

see that when we do the AMT patch again this year.

I want to close with this, Mr. Speaker. I have a chart here of who benefits from tax loopholes. Again, I'm a Fair Tax guy. H.R. 25, Mr. Speaker, I hope you'll go and pull it out, think about being a cosponsor if you're not already.

I want to change the way we do taxes in this country. But just by closing loopholes—and I hear the newspaper asking all the time: Which loopholes? What loopholes? How are you going to do that?

This shows who benefits from the loopholes, Mr. Speaker, in the Tax Code. It's not the bottom 20 percent. It's not the second 20 percent or the third or the fourth. It's not really even the top 20 percent. It's the top 1 percent.

So I would just encourage you, Mr. Speaker, to ask the President—as we're going through these discussions, he clearly has campaigned on getting more money out of the 1 percent.

I showed this chart, Mr. Speaker, that questions the morality of where we end up, questions what it means to our Republic at the end of the day if we continue to give so much of the burden to the few and leave the rest of us with none of the burden at all.

But if he is intent on doing that, he doesn't have to raise tax rates. He can do it through abolishing tax loopholes, which makes the Code fairer and more transparent to us all. We have a right to know what we have to pay in a tax code. These loopholes obscure it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what's going to happen in these final days. I know that the Speaker of this House is committed to doing the things that matter, to making a big difference for our children and for our grandchildren, to not kick the can down the road one more time. I pledge to support that plan, Mr. Speaker. I, too, did not come here to kick the can down the road. I came here to make the tough decisions.

And I say to my friends, and there are a lot of them out there who made tough decisions and they paid an electoral price for it. That's not a short list of folks. That's a long list of folks, and it happens every 2 years. You see people who had the courage to do what they thought was right, and they pay a price for that in terms of their political career.

□ 1340

But what I love about this institution, Mr. Speaker, these freshmen that I was elected with—you and I were elected with—these new freshmen that are coming in after this past election, I see men and women who care so much less about a political career and care so much more about doing things that matter for this Republic. I'm proud to be associated with them. And I'm convinced if we get past the rhetoric and get back to the discussion, we're going to be able to come up with a solution that the American people will be proud of and that we can be proud to tell our

children and our grandchildren that we were a part of.

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

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LA ROCHE COLLEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I will not speak for nearly 60 minutes. I'm tempted to engage the gentleman, my good friend, Mr. WOODALL, in debate. But I won't do that because I know he's still smarting from his Bulldogs' loss over the weekend. And I'll let him continue to think about that. I very much enjoy the friendship and camaraderie with Mr. WOODALL, although we do have a difference of opinion on some of those issues.

Before we start, Madam Speaker, I would say to the individual who will be speaking following my presentation that I plan to only speak for about 5 minutes or less. This will not be an hour-long presentation. So the speaker who will follow me on the majority side, I recommend he hang near the floor because I will be wrapping up shortly.

Madam Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 50th anniversary of La Roche College. Founded in 1963 by the Sisters of Divine Providence in McCandless, Pennsylvania, a suburb of Pittsburgh, it was named in honor of Marie de la Roche, the first superior of the Congregation of the Sisters of Divine Providence. Originally a college for religious sisters, it now educates a diverse group of students from around the world, offering high-quality educational opportunities that continue to reflect its Catholic heritage.

Soon after its founding, La Roche experienced financial difficulties that threatened the school's existence. Due to the financial strain, the congregation at that time seriously considered permanently closing the college. However, because of the profound and positive impact the school made on the community in the short time its doors had been opened, the students, State officials, and the community leaders urged the congregation and the school's leadership to continue the mission of the school and to keep the school open.

Thankfully, due to the outpouring of support from the community, in 1970 the board amended its charter to establish La Roche College as an independent, coeducational Catholic institution, which it remains today. It also joined with the Art Institute of Pittsburgh and diversified its course offerings, expanding the areas of study the college would offer, including graphic and interior design programs that are among La Roche College's most popular programs today.

