisce, having spent virtually my entire adult life as a Member of this body, privileged to stand in this well for nearly three-and-a-half decades—making arguments, engaging in debate—as I said, I'm very gratified that we were able to work on one of the many final issues, which is the first issue of the lame duck session, in a bipartisan way as my friend from Worcester just said. I was privileged to work with him and to have him as a cosigner of this Dear Colleague letter that we sent out in support of this legislation.

I am reminded, in having listened to remarks from both sides of the aisle—my California colleague (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER) and others—that on the 6th of November 1979, Ronald Reagan announced his candidacy for President of the United States. He offered lots of eloquence and lots of brilliance, but he said something that at the time was seen as absolute heresy, not only here in the United States but around the world and within this hemisphere.

On the 6th of November 1979, Reagan envisaged this notion of eliminating tariff barriers among all of the Americas so that we could have the free flow of goods and services and capital and ideas, and yes, people as well. That's aspirational. That's a notion that he put forward. A few years later in the Congress, I was privileged to be elected the day Ronald Reagan was elected President. I joined with my colleagues Mr. Colby and Mr. Lewis, and introduced legislation calling for the elimination of tariff barriers among Canada, the United States, and Mexico, which led to the North American Free Trade Agreement.

□ 1320

Mr. Speaker, the idea behind this diminution—in fact, elimination—of tariff and nontariff barriers is so we can enhance freedom, enhance opportunity, and improve the quality of life and the standard of living for people not only here in the United States, but around the world, as well. We understand that even in repressive societies, that if we can proceed with economic liberalization, political liberalization will follow.

I have to counter the statement that was made by my California colleague, Mr. ROHRBACHER, about China. I am not going to stand here on the day that Xi Jinping has become the new leader of China and claim that things are perfect in China, but I will argue that permanent normal trade relations and China's accession to the World Trade Organization has been beneficial. Why? Because if one looks at the great leap forward in China, there were tens of millions of people who were killed. During the cultural revolution, well over a million people were starved to death.

So you look at the great leap forward, you look at the cultural revolution in China, and you look today at the horrendous human rights violations that exist in China, and my goal is still to see us move towards political pluralism, the development of democratic institutions, a greater sense of the rule of law. But there are a few thousand political prisoners in China. It's horrible. It's not acceptable. But, Mr. Speaker, I argue that that is progress.

It was 10 years ago that I was very privileged to work with President Clinton in seeing China's accession to the World Trade Organization and permanent normal trade relations established. We were able to do that right here in a bipartisan way, and things are better than they were. They're not great; they're not acceptable; but, Mr. Speaker, they are better than they were.

I know there are some who—and Mr. ROHRBACHER thoughtfully did point to the fact that Russia is obviously not what it was like under the Soviet Union. I mean, we can all think back to the refuseniks. I remember adopting refuseniks, Jews who were unable to emigrate from Russia. You think about all of the military expenses that were involved throughout the Cold War, stories—I just came back from Georgia and the Ukraine, overseeing their elections, having been throughout Eastern Europe and Central Europe and heard stories about the kind of repression that existed. As bad as Russia is today, it's still a marked improvement over what existed during the Cold War and the time of the Soviet Union.

A lot of us held out a great deal of hope for Russia, more so than we have right now, just a few years ago, and because we've seen backward steps. I've talked about my friend Mikhail Khodorkovsky, who, at this moment, is

languishing in a Russian prison for simply criticizing Vladimir Putin. I'm here today in large part because I want Mikhail Khodorkovsky to be freed. I want to see an end to that kind of treatment of individuals.

Similarly, tomorrow marks the third anniversary of the tragic death of Sergei Magnitsky. It was absolutely horrible that this 37-year-old lawyer, a young man with, as my friend pointed out, a wife and small children, was imprisoned for simply being a whistleblower. He was tortured, abused, and left to die 3 years ago tomorrow. Again, in the 21st century, that is intolerable. It can't be accepted. That's why we need to continue to pursue this effort on economic liberalization.

I'm not going to counter what my friend said about the importance of the Magnitsky component to this legislation, but I would like to share the words of some formerly incarcerated Russians, some of whom were incarcerated human rights leaders in Russia who long before we did the Magnitsky language talked about how important this is. Let me just read a bit of this letter that is signed by seven human rights activists. It goes down the line of these Russians who have been opposition leaders in the forefront.

Before we did this, understanding how important PNTR and China's accession to the WTO would be, they said:

The persistence on the books of the Jackson-Vanik amendment does not help to solve the problems with democracy and human rights in modern Russia at all. Moreover, it brings direct harm. This helps Mr. Putin and his cronies.

He is basically saying that repeal of Jackson-Vanik is something that is going to help undermine Putin and his cronies.

They go on to say:

Those who defend the argument that Jackson-Vanik's provisions should still apply to Russia in order to punish Putin's antidemocratic regime only darken Russia's political future, hamper its economic development, and frustrate its democratic aspirations.

We, leading figures of the Russian political opposition, strongly stand behind the efforts to remove Russia from the provisions of the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

This is exactly what this measure has done before.

While I'm gratified that we've been able, in a bipartisan way to include Magnitsky, there is recognition that simply repeal of Jackson-Vanik would go a long way towards undermining the political repression that exists in Russia today.

Mr. Speaker, I also have to say on this overall issue of trade, thanks are being spread around. I want to express my appreciation to my very good friends and colleagues, DAVE CAMP, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and KEVIN BRADY, who chairs the Trade Subcommittee. I've worked with them for many years on the important issue of trade liberalization and in our pursuit of ensuring that we can create good American jobs, union

and nonunion jobs, by opening up these markets.

I also have to say that I know people like to malign the 87 newly elected Republican Members, this Tea Party class of crazy people. You read that. You hear that in the media on a regular basis. Frankly, I have to say, Mr. Speaker, the leadership that they have shown on this issue and on the issues of Colombia, Panama, and South Korea are very important issues. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I express my appreciation to the fact that 73 of them signed a letter to the President saying that this needed to be brought forward. We want to work in a bipartisan way to make this happen.

