



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2011

No. 20

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, February 10, 2011, at 4 p.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2011

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 9, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, 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.

THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, we hear now that the Republican majority is serious about the deficit, and that's good news because we are running up a huge pile of debt which is going to be handed on

to our kids and our grandkids and won't be paid off over 30 years. Some of this debt will weigh upon the country. But the question is, how do we get there? The deficit this year will be \$1.5 trillion, an unimaginable amount of money, borrowed, a lot of it from China, and that is just virtually unfathomable.

Now, they're going to dink around essentially and pretend they're doing something meaningful next week. They're going to take out after a Federal budget of \$3.7 trillion—and remember, \$1.5 trillion of that is with borrowed money—they are going to discuss cuts to actually \$446 billion of that. So a \$3.7 trillion budget, but the only place you can cut is \$446 billion of that. Hmm, let's see, if we eliminated that entire \$446 billion of expenditures, we'd still have a deficit of over \$1 trillion.

Now, that doesn't seem quite to work. So perhaps they've made a few too many things off-limits in terms of where we might look to cut.

Then there's one other thing they've done which is totally bizarre and I don't think many Americans would think very honest. They're saying if we decrease the income of the Government of the United States, i.e., cut taxes, give you back your money, and we don't reduce expenditures in the same amount, that doesn't count as new debt or deficit. You've got to borrow the money, probably from China; and you can send the debt forward but it doesn't count. So they're not going to look at something called tax expenditures.

So, you know, we can't begin to address things like the \$20 billion of sub-

sidies in the agriculture bill for five crops grown in eight States that are in surplus and paying people not to grow things. That's off-limits. That's mandatory spending. That can't be considered for cuts, paying people to not grow things. We can't do away with that. We're going to borrow the money so they can get paid to not grow things.

All right. Well, how about the oil companies? Now, Exxon Mobil reported the largest quarterly profit for a corporation in the history of the world the last quarter of last year, \$9 billion, and they didn't pay any taxes in the U.S. last year. None. They pay a lot of taxes around the world, but not in the United States. We actually gave them a tax refund because of the loopholes in the tax laws. That's called a tax expenditure. We're borrowing money to give to the Exxon Mobil Corporation, which had a \$9 billion profit by gouging consumers in America. Now, that's pretty extraordinary; but, no, we can't talk about eliminating the subsidy to Exxon Mobil. The Republicans have put that off-limits. That would be called a tax increase. You know, by plugging that loophole, that's a tax increase, can't talk about that.

Let's look at one other aspect of this. We were headed for a lower deficit this year. It would have been lower than last year, \$1.3 trillion last year. We were headed toward \$1.1 trillion, a good glide path, \$200 billion reduction in 1 year. If we could do that for 5 more years, we'd be down to virtually zero. But with one vote, one vote, with a deal cut between the Republicans and

☐ 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.

H555

the President of the United States, we increased the deficit by \$400 billion this year. Yep, the tax cuts. But remember, tax cuts don't count. Now, they increase the deficit by \$400 billion. We didn't cut expenditures by \$400 billion. So the money is going to be borrowed for those tax cuts, from China and elsewhere; and it's going to be passed on to our kids and our grandkids, part of the national debt.

But that doesn't count in the Republican world. Reducing the income of the government while not reducing expenditures by the same amount doesn't count. They pretend.

Let's not pretend. This is deadly serious. Let's not go after programs that are essential to America. They're going to put things like Pell Grants that are helping people get a college education and become more educated so they will have better lifetime earnings and our country will be more competitive, educate the next generation of folks to lead our Nation—that's on the table next week. We'll probably see some cuts there. Other programs like that will be on the table. Subsidies to oil companies? Tax cuts, yes, we can do more of those and increase the deficit.

So let's get real. It is a real problem, and let's stop pretending that you really care about it and you're going to do something about it.

FOREIGN AID: A TIME TO RECONSIDER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on what my friend has just said about cutting Federal spending. I agree, cutting \$400 billion is really not much of a cut, especially in these times when Congress continues to spend more and more money. So let's talk about some specific areas where we ought to reconsider putting taxpayer money, and maybe it's time to reconsider our foreign aid that we send to countries throughout the world.

There are about 192 foreign countries in the world, give or take two that sometimes exist and sometimes don't. So there's 192 countries, and we give foreign aid to over 150 of them. Now, this map over here to my left shows the world, and most of it is in red. All of those countries that are in red on this map receive American taxpayer foreign aid. The countries in green receive military aid from the United States, which is almost all of the countries in the world. There are a few countries in Europe and one part in Africa that are in blue that receive no American aid. But the vast majority receive American money, and we just keep sending it and sending it and sending it, and we send it to countries that many Americans don't even understand why we send it to those countries, and I'm going to address some of those.

But here's how it works, Mr. Speaker, and this rule needs to be changed. When a country wants foreign aid, all of the foreign aid that America gives is put into one bill. In other words, when we write a check, we're writing a check on one bill. For example, we don't separate the countries one at a time and vote up or down on whether they ought to get American money. I think if we did that, most of these countries in red wouldn't be seeing any American money. With the way the rule works, we put all 150-plus countries in one package, and we vote for all of them.

Now, I personally think it's good for the United States foreign policy that we support Israel, that we send them foreign aid and military aid. We ought to keep doing that. But if we want to continue to send aid to Israel, we've got to send it to other countries like Egypt and Pakistan and some others.

□ 1010

Right now in the crisis in Egypt, maybe it's time that we reconsider sending aid to Egypt. You know, if the Muslim Brotherhood takes over that country of Egypt, the world's in a lot of trouble. And we've all seen on television those tanks going up and down those highways and the city of Cairo. Those are American tanks. They came from American taxpayers. It would be a tragedy if those tanks and other foreign aid ends up in that radical group, the Muslim Brotherhood. Take over the government. We don't know. Time to reconsider Egypt.

But, you know, we also give money to Pakistan—Pakistan is on the border with Afghanistan—and it's given in the name of helping that country. Pakistan doesn't support us, I think, adequately in our war on terror in Afghanistan, but yet we continue to give them money.

But here is something that most Americans may not know about. We give money to Venezuela. Why do we give money to Chavez and Venezuela? He hates the United States. He defies our President, makes fun of our Nation. We don't need to give him any foreign aid.

We give \$20 million to Cuba. Why do we give money to Cuba? Americans can't even go to Cuba. It's off limits. It's a communist country. But we're dumping money over there.

And we even give foreign aid to this massive country over here, Russia, that used to be called the USSR.

And the zinger of them all, this country. Even though we are in debt \$45,000 per American, and most of that debt is owned by the Chinese, this Nation gives foreign aid to our good buddies the Chinese.

Why do we do that? It doesn't make any sense, and it's time to reevaluate our foreign aid policy. It's a time to reconsider. And let's start voting up or down on every one of these countries that want our aid.

And last thing I want to say is most of these countries we give money to,

they don't even like us. There was a poll done by FOX News yesterday that said 82 percent of the people in Egypt don't even like Americans. Well, why do we keep giving them money? We don't need to pay them to hate us. As my friend LOUIE GOHMERT from Texas says: "We don't need to pay them to hate us. They can do it on their own."

So it's time we reconsider foreign aid and save American taxpayers money. We are at war in two countries now. This debt is tremendous. We have a lot of issues in this country, and we need to start taking care of America before we start sending American money to countries throughout the world. It's a time to reconsider foreign aid.

And that's just the way it is.

POLITICAL UNREST IN EGYPT

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I was going to talk about jobs, but I think in light of the last address on the other side of the aisle, I will talk a bit about foreign policy and specifically Egypt.

There is a quote in a play by Samuel Beckett. It's called "Waiting for Godot." The quote, though, is applicable. It says something to the effect that, at this time, in this place, at this very moment in time, all mankind is us. And in many ways, Mr. Speaker, all mankind should be with the Egyptian people.

Now, it's quite true that the Egyptian people are not supportive of America's foreign policy, at least Washington's foreign policy, but they are certainly supportive of America's fundamental values. And, in fact, that's what motivates this revolution.

This protest was not started by the Muslim Brotherhood, who may, at most, be 20 percent of the Egyptian people and have forsworn violence, and, in fact, al Qaeda's second in command has issued any number of critical statements of the Brotherhood. That's not who is leading this. They may be jumping in now to take some advantage of it. But this was led by young, well-educated men and women very similar in motivation to those that led the American Revolution.

For the most part, these are folks much like the Google executive who yesterday explained that he could well lead a life of leisure. He was making a good income. His needs were being met. He had a nice apartment. But he didn't have his dignity. He didn't have his dignity when he can be arrested at any place at any time for any reason by the Egyptian Police. In fact, that's what happened. Only because he was speaking out on the street, he was arrested, blindfolded, held in captivity for 12 days, had no contact with his family. Now that he is released, he epitomizes who it is that is conducting this protest and why they are conducting it.

They want their dignity back. Sure, they would like to be able to stand tall

on an Arab street or on any street and be able to say “I am an Egyptian” without embarrassment. But most of all, they want their individual rights to vote in a free and fair election, to have a government that is not corrupt, that is responsive to their needs and desires but that, in fact, also looks out after the 36 million Egyptians who are living on less than \$2 a day.

These young people care about all of the people of that country. And they understand that under a repressive dictatorship, no one is able to fulfill their potential. They may be well cared for, some of them, but as John Kennedy said in his first inaugural address: “Unless we are prepared to address the needs of the many who are poor, we can’t possibly protect the wealth of the few who are rich.” They understand this.

It should also be said that in addition to upholding America’s most fundamental values, they are empowered by American industry, by our creativity and innovation. It’s Facebook. It’s all the social networking. It’s the Internet. It’s Google. It’s all of that technology that we have exported throughout the world. We should be proud of that. One was quoted as saying: The government can shut and lock all the doors on us, but they can’t close the windows of the Internet.

This is a time when we should be excited, when we should be proud, and we should be on the side of the Egyptian people in Tahrir Square, Freedom Square.

JOB CREATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I have said time and time again that my top priority this session of Congress is to focus on job creation and growing our economy. I think that many, if not all, of my Democratic colleagues share that same goal. However, let me share a few numbers with you here this morning on this new session of Congress. These numbers suggest that perhaps not every Member in this body shares that goal.

Five, the number of weeks that this House has been in session under the new leadership.

Twelve, the number of bills the House has voted on.

Zero, the number of House votes on bills that have been through their respective committees.

Zero, the number of House votes on bills intended to create jobs and address what should be our very top priority.

The most important contest we face today is not between Democrats and Republicans; rather, it’s America’s contest with competitors across the globe for the jobs and industries of our time. And economic growth is crucial for us to win this global race, not only for the future of our workforce but also

as a way to balance our budget and drive down the deficit.

During his State of the Union address, I was happy to hear President Obama reiterate that we share the same top priority—jobs, jobs, and jobs. In fact, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke, is sitting before the Budget Committee today. I plan to discuss the economic growth rate and the GDP with the Chairman later this morning.

In June 2010, Chairman Bernanke suggested that the GDP would rise by about 3 percent over the course of the year last year and would likely increase at a slightly higher pace in 2011. In fact, the fourth quarter of 2010 showed a rate of growth at 3.2 percent. Compare that nearly double-digit turnaround to the end of the Bush administration where we saw a 6 percent downturn in GDP.

□ 1020

In addition to that slow but steady growth, we’ve seen the private sector add 1.2 million jobs, another stark turnaround from the final month of the Bush administration, where we lost more than 8 million jobs.

Though we all acknowledge that job numbers need to grow more, I’ve been surprised at the enthusiasm for these GDP and private sector growth numbers coming from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They’ve been quite enthusiastic, claiming that the growth we’ve seen in the past few months is, in large part, from their policies. And yet we return to the numbers I mentioned previously—zero, the number of House votes on bills intended to create jobs since the start of this new session of Congress—and now we look to finish the budget for this year and await the budget proposal from President Obama for next year.

We heard a lot in the campaign last year about the other side’s job plan to cut and grow. In fact, we’ve seen that plan come to fruition through the Republican Study Committee. They have proposed \$2.5 trillion in discretionary spending cuts over the next 10 years. This plan would put more than 1 million jobs at risk, halt our economic growth, and hurt middle class families. Let me repeat that. This plan would put at risk more than 1 million jobs.

Some of the examples of job losses include small businesses, where some 161,000 jobs would be lost due to \$4 billion less in guaranteed loans. Law enforcement officials would lose their jobs where 12,900 jobs would be cut. Approximately 4,000 positions for FBI agents, 800 ATF agents, 1,500 DEA agents, and some 900 U.S. marshals would be lost, as would 5,700 correctional officers in our Federal prisons.

And 27,500 weatherization jobs would be cut. Just imagine, as one of the largest and strongest winter storms of the season just swept across the country, with some areas receiving record snowfall accumulations, temperatures that dropped dozens of degrees below

zero, and deadly storms that knocked out power and left people in the cold. We are telling the weakest and neediest amongst us that they simply are not worth our investments.

Americans’ top priorities are job creation and deficit reduction, and they demand that we work together to meet these goals. We are committed to deficit reduction, but we are not going to do it in an irresponsible way that will threaten jobs, economic growth, and the security of our middle class.

The budget cannot be slashed at the expense of jobs and investments in transportation, clean energy, innovation, and rebuilding—rebuilding America, not jeopardizing our economic recovery.

I agree with President Obama that we must out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build the rest of the world, but we cannot risk our economic future by rolling back investments that will help our private sector grow and put people back to work.

PROPOSED CUTS TO FOREIGN AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, have suggested that America would be better off if we cut out foreign aid.

In my opinion, there could be nothing further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. Cutting foreign aid from the United States to our allies and others we want to work with around the world is vital to the U.S.’s national security.

I’ll say it again. Our foreign aid that we give out, which, by the way, what’s the percentage of foreign aid in our budget compared to the whole budget? It’s 1 percent. It’s actually less than 1 percent. Some people think it’s 20 or 30 percent. It’s less than 1 percent of our whole budget. And what do we do with that foreign aid? We make alliances with trading partners. We make alliances with strategic military partners all over the world. I think most Americans understand we still live in a very dangerous world and we need allies and friends and partners.

By the way, what does that foreign aid budget include? It includes money for embassies and diplomats, interpreters. Now, would we be better off in a big complex, interconnected, hostile world if we didn’t have embassies all over the world? If we didn’t have people who understood foreign languages? If we didn’t have people who had lived in these countries, who are Americans who lived in these countries but nonetheless understood the cultures and way of thinking and history of these other nations whom we are not yet friends with or whom we are friends with but want to be better friends with, or countries on the fence whom we want to bring over to democracy and to Western values?

I think we'd be far poorer if we did not have a foreign aid budget. And don't just take my word; take the word, for example, of the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mullen, who said to Congress last year, the more significant the cuts to foreign aid, the longer military operations will take, and the more lives will be at risk. That's the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, not some crazy, wild-eyed, naive person, but the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff saying cutting diplomacy in the State Department and foreign aid threatens the lives of our warfighters, of our men and women in uniform.

Or how about when Secretary of Defense Gates, then under President Bush, said in 2008, referring to cuts, proposed cuts to foreign aid, that it has become clear that America's civilian institutions of diplomacy and development have been chronically undermanned and underfunded for far too long. This is Defense Secretary Gates, under former President Bush, relative to what we traditionally spend on the military and, more important, relative to the responsibilities and challenges our Nation faces around the world.

My goodness. Tunisia, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Iran, North Korea, China—to say now is the time to have fewer people understanding foreign languages, fewer embassies, fewer diplomats to try to avert war and nuclear proliferation when it constitutes less than 1 percent of the budget already? That's going to solve our problems? That not only won't solve our economic problems, that will create more and more danger to U.S. national security.

That is why, while we need to cut spending, while we need to get rid of waste, while we need to find additional sources of revenue, like the unnecessary \$4 billion that this Congress now gives already to the oil and gas and energy industries, to do what—\$4 billion to do what? To encourage them to look for energy. Well, I thought they were making a profit at that already, the greatest profits in their histories. Yes, they are. So why give them \$4 billion in subsidies? Let's use that for other purposes. Cut taxes—use that to reduce our deficit. Use that not to cut foreign aid, which returns probably 1,000 times per dollar than what we contribute in terms of the 1 percent of our budget that goes to diplomats, embassies, the State Department, and the meager foreign aid we provide to our essential military allies who are helping us protect against al Qaeda and the Muslim Brotherhood, who are helping us protect our vital sea lanes and economic lifeblood around the world.

I look forward to working with my Republican colleagues, but priorities are priorities, and we ought to make cuts where they make sense, not where they jeopardize U.S. national security.

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 29 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BONO MACK) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, our strength and salvation, You are worthy of all praise because true guidance has been granted this free Nation throughout its history.

Members of Congress, now chosen to make decisions that will honestly address the present needs of Your people, need Your help. Reward their efforts to establish equal justice for all and to make judgments in accordance with Your commands.

You can reach down and shatter any present barrier that hides the vision to progress. You can raise up Your forces beyond any wall of anger or prejudice and set all free; so united they may advance Your holy will.

We place all our trust in You, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois 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 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

TRIBUTE TO RONALD REAGAN

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, yesterday, Byron York, in the Washington Examiner, correctly recognized the memory of

Ronald Reagan on the 100th anniversary of the President's birth.

Without question, President Reagan stood for policies like lower taxes, less regulation, and a strong national defense.

Having served President Reagan's Energy Secretary, Jim Edwards, as deputy general counsel from 1981 to 1982, I saw firsthand his success in reducing regulations; I witnessed the success of a strong national defense by being an International Republican Institute election observer in Bulgaria, witnessing captive nations achieve freedom and democracy, with victory in the Cold War causing the defeat of communism across Europe and Asia.

Ed Meese was quoted for his contrasting the liberating policies of Reagan as opposed to the Big Government agenda of the current President.

The resources for conservatives are highlighted in California at the Reagan Library at Simi Valley and the Reagan Ranch Center of the Young America's Foundation at Santa Barbara.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, the unemployment rate last month dropped from 9.4 percent to 9 percent, but only 36,000 jobs were created. Wow, 36,000 jobs equals 0.4 percent.

