

Management. The men and women of *Resolute* and Sector St. Petersburg continue to do an outstanding job of defending our coastline, patrolling our fisheries, and providing life-saving search and rescue operations throughout the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean.

Mr. Chair, it is a great honor to be the only member of this House to represent four separate and distinct Coast Guard operations: Sector St. Petersburg, Air State Clearwater, Search and Rescue Station Sand Key, and Port Security Unit 307. Each carries out a vital mission to protect our nation and its men and women serve here and aboard to fulfill these critical responsibilities. With the passage of this appropriations bill tonight, we provide the Coast Guard with the equipment and resources it needs to undertake its training and missions safely. Please join me in saying congratulations to the crew of USCGC *Resolute*, the members of Sector St. Petersburg, and all the Coasties who serve our great nation in uniform for a job well done.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2012

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 315, I was unable to cast a vote on this amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2013 due to obligations in my district. The underlying bill was a well struck balance of funding priorities.

The United States needs to have an all-of-the-above energy approach that will meet the demand of our growing country. Nuclear energy should continue to be an aspect of our energy production and we should continue to research the capabilities and our practices surrounding the use of nuclear energy to ensure that we are as efficient and safe in our nuclear energy sector as possible.

The United States has a proven supply of resources for domestic energy use, and we should be pursuing policies that allow us to develop those resources. Nuclear energy is a renewable source with a high power generation potential.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

THE FLOOD PROTECTION PUBLIC SAFETY ACT OF 2012

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2012

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, Sacramento's flood risk is well documented. It is the most at-risk metropolitan area for major flooding in our nation. It is home to California's State Capitol, an international airport, and half a million people. If Sacramento were to flood the economic damages could reach up to \$40 billion dollars.

A critical component for protecting Sacramento from a disaster is the Natomas Levee Improvement Project. Local taxpayers have

voted to tax themselves on two separate occasions to pay for this project. Moreover, in the absence of federal participation, the state and local governments have already completed 18 miles of levee improvements and will have spent upwards of \$350 million on the project by the end of this year.

The federal government has not been able to support this crucial flood protection project, because of the current ban on earmarks and this Congress's challenges in investing in our nation's infrastructure. The result of this is that construction is expected to stop this year leaving 100,000 of my constituents at risk.

While I realize and appreciate that the authorization of Army Corps of Engineers projects is not within the purview of the Appropriations Committee, the topic is nonetheless important to raise. The underlying problem is the absolute prohibition against "earmarks" our Majority has imposed on this body, which is impeding our ability to our job. This moratorium has resulted in the stopping routine authorizing legislation our constituents badly need: a new Water Resources Development Act bill. Working with the Corps of Engineers, we have accomplished every conceivable review, documentation and approval requirement for this project to go forward, but Congress has still yet to act on the legislation necessary to move forward with these badly needed projects.

The completed Chief's Report for this project was sent to Congress by the Corps over a year ago yet no action has taken place. One hundred thousand people, an international airport, hundreds of small businesses, a number of schools remain at risk. It is my sincere hope our Majority will reexamine its current moratorium to ensure local needs can be met. Everyone can agree that we must bring an end to wasteful, unjustified projects. But in our effort to throw out the wasteful, we've also thrown out the very worthy, and people's lives and livelihood are in jeopardy.

To address the unjustified yet real prohibition resulting from the "earmark" label, I introduced legislation last month that is in full compliance with the House's rules: H.R. 4353, the "Flood Protection Public Safety Act of 2012." This bill authorizes flood protection projects that have a completed Army Corps of Engineers Chief's Report that have been sent to Congress for approval. The bill would allow a small number of flood protection projects across the nation to move forward including those in Sacramento, Topeka, Cedar Rapids, and North Dakota.

Congress faces a choice. Invest in our infrastructure today, or pay the price of recovering from a disaster tomorrow. We can all agree that preventing a disaster is a much wiser and cheaper solution.

Though an authorization is outside the scope of the bill pending before us, I ask that this body forge a responsible, sensible policy on so-called earmarks, a policy that continues to stop wasteful projects but allows and even promotes worthwhile initiatives.

For 200 years the federal government has been a partner with the states to provide for the public's safety. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to revise the current moratorium that is preventing Congress from responding to urgent public safety needs across the nation. I believe these matters are

integral to the House of Representatives as a body and deserve each of our attention.

I have written to the House's leadership urging them to revise this body's rules and provided responsible ways to ensure taxpayer money is protected, while allowing fully vetted projects to move forward.

I look forward to working with you and our colleagues in the House in a bipartisan manner to address responsible reforms that will ensure critical public safety challenges are met, while ensuring taxpayer money is being spent wisely. It is my hope we can responsibly resolve this issue in a timely manner.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2012

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 345, I was unavoidably detained and was not present to cast my vote due to other obligations.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

HEALTH CARE COST REDUCTION ACT OF 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN C. CARNEY, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 2012

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my thoughts about the tax on medical devices.

The House voted on H.R. 436, the Health Care Cost Reduction Act of 2012. This bill would have repealed the 2.3 percent tax on medical devices that was instituted to pay for the Affordable Care Act. While I did not support H.R. 436, I recognize that medical device makers are at the forefront of innovation and that Federal legislation should support those efforts. I am concerned about the impact that the medical device tax will have on American jobs. Particularly during these difficult economic times, I believe we must do everything we can to encourage, not stifle, job creation.

I believe the Affordable Care Act will provide critical health care coverage to millions of Americans, and I also believe that paying for it responsibly is important. I did not support H.R. 436 because I do not believe that Americans already struggling to afford the cost of healthcare coverage should bear the burden of eliminating this tax. Moreover, I believe we should refrain from making significant changes to the funding structure of the Affordable Care Act until the Supreme Court has rendered its decision on the constitutionality of the law. At that time, the House should revisit repealing the medical device tax with an offset that protects American families while being fiscally responsible.