I was proud to serve on the Board of Trustees at La Roche College. It was during my time as a trustee that I had the wonderful opportunity to get to know the late Monsignor William Kerr, who served as La Roche's president for 12 years. It was during his tenure that the college established the Pacem in Terris Institute, a scholarship program for outstanding college-age men and women from conflict and post-conflict nations such as Rwanda and Bosnia. The institute allows students to receive an education at La Roche College to study leadership and diplomacy in return for their agreement to return to their home country after graduation to help engage in the peace process and rebuild their nations.

The institute successfully reflects the college's vision and mission to "foster global citizenship." That program over the years has created a bond with some countries that is unlike any other institution of higher learning in America. It has had students go through the program that have gone back to their home countries and have very successfully become leaders in those countries. We are better off as a Nation and as a global community because of their work and because of that program which initiated and continues at La Roche College.

It was also during my time on the Board of Trustees in 2004 that La Roche College Board of Trustees appointed Sister Candace Introcaso as the college's seventh president. Sister Candace began her career in education at La Roche in the late 1980s, and it's under her leadership that the college has continued to expand its global footprint while placing a renewed focus on serving the needs of those in the Pittsburgh region. I had the privilege of working closely with Sister Candace during my time as a trustee and as the Congressman who now represents La Roche College. The future is bright for the college under her continued leadership.

La Roche College improves upon itself year after year. It continues to expand its academic offerings, with more than 50 undergraduate majors, 20 undergraduate minors, and three graduate programs. For six consecutive years, it has been named one of the Best Northeastern Colleges by the Princeton Review, and it fields 12 intercollegiate teams.

On many occasions my office used their facilities for workshops and town hall meetings. Over the years, La Roche students and faculty, as well as Sister Candace, came to visit my office on a number of occasions to discuss the importance of education to our country and their efforts to collaborate with the greater Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania community for the betterment of our entire region.

Next year marks the 50th anniversary of La Roche College. Despite early financial troubles, the leadership of the college persevered, kept the doors open, and always stayed true to the

mission of the school. La Roche College is a tremendous asset to our community, and we look forward to many, many more years of continued success. I wish them nothing but the best, and congratulations on their 50th anniversary at La Roche College.

I yield back the balance of my time.

A GAME OF CAT AND MOUSE WITH THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It's a pleasure to follow my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) and before that my friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL). It made a lot of sense. In fact, the last vote we took today was to eliminate the word "lunatic" from our Federal law. I don't have a problem with lunatic being used in the Federal law. Apparently, I was the only one here on the floor that didn't have a problem with using the term "lunatic." In fact, it occurred to me that not only should we not eliminate the term lunatic at a time when we are facing national bankruptcy if we don't get serious about our issues but we should also use the term to identify those who want to continue doing business as usual around this town.

It's time we got serious. One of the things that would help the administration get serious, because it is a big deal and not because CBO has no clue what it's going to cost, as illustrated by them initially scoring, I believe, \$1.1 trillion, then \$800 billion, and now \$1.6 trillion taking effect. Maybe \$1.8 trillion. They don't have a clue. They're not allowed to use real historical reality, real rules to score. They use a fictitious static rule that is just so inaccurate. It would be a joke if it weren't so sad as to what it's done to good legislation.

Because of the emphasis on tax and all the people that are going to be hit with a tax because this administration and the Democratic Senators down the Hall—at least their leadership—continue to play games of cat and mouse and of chicken with the future of our financial stability and economy, I think it's important to look at taxes.

□ 1350

The President, for example, and Majority Leader REID in the Senate say they want to help the middle class, the poor working folks. So, apparently—and I know former Speaker PELOSI said we need to pass the bill so we can find out what's in it, but it's obvious from Leader REID's comments and the President's comments, those two people never read the ObamaCare bill.

It's a bit of interesting reading. I did go through it all before I voted against it; a lot of interesting stuff. I don't know why the President needs his own

commission, the Noncommissioned Officer Corps. There were toss-outs to the big pharmaceuticals, AARP. If you saw somebody endorse this bill, then you could find a provision in here, if you knew what to look for, where they got their little pound of pork. So it's quite interesting. But Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the President and HARRY REID, since they have slapped this bill on the backs of every American, they really ought to read what they've done to Americans. There are a lot of people that have.