How did the rate drop so much with only 36,000 new jobs? Madam Speaker, it's an illusion. If you are chronically unemployed and have given up looking for a job, you don't count as unemployed in America. You fall out of the statistics. So as more and more people are out of work for longer periods of time, they are literally left out of the system. Houdini couldn't have performed an illusion as clever as the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

But shouldn't the government of, for, and by the people care about its most vulnerable in this economic climate?

I want to remind the government of the urgency of our economic situation. Send me your resume and your story to resumesforAmerica@mail.house.gov. I want to have your story entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to remind the Congress of the fierce urgency of "now."

Madam Speaker, stop the illusions. The American people need jobs, and they want to go to work. We have too many Americans who are chronically unemployed, and we don't even count them anymore. We need to do something about it, and we need to do something about it now.

URGING EXTENSION OF THE TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS PROGRAM

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, my colleagues, the American people are watching. More than anything else, this Congress will be judged on what it does to help move this struggling economy forward.

One of our most important and effective programs to assist workers displaced by changes in the global economy has been the Trade Adjustment Assistance for Workers Act. Unfortunately, key provisions of this program are set to expire this week unless Congress takes action.

Last year, displaced workers in North Carolina received over \$56 million through TAA, the second largest amount given to a single State, to ensure that they had the support and training necessary to transition into an emerging sector of the economy.

This program is working. We must support the economy and these workers by immediately approving a long-term extension of the Trade Adjustment Assistance for Workers Program.

CLEAN AIR ACT

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, in 1970, our air was so polluted that breathing was literally a public health threat. Recognizing that need to give Americans clean air, Republican President Richard Nixon signed into law the Clean Air Act.

In its 40-year history, the Clean Air Act has saved the United States trillions of dollars by keeping Americans out of hospitals, in schools, and in the workforce.

The nonpartisan American Lung Association estimates that in 2010 alone it saved over 160,000 lives. But despite saving 160,000 lives and trillions of dollars in the last 40 years, the Republican majority claims this legislation is destroying the American economy. They believe that act must be repealed so Big Oil and corporate polluters can no longer be held responsible for destroying our air and endangering public health.

If Republican efforts to repeal the EPA's Clean Air Act authority are successful, we will return to a time when every breath you take will endanger your life. History disproves Republican claims and illustrates that the Clean Air Act saves lives, creates jobs, and saves the government tens of trillions of dollars. But, apparently, these facts that Richard Nixon understood do not matter.

GET OUR FISCAL HOUSE IN ORDER

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, one of the things that we are going to hear from our good friends on the Democrat side of the aisle day in and day out is how the Republicans are callous because we are cutting spending, and they can come to the floor and enumerate hundreds and hundreds of programs that are so good for America that they cannot be cut and, therefore, we shouldn't do anything to reduce our spending.

We have a \$14 trillion national debt. We are \$1.5 trillion short this coming fiscal year. If we don't do something, we are going to feel it; but our kids and our grandkids are going to have a lower quality of life because we cannot sustain this kind of spending.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues, I anticipate listening to you rant and rave about how we are cutting programs; but long term, unless we get our fiscal house in order, the future of America is really at risk. And I think the people across this country understand that it's time to take a scalpel to the budget.

PATRIOT ACT EXTENSION, H.R. 514

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, yesterday afternoon, 26 Republicans joined me and 121 of my Democratic colleagues in defeating a misguided attempt to extend, without badly needed changes, three soon-to-expire provisions of the Patriot Act.

We must remember that the powers of intelligence and enforcement are among the most important powers of government but also the most fearsome. They must be used very, very carefully.

Last year, I joined Representative CONYERS and other members in offering the USA PATRIOT Amendments Act. This bill would have revised the three controversial provisions we debated yesterday, and other provisions, to ensure that government agents would have to demonstrate a clear connection between the target of surveillance and terrorism investigation. It is that bill we should be voting on, and I ask the House leadership to schedule hearings and a vote on that bill.

□ 1210

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF GENERAL VANG PAO

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

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of General Vang Pao. General Pao passed away on Thursday, January 6, 2011, and today marks the sixth and final day of the Hmong spiritual practices which are traditionally conducted

by the Hmong community after the passing of an individual. I stand here today to support the internment of General Vang Pao in Arlington National Cemetery.

The accomplishments and service that General Vang Pao has given to the United States are not only numerous, but are everlasting. Not only was General Vang Pao determined to protect his country, but he served to protect the lives of American soldiers. He fought to cut off the Ho Chi Minh Trail so that supplies could not be utilized to fuel the enemy's war efforts. He provided aid and support to downed American pilots, in addition to defending American outposts.

The leadership of General Vang Pao helped save thousands of U.S. servicemembers' lives and was an influential force during the Vietnam War. The dedication and service of the general not only earned him the title of Lord Protector of the country, but has also made him a hero in both the Hmong community and the United States of America.

PROTECTING HIGHER EDUCATION

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, as we look for ways to put our economy back on track, we have to be mindful of the quality of higher education that we are providing our future generations. I agree that difficult decisions must be made in order to guarantee this country's economic prosperity, but access to higher education should not be negotiable.

In California, we have seen tuition increased by as much as 10 percent on higher education, and Governor Brown has proposed a \$1.4 billion cut to higher education funding. We argue that sensible solutions to our economic difficulties are essential to prevent this burden from being passed on to the next generation. But let's look around. Our next generation is here. It is at higher education. Students are dropping out of colleges not because their GPA is too low, but because they can't afford the higher tuition costs.

Our future doctors, our engineers, our politicians, our educators, this is what we are talking about. We cannot rebuild our economy when we do so at the expense of our future generations and their American Dream.

TIME TO BEGIN THE DIALOGUE ABOUT JOBS

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

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I spent this morning talking with people at the Good Jobs, Green Jobs Conference. This conference is dedicated to building jobs for Americans that are

sustainable, that are green, and that will help our country meet the needs of the future.

They talked about efficiency. They talked about saving money with weatherization and putting people back to work doing it. Manufacturing, windmills, solar, all these things are so vitally important, and also transit, all of these critically important things to make our employment grow and to help us stay green.

Unfortunately, however, Madam Speaker, we still have 14 million Americans who are unemployed; and in the time that we have spent in this new Congress, we have not spent any time talking about job creation, green or otherwise. The time is now to focus on jobs. I implore the majority caucus to begin the dialogue about jobs because we haven't talked about it at all.

WHERE IS THE JOB CREATION AGENDA?

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my Republican friends a simple question: Where is the job creation agenda? In the first month of the 112th Congress, this body has not taken up a single piece of legislation that will create jobs and put Americans back to work.

Let's look at what we have done: H.R. 2, repeal protections of health insurance reform. Created no jobs. H.R. 359, eliminating public financing for Presidential campaigns. Created no jobs. H.R. 38, establishing a budget with no numbers. Created no jobs. H.R. 519 is on the floor today, to reduce our annual payment to the United Nations and go back into arrears. Again, creates no jobs.

Madam Speaker, my Republican friends claimed that job creation was their number one priority. The American people said loud and clear that job creation should be their number one priority. During the previous Congress we made that priority, which is why we are in the midst of 12 consecutive months of private sector job growth.

I ask my Republican friends to put aside ideology and join with the Democrats in making job creation their number one priority.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader:

FEBRUARY 8, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803 (a)), I am pleased to appoint the

Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE of Texas to the Congressional Award Board.

Thank you for your consideration of this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
House Democratic Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader:

FEBRUARY 8, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, I am pleased to re-appoint the Honorable JAMES P. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts as Co-Chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
House Democratic Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader:

FEBRUARY 8, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 2081, I am pleased to re-appoint the Honorable MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio to the United States Capitol Preservation Commission.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
House Democratic Leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

JOHN M. ROLL UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 188) to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 98 West First Street, Yuma, Arizona, as the "John M. Roll United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 188

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JOHN M. ROLL UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse under construction, as of the date of enactment of this Act, at 98 West First Street, Yuma, Arizona, shall be known and designated as the "John M. Roll United States Courthouse".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "John M. Roll United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENHAM. Madam 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 S. 188.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, Senate bill 188 would designate the Federal courthouse currently under construction in Yuma, Arizona, as the John M. Roll United States Courthouse.

On January 8, our Nation suffered a horrendous tragedy. One of our colleagues, the gentlewoman from California, Representative GIFFORDS, was carrying out her duties meeting with her constituents in Tucson, Arizona, when a gunman shot 19 people, killing six. Among those killed that day was Judge John Roll, who was simply stopping by on his way back from attending Mass to say hi to his Congresswoman.

Judge Roll was chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona and was first appointed to the Federal bench by President George H.W. Bush in 1991.

His commitment to serving the public predated his appointment to Federal court. For nearly 40 years, he dedicated his life to public service and the law. Before becoming a Federal judge, Judge Roll was a judge on the Arizona Court of Appeals, serving as presiding judge and vice-chief judge. Earlier in his career, he was an Assistant U.S. Attorney for the District of Arizona. He also served the citizens of Arizona at the local level, first as a Tucson assistant attorney and later as the deputy county attorney in Pima County. It is fitting to honor Judge Roll in this way, given his reputation as a respected jurist and his service to the law.

Although we are honoring the life of Judge Roll through naming a Federal courthouse after him, we must also honor and remember the others who were killed and wounded that tragic day. Among those killed was one of

Representative GIFFORDS' staff members, a pastor, a secretary, a homemaker, a grandmother, and a 9-year-old little girl who had just been elected to her student council; each of them simply going that day to meet their Congressman, never thinking their lives would be in danger.

And in this tragedy, we must not forget the heroes, those who took action, risking their own lives, stopping the gunman and preventing more deaths and injuries.

Our prayers continue to be with Congresswoman GIFFORDS, the others who were wounded and the families of all the victims. In honoring Judge Roll by passing this legislation, it is important that we do not forget that all the victims that day should be honored and remembered.

I support passage of this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1220

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

S. 188 is a bill to honor the life and public service of Judge John McCarthy Roll, who was gunned down, along with others, at a community meeting in Tucson, Arizona.

Judge Roll graduated from the University of Arizona Law School in 1972, and he spent the next 40 years of his life dedicated to public service. Upon graduation from law school, Judge Roll served as a bailiff in the Pima County Superior Court and soon became Deputy County Attorney for Pima County, where he prosecuted criminal cases until 1980.

After his service as Pima County prosecutor, Judge Roll moved to the U.S. Attorney's Office in Arizona, where he served both as a civil attorney and criminal attorney until 1987, primarily prosecuting drug cases for the Federal Government. Judge Roll then served as a State court judge until he was appointed to the Federal bench by President George H. W. Bush in 1991.

From this perch, Judge Roll earned his reputation as a giant amongst the legal community in Arizona. Judge Roll was respected by his colleagues and the attorneys that appeared before him as someone who devoted his life to the rule of law and afforded all who appeared before him a fair opportunity to present their case.

Judge Roll's 20-year service to the judiciary ended tragically on January 8, 2011, when he was shot and killed while attending a local event sponsored by the gentlewoman, our colleague from Arizona, GABBY GIFFORDS. Judge Roll attended the event in the course of his duties to thank Congresswoman GIFFORDS for sending a letter to the Chief Judge of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals requesting that he declare Judge Roll's Federal district a judicial emergency because it was besieged with a high number of immigration and drug

cases. Judge Roll also worked closely with Congresswoman GIFFORDS to justify to Federal officials the need for construction of the Yuma, Arizona, U.S. Courthouse to adjudicate the growing backlog of these cases.

Madam Speaker, given Judge Roll's extraordinary service to his country, it is so fitting and proper that we honor his memory by designating that very same courthouse—the U.S. courthouse now under construction in Yuma, Arizona—as the John M. Roll United States Courthouse. This action today, Madam Speaker, will clear the bill for the President and hopefully provide a small comfort to Judge Roll's wife, Maureen, his three children and his five grandchildren, in honor of his service.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 188.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. QUAYLE).

Mr. QUAYLE. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 188.

I can think of no one more worthy of this honor than Judge John Roll. Naming a Federal courthouse after Judge Roll won't make the pain of his passing any easier for his family and close friends, but it will help ensure that his exceptional legacy and final act of heroism will never be forgotten. While the painful memories of the Tucson tragedy will eventually begin to fade, there will always be a John M. Roll United States Courthouse in Yuma.

Madam Speaker, John Roll's job was to look out for the people of Arizona. That's what a good judge is supposed to do. And John Roll was a great one. We've heard from friends and colleagues about how fair he was in the courtroom and how he worked to make sure that Arizona's judicial system—with its ever-growing caseload—was working efficiently for the people. And it was no surprise, Madam Speaker, when we learned that Judge Roll died while helping to save the life of Ronald Barber, one of Congresswoman GIFFORDS' staff members. So even at the very end, Madam Speaker, Judge Roll was doing what he did every day before that—looking out for the people of Arizona.

For your service to our great State and this country, Judge Roll, we offer our deepest thanks. We will never forget you or the other good Americans who passed away on that terrible day.

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I thank her and you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing this resolution to the floor to name a Federal courthouse in Yuma, Arizona, for John M. Roll. It will be called the "John M. Roll United States Courthouse." How appropriate.

Chief Judge Roll was a dedicated public servant, as our colleagues have referenced, serving as a Federal judge in Arizona, a State judge, and a prosecutor for the city, county, and at the Federal levels. Chief Judge Roll was a proud son of Arizona, moving to Arizona as a little boy, living there for the vast majority of his life, receiving his undergraduate and law degrees at the University of Arizona.

Tragically, Chief Judge Roll was one of the six Americans who were taken from us during the horrific shooting in Tucson. He died while helping to save the life of Ron Barber, as has been mentioned, a staffer for Congresswoman GIFFORDS—protecting him. He had just come from mass. I spoke to his wife, Maureen, the other day, and she said that was his regular routine on Saturday, to go to mass in the morning. He then went from there to see Congresswoman GABBY GIFFORDS at Congress on Your Corner, and you know what happened next. He was going to talk to her about securing resources for the overwhelming court system. This was characteristic, as he dedicated his entire life to ensuring justice. He was known as a scholar of the law and a man of integrity. He is an example of the public servants who are doing serious and significant work in the judiciary every day.

We had the honor, when we went to Tucson with the President to visit GABBY and to meet with some of the families, to also take pride in the fact that Justice Anthony Kennedy from the Supreme Court came on the trip, and Sandra Day O'Connor, who is from Arizona, was there that evening as well. They were joined by other justices who served with Judge Roll as a tribute to him personally and officially. It was wonderful to hear the beautiful statements that they made in our conversations about Chief Judge Roll, and they all sang the praises of Maureen Roll.

So I hope it is a comfort to Maureen, to their three sons, and five grandchildren that so many people are saddened by their loss. We're praying for them at this very sad time. This courthouse will long stand as a tribute—and an appropriate tribute—to Judge Roll.

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

Mr. GOSAR. I stand here today in support of Senate Bill 188. Judge Roll lost his life in the tragic shooting in Tucson 1 month ago, and I believe it is a fitting tribute to honor his memory and service to our country by designating the Yuma courthouse the John M. Roll United States Courthouse.

Judge Roll loved his country. His service as a Federal judge and the chief judge for the United States District Court was admirable. He served selflessly, as he always worked to ensure that the rule of law was upheld.

Judge Roll loved Arizona. Attending the University of Arizona for his undergraduate work and the University of Virginia for his law degree, he returned to the State he loved to serve Pima County, Arizona, and the United States.

Judge Roll's patriotism was evident in the fact that he went out to talk with his Representative at the local Congress on Your Corner event. His love for his country inspired him to serve and motivated him to come and support GABBY GIFFORDS.

Judge Roll lost his life trying to protect another. His act of courage will always be remembered and his upstanding character will never be forgotten. My thoughts and prayers are with his family today.

The United States and Arizona has lost a distinguished public servant, but he will always be remembered for diligence and dedication to our Nation.

May God be with Judge Roll's family and all the victims of the shooting in Tucson.

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another of our colleagues from Arizona, ED PASTOR.

(Mr. PASTOR of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. First of all, I want to thank my colleague from Maryland for yielding the time.

About 3 years ago, Judge Roll informed us that the courthouse in Yuma, which is in southeastern Arizona, lacked the space because of the increased cases dealing with the drug cases and immigration cases that the Federal court was facing in the Yuma area.

□ 1230

It was very interesting. At the time, the request was kind of unusual because, in the line of things, at least in the court itinerary, the Yuma court was not under consideration, but Judge Roll impressed on the delegation that this was sorely needed in the Yuma area, which prompted the Arizona delegation to work in bringing forth some moneys. I have to tell you that, in the last appropriation bill that passed this House, which was the omnibus bill, Chairman JOSÉ SERRANO, from New York, was able to appropriate the moneys to have this courthouse constructed.

Also, I want to thank the leadership of the Congress, of the House of Representatives, for bringing this bill forward. It is very appropriate that we name this courthouse in the name of Judge Roll, who was the presiding judge of the Arizona courts. As you have been told—and rightfully so—he was a jurist, a scholar, and a man who had a deep belief in God; but more than that, he was a father, a good husband, and one who continually supported the efforts of his community.

So on behalf of the Arizonans, we thank this House for naming this courthouse in Yuma, Arizona, in honor of Judge Roll. May he rest in peace.

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the committee for bringing this resolution forward. I rise in support of it.

Madam Speaker, as Judge John Roll pored over the plans and designs for a new courthouse to be built in Yuma, Arizona, I am sure his intentions were not to cement a legacy in brick and mortar. To those who knew him, maintaining a reputation as a fair, ethical and intelligent jurist was legacy enough.

One Tucson attorney said, "One of the finest compliments you could give him was that you got a fair day in court."

In fact, when the ability of the Arizona Federal court system to ensure such timely care and attention in all of its proceedings came into question by what he called a "tsunami of felony cases," Judge Roll declared a judicial emergency for the District of Arizona.

An Arizonan since childhood, a two-time graduate of the University of Arizona and a public servant within the State for nearly 40 years, Judge Roll was a tireless advocate. His mission would bring him to seek the assistance of his Representative, Congresswoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS. Eventually, their efforts helped to secure approval of the funding for the Yuma courthouse.

With the construction of this building set to begin this July, Judge Roll labored over the finishing touches. To him, the building represented a means to an end to better serve the people of Arizona. The Judge John M. Roll United States Courthouse will now represent and commemorate Judge Roll's legacy as a selfless public servant.