I urge support of this rule, and then tomorrow when we have the vote on PNTR, a strong bipartisan support in behalf of the efforts of Messrs. CAMP and LEVIN and BRADY and others.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1705

AFTER RECESS

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6156, RUSSIA AND MOLDOVA JACKSON-VANIK REPEAL AND SERGEI MAGNITSKY RULE OF LAW ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 808) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6156) to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to products of the Russian Federation and Moldova and to require reports on the compliance of the Russian Federation with its obligations as a member of the World Trade Organization, and for other purposes,

on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 808, if ordered, and suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendments to H.R. 2453.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 164, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 605]

YEAS—243

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishak
Berg
Biggart
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Brown (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchson
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culbertson
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox

Frank (MA)
Frank (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Huelskamp
Huiizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
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
Marchant
Marino
Massie
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
Paulsen
Pearce
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg

Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NAYS—164

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Ciilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curson (MI)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr

Fattah
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerny
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens

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

NOT VOTING—25

Akin
Bartlett
Boren
Buchanan
Finer
Forbes
Gallegly
Grijalva
Grimm

Heinrich
Holt
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Lewis (GA)
Manzullo
Meeke
Miller, George

Pence
Rothman (NJ)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Shuler
Towns
Woolsey
Yarmuth

□ 1729

Messrs. CUELLAR, GARAMENDI, SMITH of Washington, LARSON of Connecticut, ISRAEL, JONES, MURPHY of Connecticut, CLAY and CARNEY, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 605, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 8, 2012.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from The Honorable Kimberly M. Guadagno, Lieutenant Governor/Secretary of State, State of New Jersey, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held November 6, 2012, the Honorable Donald M. Payne, Jr. was elected Representative to Congress for the Tenth Congressional District, State of New Jersey.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Trenton, NJ, November 8, 2012.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR Ms. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, November 6, 2012, for Representative in Congress from the Tenth Congressional District of New Jersey, show that Donald M. Payne, Jr. received 141,714 of the total number of voters cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Donald M. Payne, Jr. was elected as Representative in Congress from the Tenth Congressional District of New Jersey.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified, to this office by the Essex, Hudson and Union County Clerks involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

KIMBERLY M. GUADAGNO,
*Lieutenant Governor/
Secretary of State.*

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE DONALD M. PAYNE, JR., OF NEW JERSEY, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect PAYNE and the members of the New Jersey delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. PAYNE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 112th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE DONALD M. PAYNE, JR., TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say how happy I am, and the New Jersey delegation, and what a privilege it is to welcome DON PAYNE to the U.S. House of Representatives, a Member from the 10th Congressional District.

DON is a former city councilman where he served in Newark as president of that council, a county freeholder. And of course he takes over after the very tragic passing of his dad, Don Payne, who all of us have worked with over the years. I personally, as chairman of the Africa Committee, Don before me, we worked side by side on issues related to Africa. Again, I will be very brief, but he takes over, of course, after the tragic passing of Don Payne, who all of us loved, admired and respected.

I sat next to Don for years on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He was the chairman of Africa, I chaired it and do so today; and we worked side by side on malaria and a whole host of other very important issues relevant to the health and well-being of the people of Africa, global health, and human rights. So, DON, you have very big shoes to fill. I'm sure you'll do it, and it is a great pleasure.

Members should know DON has been an activist on a number of issues, including Embracing Arms. He works very strongly on job creation in Newark, which has been very hard hit by the recession. So it's great to welcome you, DON. And, again, I look forward to serving with you in this Congress and the next.

I yield to my friend and colleague, FRANK PALLONE.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank my colleague for those remarks. And just very briefly, if I can say as a senior Member of the Democrats, DON, Jr. has excelled in his own right. As was mentioned, he's been a councilman in the city of Newark for a while. He has also been a county freeholder in Essex County, New Jersey. And I could go through the long list of accomplish-

ments that he's made himself for the city of Newark and the other towns that he now represents in the congressional district.

But I do have to say your father would be so proud. He's looking down today. And you must know, for all of you who loved his dad so much, that he is very much like his father in every respect in that he respects everyone. He has the sympathy—your father always talked about simpatico, the Italian sympathy, because he grew up in the Italian section of Newark, and that's something that's shared very much by DON as well. He will be someone that you will all learn to love the way you learned to love his father.

Congratulations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1740

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to be a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and to represent the people of the 10th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey.

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank my wife, Beatrice, for being here, my three children, who did not come, my triplet children, who were the apple of my father's eye, Donald III, Jack, and Yvonne, for always supporting me and encouraging me. I could not have done this without you.

I also want to thank my uncle, the former assemblyman William Payne, who gave my father his undying love, guidance, and strong support his entire life. Without his encouragement, I would not be standing here today.

Our Nation faces many challenges, both at home and abroad, but the most immediate concern for all of us is to help New Jersey recover from the devastating effects of Hurricane Sandy. You have my word that I will continue to work every day to ensure that the 10th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey and the entire State receives all the Federal support we need until we reach full recovery.

Nearly 2 years ago, my father was sworn into his 11th and final term in Congress. I look forward to continuing to build on his legacy and serving the people of the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey, the Nation, and the world. And finally, I look forward to working with all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

For those of you that knew my father, I'd just like to end, and it'll probably be the last time I mention it. As I went through the campaign and was successful in my candidacy, after the campaign I had time to reflect on what all of this meant to me, and I realized that there were many parallels in our lives, and I'll just end with this.

When my father was 8 years old, his mother died. My mother died when I was 4. He was first elected an Essex County freeholder. That was my first elected office. He then went on to the Newark Municipal Council in the city

of Newark. That was my next elected office.

He won his first time in Congress in the middle of his second term as a Newark municipal councilman. I'm in the middle of my second term as a Newark municipal councilman.

And when he was sworn into Congress he was 54 years old. When I'm sworn in for the 113th Congress I will be 54 years old. We will both be fortunate and privileged to serve in the 112th Congress, and we have both been privileged to serve with President Obama.

When his father died he was 77 years old, and he died on March 6. My father was 77 years old, and he died on March 6. So God has a plan for your life. And I think if I am half the man he was and the public servant, I'll consider myself a success.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from New Jersey, the whole number of the House is 434.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6156, RUSSIA AND MOLDOVA JACKSON-VANIK REPEAL AND SERGEI MAGNITSKY RULE OF LAW ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, H. Res. 808.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 253, noes 150, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 606]

AYES—253

Adams	Bishop (UT)	Campbell
Aderholt	Black	Canseco
Alexander	Blackburn	Cantor
Amash	Blumenauer	Capito
Amodei	Bonner	Carney
Austria	Bono Mack	Carter
Bachmann	Boustany	Cassidy
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Barletta	Brooks	Chaffetz
Barton (TX)	Brown (GA)	Coble
Bass (NH)	Brown (FL)	Coffman (CO)
Benishek	Bucshon	Cole
Berg	Buerkle	Conaway
Berman	Burgess	Connolly (VA)
Biggert	Burton (IN)	Cooper
Bilbray	Calvert	Costa
Bilirakis	Camp	Cravaack

