

which programs like Helmets to Hardhats could identify sectors in communities that were depleted by the Wall Street crisis. And think about how to modernize the manner in which energy is provided to them, for example. So we're not just rebuilding to the past but building the future.

In my home community, we have something called Advanced Energy Utility that the Port Authority has established where they can loan funds that are then paid back through the bond offerings they do. And right now it's in its early stages. But one could see where a neighborhood could be identified and new technologies in the building sector brought to bear to create the new neighborhoods of tomorrow.

One company—Owens Corning—in our region has established a new manufacturing plant near Milan, Ohio, building a seven-layer roofing and the most incredible equipment. I defy any Member of Congress to build what they have built there and to bring off these big roles and be able to apply this roofing that I think is going to lead the industry. They could build four new factories depending on sales in the northern environments of the United States and Canada. And I see this and I think, all we have to do is put the parts together to build the residential neighborhoods of a 21st century America.

So I am just proud to join my colleagues tonight. And thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI, for bringing us together, as you so often do, to keep the focus here in the Congress on jobs and economic growth, which is what the American people sent us here to do.

Mr. TONKO. Again, thank you, Representative GARAMENDI. It's great to join with our colleagues here this evening to share thoughts about how we move from a very trying, difficult time into perhaps America's glory days.

I think it's important for us to first acknowledge that every Member elected to serve in this wonderful Chamber of the House of Representatives and those down the road here at the United States Senate, each of us is challenged, required, and responsible to polish that American Dream and make it within the grasp, provide it to be within the grasp of America's working families and those who will grow into the middle class and those who are being further empowered by work, the dignity of work, and stronger outcomes with correct policy formats.

I think that this journey that we've asked to embark upon, by putting our names on the ballot, begins with us: being a people of vision, being a House that provides a vision for America. That tells me we only need to look to our history—recent and some not so recent. But that will instruct us. Our history will instruct us.

We have built a strong Nation. We have provided for growth around the world. We know the secret to the success. We know how we built a Nation.

And it took a vision, a New Deal that provided for housing, for manufacturing, for a strong defense, for the opportunity for us, as a Nation, to respect its labor force and insert a value-added connotation for that workforce. That was us in our glory days. And we're going to be even more gloried because of investments that we can make by sound thinking.

The research that we need to provide will enable us to compete. We will create products not yet on the radar screen. And if we think all the products ever needed by society have been conceived and designed and manufactured, then the story's over. But we know better than that. Product lines are coming up as we speak that allow us to use our resources much more wisely.

We are a Nation of abundance. But that means we can't be wasteful. We need to be resourceful. That challenge is out there to us. And as we become resourceful, we become more efficient, and we become more profitable by sound policy. We can do it. We have ways to invest in our infrastructure, invest in research, invest in workforce development, invest in housing, invest in communities. And that investment will earn lucrative dividends. It's not spending. It's investing with the expectation—the rightful expectation, mind you—that we will get that just return.

And so tonight I feel hope for our Nation, driven by a sense of ideals carved by the richness of our history.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you very much. Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HIGGINS, thank you very much.

As I was listening to the three of you and thinking my own thoughts, I'm excited. I'm excited for the prospect of America. I can see the opportunities that are there. I can see the policies coming together. And each of the three of you described specific policies that we could put in place.

I don't know if we can get 27 million jobs from infrastructure. But I do know that we can get millions of jobs from an infrastructure program and, in so doing, lay the foundation for safety, from floods, fires, from other catastrophes that could occur. I know that in doing so, we can rebuild our manufacturing sector by using American-made products in that infrastructure program. I know that we can provide the jobs that Americans desperately want today—not just cheap jobs but real middle class jobs, as all three of you have described.

I am excited. I am excited about the prospect of building America, coming home from the wars and building America, as happened when my father came back from World War II. America went after building. Ms. KAPTUR, you talked about the St. Lawrence Seaway. You talked about the interstate highway, that system that President Eisenhower talked about.

We are on the cusp of a new building in America. We have the wherewithal. We can finance it with really cheap money now. And we can use these

projects to repay that money. It's a very exciting time. And it's our responsibility, as Representatives of the 300-plus million Americans, to enunciate that vision, to put in place those programs. And when we do, we'll make it in America. And Americans will make it.