Let me just say that I, along with some of my colleagues here, had the honor to attend his funeral. I heard stories of selfless service, of care and of what an incredible, wonderful jurist he was to represent the United States Government—to ensure that justice was served and for his service to the people of Arizona. There was such an outpouring of love and support for the family and, basically, just an honoring of the legacy of this great man. So I am glad we can do this small part to ensure that people remember what he has done for the State and for his country.

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I never met Judge Roll, but if you were judged by the comments, the love, the number of touches I've received just in the last 24 hours, we have a gentleman here with an amazing history, an amazing reputation. Just walking up the stairs, while coming here onto the floor of the House, I was on the floor with a local attorney, named Steve Twist, who could not stop sharing comments

of the fairness and of the devotion to his faith.

The fact of the matter is Judge Roll was tough, but you were always going to get your appropriate day in court. Therefore, I hope naming this courthouse in Yuma that he painstakingly spent time on helping design and get right is just the first step in a fitting tribute to a life well lived.

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, one of the things that we don't talk about very often is that there are different ways that people choose to serve. Some choose to serve in elected office. Some choose to serve in uniform. Judge Roll chose to serve in our judiciary. It is one of those parts of our system that Judge Roll rightly recognized as one in which it is important to hear with fairness those who come before the court. Every aspect of Judge Roll's service indicated, with regard to those who appeared before him, that he operated and functioned fairly in his courtroom. It is why he was so respected.

As we look at his 20-year service, ending so tragically just in January of 2011, perhaps several months ago, one would not have thought what the name of the courthouse would be under its construction in Yuma, Arizona. Yet, today, because of Judge Roll's service and the tragedy that met him, it seems so obvious that this courthouse should be named for such an important public servant. Given Judge Roll's extraordinary service to the country, it is true that, in his memory, we will remember him as a public servant, but we will also remember the purpose for which he served this country in our judiciary.

The John M. Roll United States Courthouse will be a place in which, not just his wife, Maureen, and his family will be able to recognize their memory, but will be one that other attorneys and judges and litigants will recognize as a place of fairness, as a fair representation of his service to this Nation.

So I do join my colleagues in supporting S. 188.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Judge John Roll, a tireless advocate for justice and a model public servant. By designating the Federal courthouse under construction at 98 West First Street in Yuma, Arizona, as the "John M. Roll United States Courthouse," Congress has chosen to pass the legacy of a champion for justice to many generations of Arizonans and Americans.

A native Pennsylvanian, Judge Roll moved to Arizona as a child. He graduated from the University of Arizona with his Bachelor's Degree in 1969 and his J.D. in 1972. He began his legal career as a bailiff in the Pima County Superior Court later that year.

Judge Roll became an Assistant City Attorney for the City of Tucson and Deputy County Attorney for Pima County, prosecuting criminal cases until 1980. He later joined the U.S. Attorney's Office where he led the organized drug crimes task force, specializing in large drug cases, from 1982 to 1986. From 1987 to 1991 he served as a judge on the State Court of Appeals, and in 1991 also held a post on the Pima County Superior Court.

Judge Roll was appointed to the Federal bench in 1991 by President George H.W. Bush and was unanimously confirmed by the Senate. He served as the chief judge of the District of Arizona from 2006 until his tragic death on January 8, 2011. He displayed remarkable fairness and evenhandedness in his rulings, and was often recognized by peers and colleagues for setting aside his personal beliefs in service of the law.

According to multiple witnesses, Judge Roll died protecting Congresswoman GIFFORDS' district office director, Ron Barber, who continues his recovery. His sacrifice will never be forgotten by the Arizona community. I believe many join me in extending heartfelt sympathies to his widow Maureen, his three sons and his five grandchildren.

For many years, Judge Roll pushed for the construction of a new Federal courthouse in Yuma. He worked diligently with my office and Ms. GIFFORDS' office to secure the funding, which finally came through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. His determination and persistence were key factors, and it is fitting that the building will bear his name.

John Roll was a great example to everyone of what a legal career can mean to a nation and a community. His passing was a very sad day for our State, and I can think of no greater tribute than to pass on his name to future generations through the courthouse he fought so hard to bring to Yuma.

Ms. EDWARDS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 188.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

UNITED NATIONS TAX EQUALIZATION REFUND ACT OF 2011

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 519) to secure the return to the United States the \$179 million overpaid into the United Nations Tax Equalization Fund as of December 31, 2009, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 519

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United Nations Tax Equalization Refund Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Approximately \$180 million in United States taxpayer funds overpaid to the United Nations remain in the hands of the United Nations because the United States has not requested the return of those funds.

(2) The funds were paid into the United Nations Tax Equalization Fund (TEF), which is used to reimburse United Nations staff members subject to United States income taxes for the cost of those taxes.

(3) In recent years, the TEF has taken in considerably more money than it has paid out, with the United States apparently overpaying into the TEF by \$52.2 million in the 2008–2009 timeframe alone.

(4) According to the United Nations Financial Report and Audited Financial Statements released on July 29, 2010, "As of 31 December 2009, an amount of \$179.0 million was payable to the United States of America pending instructions as to its disposition."

(5) That balance was allowed to accrue notwithstanding United Nations Financial Regulation 4.12, which states that any such surpluses "shall be credited against the assessed contributions due from that Member State the following year."

(6) Allowing the United Nations to regularly overcharge the United States and to retain those overpayments, or to spend them on wholly unrelated activities, is a disservice to American taxpayers and a subversion of the Congressional budget process.

SEC. 3. REFUND OF UNITED STATES TAXPAYER DOLLARS FROM THE UNITED NATIONS TAX EQUALIZATION FUND.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States—

(1) to direct the United Nations to return to the United States the \$179,010,326 overpaid into the United Nations Tax Equalization Fund (TEF) as of December 31, 2009, which the United Nations itself has identified as "payable to the United States of America";

(2) to use the voice and vote of the United States to press the United Nations to reform its TEF assessment procedures to reduce the repeated discrepancies between TEF income and expenditures; and

(3) to annually instruct the United Nations to return to the United States any TEF surplus funds payable to the United States.

(b) CERTIFICATION AND WITHHOLDING.—Until the Secretary of State submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the United Nations has returned to the United States the \$179,010,326 identified by the United Nations in its July 29, 2010 Financial Report as payable to the United States, the United States shall withhold \$179,010,326 from the United States contribution to the regularly assessed biennial budget of the United Nations.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the term "United Nations Tax Equalization Fund" or "TEF" means the fund established under the provisions of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 973 (December 15, 1955) to equalize to net pay of United Nations staff members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

□ 1240

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The American people have spoken. They overwhelmingly voted for today's YouCut proposal calling for U.S. taxpayer funds overpaid to the United Nations to be returned to the United States. The United Nations holds about \$179 million overpaid by U.S. taxpayers into the U.N. Tax Equalization Fund. This is not about the U.N. finally doing the right thing by paying for security upgrades at its headquarters in New York. The U.N. is not paying for anything.

After years of avoiding its responsibilities, the U.N., with the support of the Obama administration, is asking the American taxpayer to bail them out once again and pay 100 percent of the proposed construction costs. To make matters worse, allowing the U.N. to take \$100 million of the refund owed to U.S. taxpayers would be an increase for the U.N. budget.

This YouCut not only ensures that U.S. taxpayers receive the funds owed to the U.S. Treasury, but it prevents a \$100 million increase for the U.N. The U.N. doesn't want the American people to know this; so the U.N. and the State Department are now stating that they should allow this increase because it is for security upgrades. This is not about security. This is the U.N. and the Obama administration looking for another excuse to avoid making the difficult choices and requiring accountability from the United Nations.

This is not like U.S. embassy construction projects where the needs are assessed, where a detailed plan is developed on how the security needs will be addressed, on how the funding request is presented, and how the Congress will then allocate the funds, no. After months of requests, my colleagues on the committee and I are still waiting for the details on this proposed construction project and, more recently, on how the U.N. would fund it.

In news reports, I read that the State Department may have already handed over to the U.N. \$100 million of our overpayment into the TEF. The Tax Equalization Fund, TEF, is a round-about mechanism premised on the U.N. belief that U.N. employee salaries and benefits should be tax free. The TEF has collected much more from the U.S. than it has paid out.

The U.N.'s most recent biennial financial report states that the amount of the U.S.-paid surplus has grown to \$179 million. The U.N. readily admits that it does owe the overpaid money to our U.S. taxpayers. According to the U.N.'s official financial report, the TEF surplus is "payable to the United States of America pending instructions as to its disposition."

This YouCut proposal declares that it is U.S. policy to seek the return of those funds and the reform of the TEF assessment process. And until the Secretary of State certifies to Congress

that those funds have been returned, the bill withholds from our U.N. dues an amount exactly equal to the overpayment identified by the U.N.

That's the simple question, Madam Speaker, framed by today's vote. Should the 179 million taxpayer dollars, which the U.N., again, admits it has no right to keep, be returned to the United States taxpayers? Should the American people be asked to foot the entire bill for the U.N. construction project?

Since this issue has begun receiving public attention, there has been a great deal of misinformation that I would like to address briefly.

Last week, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs reportedly said that, "The \$179 million in overpayments are in the form of credits, not cash, and thus cannot be refunded per se." Madam Speaker, this is simply not true. Not only does the statement by the IO Assistant Secretary conflict with what the State Department budget professionals have most recently told the Congressional Budget Office, but it conflicts with the U.N.'s own position. They can't even get their stories straight.

The U.N.'s most recent financial report makes clear that the \$179 million surplus is a distinct account payable to the United States of America. So the question is, should the U.S. pay an additional \$100 million to the U.N.?

I first raised the TEF surplus issue in a letter to Secretary Clinton on November 18 of last year. The State Department response since that time has been tardy, incomplete, and evasive. At a November 18 briefing, the State Department mentioned for the first time that it was considering whether to allow the U.N. to spend part of the U.S. surplus on an unrelated construction project at the U.N. headquarters in New York. Nothing certain. The Foreign Affairs Committee requested detailed plans, cost estimates, for the proposed construction project so that we could credibly assess the claimed \$100 million pricetag. I repeated that request on December 22, then on December 29, then on January 4, and on January 25. We're still waiting for those details. The only thing that we have gotten, Madam Speaker, other than a few PowerPoint slides, the only figures we have received is this: Less than a single page of summary totals, with no supporting documentation. This is it.

The State Department has admitted that this construction proposal, in the words of the Under Secretary for Management, "is primarily the responsibility of the United Nations," but they want to stick the American taxpayers with the bill.

I disagree with the State Department. And the American people, they know that we should not be penalized because the U.N. failed to adequately plan for its own security needs. If the administration wants to fund this project, the State Department should

identify cuts to U.N. programs to offset the cost and then ask Congress to pay for it directly, explicitly, and clearly. Whatever the merits of this proposal, it should not be taken from a refund owed to U.S. taxpayers.

My colleagues, let's join together in support of this week's YouCut.

With that, Madam Speaker, I respectfully reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation, and I yield myself 2½ minutes.

This is called the YouCut agenda. It's the second bill on the YouCut agenda. If this is the kind of bill that's going to be on the YouCut agenda, I would suggest that we name it the "YouCut what?" agenda.

The CBO says, in its official cost estimate, implementing H.R. 519 would have no effect on the Federal budget, no effect. Not \$1 is saved by this particular proposal.

So we are faced with a piece of legislation that jeopardizes critical security upgrades at the United Nations headquarters, and let me just point out here, there's a large improvement plan for the U.N. building that's going on now. That is not paid by the U.S. It is paid by the apportioned assessed dues of all the member countries.

This is about a perimeter cost dealing with FDR Drive that our colleagues Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. KING and the other New Yorkers who will speak on this will go into more detail on, that's a host country obligation. There is not \$180 million in that fund because \$100 million of it has been committed to the request of the New York City Police Department to securitize the perimeter of the U.N. building where FDR Drive goes under the U.N.

Secondly, it puts us back in arrears at the U.N. We tried that once. That doesn't get our agenda through. We have a big agenda and a big reform agenda at the U.N. Failing to pay our obligation is not the answer, and because of the nature of this fund and the commitments already made, I repeat what the CBO says: H.R. 519, this legislation, would have no effect on the Federal budget.

□ 1250

So we are not saving money. We are spurning the important security requests, and we are going back into a pattern of arrearages that undermines our efforts at the U.N. and does not help to achieve those goals.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am so pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding and sponsoring this legislation.

Madam Speaker, it seems fairly simple to me: The American taxpayers have overpaid the U.N. The U.N. didn't tell anybody about it. The Heritage Foundation found out about it and published it last year; and all of a sudden,

the U.N. admits, Oops, yes. We have \$180 million of American money that was overpaid. The State Department has intervened in a letter today by saying that we not only have intervened, but we have kind of told the U.N. to spend \$100 million of that money on security in New York.

Now, no question about it, New York probably needs more security around the U.N. That's a different issue. This issue is basic honesty. It's an overpayment by taxpayers. The U.N. got caught, and they should return the money to the United States. And the United States should decide if we want to appropriate more money for security around New York City or the U.N. That is a different issue. But this is an issue of honesty.

First of all, the State Department didn't have the authority to go ahead and say, Keep a little of that money—\$100 million of it—and spend it on security. They didn't have that authority. And now there is only \$80 million left.

So I submit, we should pass this legislation. We should expect that the U.N., like everybody else, deal in basic honesty. If you make an overpayment in your private personal business, whoever you sent that money to owes you that money. Somebody else can't come in and say, Go ahead and spend it on security or something else because they overpaid the money. The money returns to that individual, just like this taxpayer money should return to the American public, and we should decide whether we want to spend more on the U.N. or not spend it or send that \$180 million someplace else.

So I am somewhat dismayed that the State Department has taken a position against basic honesty in saying that money should go ahead and stay in the U.N. because it's already spent. Somebody needs to return the \$180 million.

If the State Department spent part of it without authority by Congress, then they need to fork over another \$100 million and we get our \$80 million back from the U.N., because it's an issue of basic honesty. Then we will deal with the issue of security. And if we need more security around the U.N., then let's have legislation to deal with that and let Congress pass that legislation or vote on that legislation one way or the other. But it's simply not the U.N.'s money.

Give us back our money. It doesn't belong to the United Nations.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: I write to express the Department of State's strong opposition to House passage of H.R. 519, the "United Nations Tax Equalization Refund Act of 2011".

The Department agrees with the goal of reducing the fiscal burden on Americans during difficult economic times and has been working with the United Nations to ensure that the UN improves its methods for estimating U.S. assessments and that UN credits attributable to U.S. contributions are applied in a fiscally responsible manner. The

approach taken in this bill, however, would undermine those efforts and thus, we oppose passage of the bill.

Contrary to assertions in the bill, the UN Tax Equalization Fund (TEF) balance attributable to U.S. contributions is now approximately \$80 million. The Administration believes that these credits should be used as offsets against future assessments for UN activities, thereby reducing the need for appropriated funds to meet vital U.S. foreign policy interests.

As the Department of State notified the Congress in December 2010, the United Nations advised the Department of its intent to apply up to \$100 million of previously existing TEF credits attributable to United States assessed contributions to fund critical security enhancements at the UN Headquarters complex in New York. New York City and the New York City Police Department had requested such enhancements given the increasing threats the United Nations has come under globally, and given the obvious potential impact of these threats on the United States, as the UN's host country, and on its citizens. The Department notified Congress of its view that upgrades are the only practical means to mitigate potential threats emanating from the public streets surrounding the UN complex to protect the safety and security of staff, visitors, delegates, and senior U.S. and foreign officials present there every day, and that the United States and the UN have a strong shared interest in having increased security against threats emanating from public rights of way along First Avenue and the FDR Drive.

Additionally, the Department of Justice advises us that subsection 3(b) of the bill, which purports to declare the "policy" of the United States with respect to the TEF overpayment, implicates the President's exclusive authority to determine the time, scope, and objectives of international negotiations or discussions and therefore would be construed by the Executive Branch as declaring the sense of Congress but not imposing binding obligations on the conduct of the President's diplomatic efforts.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our views. The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this letter from the standpoint of the Administration's legislative program.

Sincerely,

RICHARD R. VERMA,
Assistant Secretary,
Legislative Affairs.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), the ranking member of the Middle East and South Asia Subcommittee of House Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am opposed to this bill for one simple reason: It's not a smart thing to do. It recklessly jeopardizes the security and safety of the people of New York City, and it does so for no reason.

This is a national security issue. It will irresponsibly and indefinitely delay the vital security improvements to the perimeter of the U.N. campus in the city that the State Department wants to undertake and has the resources to commit. Why do this? Only a radical, wild-eyed obsession with taking a pound of flesh out of the U.N., which at times deserves it, and to do so no matter what the cost to our national security.

Where is the common sense in clawing back money that is going to be used for desperately needed, long overdue security upgrades that we have the money for anyway and have the responsibility to do anyway? Where's the benefit to the taxpayer for maintaining the vulnerability of the most prominent international target which happens to be in al Qaeda's most highly targeted city?

I can see how the terrorists benefit from reduced security. But I'm having a terribly hard time seeing how New Yorkers or Americans or the 1 million tourists to the building or even the multitudes of international representatives at the United Nations, whom we have undertaken to keep safe, will benefit. The U.N.'s Capital Master Plan calls for \$100 million in security upgrades.

As the host nation, that's something about which we should be proud. We are the guarantors of the U.N.'s physical security. We have the money in the Tax Equalization Fund that we can use for the security upgrades. The State Department has already committed to do it. The U.N. wants us to do it. New York City needs us to do it. The New York City Police Department is literally on its knees begging us to do it. We have the money. We don't need further appropriations. All we need to do is to stop this bizarre and radical effort to derail the whole effort.

And you want to eliminate \$100 million in jobs? Why?

Security in New York is something I take very seriously. I think most Members do. But as this bill shows, some clearly don't. They are all too happy to rush to the floor every September 11 and boast about the amazing heroism of our police, our firefighters, our first responders. One day a year, they think New York City is part of America.

The rhetoric is all patriotism and bombast, full of promises to do "whatever it takes." And then comes the time to start paying for it. And then, Madam Speaker, some Members have a change of heart. Proudly remembering 9/11 heroism for some Members was no impediment to telling workers deathly ill from their time on "the pile" to go ahead and die. Congress didn't have any money for them—at least not until the story got out.