Crawford	Kelly	Reed	Matsui	Polis	Smith (WA)
Crenshaw	Kind	Rehberg	McCarthy (NY)	Price (NC)	Speier
Crowley	King (IA)	Reichert	McCollum	Quigley	Stark
Culberson	King (NY)	Renacci	McDermott	Rahall	Sutton
Denham	Kingston	Ribble	McNerney	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell	Michaud	Reyes	Thompson (MS)
DesJarlais	Kissell	Rivera	Miller (NC)	Richardson	Tierney
Diaz-Balart	Kline	Roby	Moore	Richmond	Tonko
Dold	Labrador	Roe (TN)	Murphy (CT)	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Donnelly (IN)	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Nadler	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Dreier	Lance	Rogers (KY)	Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez
Duffy	Landry	Rogers (MI)	Oliver	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Rohrabacher	Owens	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)
Duncan (TN)	Latham	Rokita	Pallone	Schiff	Wasserman
Ellmers	LaTourette	Rooney	Pascarell	Schwartz	Schultz
Emerson	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen	Pastor (AZ)	Scott (VA)	Waters
Eshoo	Levin	Roskam	Paul	Scott, David	Watt
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Ross (AR)	Payne	Serrano	Waxman
Fattah	Long	Ross (FL)	Pelosi	Sewell	Welch
Fincher	Lucas	Royce	Perlmutter	Sherman	Wilson (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer	Runyan	Peters	Sires	
Flake	Lummis	Ryan (WI)	Pingree (ME)	Slaughter	
Fleischmann	Lungren, Daniel	Scalise			
Fleming	E.	Schilling			
Flores	Lynch	Schmidt	Akin	Grijalva	Miller, George
Fortenberry	Mack	Schock	Andrews	Grimm	Pence
Fox	Marchant	Schrader	Bartlett	Heinrich	Rothman (NJ)
Franks (AZ)	Marino	Schweikert	Boren	Holt	Rush
Frelinghuysen	Massie	Scott (SC)	Buchanan	Jackson (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Gardner	Matheson	Scott, Austin	Costello	Jackson Lee	T.
Garrett	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner	DeGette	(TX)	Sanchez, Loretta
Gerlach	McCaul	Sessions	Filner	Lewis (CA)	Towns
Gibbs	McClintock	Shimkus	Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Woolsey
Gibson	McGovern	Shuler	Frank (MA)	Manzullo	Yarmuth
Gingrey (GA)	McHenry	Shuster	Gallegly	Meeks	
Gohmert	McIntyre	Simpson			
Goodlatte	McKeon	Smith (NE)			
Gosar	McKinley	Smith (NJ)			
Gowdy	McMorris	Smith (TX)			
Granger	Rodgers	Southerland			
Graves (GA)	Meehan	Stearns			
Graves (MO)	Mica	Stivers			
Griffin (AR)	Miller (FL)	Stutzman			
Griffith (VA)	Miller (MI)	Sullivan			
Guinta	Miller, Gary	Terry			
Guthrie	Moran	Thompson (PA)			
Hall	Mulvaney	Thornberry			
Hanna	Murphy (PA)	Tiberi			
Harper	Myrick	Tipton			
Harris	Neal	Turner (NY)			
Hartzler	Neugebauer	Turner (OH)			
Hastings (WA)	Noem	Upton			
Hayworth	Nugent	Walberg			
Heck	Nunes	Walden			
Hensarling	Nunnelee	Walsh (IL)			
Henger	Olson	Webster			
Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	West			
Huelskamp	Paulsen	Westmoreland			
Huizenga (MI)	Pearce	Whitfield			
Hultgren	Peterson	Wilson (SC)			
Hunter	Petri	Wittman			
Hurt	Pitts	Wolf			
Issa	Platts	Womack			
Jenkins	Poe (TX)	Woodall			
Johnson (IL)	Pompeo	Yoder			
Johnson (OH)	Posey	Young (AK)			
Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)	Young (FL)			
Jordan	Quayle	Young (IN)			

NOES—150

Ackerman	Cohen	Hastings (FL)
Altmire	Conyers	Higgins
Baca	Courtney	Himes
Baldwin	Critz	Hinche
Barber	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Barrow	Cummings	Hirono
Bass (CA)	Curson (MI)	Hochul
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Holden
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Honda
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Hoyer
Bishop (NY)	DeLauro	Israel
Bonamici	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Boswell	Deutch	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Jones
Braley (IA)	Dingell	Kaptur
Butterfield	Doggett	Keating
Capps	Doyle	Kildee
Capuano	Edwards	Kucinich
Carnahan	Ellison	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Engel	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Farr	Larson (CT)
Chandler	Fudge	Lee (CA)
Chu	Garamendi	Lipinski
Cicilline	Gonzalez	Loebsack
Clarke (MI)	Green, Al	Lofgren, Zoe
Clarke (NY)	Green, Gene	Lowe
Clay	Gutierrez	Lujan
Cleaver	Hahn	Maloney
Clyburn	Hanabusa	Markey

gether, they need a united Congress behind that effort. For others, the rebuilding has not yet begun as they still wait more than 2 weeks for power and fuel to be restored to them. For far too many, we grieve at the ultimate loss—precious men, women and, yes, children who are no longer with us as a result of this storm.

Lastly, we must acknowledge the constant heartfelt support from all of our public servants, including all the firefighters and volunteer fire departments, the police departments, the National Guard, FEMA, and particularly our sanitation workers, who are cleaning the mounds of sand and debris from people's homes. We continue to learn of incredible heroic acts that are moving but that are in keeping with the best of America's traditions.

I also want to point out that my mother's hometown of Rockaway Beach was devastated by this storm and, particularly, a community known as Breezy Point, where our good friend and our colleague BOB TURNER lost his entire home. It burned to the ground.

Please join me in keeping all of those we have lost in your thoughts and prayers, and remember them in the weeks and the months ahead as they begin to rebuild their lives.

I now yield to my colleague, my friend from New York, BOB TURNER.

Mr. TURNER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize those who lost their homes, livelihoods and, most tragically, their lives during the most devastating storm ever to hit the Northeast. For the heroic efforts of New York's police, fire department and sanitation workers, who were on the scene immediately, forsaking their own personal interests and safety, and for all of those affected by the hurricane, I ask that the House stand and engage in a moment of silence.

MARK TWAIN COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 2453) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Mark Twain, 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 Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 370, nays 19, not voting 44, as follows:

NOT VOTING—30

Andrews	Grijalva	Miller, George
Bartlett	Grimm	Pence
Boren	Heinrich	Rothman (NJ)
Buchanan	Holt	Rush
Costello	Jackson (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
DeGette	Jackson Lee	T.
Filner	(TX)	Sanchez, Loretta
Forbes	Lewis (CA)	Towns
Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)	Woolsey
Gallegly	Manzullo	Yarmuth
	Meeks	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1750

Mr. CROWLEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 606, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF HURRICANE SANDY

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Thank you to all of my colleagues from the Northeast who stand with us today. I want to particularly thank my colleague from New York (Mr. TURNER) for helping to arrange this bipartisan moment of support and to demonstrate to our country how we should all come together at a time of crisis.

This storm, known as Sandy, was utterly devastating, not only to property and to homes but to families, communities and neighborhoods—entire neighborhoods. Our hearts are with those in places like City Island, Edgewater and Locust Point, which is in my district in the Bronx, for those in lower Manhattan, Staten Island, Hoboken, coastal New Jersey, Fairfield County, parts of Philadelphia, and other parts that were affected by this horrific storm.