Thank you so very, very much for joining us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2120

A HOUSE OF CIVILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to be able to share some comments here in the last few weeks in which I am privileged to be a Member of this House. I thought I would read into the RECORD a letter that I penned to my constituents upon the conclusion of my election process. I said at the time:

I'm satisfied that enough votes have been counted to determine that I will not be representing the citizens of the Seventh Congressional District during the 113th Congress. It was a tough campaign, and I accept the outcome. I congratulate Dr. BERA in his victory, and I wish him well as he accepts this new challenge. It is my hope that Dr. BERA approaches Congress, as have I, with a humble heart, respect for the institution, and a desire to perform his duties in the best interest of the people he represents and the country.

No one can fulfill the obligations of public service alone. The contributions of my wife Bobbi and our family have been inestimable. I could never thank them enough. My staff has worked tirelessly on behalf of others. There are no better public servants anywhere.

I'm proud of the work that we've accomplished representing Californians both in the California Department of Justice and in the United States Congress. The experience of 18 years serving in the House of Representatives and 8 years as California's Attorney General truly has been an honor and one for which I will be forever grateful.

During my time in the House, we were able to build coalitions across the aisle to advance legislation that not only benefited the people of the district, but all Americans. I'm proud of the meaningful working we have achieved with Folsom Dam, our levees, U.S. port security, chemical facility security, cybersecurity, criminal justice reform, immigration reform, national security, human trafficking, reining in government spending, and the myriad of other issues that came before the Congress.

Bobbi and I wish to thank the multitude of volunteers and supporters who were by our side in this effort. Your support is gratifying and humbling, and for that we are immensely grateful.

God bless you, and God bless this land of ours.

I read that to suggest the feelings that I have at this time when I am approaching the end of my service in this House. One of the thoughts that I have as I do that is the question of civility

in this House, in the Congress, in the political dialogue, and in the country at large.

If one examines the history of the House of Representatives, one understands immediately that we are governed not by Robert's Rules of Order, but by, in fact, Jefferson's Manual, the manual authored in the first instance by Thomas Jefferson. If you analyze the spirit—and I believe the letter—of that manual, you will find that President Jefferson believed that vigorous and robust debate was appropriate, but he also understood the nature of man. He understood that we sometimes did not maintain the type of discourse that would be of honor to us and this House. As a result, he envisioned a place for debate, a place for legislating, reflecting the views, aspirations, and hopes of the American people that would guard against the temptation, the tendency, perhaps, to allow the emotions of the day to govern and cause conflict on this House, indeed, physical altercations or confrontations.

One of the manners in which he believed that we could guard against that was to have Members of the House address the presiding officer rather than directly respond to another Member. Some may think this is arcane. Some may think this is outdated. Some may think this is difficult to understand. Yet it serves a purpose. It reminds us that while we're on the floor, that we are here representing this country. We're elected from different districts, but we are here as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. We address one another through the Chair as the distinguished gentleman or gentlelady from a particular State. We don't call people by their first name. Frankly, if we do call them by their last name, it is an adjective describing the particular person from the State that they represent.

There are those who find it difficult to understand why it is wrong to traverse the well, why it is inappropriate for someone to walk here in the well because this is a large Chamber. It would seem natural that you would move from Point A to Point B. Yet the idea is as I am addressing this House, I am addressing the presiding officer. For someone to traverse the well is in essence an act of rudeness, an act of incivility, a lack of respect for those who are speaking and the institution. It is as if I were speaking to someone immediately in front of me and someone walks between the two of us while we're having the conversation. One would immediately understand that to be not in keeping with proper conduct. Yet I think sometimes we forget the purpose of the rules that we have here.

I would say I was taught when I was a young attorney that you are to be court-ready. If you're a male Member of this House, you are to wear a coat and tie. You could vote easily without a coat and tie. You could vote easily in shorts here. You could vote easily in a T-shirt here. But what would that do?

That would in a very real sense demean the institution of the House, and it would suggest that perhaps we weren't ready to do business.

I recall several decades ago when a number of school districts believed that in an effort to increase the level of comportment in school, they would have students wear uniforms. It was unheard of at the time, yet they found that when students wore uniforms, in some ways the "gang colors" didn't come into play. People weren't looking at who has the rich clothes versus who has the poor clothes. But more importantly, I remember a comment by someone who was in favor of it and said this reminds the young people that they are there to do work to advance themselves for their future. In other words, it was their "work clothes." That is a similar sort of thing that we do in this institution. Those are just some physical manifestations of the kinds of things that lead to the idea of civility in this House.

The other thing is that we follow the precedents of the House, rulings of the House that guard against us bringing uncivil behavior to this House, that guard against us from violating the spirit of this House. What do I mean by that? One of the rules is you should not do anything that brings the House into disrepute. One of the many precedents in the House is if you engage in a debate in which you question the motivation of your opponent, you question the motivation of a Member of the Senate, you question the motivation of the President, that is considered out of order, and you can be called to account for that.