Those of us from New York haven't forgotten all the so-called "patriots" who fought tooth and nail to stop the passage of the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act. So now, instead of fighting to get Congress to do the minimally decent thing, we find ourselves on the floor of the House fighting to prevent Congress from doing the maximally stupid thing. I'm not sure this constitutes progress. Taking money from vital security upgrades is radical, irresponsible, and reckless. It's stupid.

Vote "no" on stupid.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wish to rebut some of the arguments. To my colleagues, I ask, if this was so urgent, why didn't the Obama administration request these funds legitimately last year? Why didn't the last Congress fund it? Secondly, the CBO needs to have the actual funds reimbursed so that the savings can be tabulated.

And also, Madam Speaker, I hold out this letter from the Under Secretary of State for Management, which says that this construction is primarily the responsibility of the United Nations. They, themselves, are saying that this is not a U.S. host country responsibility.

And less than 2 hours ago, we received a letter, finally, from the State Department—even though we've asked for it repeatedly—claiming for the first time ever that the current TEF surplus is "now approximately \$80 million." It's either the new math or it took the scheduling of the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives to get the administration to effectively admit for the first time that it has already given away \$100 million owed back to the U.S. taxpayers.

This is an outrage, Madam Speaker.

Even now, the State Department doesn't have the honesty to admit its decision but tries to hide behind the U.N. In that letter, they write, "As the State Department notified the Congress in December 2010, the United Nations advised the Department of its intent to apply \$100 million of previously existing TEF credits to fund critically important security enhancements at the U.N. Headquarters complex."

But the U.N. can not and will not do any such thing without express instructions from the U.S. Don't take my word for it. This is what the State Department told Congress when we started asking these tough questions a few months ago. The U.N. "applies credits consistent with requests from the relevant member states and will not move forward with using them in other ways."

So the administration owes Congress a long overdue explanation of:

One, who instructed the U.N. to keep and spend \$100 million that were payable to the United States?

Two, when did they do it?

Three, on what basis did they make that decision?

□ 1300

After 3 months of repeatedly asking for the detailed plans and the costs and the estimates, we have received only, again, a single piece of cursory figures. This is it.

The U.N. should give U.S. taxpayers back the \$179 million that we overpaid, plain and simple. If the State Department gave most of that away to the U.N. in some backroom deal, then we will make sure that we can recoup these funds from the Department.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Homeland Security

Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. And I say that as one who has voted continually for reform at the U.N., has been critical of funding procedures involving the U.N.

But I'm here today to save lives. The fact is, contrary to what has been said, I don't want to get caught in an accounting debate. I don't want to get caught in a fight between Democrats and Republicans, between the Obama administration, the State Department, the U.N., between chairman and ranking members.

I am here because of the fact that this is not something that started 3 months ago or 4 months ago or 5 months ago. This has been an ongoing matter between the New York City Police Department and the U.N. and the State Department.

The results of an attack in this area would be catastrophic. I am not going to go into details. But anyone who wants to check the series of correspondence going back long before this became an issue here in Congress about how vital it was to have this \$100 million in construction changes and hardening made, whether we are talking about First Avenue or FDR Drive or the perimeter, the fact is, this is a disaster waiting to happen.

And I would say to Members on both sides, if there is an attack, if there is a vehicle bomb, if there is an attack in these areas that have been designated by Commissioner Kelly, and we see hundreds of lives lost or thousands of lives lost, we're going to come back and say well, that could have been taken care of, but it was in this account rather than that account; it was authorized but not appropriated, or it was spent by the U.N. at the direction of the State Department and Congress didn't have time to act in time.

The fact is, this is a matter of life and death. This is a serious matter. I was on the phone late last night at midnight with the highest-ranking people in the New York City Police Department, and how vital this is to them.

We can have our debate back and forth. We can go back and forth as to when it should have been done, who was hiding what. The fact is, I'm concerned with saving lives, not just for New Yorkers, but all the tourists that visit there, the impact this would have.

And if people are concerned about saving money, put it in very harsh economic terms what this would do to our economy if a car bomb went off in the vicinity specified by Commissioner Kelly and we saw lives being lost, people being burned to death, we saw buildings coming down because we felt the money wasn't done exactly the appropriate way as far as which part of the balance sheet it came off.

So I am urging my colleagues to save lives, to do what has to be done for security, put partisan politics aside. And

it's not just important to know the cost of something. It's important to know the value of something and the damage that can be caused if that value is impaired.

So I urge the defeat of this legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I want to congratulate her on being the new chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I know she is going to do an outstanding job.

Madam Speaker, let me just start off by saying the U.N. has been a scandal-ridden mess for as far back as I can remember. I've been in Congress 28 years, and we've had scandal after scandal after scandal. The people over there that have been overpaid, comparing it to the private sector for accountants, for business, for all kinds of things, and we raise Cain about it on this floor, but nothing ever changes.

Remember the oil scandal involving Iraq? Remember Saddam Hussein and the deals that were cut and how the U.N. was involved in that?

Nothing ever changed. We keep throwing the money in the same direction and the same amounts, year after year after year. We give them 22 percent of their budget. Now, if you take all the countries in the world that are involved in the U.N., you'll find that we're sending a real disproportionate amount of money to them. Our share should not be 22 percent. Nevertheless, we do it year after year after year.

And now we find out that the U.N. Tax Equalization Fund, the TEF, was overpaid \$179 million. Why in the world should we allow them to keep our money? We're already paying them more than we should, in my opinion.

I heard what my colleague said about the security of the place and all that. We give them more than enough money to take care of the place and to pay the salaries and to do what needs to be done over there. That is, if you support everything the U.N. does.

But to allow them to keep almost \$180 million of our money when it's an overpayment makes no sense whatsoever. So what we're saying here today is, you know, we're just going to hold this money back if they don't return what they already owe us.

Now, if we had any other creditor that owes us money, or if you had a creditor in your hometown, you would expect that creditor to pay you back. You'd expect them to pay what they owe.

But the U.N. is a different thing. Why? It makes no sense to me whatsoever.

I've been here long enough to know that there has been problem after problem after problem with the U.N., and we've complained about it. We have done very little to correct that, but

we've complained about it time and again.

But at the very, very least, at the very least we should expect them to pay us back the money that they owe us. So I wish my colleagues would think about this from a logical point of view. Why should we let them keep money that they owe the United States, especially at a time when we have a \$14 trillion, get that, \$14 trillion national debt? We're going to be \$1.5 trillion short this year, and the legacy we're going to leave to our kids and grandkids is unbelievably bad. And so this is a drop in the bucket, no question about it. But I think we should get our \$170 million back, and I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will concur.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, this is a fundamental principle that we developed in the Homeland Security Committee, where we work with our stakeholders to protect this country. The notion of taking the resources away from the New York City Police Department, a major stakeholder in keeping this country safe, does not make sense.

Representative KING, the new chairman of the committee, outlined in a very passionate statement how this would devastate New York City. That partnership we've created has rendered results. All of the statistics that we have gleaned on this committee indicate that New York City is the number one terrorist target in the United States. This \$100 million investment with the New York Police Department is an investment in security.

What we have here is smoke and mirrors that ultimately will render the citizens of New York City vulnerable to any potential attack. So I call upon my colleagues to oppose this unfortunate cut in the name of getting paid back, and look at it in what ultimate damage it will cause.

The New York City Police Department is known worldwide for its security investments and enhancements, but that's because of the partnership it's had with the Federal Government. We shouldn't punish the good people of New York for some ostensive reason with the United Nations.

And let's talk a little bit about the United Nations. We're fortunate to have them on our shores here in the United States. That's worth a lot. We bring a lot of people to this country. Thousands of tourists visit that building every day. And so why all of a sudden do we want to limit the security of those individuals, among others who visit that building, just because we're trying to "get some money back."

□ 1310

Well, we are bigger than that. We have to lead by example. The best example we can do here today is to defeat

this unwarranted, mean-spirited deal that does not provide any security for the good people of New York or the people who work in and around the United Nations building.

That building was put here in 1951. It has been here a long time. We have been that beacon of hope for world order. And now, all of a sudden, we jeopardize it in a document that clearly we understand will not really cost any more money. So I ask for a vote in opposition to H.R. 519.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) in whose district these security perimeter improvements are being made.

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for leading on so many important issues for the safety of our country and world peace.

I rise in strong opposition to this legislation which would, I believe, make New York City more vulnerable to terrorist attacks; and this includes people that I represent who are visiting or live around the U.N. compound.

The bill would divert funds that the U.N. has that the State Department, United Nations, and the New York City Police Department have planned to use for much-needed security enhancements to the U.N. compound and surrounding perimeter in Manhattan.

I just spoke earlier today with Police Commissioner Kelly, who says these funds are absolutely critical to maintain homeland security. Homeland security should be the number one priority for this country, and not having these funds would put at risk the lives of people who work there, people who visit, and people who live in the area.

We know that threats of terrorist attacks are real. New York City has been attacked twice. And the police commissioner told me today that there have been 11 attempted attacks since 9/11, which they have stopped. So it is a real threat. And as a host country, we have a responsibility to protect the diplomats and those who work in and visit the United Nations. And we know that the U.N. is a terrorist attack target across the world, most notably in 2003 the attack in Iraq and in 2007 the attack in Algeria. So this is important. This vote, if you support the funding and the continued homeland security, will save lives.

I would like to point out very importantly and place in the RECORD a statement from the nonpartisan CBO. They have said that this "will not provide any savings to taxpayers." So if we are not providing savings to taxpayers, why are we not willing to speak out and vote for saving lives and security? I urge a strong "no" vote on this legislation.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, February 9, 2011.

Hon. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 519, the United Nations Tax Equalization Refund Act of 2011.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Sunita D'Monte, who can be reached at 226-2840.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF.

Enclosure.

H.R. 519—United Nations Tax Equalization Refund Act of 2011

CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 519 would have no effect on the federal budget. Enacting H.R. 519 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply. The bill would establish a new policy to direct the United Nations (U.N.) to return \$179 million that the United States overpaid to the U.N. as well as any similar over-payments in future years. Under the bill, if the Secretary of State is unable to certify that the U.N. has returned \$179 million, the State Department would be required to withhold the same amount from its assessed contributions to the U.N. Those contributions are funded through annual appropriations acts.

Based on information from the Administration, CBO expects that the State Department would not seek the return of those funds and that the Secretary would thus be unable to make the necessary certification. CBO estimates that amounts appropriated in 2011 for assessed contributions to the U.N. will be obligated and expended before this bill would be enacted; therefore, there would be no funds available this year to withhold pursuant to the bill's requirement. Under current law, there are no appropriations authorized or provided for 2012 or future years for assessed contributions to the U.N.; therefore, CBO also would not attribute savings to H.R. 519 in future years. Thus, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would have no effect on the federal budget. If future appropriations are reduced by \$179 million, CBO estimates that discretionary outlays would be reduced by a corresponding amount.

H.R. 519 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Sunita D'Monte. The estimate was approved by Theresa Gullo, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, a former member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, H.R. 519 is wrongheaded and should be defeated. This bill cuts the United Nations Tax Equalization Refund Act as part of a gimmicky House Republican YouCut proposal.

According to the CBO, our nonpartisan official scorekeeper, H.R. 519 has absolutely no effect on the Federal budget. It saves nothing. Not a penny.

So what would this bill do if enacted? It would put urgently needed security

upgrades to the United Nations headquarters at risk. This bill would undermine the protection that we are trying to provide to the people who live in New York. Haven't they suffered enough already?

In fact, the State Department has already committed \$100 million from this fund to help the New York Police Department, which requests the support to secure the perimeter against terrorist threats. And these threats are serious, Madam Speaker. U.N. facilities in Iraq and Algeria have already been attacked. And I must say, Madam Speaker, this is part of an extreme agenda that is anti-United Nations from the start.

So let me just say in conclusion, often my colleague Mr. KING and I don't agree, but we agree on this one 100 percent. Mr. KING said, and I quite agree with him, that this bill would undermine security in New York City; it is wrong and indefensible. And I would say that I think he is absolutely right.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MACK), a gentleman you may be familiar with, who is the chairman of our Western Hemisphere Subcommittee.

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

Mr. MACK. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of what the chairwoman is doing on the U.N.

I think it is a disgrace that we continue to fund an organization like the U.N. when in fact they tend to hinder progress instead of help it.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, as a New Yorker and a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong opposition to this misguided, ill-advised legislation which would limit the New York Police Department's ability to protect American citizens in the Nation's most at-risk city.

According to the State Department, up to \$100 million of the \$179 million that the other side is seeking to cut from the U.N. Tax Equalization Fund has been reprogrammed to help enhance security around the U.N. complex in New York City.

As the only member of the Committee of Homeland Security from New York City, I know firsthand the vital role that the NYPD plays in protecting not only U.N. workers but city residents and millions of tourists that visit each year. I have a particular concern to ensure that the NYPD is adequately funded to meet the challenges of defending the U.N. and New York City.

With the broad array of threats that New York City faces, it is unfathomable that we would consider hindering the NYPD's ability to protect one of the most important areas of

the city. The NYPD has protected visiting dignities and the city during the United Nations General Assembly for decades, and we must support our public safety officials and invest in the training and equipment to prevent and respond to emergencies. We should not take away the resources needed for the NYPD to protect citizens, and prevent and mitigate terrorist threats.

As we near the 10th anniversary of 9/11, we are reminded that New York City has been the target of multiple significant terrorist plots. United Nations facilities located around the globe have been targeted by terrorists. A vote for this legislation is a vote to expose New York to extreme risk and recklessness at best.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this misguided and potentially harmful legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the gentleman.

You need to look more carefully at the YouCut program. You know, the U.S. can't withdraw from the world, nor can we be the policemen of the world; but we can protect the people who work at the U.N. in New York. Is this a YouCut for sovereignty? Will you seek to cut funds for the WTO which doesn't allow Buy America?

Let's talk real sovereignty. Will you withdraw from China trade? No. Will you withdraw from NAFTA and GATT? No. Reduce the power of the Fed? No.

Let's talk real savings. Will you cut funds from the Pentagon? No. Will you cut money for the war in Iraq? No. Will you cut funds for the war in Afghanistan? No. Will you cut money for U.S. bases around the world? No. But you are going to cut funds for the New York City Police to protect citizens. When you do that, you cut off your nose to spite your face.

□ 1320

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, as we meet here this afternoon, there are 15 million Americans unemployed, and yet we are passing up yet another opportunity to work together to try to create jobs in our country. And what are we doing? We are passing a spending reduction bill that the Congressional Budget Office says doesn't have any impact on the budget at all, so we are not saving any money.

We are passing a bill, or some of us are going to pass a bill, that the New York City Police Commissioner, who is entrusted with defending people around the U.N., says is dangerous because it impairs his ability to do that. And at a time when the most dangerous area of the world is literally in flames and calling out for cooperation between our country and other countries around the world to try to calm things down, we are sending a signal to the most important international institution that our participation is somehow contingent upon domestic politics.

We should be doing a jobs bill, not putting our imprimatur today on a bill that is yet another exercise in politics. The right vote for the country is "no."

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam 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.R. 519.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, we do get \$179 million back into the Treasury, which the CBO does not count as a savings, but if we pass this, we do get the money back. It is obvious that these security upgrades should be funded through the U.N. capital master plan, that is, the \$2 billion 5-year effort to renovate the U.N. headquarters in New York. We do know that by raiding the TEF overpayments owed to American taxpayers, rather than funding the construction properly through the capital master plan, we do know that the State Department and the U.N. will stick American taxpayers with 100 percent of the bill rather than the 22 percent we would owe if it was funded through proper channels.

That is what this debate is about. It is not about whether U.N. headquarters in New York should have adequate security. It is about how the costs of that security should be apportioned and whether the funding process can bear even minimal scrutiny. U.S. overpayments into the tax equalization fund are owed to the United States and the State Department should instruct the U.N. to return that money.

Now, when the U.N. is sitting on hundreds of millions of dollars—in this case the U.N. actually told us about it. That is good to know. But one thing has kept it from being returned to the Treasury, and that is the U.S. hasn't asked for its money back. When we Americans are overassessed or overpay the IRS, we get a refund. Well, when the Obama administration overpays the United Nations, they say, keep the check.

We had a Foreign Affairs meeting the other week. We were told the U.N. can't really give us an honest accounting of their annual budget. The budget is somewhere between \$5 billion and \$6 billion annually. Hundreds of millions is literally considered a rounding error there. But this is no rounding error to U.S. taxpayers. It is \$179 million.

We carry 22 percent of that budget over there. China carries less than 3 percent. They should at least be asked to carry their 3 percent of the costs going forward.

So let's take this step. Let's ask for the money back that they have told us at the U.N. that we have overpaid, and let's put it into Treasury at a time when we are running a \$1.5 trillion budget deficit.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 45 seconds to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RIVERA).

Mr. RIVERA. I thank the chairman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of making it policy that the U.N. return the \$179 million. The U.S. is the United Nation's largest financial supporter. We pay most of the costs of U.N. peacekeeping operations, we pay for most of its security costs, and now the Obama administration refuses to let the United Nations pay us back.

Just one example: in 2005, then-U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan acknowledged the core failings of the U.N. Human Rights Council by stating that the countries who sought membership on the Human Rights Council did so not to strengthen human rights, but to protect themselves against criticism. This is still the case today as some of the world's worst terrorist regimes and enemies of freedom and individual liberty, including Cuba and China, hold powerful seats on the Human Rights Commission.

The U.N. needs to reform. It is time to end their dependency on the U.S. They should be an organization for peace, human rights, and freedom across the world.

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

Madam Speaker, let's go through some of the issues and sort of disaggregate all of this.

We have a bill that seeks to withhold funds unless the Secretary of State certifies she has gotten back \$179 million from the fund. The fund doesn't have \$179 million, because \$100 million has been designated to this perimeter security on FDR Drive at the request of the New York Police Department. Why did they do it that way? Because to do it now in the context of the overall U.N. reconstruction will save at least \$100 million over doing it when we finish appropriating.