For many, recovery has already begun; but as they begin to piece their lives and their communities back to-

[Roll No. 607]

YEAS—370

Ackerman Dold Lankford
 Adams Donnelly (IN) Larsen (WA)
 Aderholt Doyle Larson (CT)
 Alexander Dreier Latham
 Altmire Duffy LaTourette
 Amodei Duncan (SC) Latta
 Austria Duncan (TN) Lee (CA)
 Baca Edwards Levin
 Bachmann Ellison Lipinski
 Bachus Ellmers LoBiondo
 Baldwin Emerson Lofgren, Zoe
 Barber Engel Long
 Barletta Eshoo Lowey
 Barrow Farenthold Lucas
 Barton (TX) Farr Luetkemeyer
 Bass (NH) Fattah Lujan
 Becerra Fincher Lummis
 Benishek Fitzpatrick Lungren, Daniel
 Berg Flake E. Lynch
 Berkley Fleischmann Mack
 Biggert Fleming Maloney
 Bilbray Fortenberry Marchant
 Bilirakis Foxx Marino
 Bishop (GA) Frelinghuysen Markey
 Bishop (NY) Fudge Matheson
 Bishop (UT) Garamendi Gardner
 Black Gerlach McCarthy (CA)
 Blumenauer Gerlach McCarthy (NY)
 Bonamici Gibbs McCaul
 Bonner Gibson McClintock
 Bono Mack Gingrey (GA) McCollum
 Boswell Gohmert McDermott
 Boustany Gonzalez McGovern
 Brady (PA) Goodlatte McHenry
 Braley (IA) Gosar McIntyre
 Broun (GA) Gowdy McKeon
 Brown (FL) Granger McKinley
 Buschon Graves (MO) McMorris
 Buerkle Green, Al Rodgers
 Burgess Green, Gene McNeerney
 Burton (IN) Griffin (AR) Meehan
 Butterfield Griffith (VA) Mica
 Calvert Guinta Michaud
 Camp Guthrie Miller (FL)
 Campbell Gutierrez Miller (MI)
 Canseco Hahn Miller (NC)
 Cantor Hall Miller, Gary
 Capito Hanabusa Moore
 Capps Hanna Moran
 Capuano Harper Murphy (CT)
 Carnahan Harris Murphy (PA)
 Carson (IN) Hartzler Myrick
 Carter Hastings (FL) Nadler
 Cassidy Hastings (WA) Napolitano
 Castor (FL) Hayworth Neal
 Chabot Heck Neugebauer
 Chaffetz Hensarling Noem
 Chu Herrera Beutler Nugent
 Cicilline Higgins Nunes
 Clarke (MI) Himes Nunnelee
 Clarke (NY) Hinchey Olson
 Clay Hinojosa Oliver
 Cleaver Hirono Owens
 Clyburn Hochul Palazzo
 Coble Holden Pallone
 Coffman (CO) Honda Pascrell
 Cohen Hoyer Pastor (AZ)
 Cole Huizenga (MI) Paulsen
 Conaway Hultgren Payne
 Connolly (VA) Hunter Pearce
 Conyers Hurt Pelosi
 Cooper Israel Perlmutter
 Costa Issa Peters
 Courtney Jenkins Peterson
 Cravaack Johnson (GA) Petri
 Crawford Johnson (IL) Pingree (ME)
 Crenshaw Johnson (OH) Pitts
 Critz Johnson, E. B. Platts
 Crowley Johnson, Sam Polis
 Cuellar Jones Pompeo
 Culberson Jordan Posey
 Cummings Kaptur Price (GA)
 Curson (MI) Kelly Price (NC)
 Davis (CA) Kildee Quayle
 Davis (IL) Kind Quigley
 DeFazio King (IA) Rahall
 DeLauro King (NY) Rangel
 DelBene Kingston Reed
 Denham Kinzinger (IL) Rehberg
 Dent Kissell Reichert
 DesJarlais Kline Renacci
 Deutch Labrador Reyes
 Diaz-Balart Lamborn Richardson
 Dicks Lance Richmond
 Dingell Landry Rivera
 Doggett Langevin Roby

Roe (TN) Sewell Van Hollen
 Rogers (AL) Sherman Velázquez
 Rogers (MI) Shimkus Visclosky
 Rokita Shuler Walberg
 Rooney Shuster Walden
 Ros-Lehtinen Simpson Walsh (IL)
 Roskam Sires Sires
 Ross (AR) Slaughter Smith (NE)
 Roybal-Allard Smith (NJ)
 Royce Smith (TX)
 Runyan Smith (WA)
 Ryan (OH) Southerland
 Ryan (WI) Speier
 Sarbanes Stark
 Scalise Stearns
 Schakowsky Schiff
 Schiff Schilling
 Schmitt Terry
 Schock Thompson (CA)
 Schrader Thompson (MS)
 Schwartz Thompson (PA)
 Scott (SC) Tiberi
 Scott (VA) Tierney
 Scott, Austin Tipton
 Scott, David Tonko
 Sensenbrenner Tsongas
 Serrano Turner (NY)
 Sessions Upton

Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Webster
 Welch
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NAYS—19

Amash Graves (GA)
 Blackburn Huelskamp
 Brady (TX) Kucinich
 Brooks Massie
 Flores Mulvaney
 Franks (AZ) Paul
 Garrett Poe (TX)

Ribble
 Rigell
 Ross (FL)
 Schweikert
 Thornberry

NOT VOTING—44

Akin Grimm
 Andrews Heinrich
 Bartlett Herger
 Bass (CA) Holt
 Berman Jackson (IL)
 Boren Jackson Lee
 Buchanan (TX)
 Carney Keating
 Chandler Lewis (CA)
 Costello Lewis (GA)
 DeGette Loebsack
 Filner Manzullo
 Forbes Matsui
 Frank (MA) Meeks
 Gallegly Miller, George
 Grijalva Pence

Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rothman (NJ)
 Ruppberger
 Rush
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Towns
 Turner (OH)
 Woolsey
 Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1802

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 607, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 808.

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

There was no objection.

URGING PASSAGE OF FARM BILL

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this House to come together and support a new comprehensive farm bill. Farmers in my district are the most efficient producers in the world; however, their productivity and efficiency could be hindered if this body does not act on a new farm bill.

After facing a historic drought this year, farmers saw a tremendous drop in yields. Crop insurance was there to keep them afloat; however, there is so much uncertainty that, if we don't act soon, the producers in my district and across the country could be facing unjust consequences when going to buy their seed, fertilizer, and other inputs for the 2013 crop.

There are differences between the bill that was passed by the House Ag Committee, of which I'm a member, as compared to that of the Senate. That's why we need to bring the House bill to the floor for a vote, so that we can go to conference committee and work out our differences just as we did last year in the highway bill.