How do we do it in this place? Again, some would consider it an arcane way. Another Member gets up and asks that the person who has spoken those words have his or her words taken down, and the process is, of course, the reporter transcribes the words, those words are then uttered, they are considered by the presiding officer with the assistance of the Parliamentarian. If, in fact, they're offensive words, unless one is granted unanimous consent to have those words removed from the RECORD, that person is not allowed to speak for the rest of the day.

Some would say what is that? It's like timeout in a schoolyard. No, it really goes to the essence of this place. We are here as representatives of the people of the United States from particular districts and particular States, but part of our purpose in representing our constituents is being able to articulate on their behalf, being able to argue on their behalf, being able to speak on this floor. Therefore, the penalty of not being able to speak on the floor goes not just to the Member, but goes to those he or she represents. They are rendered silent for that day. If you really think about it, that is, in fact, a particularly pernicious punishment because it goes to your ability to represent your constituents.

It seems to me that those who have been privileged to serve in the House,

less than 11,000 in the entire history of this body, have an obligation to understand that this is beyond each and every one of us. It is the institution, the continuing perpetual institution of democracy in our country. We should be very proud to be a part of that. Civility should be a part of that. Tough, vigorous, robust debate should be a part of it. Insulting, demeaning language, calling into question the motivation of another ought to have no place here.

And while we are here—someone suggests in a cocoon—that is, the Chamber of the House, I would rather consider it to be a venerable place. A symbol of the institution with the words of our national motto is above the very rostrum: "In God we trust." As we think about that, we also should understand that we are part of more than just this institution. We are a part of the society in which we play, hopefully, a significant role.

□ 2130

The manner in which Members get to have the opportunity to represent their constituents is through a process that we call "political." It is through an electoral process, and the electoral process reflects our society as well as giving guidance to our society. There, I fear, the level of civility has been diminished. Let me give you an example—and I'm not suggesting in any way that this made the difference in my election, but it is my observation, having been a part of it, that the rules of civility have been tossed aside.

There was an ad run against me and the gentleman from Florida and others, but it was made specific to each of us and our individual races in which they had a girl who was approximately 5 years old, looking into the camera, asking this question, "Why does DAN LUNGREN want me to die?" as did a 19-year-old, who indicated that he had suffered some paralysis from an accident, as did an approximately 40-year-old woman for some disease she had.

Stunning. Stunning.

The only thing I could see on the other side of the philosophical divide would be someone who was an Army vet, having been paralyzed, sitting in a wheelchair, looking at the camera, and saying about a Member who had voted against a defense bill, "Why do you want me to die? Why do you want me to be in a wheelchair?"

In either case, the civility is out the window. The ability to talk about an issue that is underlying is lost. In the example I gave, the questions would be, was it an appropriate level of funding for defense? Were there certain problems with the defense bill? Not, do you want this veteran to die?

In the case that I cited in which I was the subject of that ad, the issue was embryonic stem cell research, not the question of what is the moral and ethical thing to do in a very difficult circumstance. I remember when President of the United States George W. Bush

had a national address to the country in which he talked about the difficult moral and ethical decision about whether you would have lines of stem cell research allowed that originated from embryos. It was the question of when life begins. Is that an individual? Is it a potential individual? Is it an individual who has any rights?

None of that talked about in the ad.

There was the question of umbilical cord blood stem cells, of which I have been privileged to be a leader with CHRIS SMITH from New Jersey and others, and of having a press conference, I remember, with the great basketball star Dr. J, because, in fact, we had found that using blood cord stem cells had actually already been applied to some people with success, including, I believe, to some in this Nation who suffered from sickle-cell anemia.

Forgetting totally about adult stem cells, the ad appeared the very week that the Nobel committee announced its prize for medicine to the two scientists who had unlocked the key in the ability to take adult stem cells and reprogram them back to induced pluripotent cells, meaning that they had the capacity to become different types of cells. Then, in just the 2 weeks before, I believe it was a German experiment in which they successfully cured paralysis in dogs by using cells from the dog's nasal passages.

There can be a legitimate debate about the moral and ethical concerns surrounding stem cell research and embryonic stem cell research, but to have an ad that reduces it to the question of whether a 5-year-old can look in the camera and say, "Why does this Congressman want me to die?"—how does that elevate the debate? How does that in any way enhance our ability to make very difficult decisions?

Does that condemn anybody who happens to have traditional values consistent with the traditional teachings of the Catholic church and other churches to be ridiculed? To be condemned for a lack of concern for fellow human beings? And to have the ad run in the last weeks of the campaign without any ability to respond to it. I ask you, is that civil?