Well, why didn't we do an appropriation? Well, if anyone has noticed, the Congress didn't exactly do appropriations this fiscal year. So we are left in a situation where the administration

makes a decision to designate \$100 million from the fund to do something that if they don't do it now will cost twice as much to do it later through the appropriations process and to take the rest of that fund and offset it against our fiscal year 2012 dues.

But the strangest part of this bill, in addition to all the arguments that have been made, it seeks to withhold the payment of dues that the CBO says will have already been paid and there will be nothing to withhold. Fiscal year 2011 dues will be paid before this bill is ever law. You can ask the Secretary and require the Secretary to withhold a certain amount of dues, but once you have paid it all, there is nothing to withhold.

It is really a poorly crafted bill, not contemporaneous with the situation that exists now that seeks to jeopardize an important security project and start us going down the road towards simply trying to not pay; but it won't even work to not pay the dues that we owe through our assessed contributions.

I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Only in Washington can we have the debate over how desperately New York and the U.N. needs \$100 million, while simultaneously arguing that not giving that money to the U.N. would not result in any savings for the U.S. taxpayer. If money is vital in one account, how can it be worthless in another?

The truth is that CBO is restrained in its analysis; and because of those rules it is forced to observe, it reached the conclusion that having the U.N. repay the U.S. \$179 million would have no impact on our balance book. How can getting \$179 million from the U.N. not be counted as savings? Does any person who has ever balanced a checkbook believe this to be true? Of course not.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, the legislation introduced by House Republicans to return \$179 million from the United Nations Tax Equalization Fund, TEF, is both factually inaccurate and diverts Congress' attention from far more pressing national security considerations facing the 112th Congress, such as Afghanistan.

The bill incorrectly states that there is \$179 million in the TEF to date, when in fact there is \$79 million. The legislation fails to take into account the \$100 million that United States has already committed to support critical security upgrades at the U.N. Headquarters, as requested by the City of New York. Forcefully transferring \$179 million to Treasury—as this bill dictates—would make it impossible for the U.S. to follow through on our commitment to fund necessary security enhancements that we as the host nation are responsible for, not to mention place U.N. personnel at risk.

At a time when U.S. taxpayers are spending a staggering \$100 billion per year in Afghani-

stan, it seems odd that the Republicans would choose this as a top priority.

I do not support this bill and urge my colleagues to vote against it. I also urge my Republican colleagues to follow through on their number 1 campaign promise and focus on creating jobs and growing our economy—something they have yet to do in any meaningful way since assuming control of the House.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today I will vote against H.R. 519. This bill would direct the United Nations to return \$180 million of previously allocated credits to the United States.

U.S. citizens who work at the U.N. pay taxes on their salaries—unlike other nations. To offset this difference in pay and put American employees on an equal level with their foreign counterparts, we pay money into the United Nations Tax Equalization Fund. Over the years, the U.S. has overpaid by \$180 million in credits. Since the TEF funds are in the form of credits, not cash, they cannot simply be refunded as H.R. 519 proposes.

As a result, the State Department—in consultation with both Democratic and Republican members of Congress—has offset future appropriations by shifting the funds towards areas of spending that ought to be a high priority for everyone: American security and peace keeping operations abroad. \$100 million will be directed towards enhanced security at the U.N. Headquarters in New York to better protect the men and women who work there. The remaining \$80 million will reduce future spending on U.S. peacekeeping dues, a policy supported by the current and previous administrations.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) states that this bill will not save taxpayers one dime. The money has long been allocated for other purposes and should not be taken away. In this protracted recession, Congress should spend its time on legislation creating jobs and strengthening our economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 519.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1330

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 188, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 519, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

JOHN M. ROLL UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 188) to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 98 West First Street, Yuma, Arizona, as the "John M. Roll United States Courthouse", 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 California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 429, nays 0, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—429

Ackerman	Castor (FL)	Fitzpatrick
Adams	Chabot	Flake
Aderholt	Chaffetz	Fleischmann
Akin	Chandler	Fleming
Alexander	Chu	Flores
Altmire	Cicilline	Forbes
Amash	Clarke (MI)	Fortenberry
Andrews	Clarke (NY)	Fox
Austria	Clay	Frank (MA)
Baca	Cleaver	Franks (AZ)
Bachmann	Clyburn	Frelinghuysen
Baldwin	Coble	Fudge
Barletta	Coffman (CO)	Galleghy
Barrow	Cohen	Garamendi
Bartlett	Cole	Gardner
Barton (TX)	Conaway	Garrett
Bass (CA)	Connolly (VA)	Gerlach
Bass (NH)	Conyers	Gibbs
Becerra	Cooper	Gibson
Benishek	Costa	Gingrey (GA)
Berg	Costello	Gohmert
Berkley	Courtney	Gonzalez
Berman	Cravaack	Goodlatte
Biggert	Crawford	Gosar
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Bishop (GA)	Critz	Granger
Bishop (NY)	Crowley	Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Black	Culberson	Green, Al
Blackburn	Cummings	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Griffin (AR)
Bonner	Davis (IL)	Griffith (VA)
Bono Mack	Davis (KY)	Grijalva
Boren	DeFazio	Grimm
Boswell	DeGette	Guinta
Boustany	DeLauro	Guthrie
Brady (PA)	Denham	Gutierrez
Brady (TX)	Dent	Hall
Braley (IA)	DesJarlais	Hanabusa
Brooks	Deutch	Hanna
Broun (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Harper
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Harris
Buchanan	Dingell	Hartzler
Bucshon	Doggett	Hastings (FL)
Buerkle	Dold	Hastings (WA)
Burgess	Donnelly (IN)	Hayworth
Burton (IN)	Doyle	Heck
Butterfield	Dreier	Heinrich
Calvert	Duffy	Heller
Camp	Duncan (SC)	Hensarling
Campbell	Duncan (TN)	Herger
Canseco	Edwards	Herrera Beutler
Cantor	Ellison	Higgins
Capito	Ellmers	Himes
Capps	Emerson	Hinchee
Capuano	Engel	Hinojosa
Cardoza	Eshoo	Hirono
Carnahan	Farenthold	Holden
Carney	Farr	Holt
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Honda
Carter	Filner	Hoyer
Cassidy	Fincher	Huelskamp

Huizenga (MI) Mica Sanchez, Loretta
 Hultgren Michael Sarbanes
 Hunter Miller (FL) Scalise
 Hurt Miller (MI) Schakowsky
 Inslee Miller (NC) Schiff
 Israel Miller, Gary Schilling
 Issa Miller, George Schmidt
 Jackson (IL) Moore Schock
 Jackson Lee Moran Schrader
 (TX) Mulvaney Schwartz
 Jenkins Murphy (CT) Schweikert
 Johnson (GA) Murphy (PA) Scott (SC)
 Johnson (IL) Myrick Scott (VA)
 Johnson (OH) Nadler Scott, Austin
 Johnson, E. B. Napolitano Scott, David
 Johnson, Sam Neal Sensenbrenner
 Jones Neugebauer Serrano
 Jordan Noem Sessions
 Kaptur Nugent Sewell
 Keating Nunes Sherman
 Kelly Nunnelee Shimkus
 Kildee Olson Shuler
 Kind Olver Shuster
 King (IA) Owens Simpson
 King (NY) Palazzo Sires
 Kingston Pallone Slaughter
 Kinzinger (IL) Pascarell Smith (NE)
 Kissell Pastor (AZ) Smith (NJ)
 Kline Paul Smith (TX)
 Kucinich Paulsen Smith (WA)
 Labrador Payne Southerland
 Lamborn Pearce Speier
 Lance Pelosi Stark
 Landry Pence Stearns
 Langevin Perlmutter Stivers
 Lankford Peters Stutzman
 Larsen (WA) Peterson Sullivan
 Larson (CT) Petri Sutton
 Latham Pingree (ME) Terry
 LaTourette Pitts Thompson (CA)
 Latta Platts Thompson (MS)
 Lee (CA) Poe (TX) Thompson (PA)
 Lee (NY) Polis Thornberry
 Levin Pompeo Tiberi
 Lewis (CA) Posey Tierney
 Lewis (GA) Price (GA) Tipton
 Lipinski Price (NC) Tonko
 LoBiondo Quayle Towns
 Loeb sack Quigley Tsongas
 Lofgren, Zoe Rahall Turner
 Long Rangel Upton
 Lowey Reed Van Hollen
 Lucas Rehberg Velázquez
 Luetkemeyer Reichert Vislosky
 Luján Renacci Walberg
 Lummis Reyes Walden
 Lungren, Daniel Ribble Walsh (IL)
 E. Richardson Walz (MN)
 Lynch Richmond Wasserman
 Mack Rigell Schultz
 Maloney Rivera Waters
 Manzullo Roby Watt
 Marchant Roe (TN) Waxman
 Marino Rogers (AL) Webster
 Markey Rogers (KY) Weiner
 Matheson Rogers (MI) Welch
 Matsui Rohrabacher West
 McCarthy (NY) Rokita Westmoreland
 McCaul Rooney Whitfield
 McClintock Ros-Lehtinen Wilson (FL)
 McCollum Roskam Wilson (SC)
 McCotter Ross (AR) Wittman
 McDermott Ross (FL) Chandler
 McGovern Rothman (NJ) Wolf
 McHenry Roybal-Allard Womack
 McIntyre Royce Woodall
 McKeon Runyan Woolsey
 McKinley Ruppertsberger Wu
 McMorris Rush Yarmuth
 Rodgers Ryan (OH) Yoder
 McNerney Ryan (WI) Young (AK)
 Meehan Sánchez, Linda Young (FL)
 Meeks T. Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Bachus Giffords
 Bilbray Harman McCarthy (CA)

□ 1355

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED NATIONS TAX EQUALIZATION REFUND ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 519) to secure the return to the United States the \$179 million overpaid into the United Nations Tax Equalization Fund as of December 31, 2009, and for other purposes, 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 gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 259, nays 169, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]
 YEAS—259

Adams Fincher LaTourette
 Aderholt Fitzpatrick Latta
 Akin Flake Lee (NY)
 Alexander Fleischmann Lewis (CA)
 Altmire Fleming LoBiondo
 Amash Flores Long
 Austria Forbes Lucas
 Bachmann Fortenberry Luetkemeyer
 Barletta Foxx Lummis
 Bartlett Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel
 Barton (TX) Frelinghuysen E.
 Bass (NH) Gallegly Mack
 Benishek Gardner Manzullo
 Berg Garret Marchant
 Biggert Gerlach Marino
 Bilirakis Gibbs Matheson
 Bishop (UT) Gibson McCarthy (CA)
 Black Gingrey (GA) McCaul
 Blackburn Goodlatte McClintock
 Bonner Gosar McCotter
 Bono Mack Gowdy McHenry
 Boren Granger McIntyre
 Boustany Graves (GA) McKeon
 Brady (TX) Graves (MO) McKinley
 Brooks Green, Gene McMorris
 Broun (GA) Griffin (AR) Rodgers
 Buchanan Griffith (VA) Meehan
 Buchson Guinta Mica
 Buerkle Guthrie Miller (FL)
 Burgess Hall Miller (MI)
 Burton (IN) Hanna Miller, Gary
 Calvert Harper Mulvaney
 Camp Harris Murphy (PA)
 Campbell Hartzler Myrick
 Canseco Hastings (WA) Neugebauer
 Cantor Hayworth Noem
 Capito Heck Nugent
 Carney Heinrich Nunes
 Carter Heller Nunnelee
 Cassidy Hensarling Olson
 Chabot Herger Palazzo
 Chaffetz Herrera Beutler Paul
 Chandler Himes Paulsen
 Coble Holden Pearce
 Coffman (CO) Huelskamp Pence
 Cole Huizenga (MI) Peters
 Conaway Hultgren Peterson
 Cooper Hunter Petri
 Costello Hurt Pitts
 Cravaack Issa Platts
 Crawford Jenkins Poe (TX)
 Crenshaw Johnson (IL) Pompeo
 Critz Johnson (OH) Posey
 Culberson Johnson, Sam Price (GA)
 Davis (KY) Jones Quayle
 DeFazio Jordan Reed
 Denham Kelly Rehberg
 Dent King (IA) Reichert
 DesJarlais Kingston Renacci
 Diaz-Balart Kinzinger (IL) Ribble
 Dold Kissell Rigell
 Donnelly (IN) Kline Rivera
 Dreier Labrador Roby
 Duffy Lamborn Roe (TN)
 Duncan (SC) Lance Rogers (AL)
 Duncan (TN) Landry Rogers (KY)
 Ellmers Lankford Rogers (MI)
 Emerson Larsen (WA) Rohrabacher
 Farenthold Latham Rokita

Rooney Shimkus Upton
 Ros-Lehtinen Roskam Walberg
 Roskam Shuler Walden
 Shuster Shuster Walsh (IL)
 Ross (AR) Simpson Webster
 Ross (FL) Smith (NE) Welch
 Royce Smith (NJ) West
 Runyan Smith (TX) Westmoreland
 Ryan (WI) Southerland Whitfield
 Scalise Stearns Wilson (SC)
 Schilling Stivers Wittman
 Schmidt Stutzman Wolf
 Schock Sullivan Womack
 Schrader Terry Woodall
 Schweikert Thompson (PA) Yoder
 Scott (SC) Thornberry Young (AK)
 Scott, Austin Tiberi Young (FL)
 Sensenbrenner Tipton Young (IN)
 Sessions Turner

NAYS—169

Ackerman Green, Al Pastor (AZ)
 Andrews Grijalva Payne
 Baca Grimm Pelosi
 Baldwin Gutierrez Perlmutter
 Barrow Hanabusa Pingree (ME)
 Bass (CA) Hastings (FL) Polis
 Becerra Higgins Price (NC)
 Berkley Hinchey Quigley
 Berman Hinojosa Rahall
 Bishop (NY) Hirono Rangel
 Bishop (GA) Holt Reyes
 Blumenauer Honda Richardson
 Boswell Hoyer Richmond
 Brady (PA) Inslee Rothman (NJ)
 Braley (IA) Israel Roybal-Allard
 Brown (FL) Jackson (IL) Ruppertsberger
 Butterfield Jackson Lee Rush
 Capps (TX) Johnson (GA) Ryan (OH)
 Capuano Johnson (GA) Sánchez, Linda
 Cardoza Johnson, E. B. T.
 Carnahan Kaptur Sanchez, Loretta
 Carson (IN) Keating Sarbanes
 Castor (FL) Kildee Schakowsky
 Chu King (NY) Kind
 Cicilline Clarke (MI) King (NY) Schiff
 Kucinich Langevin Kucinich Schwartz
 Clarke (NY) Larson (CT) Scott (VA)
 Clay Lee (CA) Scott, David
 Cleaver Levin Serrano
 Clyburn Cohen Sewell
 Cohen Lipinski Sherman
 Connolly (VA) Loeb sack Sires
 Conyers Lofgren, Zoe Slaughter
 Costa Lowey Smith (WA)
 Courtney Luján Speier
 Crowley Lynch Stark
 Cuellar Maloney Sutton
 Cummings Markey Thompson (CA)
 Davis (CA) Matsui Thompson (MS)
 Davis (IL) McCarthy (NY) Tierney
 DeGette McCollum Tonko
 DeLauro McDermott Towns
 Deutch McGovern Tsongas
 Dicks McNeerney Van Hollen
 Dingell Meeks Velázquez
 Doggett Michaud Velosky
 Doyle Miller (NC) Walz (MN)
 Edwards Miller, George Wasserman
 Ellison Moore Schultz
 Engel Moran
 Eshoo Murphy (CT) Waters
 Farr Nadler Watt
 Fattah Napolitano Waxman
 Filner Neal Weiner
 Frank (MA) Olver Wilson (FL)
 Fudge Owens Woolsey
 Garamendi Pallone Wu
 Gonzalez Pascrell Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Bachus Giffords Harman
 Bilbray Gohmert Lewis (GA)

□ 1404

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, on February 9, 2011, I missed rollcall votes Nos. 27 and 28 due to the funeral of a very close friend in Athens, Georgia. Had I been present, I would

have voted "yea" on No. 27 and "yea" on No. 28.

ELECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 78

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Woodall.

(2) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Hultgren, Mr. Cravaack, Mr. Bucshon, and Mr. Benishek.

Mr. HENSARLING (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 536

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following cosponsors be removed from the permanent record as cosponsors of H.R. 536: JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina 3; VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina 5; ADRIAN SMITH, Nebraska 3.

These Members intended to cosponsor my legislation, H.R. 455, the 10th Amendment Regulatory Reform Act. A clerical error led to their names being added as original cosponsors of this legislation. These Members never agreed to cosponsor H.R. 536, and I ask that the record reflect that they were never cosponsors of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the cosponsors will be removed.

There was no objection.

THE HOUSTON DYNAMO'S NEW STADIUM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me say, Madam Speaker, that on many occasions, we come to speak of the needs of our constituents, and sometimes we come to celebrate. And I'm delighted to rise to celebrate the groundbreaking for our very favorite Houston soccer team, Houston Dynamo, that has broken ground for a 22,000-seat stadium in the 18th Congressional District, serving all of Texas.

I am congratulating them for many reasons. First of all, for the outstanding team wins that they have had but also because of the community outreach and the inspiration that they have provided. I am delighted to have been with the mayor of the City of Houston, the county judge, and elected officials celebrating the fact that we are creating \$100 million in economic opportunity, creating jobs, and also joining in partnership with the historically black college Texas Southern University, where they will be playing their football games. They are the 2010 SWAC winners. So congratulations to the Houston Dynamo.

And we are excited to have one of our champs in our community, Mr. De La Hoya, who will also be bringing boxing programs into the stadium.

It's a family event. We love soccer. It's a growing, growing sport in this country. And maybe Texas—even though it may not be at that stadium—will get the World Cup. But I am congratulating our local community. I was very glad to be a part of it in early support of this stadium and working with Mr. Oliver Luck.

I congratulate all of the present leadership. We in the Federal Government will work with them to continue to build jobs and to provide an economic engine for our community.

Again, congratulations to the Houston Dynamo.

□ 1410

OUR BORDER SECURITY PLAN IS NOT WORKING

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Christmas is supposed to be the happiest time of the year, especially for children. But it wasn't for an 8-year-old girl who was raped by an outlaw in her own home. Her rapist was Salvador Portillo-Saravia, a known criminal who was illegally living in the United States.