Certainty is what the farmers need right now in order to continue to produce the safest and most affordable food in the world. I urge both sides to come together and pass a new 5-year farm bill before the end of the year.

□ 1810

VIOLENCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, violence is continuing to erupt in the Middle East. Unfortunately, it remains true that for every action there is a reaction. So when this administration decided to push its ally, President Mubarak, out of leadership in Egypt, it was assisting in creating instability around our other ally, Israel. And that instability continues to grow.

One of the things that was helpful from Egypt while President Mubarak was in charge, at least there were some efforts to restrict the transfer of rockets into the Gaza Strip. So there were some tunnels that would be found. The tunnels had to be kept small, so they were able to get smaller rockets into Gaza. But now that there is a new regime, apparently the bigger rockets are getting into Gaza, and they pose more and more of a threat as they continue to be fired into Israel.

The action is not only the fall of an ally, President Mubarak, but the assistance in bringing to power in Egypt the Muslim Brotherhood. They want to see Israel gone, and they would also not mind seeing the United States gone.

It's important when formulating foreign policy that the United States, particularly the Obama administration, decide are we going to be assisted with our own personal security here in the United States by the actions that we take, or are the reactions that are going to be caused by our actions actually going to cause greater threats to our closest allies and to ourselves. And, unfortunately, that's what we're seeing. In fact, I saw an article in May of 2010 which indicated that this administration, the Obama administration, sided with Israel's enemies in demanding that Israel disclose any nuclear weapons. We'd never sided with Israel's enemies in trying to push Israel into doing something against its own interests. When you're a very small country surrounded by countries that want to see you go away, it is important that they not know all of your defenses.

Going back in the Old Testament, you find history, King Hezekiah showing all of their treasure and all of their defenses. All of their defenses they had in their armory, he showed them to the leaders of Babylon. As a result, ultimately that kingdom was lost to the Babylonians.

You don't show other nations, even people you think are friends at the moment; they may turn into enemies. It is important that your enemies, and even your friends, not know all of your defenses. And yet we sided with Israel's enemies, or at least this administration did.

The result we saw within 2-3 days, the flotilla head from Turkey to challenge the blockade of the Gaza Strip. It was a legitimate, lawful blockade that was trying to keep rockets out of Gaza that would inflict death and terror upon Israel. A legitimate blockade. The only things being kept out were weapons, rockets, things that would kill the Israelis and terrorize our ally. But that's what happens. You have challenges to a nation when that nation's enemies see their strongest ally pull away and siding with that nation's enemies.

That's why it was so important, and I began pushing at that time, to have Prime Minister Netanyahu invited to speak here in this Chamber. And a year later, to his great credit, Speaker BOEHNER, at the urging of many of us, invited Prime Minister Netanyahu, and he gave the best speech I've heard here in Congress. It helps when a nation's enemy sees their strongest ally siding with them.

On the other hand, when a nation's enemies see the strong ally, in this case the United States, turning on an ally, as this administration had with President Mubarak, and helping people who want to see Israel gone from the map take power, it encourages Israel's enemies.

This administration also had relations with Qadhafi, who had opened up—he had blood on his hands from prior years, not a good man, but he had opened up his country, abandoned any

nuclear weapons pursuit, and become an ally. I have seen individual family members of Muammar Qadhafi here in Washington to meet with administration officials. And then, lo and behold, a year and a half or so ago, this administration sides with the enemies. And at the time we knew al Qaeda was contained within the revolt, and we sided with the al Qaeda-backed revolt to drive out Qadhafi. That appears to have inspired the violence in Tunisia.

And so we have seen Israel's enemies and our own enemies actually grow in strength—Tunisia, Libya, Egypt—coming on to surround Israel, and any threat to Western values that are found in Israel is a threat to our own existence. And it's important that someone in this administration make repeated note of that because the result here recently has been further violence to our friend and ally, Israel.

So we have this report, November 15, 2012, three people were killed as rockets fired from Gaza struck southern Israel escalating violence. They died when a four-story building in the town of Kiryat Malachi was hit. There had been about 200 rockets fired into Israel. Israel's Iron Dome was able to intercept many of them, but couldn't possibly intercept as many as 200.

□ 1820

“‘ Hamas’ political leader Khaled Mashaal vowed to continue the ‘resistance’ against Israel,” Reuters news agency reported.

This “resistance” is just another word for “violence.” They're inflicting violence on Israel and then turning around and blaming Israel for defending itself and trying to continue to grow world opinion against the tiny nation of Israel when it's not Israel that is demanding the total annihilation of its enemies in surrounding countries. They just want to live in peaceful coexistence. But this administration has helped its enemies take over the countries surrounding it.

And now we're aware of enemies coming into Jordan, beginning to incite a potential revolt there against another ally who must wonder is this administration going to turn on him next.

King Abdullah has not been someone with whom we've agreed on all things, but he has kept a relatively very peaceful border with Israel. So necessarily he would wonder, Because I've kept the peace with Israel on their border, am I going to be targeted next? And the answer needs to come very loudly and very clearly—and it doesn't seem to be much of a muffle at all—that we support those who will prevent violence against Israel, against their Western values, against their desire to just live in peace and be left alone. And yet we've helped their enemies build violence and potential for more violence around it.

This story from Sky News reported that the rockets hit near Tel Aviv deeper into Israel. Palestinian militants target Israel with nearly 150

rockets, striking the outskirts of Tel Aviv as Israel continues airstrikes.

And there has been a problem: Since this administration helped create the environment in north Africa and in the Middle East where those who want to see Israel destroyed could take power, more violence has occurred, not less; more people's lives are in danger, not less. There's less freedom of worship, not more. The things that we believe in—freedom of worship of all people or no worship if people choose not to worship—these kinds of things should be kept inviolate.

And yet we've seen, as this Nation took over Afghanistan, more Americans have died in about half the time under Commander in Chief Obama as died during the 7 years and 3 months under President Bush in Afghanistan, American military. Over 70 percent of those killed in Afghanistan have been under Commander Obama in about half the time. We've seen violence escalating against Americans in Afghanistan. We've seen the last Christian church, public Christian church pull out of Afghanistan.

This administration should be encouraging freedom of worship, encouraging the liberation of women, of children. And yet for all its help, it's created environments in Libya, in Egypt, in Afghanistan, in Iraq where there is more and more violence, more and more oppression against women, against children, against Christians, against Jews, against anyone who wants to worship other than in a radical Islamist way.

Sometimes we wonder who's in charge in this administration because somebody's got to figure it out. So I was glad to hear President Obama say yesterday, Don't be accusing Ambassador Rice of going out and lying.