There was a good article, it seemed to be—I don't know Guy Benson, but a political editor for Townhall.com wrote on September 20, 2012, he was talking about the President:

Barack Obama's re-election racket has been running millions of dollars worth of advertisements claiming that Mitt Romney's "plan" will raise taxes on middle class Americans. This isn't true; Romney promises precisely the opposite, and FactCheck.org has called out Democrats for repeating the debunked charge. But to paraphrase Bill Clinton's DNC speech in Charlotte, it takes some brass to preemptively criticize someone for doing what you've already done yourself. Before we get to the latest dreary punch line, let's go back to the video tape.

And online it had a video that could be punched, and it was President Barack Obama speaking. Part of his quote says:

I can make a firm pledge: Under my plan, no family making less than \$250,000 a year will see any form of tax increase. Not your income tax, not your payroll tax, not your capital gains taxes, not any of your taxes.

The article goes on:

This man's "firm pledges" aren't worth very much, are they? Kate touched on this last night, but it's worth another spin, if only to marvel at the sheer hypocrisy of it all. The Congressional Budget Office has determined that millions of Americans will get socked by the ObamaCare mandate tax, 80 percent of whom are middle-income citizens. Nearly 6 million Americans—significantly more than first estimated—will face a tax penalty under President Barack Obama's health overhaul for not getting insurance, congressional analysts said Wednesday. Most would be in the middle class. The new estimate amounts to an inconvenient fact for the administration, a reminder of what critics see as broken promises. And the Budget Office analysis found that nearly 80 percent of those who'll face the penalty would be making up to or less than five times the Federal poverty level. Currently that would work out to \$55,850 or less for an individual and \$115,250 or less for a family of four. Average penalty: about \$1,200 in 2016.

It goes on to point out:

CBO also said there will be 30 million people without insurance, though all but the 6 million will be exempt from the tax. The exempt Americans are a combination of illegal immigrants and those with incomes too low to pay income tax.

The article says:

Just so we're clear: ObamaCare raids \$716 billion from almost-insolvent Medicare to chip in toward its own \$2 trillion price tag, raises premiums on average families, increases national health care spending faster than doing nothing would have, swells the deficit, exacerbates the national doctor shortage, is insanely costly and difficult to

comply with, and raises taxes by \$500 billion on the backs of millions of middle class families—and the country will still have 30 million people lacking health insurance. What a deal! And most of that dysfunction doesn't kick in until 2014.

If it had kicked in in 2012, you would have seen a different President elected, I'm sure. But in any event, what the ObamaCare bill requires—and one further comment. When a bill is based on a fraud, it's probably not going to end up being a good bill. The ObamaCare bill—and I hear people talk about 2,700 pages, 2,500, 2,600—let's see. My version here—this is one we got from the official printer—2,407 pages. But it's interesting, the title of the bill:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 3590) entitled "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes," do pass with the following amendments: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert—ObamaCare.

So they took House bill 3590 that was an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes—this is a tax credit for our military members—they struck, as it says: "Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert" ObamaCare. That's a fraudulent bill. That bill did not originate in the House, it originated in the Senate. The Constitution requires that any bill that raises revenue must originate in the House. It started as a fraud. This bill became a fraud when it was enacted and it was asserted that this originated in the House. It did not.

We had a tax credit for first-time homebuyers for our military. There was nothing germane about ObamaCare to a tax credit for our military. That's why I say a bill that starts out as a fraud is probably not going to be real good for a lot of folks.

So, though the President promised people all across America over and over that if you make less than \$250,000 then you will not see your taxes go up, well, let's take a breather from the so-called fiscal cliff—the truth of the matter is we went off of that back in August 2011 when we passed that ridiculous debt ceiling bill that is going to further gut Medicare, on top of what ObamaCare did to it, and also gut our national security. But looking back at ObamaCare and the tax consequences—and Madam Speaker, that's why I keep saying the President really ought to read the bill that bears his name, that people refer to as ObamaCare. He really ought to read it. Majority Leader REID really ought to read the bill because he'll get to the part that has a mandatory provision that the Supreme Court had to take up: Is this mandate a penalty or a tax? And of course the intellectual gymnastics that our Chief Justice had to go through to say, between