In 2003, Portillo-Saravia was an MS-13 gang member. He was arrested and deported back to El Salvador. But since we have open borders, the child rapist was able to come back into the United States very easily and unnoticed.

In November of 2010 he was arrested for public intoxication in Virginia, but rather than be held in jail and deported, he was released back into the streets of America because his illegal status was not discovered by a computer system. One month later, Salvador Portillo-Saravia raped an innocent 8-year-old girl. This disgusting crime would have been prevented if we really secured our borders, we deported criminal aliens and then kept them from returning to the United States.

Tell the parents of this 8-year-old girl that our border security plan is working.

And that's just the way it is.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss what's on every American's mind, and that is a job. My own family, they're thinking constantly about will they be able to keep their job, what's going to happen in the school system, are there going to be layoffs?

I know that in the communities I represent that have very high unemployment, on the minds of every family is, will there be a job for me?

Over the last more than 2½ years now, the Democratic majority, and now the Democratic minority, has focused on this issue. Like a laser, our focus was on creating jobs in America. Immediately upon taking office in 2009, President Obama and the Democratic majority here in this House put forward the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. That law created, by most every economist's estimate, more than 2 million jobs, or maintained more than 2 million jobs in America. It was an enormous boost to the American economy. That, together with other programs that were developed during that period of 2009, stabilized the American economy. It certainly didn't get us out of the recession, but it prevented the great depression that could have occurred.

We're now, this year, in 2011, once again focusing, like a laser, on creating jobs in America. It's the President's intent. He spoke to this issue here when he spoke to us at the State of the Union. He was across the street from the White House just 2 days ago talking to the Chamber of Commerce about this issue of creating jobs, jobs in America. And this is where we're coming from. If America's going to make it, we're going to have to make it in America. Great examples of this are once again being seen. I see that my colleague from Detroit is here, and if he would care to join us in a few moments, we'll be talking about a very unique advertisement that occurred at the Super Bowl, one in which Imported from Detroit is now the message across America. It's not that Chrysler disappeared; it's actually that Chrysler continues to exist, along with General Motors, because the Obama administration and the Democrats here in the Congress reached out and gave a boost up for those two great American corporations. And today they continue, they continue to produce jobs in America because they are making cars in America. So our theme is Make It in America. There's a whole series of policies that are encompassed in this schematic of Make It in America, so that America can make it.

Trade policies. We're all for trade. We think it's an extremely important element in growing jobs and growing the economy. But it has to be fair trade. And when we look to countries such as China, we question whether indeed it is fair trade.

The Democrats in this House last year—and we will try once again this year to pass a currency reform piece of legislation that would force the Department of Commerce to take into account the unfair currency manipulation that China is engaged in. Economists estimate that it's perhaps 40 percent undervalued. Who can compete against that? Not very many. And therefore, we see goods flowing into America and America cash flowing into China.

Tax policy, extremely important. Last year, without the help of any of our Republican colleagues, we passed legislation that became law that ended a \$12 billion a year tax break for American corporations that are shipping jobs offshore. What was that all about? You mean to tell me that American corporations actually got a reduction in their taxes when they shipped jobs offshore? Yes, they did. But not anymore, because of the Democratic determination to keep jobs in America.

Energy policy, labor policy, education policy, intellectual property, infrastructure. All of these elements, all seven of these elements, are key ingredients in creating jobs in America.

You can hear some people say, well, it's all about the private sector; just let the private sector go and there will be plenty of jobs. It doesn't happen, never happened. You can go back into the history of this Nation, and it's always been solid, good public policy connected to the private sector that created the great surges in the American economy.

Take, for example, the railroads in America in the 19th century. In the mid-1800s, during the great Civil War, a bill was passed here in Congress signed by President Abraham Lincoln that did two things. That piece of legislation created the intercontinental rail system by giving government land to the rail companies so that they would be encouraged to build those intercontinental railroads.

The second bill that was passed created the research, and that's the intellectual side of this, and that's the land grant institutions. We must continue that long history of America, private sector working in concert with public policy to create jobs in America. And that's what we want to do with our Make It in America program that creates strong middle class jobs.

I'd like now to turn to my colleague from the great state of Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR. If you would join us and tell us what's happening in the great industrial belt of America that we intend to rebuild.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman GARAMENDI, I want to thank you for your leadership. You are such an addi-

tion to this Congress. The people of California certainly made the right decision in sending you here.

And you know, this happens to be the week of the Super Bowl. And as we think about America as a super Nation, with made in America at the heart of our economic prowess, the big winner in the Super Bowl this year was actually the commercial by Chrysler Corporation for its innovative 2-minute spot featuring the Chrysler 200, to the soundtrack of Detroit and rap artist Eminem. The commercial is really a celebration of the greatness of Detroit and the resilience of this incredible, incredible city.

□ 1420

Mr. GARAMENDI. If you would be so kind as to yield. I notice that Representative CLARKE just arrived, new to Congress, not new to Detroit. And what's going on in Detroit? Should I import my car from Tokyo or from Detroit?

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Absolutely not from Tokyo, definitely from Detroit. I want to thank you so much, Representative GARAMENDI, for making it a priority that we make it in America.

Yesterday I did talk about the great TV ad that was aired during the Super Bowl where the rapper Eminem highlighted the grittiness and ingenuity of Detroiters that have given us the ability to make some of the finest vehicles in the world. And I also mentioned how that spirit of Detroit is really rooted in American values, those values that cherish our God-given rights, to life, to liberty, to the pursuit of happiness.

I'm not just bringing these up as a constitutional exercise or as a discussion of American history. If you don't mind, I would like to share with you; this is really about my dad. My dad would be 100 years old if he were living today.

Back during the 1930s, during the Great Depression, he risked everything to emigrate to the U.S. from India. He risked everything to come over here, and he was attracted to Detroit so he could get a chance to build cars in the Ford foundry.

The heart that he brought to his job was the same heart that transformed the city of Detroit into the arsenal of democracy that helped save this country and save this world from fascism. And as I mentioned, it's that same heart that I believe will restore financial prosperity to our country and financial security to American families if we make it in America, because we've got the insight, we've got the hard work, we have the research and the capability to build those cars that are going to be powered by electricity, to help build those homes and those buildings that will be heated by the sun, and to manufacture the best products in the world that will provide economic stability to our country but also provide prosperity to the world.

There are many people here watching us whose family came here to this

country because they had a dream. There are others, like my mother's people, who came to this country against their will. But either way, when you come to America, you have the right to have an opportunity to pursue happiness, whether it's happiness of having the peace of mind of being comfortable here or enjoying the excitement of pursuing your own personal ambition.

The pursuit of happiness in this country means that all of us have the opportunity to live our life as full as we choose it. And, you see, that opportunity to really use our intellect, our mind, our body and our spirit, that's what makes American manufacturing the most extraordinary achievement of modern civilization, because American manufacturing is not just about cheapening costs or taking someone's technology. It's about harnessing the genius that's within all of us. It's about unleashing the ingenuity that's inherent in humankind.

So that's why I urge this Congress, when we consider these policies right here on the board, whether it's who to trade with, who to train, how to tax, that we do all of this to focus on making it in America. Because when we do that, we can truly have enduring prosperity for all Americans and American families, and right now, our families are feeling so insecure. The answer is in our roots. It's in American manufacturing.

When we make it in Detroit, we make it in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Representative CLARKE. Your passion for this issue was well displayed in that Detroit Chrysler advertisement.

And I would just point out, before I turn back to Ms. KAPTUR, that Chrysler and General Motors were saved as an American manufacturing icon by policies of President Barack Obama. It was his policies, supported by the Democrats in the House and the Senate, that allowed for the support that those two corporations needed to reinvent themselves so that there could be jobs in America.

Now, Ms. KAPTUR, you come from an area where manufacturing has been, really, the essence of the economy for a long time, and you have been supporting legislation and introducing legislation. Could you share with us those things that you are working on now and the legislation that you are pushing through this House?

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes.

First of all, let me just say, Congressman GARAMENDI, it is such a joy to have Congressman CLARKE here from the wonderful city of Detroit. I really loved that commercial because I think it captured the struggle of our country through the lens of Detroit and, I might say, Toledo, just a few minutes south of Detroit. It talked about how the city had been to hell and back, and the trials and tribulations that manufacturing in our region has really experienced over the last quarter century.

There is, without a doubt, as Congressman CLARKE says, that Detroit was the arsenal of democracy, and it still is. All along I-75, from Detroit down through Toledo, that as you take it down through Ohio and into the areas south, the automobiles, the tanks, all of our overland vehicles, the expeditionary fighting vehicle for the Marine Corps, all of that, the Warren Tank Command, is all along that region.

In Toledo, I have to brag a little bit, my hometown, that toddlin' town, still is, for all intents and purposes, home to the Jeep, the general purpose vehicle for which General Marshall ordered production for our troops in the European and Pacific theaters and we won the war. Rosie the Riveter, she had presence in Toledo, Ohio, at places like Champion Spark Plug where our mom worked, or at then Kaiser Jeep Corporation from which our father retired.

One of the most important challenges we have in this Congress is to have patriotic capitalism, to reward investment in America through our tax code. Not to let outsourcing win, but to let insourcing win, in the way we look at the books here at the national level.

In addition to that, I have a bill to renegotiate NAFTA; because back in 1993, NAFTA gave the green light to globalization and outsourcing, and every other trade agreement that has come down the pike has outsourced more jobs than insourced jobs for us. We got away from making it in America, and in sector after sector, closed markets in Japan, in China, in South Korea snuffed out production here as their production grew. But it has reached a breaking point. It has reached a breaking point in our country.

We have had to, through defense legislation we passed, saved the strategic metals industry, beryllium, titanium, magnesium, all of these important metals, both in defense as well as in the commercial industrial sector we could lose to other places. Our ability to do machine tooling, that was one of the first fights I had in here in the President's investment tax credit for investment in the United States to save the tooling, which is located within 300 miles of Detroit and Toledo. That's what America has. Is it any wonder that unemployment is 9 percent when you have these wacko trade deals that outsource more jobs?

The one bill I haven't mentioned, which is short-term, but we have so many people who are long-term unemployed.

This morning I asked Chairman Bernanke from the Federal Reserve, what do we do with people that want to work in Detroit, in Toledo, in places across this country? And he basically answered the question. I said, "Please give us your suggestions." And he said, "Well, you know, we ought to tie unemployment compensation to somehow job training so people can be retooled back into the workforce in a very pro-

ductive way, because I think we could lose the value of the work ethic itself."

So the issue of training, the issue of education is a very important one, Congressman GARAMENDI, that you have well outlined there.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might interrupt for just a second and pick up on that subject of education. We are now, in this Chamber on this floor in Congress and the Senate, engaging in a debate about how the Federal Government can support these critical educational investments. The proposal that we anticipate being made tomorrow by our Republican colleagues would significantly reduce the funding for the workforce investment boards across the Nation. These are local organizations put together in counties and cities to support reeducating workers who have been laid off from jobs that have gone offshore. Those educational programs, career educational, vocational education programs are crucial to upgrade the skills of our current workforce and the workforce of tomorrow.

So as we go through this debate about deficits versus taxes versus cuts, we need to keep in mind the critical investments that are made every year, and have been for decades, by the Federal Government to support things like education.

□ 1430

Without education, which is the most crucial of all investments, this Nation cannot compete. So the point you brought up, Ms. KAPTUR, is so critically important that the reeducation, the upgrading of skills and the support, I would add, from the Federal Government is going to be debated here.

So watch carefully, America. Watch carefully what is happening here in Congress, and make sure that you participate in this debate. It is not just about balancing the budget; it is about giving Americans the opportunity to get a job, in this case education.

Thank you for allowing me to interrupt.

Ms. KAPTUR. Oh, it is my privilege. I wanted to reinforce what you were saying about education and the Workforce Investment Act. In the counties that I represent, whether it is the Source in Lucas County or One Shop Stopping in Ottawa County, every single county has workforce investment boards that try to connect to our community colleges and institutions beyond high school in order to help people transition into education, as well as those who fall out of the workforce and have to retool.

I was shocked to hear today that on the other side of the aisle, they can't bring up a bill to extend trade adjustment assistance to workers who have been booted out of their jobs because their companies moved to Mexico or to Korea or to China and workers are thrown out of work. That program expires February 13, and they were not able to bring up a bill to extend that

for the millions of people across our country who have lost their jobs in manufacturing because they moved abroad. I just think that that is simply unconscionable.

I say to the gentleman that the important issue of linking our community colleges, our apprenticeship programs, our university programs, our GED programs to help people move into, and, frankly, many of our small business programs, to help people move into the private sector is something that is so vitally needed and cannot be done in this economy in areas of high unemployment without the Federal Government partnering with them.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I know that you have spent much time on energy policy issues. It is a critical issue for the Nation's security. It is an issue that really speaks not only to climate change, which some people believe isn't real, but I happen to think it is a fundamental problem facing us and future generations.

But even if you are not into climate change, you have to be aware that we have a very serious energy security issue in the United States, one that really puts our Nation at risk. At any moment we could see the shutdown of the flow of oil from one or another part of the world and, bam, we have got a crisis in America.

We also know that we are shipping off to countries, many of whom are not our friends, \$1 billion a day; \$1 billion a day of hard-earned American money is flowing offshore as oil from the petro-dictators of the world flows into our country.

So the American energy policy is of profound importance; and all across this Nation, and you have spoken to this also in the past, all across this Nation people are saying, we need an American energy policy that brings our energy sources onshore and gives us the opportunity to capture the green technologies of the future. Solar, solar-wind, solar-photovoltaic, solar-thermal systems, nuclear, all of these potential energy sources, biofuels, are out there in the future for us if we aggressively put in place the public policies that support the creation of these new technologies and the production of those machines, of those solar systems, of those wind turbines, of those advanced biofuels, produce them, manufacture them in America.

Now, I think you were telling me that in your area there is an effort to build some of these pieces of equipment. Could you share with us what is happening in Ohio?

Ms. KAPTUR. For 25 years we have been trying to give birth to the solar sector, and the Toledo region, northern Ohio, is home to one of the three solar platforms on the continent.

People go, well, but you don't live in California. I said, no, but I historically represent the glass industry, which advanced into the photovoltaic industry. So the hottest act on Wall Street a couple of years ago was First Solar. A

company called Xunlight is about to send out its first shipment to Italy this spring. We have other companies, like Kelsey-Hayes, that are in the process of bringing up their factory floors. There is Nextronics, one of the solar inverter companies that is hiring and looking for financing to expand their operation. There are many companies that didn't exist 25 years ago when we started. So I actually have seen what is happening.

But my fear, my fear is that the intellectual property will be stolen; that it will be no different than the automotive industry; that you can't staple it down; that we have to have a balanced trade policy and very tough intellectual property protections. I see your intellectual property proposal up there. I completely agree with that, because if they take our property, our intellectual property, we lose our ability to continue to manufacture and be suppliers globally.

So I wanted to say, Congressman GARAMENDI, you referenced oil. People say, well, why should we incentivize solar and hydrogen and biofuels and all these sectors, as if we weren't subsidizing the petroleum industry by allowing them to book their royalties or not book their royalties and be charged taxes, as though our entire military establishment wasn't deployed around the globe in order to protect those sea lanes so that petroleum can get in here for refining.

We have to realize we are already subsidizing a sector that is going to be more diminished as this 21st century moves forward. So either you live in the shell of the past, or you break out of it and create a whole new independent America, again, from an energy standpoint; and that is why we need to move.

Mr. GARAMENDI. But let me just add a couple of things. You hit one of my hot buttons there. I am on the House Armed Services Committee, and I asked, how much money do we spend protecting the flow of oil? Well, the Department of Defense didn't come up with an answer, but Rand Corporation, one of the consulting firms, said, I think we can do that.

They came back with a number that is about 15 percent of the total defense budget. So we are talking over \$100 billion a year to protect the flow of oil. That is in addition to the \$1 billion a day, which is almost what, \$365 billion, that we are also sending overseas. So we are looking at somewhere near half a trillion dollars a year because we are, as you said, stuck in the last two centuries' energy policy.

Now, here in this Chamber just a couple of weeks ago standing behind me was the President of the United States; and when he said we should end the subsidies we are giving to oil companies and transfer those subsidies to the energy of the future, the green technologies, I stood up and cheered. My friend, I guess it was my date for the night, is that the word, my date for the

night, a good Republican, kind of stood up and clapped his hands, because he is a moderate Republican.

But, nonetheless, it is really true. It is billions and billions of dollars a year that we are subsidizing a very successful industry. We don't need to do that. They don't need our subsidy. They are the richest industry in the world. Fine, end the subsidies, bring that money back and put it into the green energy so that in your area your solar voltaic manufacturers will have the opportunity.

I am going to add just one thing here and keep this microphone for a second. At this moment, tomorrow the House Republicans will put forth their budget which calls for, we anticipate, I hope I am wrong, I will be happy to apologize tomorrow if I am wrong, but it is anticipated that their proposal will terminate many of the tax breaks that are given to encourage solar, wind, photovoltaic, advanced biofuels, all of those new green energy technologies. I hope I am wrong. I really hope I am wrong, because how else can we build our future energy security unless we create the new energy sources? And if we fail, those jobs will be created overseas and we will import.

□ 1440

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman be kind enough to yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. You know, there are some people that live in the past and there are others that are involved in inventing the future. And when you have the major trade deficit category "imported petroleum," and you have marines and soldiers dying all over the world to protect that, pretty soon you begin to think, You know what? This picture has to change.

Every time our country's gas prices go up over \$4 a gallon, we go into deep, deep recession. We are trying to crawl out of one just now. And in 2007–2008, gas prices went over \$4 a gallon. People forget that. The mortgage foreclosure crisis followed that. But the point was it happened to us again. How many times do our people have to suffer before we realize the source of the problem?

And I had a great experience. I had to go back to the University of Wisconsin, my alma mater, and I gave a commencement address a few weeks ago. It was not a bad speech. It was a pretty good speech. But one of the lines I used was: And America just simply must grasp the future and restore our energy independence. That was the loudest applause I got in this massive audience. And I thought, The American people know it. They know it. We have to do it. We have to make it happen.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The people of America understand that our future lies in a secure energy source.