And we know that something is not a lie unless somebody knows that it's not true when they say it. The President apparently indicated that she was given the information that was untrue, to go out and spread those untruths. And if she didn't know that the statements she was told by the White House to go out and tell were not truths, then she was not lying. And she should be given credit for not lying if she didn't know those untruths she was telling were not true.

But then it raises more and more questions. You know, who is in charge there?

Woodward's book raises the issue of the President coming to meetings over crises and not even knowing who's going to be coming to brief him on things; whereas, a strong leader would come in and, I want to hear from this person, this person, this person.

Who's making the decisions? Who does know what's true and not true in this administration? Who can we depend on at 3 in the morning when we have public servants who have been sent into harm's way to do this administration's bidding, who is going to answer that phone and say, The people

that we ordered into harm's way on our behalf are in trouble? Right now, get them all the help we can give them. Who's going to answer that call? Why does it take 8 hours to get the people ordered into harm's way some help? We're stronger than that. We've got vehicles, planes, things that can get there faster.

So why are people trying to cover up who makes those decisions? Who decides not to help the people we have in harm's way? And if we don't figure that out, how can we expect anybody to ever come forward and sign up to put their lives on the line for their country?

We have the greatest military in the history of this country. The men and women who have served this country throughout our history have been extraordinary, but never with the power and the ability of the military that we have now. It's extraordinary.

But when this administration creates rules of engagement that even go one step worse than telling our people, When you're fired on, you can defend yourself, but if you're not fired on and somebody raises a weapon and they're going to shoot at you, they look like they're going to shoot at you, you have got to wait to make sure they're going to shoot at you before you shoot back, that's the kind of impression our military has gotten in the field in the past.

But as I've talked to military members in Afghanistan, it's their impression that the rules of engagement are such that now when they're fired at, they can't fire back if they think there might be a civilian somewhere that might get hit, because if they do and they hit a civilian, even defending themselves in what in America would be self-defense, sent into harm's way might get them sent to prison when they get home. So they are tasked with an unenviable position of deciding, Do I want to defend myself against death and risk going to prison when I get home, being jailed by the country that I'm trying to defend, to serve?

We've got to get some answers of who's making the decisions that are getting our military killed, that have gotten an Ambassador killed, that got two former SEALs killed. We have got to get some answers. Who's covering this stuff up? Somebody is. We can't get the story straight.

□ 1830

General Petraeus is supposed to appear tomorrow.

We need an independent prosecutor to do an investigation, not with the intention, as apparently Fitzgerald had, of "getting somebody," so that he goes into the investigation into whether or not Valerie Plame was outed and he finds out the answer and decides to do what he can to get somebody inside the Bush administration, even though he knew that Scooter Libby was not responsible and was set up. He should have been truthful. You should always be truthful. But the prosecutor was not

honorable in the way that that was pursued. If he knew the answer as to who had outed Valerie Plame, that it was not Scooter Libby, it was not Karl Rove, he should have been honorable enough to own up to that instead of asking for more money and trying to set up other individuals.

So with those kinds of things going on, it's understandable how people would expect that having an independent counsel might not be a good idea. But when there are clearly conflicts of interest, when you have an FBI that is investigating information that involves the Director of the CIA, when you have an Attorney General that has information that needs to go immediately to the Commander in Chief, to the President of the country, we need to find out, did it go there, and if not why not. And, if so, what in the world is the President doing with this information because now he's saying they didn't get it until after the election. Why so long? Where are the problems here? Why are the stories different? Why are the stories that were told different from the evidence those people had in their hands when they told their stories? The answers need to be found, and there's clearly a conflict of interest.

We do not need to return to the days of an FBI Director who investigates, not to report to the Commander in Chief, but to gather information so that he can get it and use it or provide it to someone else who can use it to force people to do what they want.

So what happens when an FBI Director comes into office honorably, with the best of intentions, as it appears J. Edgar Hoover did, to battle organized crime that was such a blot on this country. When you're in power too long, as Stalin, who should have known, said, With power dizziness.

So there has to be accountability. It's what the Founders had in mind. Checks and balances. We've seen with the Supreme Court's decision in ObamaCare that they're going to allow unconstitutional laws to go forward. They're not going to be the ones to rein in violations of the Constitution that are contained in bad legislation: You guys in Congress need to figure that out. Our Chief Justice punted on that one.

So it's back to us. Members of Congress have the purse strings. And if the administration will not properly appoint a special prosecutor to investigate, not with the intent of putting someone in jail but to see if there is something that needs to be prosecuted, if they're not willing to do that, then we need to cut off funds to those areas that are refusing to do justice. Because an Injustice Department should not be funded, at least the parts of it that are doing injustice. There are parts that are serving nobly and well. Fund those parts.

We have the power of the purse to check and balance an administration running amok. So when an administra-

tion takes actions to make sure that people who are illegally voting have the chance to illegally vote, we need to look at what areas we are funding there. Because if there's a Justice Department that is assisting—complicit—in seeing that people not legally allowed to vote, vote, then we have the power of the purse strings to do something about it, and we should. And if the Senate fails to rein in injustice, they need to be exposed, those who stand in its way. Because that's the great thing about America. When Americans get the truth, they stand on the truth and stand for justice. They always have. But they've got to get the truth.

And sometimes these days it's hard to know what's true. When you have an administration sending out different stories, and then we find out that they knew all along that it was a violent, coordinated attack on our Ambassador, that the two former SEALs that were killed were not killed seeking cover, as this administration released that they were. You had one on the top of a building using a machine gun, fighting to the end to protect others. That's not a man seeking cover. That's a man giving cover to others. That's a man laying down his life for his country. And this administration did not serve him as he served it.

We need to get to the bottom of what's going on. Whatever it takes, lawfully, ethically, we need to get to the bottom of it. We need to require that if this administration is going to continue getting funding, it better start protecting those who are protecting it. And if that means that in order to protect those who are in harm's way, then let's fund those who are in harm's way protecting us and not fund the rest until they are committed to protecting those of us who are in harm's way. We can do that.

Social Security, despite the lies that were told by some in the last couple of years that, oh gee, if there's a shutdown, Social Security recipients, you're not going to get a dime. Garbage. Those are lies. And people need to know if and when those things start getting told, they are lies, whoever would tell them, because the law has been passed previously that if there is a government shutdown, Social Security recipients will get their Social Security checks. They will be coming. Because the money will continue to come in. Just because there has been a government shutdown in the past did not mean that people didn't have to send in their tax payments. They have to come. You commit a crime if you intentionally refuse to pay taxes.

So the money comes in. Social Security checks will go out. We've had bills in the past, and we'll have them as soon as we start a new Congress, that will ensure that those Americans who are standing in the gap, who are in harm's way for us, those men and women wearing uniforms, should never have to worry about whether or not

their paycheck will be forthcoming; that regardless of what kind of games get played here in Washington, they're going to get paid. They ought to know that. We ought to pass that bill like we have with Social Security to make sure those in harm's way don't have to worry about that.