That ad was produced by the pro-majority PAC, by the way, with connections to some Members of the House. They don't have to abide by the rules in terms of advertising, but my question is, where does that leave us as a Nation when we can't talk about difficult, serious issues—issues of morals and issues of ethics and issues of conduct—without reducing it to that level?

Look, I'm, as they say, a big boy. I've been involved in politics and government a long time. I know campaigns can be tough. But is that an excuse for losing any sense of proportionality? Any sense of respect for one another? Any sense of civility?

We hear many in the press decry the level of debate—but yet, not a peep about ads such as that. We hear people

decry the lack of respect for one another—but yet, not a mention made of ads like that, which, I think, eliminate civility.

Some would say the rule of traversing the well while someone is speaking is unnecessary. Why would you complain about that? If you don't understand the basis of civil conduct in the House, you would say that makes no sense at all. If you do understand it, you will understand that it is part and parcel of the entire complex of things we do that either shows respect or disrespect for the institution we serve and for our fellow Members.

I'm not a Pollyanna. I've seen campaigns since I was a very little kid. I think I was 4 or 6 years old when I handed out literature for one of my neighbors who was running for Congress for the first time. I've been blessed to be involved with this. It has been a great ride to be able to represent my fellow constituents here in the House of Representatives in two different tours of service and as the California attorney general. I want tough and vigorous and robust debate, but I do wonder whether the coarseness of the debate, whether the lack of any respect for another's thoughts or another as a person makes us a better or a lesser Nation.

There is something called "appeal to the better angels of human nature." Maybe once in a while we ought to do that here. Maybe once in a while we ought to not only listen to a great speech by Abraham Lincoln or a great speech by Martin Luther King, Jr. or a tremendously written statement by George Washington, but maybe we ought to listen to what they say, and how they say it, and the respect with which they held those who may have disagreed with them.

This is a great institution, representing the greatest country on the face of the Earth. So I don't say this as a loser's lament. Maybe it's a lover's lament. I love this country. I love the State that I represent. I love the people of this country. It is in a real sense an unconditional love, but it is not an uncritical love. We have an obligation to review, to criticize, to constantly guard against the lesser angels of human nature. You can do that with all the vigor in the world, and you can do that with all the respect in the world. If, in fact, we wish to solve the problems of this Nation, recognizing that there has to be some work across the aisle, perhaps the first way in which we do it is to think, how can I be civil in the discussion that I have even though I think my opponent, my counterpart on the other side of the aisle, is dead wrong?

□ 2140

I always thought Ronald Reagan had the best attitude. I would probably sum it up this way. They said that he always saw the glass as half full rather than half empty, but I always thought he had what I called the openness of a

confident and a cheerful conservative. He believed that we ought to conserve essential values of this country; we ought to avoid the fad of the day. And he believed that we ought to be proud in expressing our point of view. But I do believe he also thought that he could sit down with just about anybody and attempt to persuade them, much like my friend and someone who I considered almost a brother, Jack Kemp.

I used to say about Jack: I'm sure there's somebody out there who doesn't like Jack Kemp, but I don't think Jack ever met someone he didn't like. And I don't think Jack Kemp and I don't think Ronald Reagan ever believed they met a man or woman that they couldn't persuade to their side.

And maybe if we kept that in mind, how do we continue to work by putting all of our effort into persuading not only our side but persuading those who disagree with us to the rightness of our position, we might in fact find and they may find that we have far greater commonality of interest and approach than we ever thought.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you know me at all, you know that I don't give up easily. You know that I don't back down from a fair fight or any fight. And you know that I believe deeply in those principles and values that brought me to this place, and I believe deeply that I have not lost them. But I do respect those who have a different point of view, and I respect their sincerity and I respect their genuineness, but I can question their judgment without calling into question their motivation.

And maybe that's the summation of what I'm trying to say here. I have had the great privilege of serving this House for almost two decades. I've had the great privilege of serving 8 years as California's attorney general, so 26 years in public service as an elected official. I don't give up on this place. I don't give up on this country. I don't give up on its people. We've always had difficult times, and the key to solving those difficult times is to recognize their difficulty, recognize their presence, and recognize that we have no right to say it's not our job. When we are in this place in this time, it is our job.

And I would hope and I would pray that we would approach that, and my colleagues would approach that, and those that come after in this new Congress, that they would approach it with a sense of civility and a sense of love of this country. And if we do that, I have no fear for our future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on November 16, 2012, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval the following bills.