I'm carrying two bills this year that I actually introduced last year.

I'm going to say good-bye to my good friend from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). Thank you so very much for joining us.

I introduced two bills last year that deal with this issue. Our tax money has, in the past, been used to buy photovoltaic cell systems for houses and businesses, wind turbines, and other green energy equipment that is manufactured offshore so that our tax money is actually used to subsidize businesses and manufacturing that is in other parts of the world. And I'm going, What sense is that? Let's use our tax money to help American businesses who manufacture wind turbines here in America.

In my own district we have two major wind farms, huge operations, producing enormous amounts of power. However, many of those turbines in recent years—and great steel towers, 400 feet high—are made overseas. And yet our tax money subsidizes the importation of the steel towers, the importation of the turbines, and all of the equipment that goes with it. And I say, Time out. Time out. This makes no sense at all.

So, one of the bills that I've introduced simply says that if you want to take advantage of a Federal tax subsidy—which I hope will continue in the future—to put a photovoltaic system on your roof, to install a wind turbine, to do advanced biofuels, or to build a solar thermal system out in the deserts in the West, then it must be American-made equipment. No more buying offshore equipment using our tax dollars. Now, you want to use your own money? I don't care where you get that photovoltaic system or that wind turbine. But if you're using American tax dollars, it must be made in America.

The other piece of legislation is similar. In my own district, one of the transit districts that buys buses and moves people around decided that they needed new buses. Well and good. They're using the local tax dollars. They're using some Federal tax dollars from the gasoline and diesel tax, excise tax that all of us pay when we buy a gallon of gas. It's 18.4 cents. If you're buying diesel, it's 24.4 cents for every gallon you buy. Much of that money goes into building and maintaining our roads. Good. About \$3 billion of it a year goes into buying buses and trains and supporting public transportation. Good.

I asked him, Where's the bus being made? Oh, we got a wonderful bus built in Belgium. And I go, No. Don't you understand that in the San Francisco Bay area, one of the very few bus manufacturing areas left in your own area, people who commute on your buses work in that factory, and you're buying a bus from Belgium rather than buying a locally made bus that is just as good?

They said, Well, we like the size of the back window.

There ought to be a law. There ought to be a law that if it's our tax dollars that are being used to buy equipment—buses, trains, planes, whatever—it must be made in America. After all, how can we create and reestablish the great manufacturing sector of America if we simply export our dollars and get

a bus—good bus, no doubt about it, has a nice back window—but it's not made in America?

I am very thankful that this Congress, in passing the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, known as the stimulus bill, put in a provision concerning high-speed rail. Since 1988, when I was in the California Legislature, and together with my colleague here, JIM COSTA, we offered legislation then that established the High-Speed Rail Commission in California. We're patient people. It was 23 years ago. But in the Recovery Act there's money for high-speed rail and a provision that says that this money can only be spent on equipment manufactured in America. Good. Wonderful. That's the kind of law we need. We need to support American manufacturers.

Now, they don't build high-speed rail systems in America. They're built in China. They're built in Japan. They're built in the European countries. Good for them. But if they want part of this action, if they want to build the train sets or other pieces of the equipment, then establish your manufacturing plant in America. Come to America.

And I'll note—and I've seen it in the full-page advertisements in Roll Call and Politico—some of these companies are advertising. We'll make it in America. Excellent. Here's where public policy intersects with the private sector to create good middle class manufacturing jobs in America. It's the public policy that sets the stage. Let the businesses go out and build it; but remember, it's public policy.

I'm looking for one of my friends who's supposed to join us here from Iowa, and he may show up, but I want to go back through this again. These are critical public policies that affect the manufacturing sector in America. Trade policies. Fair trade, free trade. There's a difference. It's easy to harm—and Ms. KAPTUR talked about this earlier—to harm American workers with trade policies that allow jobs to be shipped offshore without an opportunity for American manufacturers to participate here at home.

Also, this is an issue of currency policy. China. Many people, including me, believe—and economists believe—that China's currency is undervalued by as much as 40 percent. Who's going to be able to compete with China when that kind of currency policy is in place? So we passed a bill here—it didn't pass the Senate; it's being reintroduced and hopefully will go to the Senate and to the President—that forces the Department of Commerce to institute a tariff when these kinds of currency policies persist.

Taxes. We talked earlier about the tax policy of ending tax subsidies for American corporations that ship jobs offshore. That's done. In the tax bill of last year was another incentive for big businesses and small businesses to invest in capital equipment now. It's the law. Capital equipment purchased by a business this year and the last 3

months of 2010 can be written off against profits in the first year; that is, the year in which it is invested. An enormous encouragement to businesses in America to invest in American capital equipment that creates jobs down the way.

I just heard from some farmers in my district that they're out buying irrigation systems, replacing pumps, irrigation pipe, and other kinds of systems because they want to take advantage of that tax law. And so they are encouraging the production of those facilities. We just talked about energy policy at length here, and there's much more to discuss on energy.

The labor issues. We must have a well-educated labor force, and that ties into education. The most fundamental of all investments is education. If we don't have a well-educated workforce, one that's prepared to compete in every sector, this Nation will not be able to compete. So if we want to make it in America, we have got to make sure that our current labor force is trained and retrained to take the new jobs that are going to be created; and for tomorrow's labor force, the men and women that are in school today, that they have the very best education.

It's not happening. This is a great tragedy in America. We are not adequately educating our children. It is a very serious problem. It's pervasive. And in the discussions in this House, in the committees over the next month and a half, this issue is going to come back many, many times as the effort to cut the Federal budget in education goes forward.

I will add that, in the education sector, for those that are in higher education, a very, very important bill passed the Congress, again, without Republican support, signed into law by the President, that would end the subsidy given to private banks to run the student loan programs.

□ 1450

Those subsidies are over. The money is plowed back into the student loans, increasing the availability of student loans and decreasing the interest rates on student loans—a wise policy that creates a much more efficient Student Loan Program for kids that are in the higher education system.

Discussed by my colleague MARCY KAPTUR was intellectual property, which is critically important in California with the high-tech industries—the computer industry and the like.

Then this last one down here, infrastructure, is profoundly important. America moves on infrastructure. It moves on streets and highways, on rails and airlines, and in airports. All of those infrastructure systems are financed, in part, by local governments, by State governments, and by the Federal Government.

One of the very first actions taken in the new 112th Congress was a rule from the Rules Committee that would significantly reduce the availability of

money for infrastructure. Once again, as we begin to debate the expenditure, tax and deficit issue, this issue will come back.

So, for Americans, please listen. Listen to what is happening in Washington with regard to the budget issues.

It's not just cut and slash and burn. It's what is the money being used for. What are we using the money for? Are we using it to build our roads, to build our transportation, to build our infrastructure, our water systems, our levee protection/flood protection systems, or are we using it in some wasteful way?

If it's wasteful, don't do it. But if it's a critical investment, what happens if we don't make that investment? What happens if we don't educate our kids? What happens if we don't build the water system or the sanitation system? We have to think about what happens if we don't make these investments.

We also have to think about what happens when we invest over \$100 billion a year to fight a war in Afghanistan. Do you want to make a cut? I'll tell you where I'll cut. I'll cut right there. Over \$100 billion. What if we took that money, left some in Afghanistan for economic/social development, focused like a laser on the terrorist organizations—some there, some in Pakistan, some in Yemen, some in Somalia, and some in America—but got our military out of Afghanistan and brought that money home and invested in our own infrastructure.

Personally, for me, I live in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. We are dependent upon the levees for flood protection, so we go to the Army Corps of Engineers and say, We need to have these systems designed.

Well, we can't do it right now.

Why can't you do it right now?

We don't have the personnel.

Where are the personnel?

Well, they're building things in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Okay, life's about choices.

On this floor, this Congress is going to make some really serious choices in the weeks ahead. Those choices are going to be before us. As this issue of the deficit and as this issue of budget cuts come into focus, what will be cut?

Pay attention to this: When we do a tax policy that gives a \$750 billion tax break to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, don't come back to this floor and tell me that that's a good thing but a bad thing to educate our children. When we are on this floor and we want to spend \$100 billion or more fighting what will ultimately be an unsuccessful war in Afghanistan but then tell me that we cannot build our infrastructure to protect our people from floods or that we cannot build our transportation system, it's about choices.

It's about choices, and we're going to make those choices here on this floor.

Over the next several weeks and months ahead, I can guarantee you that the Democratic minority in this

House will be talking about this issue of Make It In America, because if America is going to make it, we have to once again make it in America. We have to make sure that General Motors and Ford—the great manufacturing sector of America—is strong and vibrant and that it has the support it needs, that it has the Federal policies in place that support those manufacturing jobs so that it no longer puts American manufacturing at a disadvantage.

So stay tuned. This is going to be a constant thematic that we will be carrying in the weeks ahead because we are determined that the Federal policies will support making it in America.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

Mr. BURGESS, Texas.

HONORING PRESIDENT RONALD WILSON REAGAN

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GALLEGGLY. 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 the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLEGGLY. Mr. Speaker, as the author of the legislation creating the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission, I was asked by the Reagan Foundation to host a Special Order this afternoon, and I am honored to have many of my colleagues here to join us on this floor today.

As a fellow Californian, I had the great privilege of spending some time with President Reagan in my early years here in Congress, and I can tell you that those times will be etched in my mind forever. Coincidentally, my own personal residence happens to be almost adjacent to the Ronald Reagan Library—in fact, only a few hundred yards away—in Simi Valley, California.

I simply can't say enough about how grateful I am for the opportunity to have known Ronald Reagan. I could go on for hours, but we have other Members to whom I want to yield this afternoon, Members from all across the country. So I will stand back and yield

to my colleagues, and then have enough time so maybe I can wrap it up.

At this point, I yield to my good friend STEVE STIVERS from the State of Ohio.

Mr. STIVERS. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in my office, I have a picture of President Ronald Reagan, with a quote from January 25, 1988. It reads: After all our hard-fought victories earned through the patience and courage of every citizen, we cannot—must not—turn back. We will finish our job. How could we do anything else? We are Americans.

These thought-provoking words from President Reagan still inspire us today. We are facing a number of challenges in our country: a tough economy, fierce competition for jobs from nations like India and China, and the fighting of two wars with determined enemies who are committed to destroying the American way of life.

□ 1500

President Reagan's words remind us that while we face difficult challenges, we must face them together, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans because we're all in this together.

His actions lived up to his own words. He rolled up his sleeves, worked with Members on both sides of the aisle, and provided leadership to move America forward.

Today, with a Republican House, a Democratic-led Senate and administration, we only need to look to President Reagan's work with Speaker Tip O'Neill on Social Security reform in 1983 to learn an important lesson. It shows us today that you can be successful in making a good faith effort to work together toward a common goal if you work together and don't lose sight of your core principles.

America is a shining city on a hill, and we will always be living President Reagan's legacy. You know, we need to honor his optimistic spirit by living and leading by his example.

I'd like to join my colleagues in honoring President Reagan on the 100th anniversary of his birth. He was truly one of our great Presidents, a man who understood what it meant to be an American leader.

Mr. GALLEGGLY. Thank you very much, STEVE. At this point I'd like to yield to the gentleman from California on the other side of the aisle, my good friend, JOHN GARAMENDI.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I was on my way out the door when I realized that this Special Order was going to be on President Reagan, and as I was walking out the door, I recalled a picture that's been on my family's wall for a long time. It was a picture of President Ronald Reagan. I'm kind of standing to one side, and he's bending over, and he's shaking the hand of my daughter. It was in the White House. This was in the 1980s when I was in the California legislature.

Embodied in that picture is so much the character of Ronald Reagan, the smile, the bright eyes, the enthusiasm, greeting a young girl. She was about 7 years old at the time, and you can just see that he wanted to spend that moment with her and to give to her his enthusiasm for life, his enthusiasm for America.

That picture has always been there, and every now and then some of my Democratic friends, including the President, see it; what's that doing in this house? And I say, that's a very special moment in the life of my daughter Christina. But that's the way Ronald Reagan was. I was in California when he became the President and actually came into the legislature the day he left office, and he set the stage in California for much of what is good there, and he certainly did that for America, also.

So I join with my colleagues on the Republican side and colleagues on the Democratic side to say a very special man, a very special man in the life of America and a very special man in my life and in my daughter's life. Thank you for the time.

Mr. GALLEGGLY. I thank JOHN very much. I'd just like to say, in listening to the gentleman from California, when we were working on this bill, it got a little complicated at the end, but you know what the simplest part of making this bill work was? I did not have one individual on either side of the aisle say, no, ELTON, I can't be a cosponsor. I don't think there's anytime in history that I've had as many people agree on—we can't get that many people to agree on what day of the week it is around here.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That's true.

Mr. GALLEGGLY. And it was very special to me to hear the comments from the folks on the other side of the aisle. While they may have disagreed with him on certain policy, I don't know that anyone disagreed on the man's integrity and his compassion for this country and how committed he was to make it a better place, and with that, he was able to get a lot of things done on the other side of the aisle that he wouldn't otherwise have been able to do. Thank you very much, JOHN.

At this time, I'd like to yield to my friend, the gentlelady from Kansas, LYNN JENKINS.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

“Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.” With those words, President Reagan felled not only a wall dividing a city but an ideology that divided the world. I carry a piece of that wall with me today, and though 20 years have passed, I am struck by the enormity of what this used to represent and the courage, conviction, and character of the man who stared down the Soviet empire and won.

President Reagan was not just “a,” he was “the” Great Communicator, but

it wasn't his style that made the difference. It was his content and corresponding action. Too often rhetoric is turned around in this town with little thought and even less action.

As we celebrate this 100th birthday of President Reagan, I desire that we can remember that not only did President Reagan inspire us with hope for a new morning in America, that he took real action that led a country waiting in gas lines, on the brink of nuclear war, and reminded us all that we truly are a shining city on the hill.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Thank you very much, LYNN.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, JEFF DUNCAN.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California for hosting us out there recently at the Reagan library. What an inspiration it was to be at the Reagan library and to understand what President Reagan did and the man, Ronald Reagan, did for liberty, not just in the United States but also around the world.

Today, I join my colleagues in honoring one of my true heroes, Ronald Reagan. It's fitting that we pay tribute to Reagan during a time when conservatives are once again waging battle against dangerous and out-of-control Federal spending. President Reagan understood the dangers of government expansion all too well. In his famous "A Time for Choosing" speech, he called America to action because, "If we lose freedom here, there's no place to escape to. This is the last stand on Earth." This was our "rendezvous with destiny."

As we in the Congress who uphold Reagan's values continue toward that rendezvous with destiny, we should keep Reagan's thoughts about government at the forefronts of our minds.

As I walk the Halls of Congress, his words reverberate in my ears every day that "man is not free unless government is limited." You have to wonder what Reagan would say to out-of-control government growth as we see in this administration.

I learned a lot about politics from President Reagan, and one particular quote has resonated with me about how we should live our lives. He said that "We should not carry a banner of pale pastels but of bold colors which makes it unmistakably clear where we stand on the issues."

I've always tried to live my life that way, so let me be bold today and say, in honor of President Reagan, I believe in God; I believe in the United States Constitution; I believe that government spends too much money, borrows too much money, and indebts the American people; and I believe that by protecting liberty in this country that our Nation once again will be a shining city on the hill.

When President Reagan spoke of that shining city, it inspired Americans to greatness. It inspired them to strive for something that is beyond comprehen-

sion at times. He spoke about a new day in America. I think that honoring President Reagan and remembering what he did inspires me as a Congressman and others to help us, once again, be a shining city for America, a shining city for liberty, a shining city for those who believe in freedom. Let us once again strive for a new day in America.

Thank you, Mr. Reagan.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Thank you very much, JEFF, and I really enjoyed you coming out to California and getting an opportunity to really enjoy the Reagan library. It's truly a place that every American should have an opportunity to visit one time or another. It's pretty inspiring. Thank you, JEFF.

At this point I'd like to recognize the gentleman from New York, MICHAEL GRIMM.

□ 1510

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Ronald Reagan this past Sunday.

President Reagan has left a lasting mark on our world, inspiring people to turn to democracy. He often spoke of freedom and made it a driving force behind his foreign policy. During his Presidency, Reagan was instrumental in the collapse of the Soviet Union. He worked tirelessly; and with the words, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall," he helped bring freedom to people under Soviet control. He left behind a legacy known for the spread of democracy and freedom throughout the world.

Reagan also understood the value of conservative economic policies. In a 1982 address, he said, "We don't have a trillion-dollar debt because we haven't taxed enough; we have a trillion-dollar debt because we spend too much." Thirty years later, this message couldn't be more true.

While Reagan may be best known for leading our country through a strong economic recovery or for the fall of the Soviet Union, the Great Communicator was known for his optimism. I hope that Americans can once again find that optimism as we move forward to put power back into the hands of the people. By returning to the same conservative principles on which Reagan relied, I am optimistic that we can restore the honor, individual liberties, and economic prosperity that once defined our great Nation.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Thank you very much, MICHAEL. We know MICHAEL is from the great State of New York, so we have got both coasts covered today, from sea to shining sea.

At this point, I have another great Californian and a new Member. It's my honor and pleasure to recognize my good friend from California, JEFF DENHAM.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of our Nation's greatest leaders, President Ronald Reagan. And Congressman

GALLEGLY, you truly are privileged to live so close to Ronald Reagan, in the area, as well as to his library.

This past weekend, on his 100th birthday, Americans in Simi Valley and across the country remembered President Reagan's legacy not only as Governor of California but as the 40th President of the United States.

In tough times, President Reagan was a true leader who inspired millions of Americans with a bold vision to return greatness to our country. While focusing on shrinking the size of the Federal Government, reducing taxes, and growing our economy, he played an influential role in unifying a divided Europe and spreading the principles of democracy across the world.

A true believer in liberty and freedom and limited government, President Reagan taught us important lessons and led with a conviction that continues to encourage us today in the 112th Congress. President Reagan will always be remembered and celebrated not only by Californians but by individuals worldwide.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Thank you very much, JEFF.

At this point, I yield to RICK CRAWFORD from the great State of Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to speak in honor of the legacy of President Ronald Reagan.

While running for this office, I was often asked, "Why are you conservative? Why are you conservative?" My answer was always, "Ronald Reagan."