And then the message needs to be loud and clear that an administration that refuses, whether it's intentional or neglect, negligence, that fails to ensure the protection of those protecting us, you're not going to get funded until we get commitments to make sure it's done in the future. And when you obfuscate the truth and you keep us from finding out who made these decisions that got our people killed, what in the heck were they doing over there in the first place?

Our embassy's not in Benghazi. What was going on? Who gave the order for Ambassador Stevens to be there in harm's way? Until we can start finding out those answers, it's going to be impossible to make sure that we protect those who are protecting us in the future. And what kind of message does that send to our allies?

□ 1840

In Israel, a year ago, a minister told me that they routinely get visits from Chinese diplomats who say: Hey, have you figured out you can't trust the United States yet? Because we'll be your great ally. We'll be a lot better ally than the United States has been. All you've got to do is let us know when you figure it out. You can't trust the United States; they'll break their word, you can't count on them. When you find that out, let us know. We'll keep coming around because you'll find out at some time.

Listen, there never needs to be a time again ever when a United States ally is betrayed by the United States. When we make an agreement with an ally, with a friend, that agreement needs to be kept. People need to know that this country keeps its word. Even when it hurts, we keep our word. And that seems to be a problem lately.

You want to go back to when America began to grow economically and become a power economically? After the War of 1812 that dragged on for 2 years really destroyed so much, including the fire in this very building—this section was not here yet, but the central part of the Capitol, fires were set. The smaller Federal offices out here in what we now consider the Mall, they were burned. The White House was set on fire—even though the interior was completely destroyed, the exterior shell was left in place. But that also was true of much of the country, devastated. But there were loans that had been taken out by Americans from British banks before the War of 1812. Those in British banks might have suspected that as a result of our war with Great Britain, 1812 to 1814, that at the end of the war we would not pay our debts. But instead what happened,

those American forefathers, foremothers, they agreed, look, we made a promise to pay back our loans to the banks in England, we're going to stand good for our word, despite the fact that their country destroyed so much of ours.

And it was after the world took note that Americans had such incredible honor, that even after a war with Great Britain they would stand behind their commitments to pay back their loans to the British banks, people said: Wow, this is a country we can do business with, and American economic power began to grow to where it is now the strongest economic power in the world.

Now, people are beginning to wonder: Should we end the dollar as an international currency because we're not sure you can trust the United States? It's time people quit wondering whether they can trust the United States. There's only one way that will happen, and that is when we have an administration—and this one's been reelected for 4 years, so it has to be this one—stops playing games, stops covering up truth, stops giving mixed signals, and is forthcoming: Here are our policies; we have made agreements; we stand by our agreements. King Abdullah, we may disagree with you on a bunch of things, but we have agreements, and we will keep our agreements. This administration needs to make those things clear.

When someone attacks an ally of ours with whom we have agreements, we stand by our agreements. That's the way you prevent wars. Because what we're seeing right now in Israel, with this enhanced and heightened violence that's beginning to occur, people have seen this administration pulling back from our commitments to Israel. That's the way it appears to Israel's enemies. So of course the rockets have gotten bigger that they've been able to smuggle in and construct there in Gaza. The rockets are flying farther into Israel—right now up to their capital at Tel-Aviv—because this administration has not stood firmly enough with our ally. We need to make that clear.

This Secretary of State should not be authorized by the President to tell Egypt, sure, the Muslim Brotherhood appears to be back in charge; sure, Israel is our ally; sure, you want to see Israel wiped off the map; but here's a billion and a half dollars. That's not the message that should be coming. The message that should be coming from this administration is: not one more dime until you start keeping your agreement to protect the border of Israel, not another dime. That ought to be the message. Because Israel is our ally. And if you, Egypt, are going to be our ally, you're going to have to protect our allies as well. That's not an entangling alliance; that's a country that stands by its agreements. Don't make agreements unless we intend to keep them. Yet we've seen this administration repeatedly throw our allies

under the proverbial bus. It's got to stop. People have got to know in other countries they can trust our word.

And just like the West African told me when I was there 2 years ago, you've got to tell the people in Washington to quit getting weaker. We were so excited when you elected a black President, but we've seen America get weaker. You've got to tell people in Washington to quit letting your country get weaker, because if America grows weak, we have no chance of peace in this life. That was echoed by others, other West Africans.

It's time to stop growing weaker. It's time to stop breaking our word to our allies. It's time to make clear to Israel's enemies that Israel is our friend, you better back off or you're going to have us militarily to answer to.

Is it any surprise more rockets are flying at Israel? This administration wins 4 more years and the violence just gets greater against Israel, Israel then forced to defend itself when they just want to live in peace. They want the countries around them to stop demanding their obliteration from the map.

If the U.N. is going to persist in helping those who want to see a member of the United Nations wiped off the map, then the U.N. does not need to continue to have the United States as a member. That's the way it ought to be. It ought to be clear. We joined the U.N. The U.N. has a charter that will protect its member states. And if you're going to assist those who want to obliterate Israel, then we will no longer be a part of the United Nations because it's not united, it's anti-Semitic. It's not united, and we will not be part of an un-United Nations.

It's time to get serious because people are dying around the world, including our own Ambassador. It's time to quit covering for the truth. Let us get down to what the truth is. Let the chips fall where they may. Let us find out who did what wrong so we can correct it for the future. And I hope and pray there was no criminal activity—certainly there was negligence, but you don't know until we get a proper investigation.

An Attorney General cannot properly investigate himself. An Attorney General cannot properly investigate his boss. One department, the FBI, cannot properly investigate another agency unless that department's ultimate boss, the President, is aware and coordinates. And now that we know that did not happen—according to the President, he knew nothing. Like Sergeant Schultz from the old Hogan's Heroes, I know nothing, I know nothing, not until after the election. My administration kept me from knowing anything that was going on so I didn't make these decisions, somebody else made those decisions. I didn't know anything until after the election. They kept all this stuff from me, so I had plausible deniability. I didn't know of this stuff.

□ 1850

It's time somebody knew, but we're not going to get to the bottom of it until we have an independent investigation by someone with the power to do that properly. And if the executive branch will not do what the Constitution would require in a conflict of interest situation like this, then we need a select committee to do the investigation, get to the bottom of it, just as the Watergate committee did.

Let the chips fall where they may, because when people, in government and out of government, see that the government is actually interested in truth, then government gets the truth. People have more faith in the government, and we have a better country. And I hope and pray that day will come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 6511

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (during the Special Order of Mr. GOHMERT). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Representative MIKE ROGERS from Michigan be removed from H.R. 6511 as an original cosponsor.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HEINRICH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and November 16.

Mr. HOLT (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and November 16.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2606. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allow the construction and operation of natural gas pipeline facilities in the Gateway National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4114. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 2012, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 743. An act to amend chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the disclosures of information protected from prohib-

ited personnel practices, require a statement in non-disclosure policies, forms, and agreements that such policies, forms, and agreements conform with certain disclosure protections, provide certain authority for the Special Counsel, and for other purposes.

S. 1956. An act to prohibit operators of civil aircraft of the United States from participating in the European Union's emissions trading scheme, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 16, 2012, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE—MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 112th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., New Jersey Tenth.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8337. A letter from the Director, Policy Issuance Division, Office of Policy and Program Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Summary of the Final Rule, Additional Changes to the Schedule of Operations Regulations received October 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8338. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Investment Management (RIN: 3052-AC50) received November 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8339. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmit-

ting a proposed change to the Fiscal Year 2011 National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation (NGREA) procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8340. A letter from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Defining Larger Participants of the Consumer Debt Collection Market [Docket No.: CFPB-2012-0040] (RIN: 3170-AA30) received October 31, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8341. A letter from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E) [Docket No.: CFPB-2011-0009] (RIN: 3170-AA15) received October 31, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8342. A letter from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's "Major" final rule — Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E) [Docket No.: CFPB-2011-0009] (RIN: 3170-AA15) received October 31, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8343. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Region III, Philadelphia City, Philadelphia County, PA) [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8093] received October 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8344. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Germany pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

8345. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Annual Stress Test (RIN: 3064-AD91) received November 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8346. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Clearing Agency Standards (RIN: 3235-AL13) received November 5, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8347. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Energy, transmitting A report on "The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petrol Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran", pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 68513(a) Public Law 112-81, section 1245(d)(4); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8348. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's 2011/2012 report on the economic dispatch of electricity, "Economic Dispatch and Technological Change"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8349. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program Test Procedures for Residential Dishwashers, Dehumidifiers, and Conventional Cooking Products [Docket No.: EERE-2010-BT-TP-0039] (RIN: 1904-AC01) received October 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8350. A letter from the Director, Sustainability Performance Office, Department of Energy, transmitting copy of the Department's Energy Fleet Alternative Fuel Vehicle Acquisition Report for Fiscal Year 2008; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8351. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina Portion of the Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, North Carolina-North Carolina 1997 8-Hour Nonattainment Area; Reasonable Further Progress Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0019(a); FRL-9741-2] received October 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8352. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Portion of York County, South Carolina Within Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, North Carolina-South Carolina 1997 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area; Reasonable Further Progress Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0177; FRL-9740-9] received October 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8353. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire; Infrastructure SIPs for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter Standards [EPA-R01-OAR-2011-0317 and EPA-R01-OAR-2011-0321 (CT); EPA-R01-OAR-2011-0318 and EPA-R01-OAR-2011-0322 (ME); EPA-R01-OAR-2009-0459 and EPA-R01-OAR-2011-0323 (MA); EPA-R01-OAR-2009-0460 and EPA-R01-OAR-2011-0324 (NH); A-1-FRL-9740-1] received October 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8354. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley Nonattainment Area Determinations of Attainment of the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0370; FRL-9738-3] received October 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8355. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama; Disapproval of 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) Infrastructure Requirement for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0343; FRL-9739-3] received October 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8356. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-1015; FRL-9739-2] received October 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8357. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0754; FRL-9740-7] received October 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8358. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting

Transmittal No. 12-57, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8359. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-0138, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8360. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-071, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8361. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-146, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8362. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-133, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8363. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-144, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8364. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-140, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8365. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-130, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8366. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-121, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8367. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's Report of FY 2012 Audits and Significant Findings; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8368. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's Semiannual Report to Congress for the six-month period ending September 30, 2012, as required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8369. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8370. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Review of the District of Columbia's Performance Measurement System"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8371. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Accounts and Operations of ANC 2D for Fiscal Years 2009 through 2011"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8372. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the semiannual report of receipts and expenditures of appro-

priations and other funds for the period April 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012, pursuant to Public Law 109-55, section 1005; (H. Doc. No. 112-155); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

8373. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Definition of Enforcement Action received November 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8374. A letter from the 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; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area; Amendment 97 [Docket No.: 110620343-2450-02] (RIN: 0648-BB18) received November 5, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8375. A letter from the Clerk, Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, *Duron-Ortiz v. Holder*, No. 11-3851, (October 15, 2012); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8376. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Commercial Acquisition; Anchor Tenancy (RIN: 2700-AD64) received November 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

8377. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Cross Waivers of Liability Clauses (RIN: 2700-AD55) received November 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

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. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1206. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to preserve consumer and employer access to licensed independent insurance producers (Rept. 112-694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 285. An act for the relief of Sopuruchi Chukwueke; with an amendment (Rept. 112-695). Referred to the private calendar and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 6590. A bill to provide incentives for States to invest in practices and technology that are designed to expedite voting at the polls and to simplify voter registration; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. STARK, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 6591. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to establish a minimum period of 15 days for early voting prior to the date of an election for Federal office and to ensure that no individual will be required to wait for longer than one hour to cast a ballot at a polling place in an election for Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 6592. A bill to ensure that the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority complies with the Federal Acquisition Regulation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BACHMANN (for herself, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GARRETT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JONES, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 809. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month by promoting national awareness of adoption and the children in foster care awaiting families, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, recognizing current programs and efforts designed to promote adoption, and encouraging people in the United States to seek improved safety, permanency, and well-

being for all children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H. Res. 810. A resolution urging the Federal Aviation Administration to continue its cooperation with airports across the United States seeking to implement noise mitigation plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. PLATTS):

H. Res. 811. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of American Education Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself and Mr. NADLER):

H. Res. 812. A resolution commending the Albanian people on the 100th anniversary of the declaration of their independence from the Turkish Ottoman Empire on November 28, 1912, and commending Albanians in Albania and Kosova for protecting and saving the lives of all Jews who either lived in Albania or sought asylum there during the Holocaust; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 6590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 6591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 6592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 321: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 718: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1041: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1044: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1054: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1498: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1675: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1802: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LOEBBACH, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1810: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1833: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1897: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 2257: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2514: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 2524: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2547: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2679: Ms. WATERS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2885: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 2950: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3032: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 3053: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 3102: Mr. MORAN and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3238: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 3506: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3679: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 3713: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 4077: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 4122: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4137: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 4165: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 4202: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 4228: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 4296: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 4306: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 4323: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 5817: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 5871: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 5903: Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 5943: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 5969: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 5970: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 6047: Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.R. 6107: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 6149: Mr. DOYLE, Ms. CHU, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 6209: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 6273: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 6299: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 6311: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 6388: Ms. SPEIER, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 6439: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 6441: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 6445: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 6454: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 6470: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 6482: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 6524: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 6575: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 6579: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 6587: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 6588: Mr. MORAN and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.J. Res. 106: Mr. JONES.

H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. GARDNER.

H. Res. 583: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 774: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, and Mr. BARLETTA.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 6511: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.