As a soldier, I was stationed in a bomb disposal unit in Pennsylvania, and I was tasked several times with Secret Service details protecting the President. And there was one in particular that I remember, September 17, 1987, when he gave the address at the bicentennial of the Constitution at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. I was literally standing in the shadow of history and, as a 21-year-old soldier, didn't fully appreciate it. And as I look back on that moment now, I fully appreciate what President Reagan had to say.

In his speech, he said the Founding Fathers had the presence of something higher that enabled them to write the Constitution. He said, "It was that ideal that enabled them to rise above politics and self-interest, to transcend their differences, and together create this document, this Constitution that would profoundly and forever alter not just these United States but the world."

We can learn a lot by looking back at President Reagan's speech. President Reagan always remembered the principles and sacrifices this country was built upon. In my opinion, the best way we can honor President Reagan's legacy is to walk these Halls with the sacrifices of our Founding Fathers in mind, just as President Ronald Reagan did.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Now, from Ronald Reagan's home State, the great State of Illinois, RANDY HULTGREN.

Mr. HULTGREN. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be with you today to honor one of my heroes. And I bring greetings to the United States Capitol from Tampico, Illinois, Ronald Reagan's birthplace, and Dixon, Illinois, Ronald Reagan's boyhood home. I am privileged to represent those areas back in Illinois. I was there over this weekend and was able to be in Ronald Reagan's birthplace and also his boyhood home. And I heard from them again all the memories that they have and the incredible roots that were developed there in Illinois into one of our greatest Presidents ever, Ronald Reagan.

As I look back about 30 years ago to 1981, I see that times are similar today as they were when Ronald Reagan took office. It was desperate economic times. There was very discouraging unemployment news. It also was a very dangerous world that we faced. And yet Ronald Reagan came in and had an impact in turning our world around, bringing hope once again.

I see in Ronald Reagan several things:

First of all, he clearly was a man of faith. It was almost exactly 30 years ago next month when, tragically, Ronald Reagan was shot. We are so grateful that he survived and did well through that. And through that lesson and through that horrible experience, Ronald Reagan said he dedicated his life and his Presidency to God. He was a man of faith.

He was also a man of optimism. He saw that the opportunity in America's future was not in government but in the American people.

He was also a man of vision. I appreciate his statement that "it's morning in America again," and I see that same opportunity today, where our days are brighter ahead than they were in the past because of the great American people and their spirit.

Ronald Reagan had three big goals when he entered the Presidency, and he had incredible focus on these three goals. When you talked to people who were here at that time, it was amazing that oftentimes he was the only one talking about these things or had the idea that we could be successful.

One of those was restoring our economy, getting things turned around again, getting people working again. He also wanted to restore American exceptionalism, and he fought diligently to do that, to recognize that we are a great Nation because of our great people. He also was committed to defeating communism. And his strong voice and strong presence against the USSR showed and was successful ultimately because of his diligence and his focus and his vision. And we are so thankful. It is a different world today because of Ronald Reagan.

I look back at so much that he accomplished. Let's go back to the roots that he developed, the Midwestern roots in Illinois that went so deep. I see

it still in the people there—a commitment to America, a commitment to service, a commitment to a brighter future. All of those things were born and bred into Ronald Reagan in Tampico and Dixon, Illinois, and continued on through his life out in California and right here in Washington, DC.

It is my honor to recognize one of my heroes just a couple days after his 100th birthday and say, Thank you, President Reagan. Thank you for all that you've done. Thank you for the hope and the future that we all enjoy because of what you have done.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Thank you very much, RANDY.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina). The gentleman has 39 minutes remaining.

Mr. GALLEGLY. At this point, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, ANDY HARRIS, a freshman Member and good friend.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman from California for giving me this opportunity.

"Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall." Mr. Speaker, perhaps those were Ronald Reagan's most famous words, words which meant a great deal to millions of people. But his speech at the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin that June afternoon touched me and my family personally.

As many of you may know, my immigrant parents were victims of communist regimes in Eastern Europe. My Hungarian father served 2 years in a Siberian gulag for his anticommunist views, and my Ukrainian mother fled just before the Red Army seized control of her native country. They, like Ronald Reagan, understood that communism, especially the Soviet brand of communism, meant a life of restriction, oppression, and in many cases violence or cold-blooded murder.

□ 1520

While some derided President Reagan when he took on the USSR to win the Cold War, it was a point of inspiration for the Harris family. His courage and unwavering belief that freedom must always conquer evil has forever immortalized him to those who witnessed and lived through one of the most despicable and deadly regimes in the history of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Harris family, I want to thank President Reagan. May his legacy always remain a beacon for those around the world who seek the asylum of freedom and liberty.

Mr. GALLEGLY. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my very good friend from the State of Texas, Tyler, Texas, as a matter of fact, Judge LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, my friend from California. At Fort Benning, Georgia, in 1978–1980, we saw the military being cut, demoralized and marginalized. Our U.S. embassy in

Iran was attacked and our diplomats taken hostage, while the sad administration wrung its hands and begged Iran to let them go. The U.S. seemed pathetic in the face of a vicious enemy.

Interest rates were rising from 12 percent up to 20 percent as my wife and I purchased our first home. Inflation and unemployment were both in double digits.

The Carter administration decided to deal with an over-reliance on foreign oil by asking people to wear sweaters at home and leave the heat turned down lower. Then, as now, the President waged a private war against producing our own energy, so then, as now, the price of gasoline skyrocketed.

We in the U.S. Army could not publicly express our dismay over our dismal leadership because it is a military crime to be disrespectful of the Commander in Chief.

Then in 1980, a new day dawned with the election of Ronald Reagan. Our hostages were released when President Reagan took office, and we had a newfound respect from other countries. As Reagan's tax-cutting policies took over, double-digit inflation, unemployment, and interest rates all came down.

Our military began to be respected again and feared again, which provided much needed protection for America.

The Bible says, "Joy comes in the morning." It truly was morning in America. Thank God for the life and the gift of Ronald Reagan.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Thank you very much, LOUIE. And now I would like to yield to the gentleman from California, my good friend, KEN CALVERT, who played an instrumental role in helping to bring Air Force One to Simi Valley.

Mr. CALVERT. I want to thank my good friend, ELTON GALLEGLY, from Simi Valley, California, where, of course, our library for Ronald Reagan is located. We're very proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and pay tribute to the 100th birthday of the late President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, a man who deeply loved our country and who, through the course of his life, changed the world to a better place.

Upon taking office, President Reagan initiated sweeping economic reforms to combat double-digit unemployment and inflation. His policies ended the recession and provided one of the longest peacetime economic booms in our history. I wish we can do that again very soon.

America was also facing a 35-year-long war at that time, the Cold War, and President Reagan never shied away from speaking in defense of freedom. He delivered his courageous address near the infamous Berlin Wall and demanded, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall." This was the beginning of the end of the Cold War and the wall would come down 1 year after President Reagan left office.

President Reagan brought so much greatness to the world; and 2 years ago,

as a Californian, working with my friend, ELTON GALLEGLEY, and others, I had the privilege of initiating the effort to bring the statue of President Reagan to our Nation's Capitol. So those of you who visit the Capitol, I encourage you to go visit the statue. It's a fitting tribute to our former President of the United States. The statue is a constant reminder of his legacy. Today, as we honor his life, we will always remember his words and pledge to forever preserve his vision of America as a shining city on a hill for all mankind to see. God bless America. God bless Ronald Reagan, and thank you for the time.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. Thank you, KEN.

I'd now like to yield time to my next-door neighbor in the Rayburn Building and a friend of mine, I think the only senior Member to me here today, the gentleman from Indianapolis, Indiana, DAN BURTON, who personally knew Ronald Reagan very well.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just say that we all talk about what Ronald Reagan did as President and the great things he did for the country and for the world. But I want to tell you a story that's a personal story of mine.

My mother was a waitress for 18 years, and my stepfather only went to the seventh grade. And I told them when I entered politics one day I was going to run for Congress, and if I got elected to Congress, I was going to take them in the front door of the White House and introduce them to the President of the United States. So finally I got elected to Congress after quite a while.

And I called the White House and I got a hold of Reagan's secretary, and I told her the story about how I'd promised this to my mother and how she'd worked for 18 years as a waitress, and about my stepfather. And she says, well, let me talk to the President about it. So I got a call about a day or two later, and she said, the President can see you on this particular day. So I called my mother and my stepfather and I said, I want you to come out, I want to take you in the front door of the White House to meet the President.

Well, it came out my mother loved Ronald Reagan as an actor. He was her favorite. And so here she was coming in the front door of the White House, and I've got her hand in one hand and my stepfather in the other, and they're both shaking because here they are very common folks, and they're going to meet the most powerful man in the world, and her great favorite actor.

So we go in. And when we walked in the Oval Office, Ronald Reagan stole my heart forever, and I want to tell you why. He came up and he looked at my mother and he looked at me and he put his arm around me and he says, Ms. Kelly, I want you to know your son is one of the brightest young men we have in Congress, and he's going to do great things for America. And I know

you had to wait on tables, and I know he shined shoes and I know you had a tough time. We had a tough time in my family like that. And he says, but I know things are going to be great from here on out, and you ought to be very proud of him.

And I kept thinking, how does he know all this? And he had called my office to get information so he'd make my mother feel really, really proud and happy. And they took those pictures, and my mother carried those pictures with her till the day she died. And from that moment on, I'd have done anything for that guy. He could walk on water. He was not only a great President; he was a great human being. Thanks for the time.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. Thank you, DANNY.

I now yield to a Member from Ronald Reagan's home State, BOB DOLD from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Times have changed, but familiar challenges remain. We must strive to make our government smarter, protect America in a dangerous world, and create jobs here at home. As we enter a new era, we look to the past for guidance, to the man from Dixon, Illinois, who redefined our party and who reshaped the world, and we look forward always with the optimism and competence of our 40th President.

At a time when the world stood at the intersection between freedom and tyranny, President Reagan's leadership made it clear that the American path was the right way to go. As we work to create jobs and rein in spending right now, it is critical that this Congress, and indeed all Americans, stay committed to his vision.

Ronald Reagan trusted the American people, believing that we possess the strength of character to freely lead our lives, to grow our businesses and to create jobs. As I talk with people back home in my district, one constant I hear is the desire for the Federal Government to simply stop making things so difficult on them, to get out of the way.

Today we face great challenges, massive deficits, a weakened economy, and businesses struggling to provide jobs. Moving forward, we need not just a dose but a full commitment to the principles of individual liberty and free markets championed by President Reagan. I believe we need to empower our citizens to create new opportunities for growth.

Today we admire President Reagan for his eternal optimism and his firm belief in American exceptionalism.

□ 1530

Mr. GALLEGLEY. One of the things that creates a challenge for us on a Special Order like this is we have so many folks that want to speak and reminisce about what a great man Ronald Reagan was and I only have so much time. So if you will be sensitive to that, I want to make sure everyone

has an opportunity to recognize Ronald Reagan this afternoon that would like to.

At this point, I yield to my neighbor from California and good friend, GARY MILLER.

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Thank you for giving me the time, Mr. GALLEGLEY. I know you are honored to represent the library and are personal friends with the family, and that speaks volumes for your character.

I rise today to honor the remembrance of the most beloved figure and inspiring man I know of in politics, the late Ronald Reagan.

I think many Members of Congress and politicians speak volumes for the man when they stand before a crowd and say, "I'm a Reagan Republican." When you can leave a legacy like that behind, because not many people say they're a Miller Republican or a Gallegley Republican, but a Reagan Republican, speaks volumes for who the man was.

As we commemorate Ronald Reagan's centennial birthday, I am honored to have the opportunity to reflect on his many accomplishments as a leader and a person. As President, Ronald Reagan believed in the American Dream. And when he talked about the American Dream, he always had this huge smile on his face because he believed in the American Dream.

His wisdom and leadership in promoting freedom, prosperity, and compassionate respect for all individuals guided our great Nation during times of both tranquility and turmoil.

President Reagan's strong belief in a limited government and fiscal responsibility should serve as a model for us today. As President, he refused to deviate from his principles and strong belief in the power of the free market. His success in reducing taxes and government spending led to a period of unprecedented economic growth and prosperity.

In the area of foreign policy, Ronald Reagan's support for a strong national defense strengthened America's standing in the world. His belief that America should serve as a beacon for democracy and freedom was unrelenting. The Reagan administration's tough stance against communist regimes and the negotiation of treaties with Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev culminated in the symbolic end of the Cold War and the liberation of millions across the globe.

As we reflect on the life and legacy left by President Reagan, his resounding words of resolve bring hope to our Nation through these times of trial and tribulation. It is my hope that President Reagan's vision for our Nation will long be remembered and revered.

I am honored to represent this man in California and say he is a hero.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. I thank the gentleman.

The next gentleman I would like to introduce is SCOTT TIPTON from the State of Colorado. I had the real honor

of showing SCOTT and his wife, Jean, around the library just last weekend. We had a great time, and I am sure you can attest to what a great venue that is and a tribute to a great man.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And, indeed it was. Thank you so much for your hospitality. That was exceptional.

Members, in 1976, I had the honor and pleasure of serving as the youngest delegate to the Republican National Convention. At that convention, I listened to Ronald Reagan tell us, "Go out and communicate to the world that we may be fewer in numbers than we have ever been, but we carry the message that they are waiting for." His words inspired me to the realization that ours is a Nation of ascendancy, and filled me with hope for the future.

Like then, the future of our country now depends upon our present actions and our ability to deliver a powerful message. Our message is, and must be, clear. We cannot continue down a path of reckless spending that satisfies government excess while enslaving future generations to insurmountable debt. It is time that we roll up our sleeves. For while many may have never met a government program that they do not like, it is time that we get to work cutting spending.

We must embrace Reagan's prudence and heed his warning that government always finds a need for whatever money it gets, and remember that it is our responsibility to tend that fragile flame of liberty so that our children and grandchildren may know brighter days.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, TREY GOWDY.

Mr. GOWDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a modern-day forefather who rekindled the foundational beliefs of our country, a leader who earnestly believed in American exceptionalism and the durable power of individual aspirations.

At a time when the prevailing mood in our country suggested that our best days were in the past, a time when the challenges seemed larger than our capacity to meet them, President Reagan gave us a reason to hope.

Through his words, through his actions, he forced us to take a hard look at ourselves and, in doing so, recapture the ideals that made this Nation great: Hard work, perseverance, personal responsibility, the collective belief that, when working together, greatness is always within our grasp. One by one, he re-inspired the robust American spirit of optimism that sustains us as individuals and unifies us as a country. He was a founding father of the New America, and for that we honor his memory and remain forever grateful.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to advise me how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 22 minutes left.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At this time, it is my distinct honor and pleasure to introduce another Californian, the gentlelady, the leader of the minority, NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for calling this Special Order to give us the opportunity to join in a bipartisan way to celebrate and pay tribute to what would be the 100th birthday of President Ronald Reagan, and to do so with great pride as members of the California delegation.

In August of 2006, the California legislature passed a law in a bipartisan way to have President Reagan representing our State as one of the two statues in the Capitol. Just a year-and-a-half ago, again in a bipartisan way, we celebrated the life of President Reagan by welcoming this statue to the Capitol. So for the last few years we have been building in a tribute to the President.

It is impossible to talk about President Reagan and the optimism he had for life and the love he had for our country and his patriotism without talking about Mrs. Reagan. They shared one of the great love stories of our time. Mrs. Reagan in recent years has turned that love into action, speaking out powerfully about stem cell research. In doing so, she has saved lives, found cures, and given hope to millions. Today, as we pay tribute to President Reagan, we also honor Mrs. Reagan for her service to our Nation and for her love of her husband.

On what would be his 100 birthday, we remember President Reagan's optimism for our Nation, always believing that America's best days are ahead, and we share his patriotism, his life of service to our country.

To honor him, a Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission has been established, and I am pleased to recognize three House appointments—two Republican, one Democrat—to the Reagan Centennial Commission and thank them for their service to the legacy of President Reagan: Congressman GALLEGLY, congratulations to you; Congressman AARON SCHOCK, one of the newest Members of Congress and youngest; and Congressman SILVESTRE REYES, who proudly serves in that capacity.

Again, as a Californian, we take great pride in the fact that Ronald Reagan was not born in California but from California, that his life of service and patriotism is recognized in the Capitol, and that today we send our deepest regards and respect to Mrs. Reagan in celebration of the President's 100th birthday.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentlelady, our leader of the minority, and fellow Californian.

I now yield to PAUL GOSAR from the great State of Arizona.

□ 1540

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to honor President Ronald Reagan and to commemorate his hope, optimism, and eternal belief that America is truly the greatest country in the world.

Reagan once said, "It is not my intention to do away with government. It is rather to make it work—work with us, not over us; stand by our side, not ride on our back. Government can and must provide opportunity, not smother it; foster productivity, not stifle it."

I can think of no better time than the present to listen to the wisdom of Reagan's words. We are at a turning point in our Nation and the American people are asking for a government that works with the people, not one that picks winners and losers. I am forever encouraged by the words of Reagan and will always be inspired to keep his dream of a smaller, more nimble government alive.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I now yield to DIANE BLACK, a new Member from the great State of Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great legacy of our 40th President, Ronald Wilson Reagan. As I watched some of the coverage of the President's centennial, I found myself filled with the same hope and idealism that he inspired in me over 20 years ago.

During the 8 years he was in the White House, President Reagan faced great challenges but was always optimistic that the greatness of our country and its people would bring us to a brighter day. A truly one-of-a-kind leader, President Reagan inspired freedom throughout the world and kept the American dream alive and burning brightly for all of us.

He reminded us that democracy is a precious gift, but one that is dependent on the dedication of all Americans. He believed strongly in American exceptionalism and reminded us that as citizens of such a great Nation, we had a responsibility to be a beacon of hope to all of those around the world who do not enjoy the same freedoms. All of these years later, his ideals still stand true for all of us, and his message is just as urgent today as it was in the past, perhaps even more so.

President Reagan is a personal hero of mine, and I want to work with my colleagues to keep his ideals of a smaller government, a commonsense government, alive here in Washington.

President Reagan believed that the people of this country are the best hope for the future, not the government or its bureaucrats. He believed that the ideal of self-government that this Nation was founded on was one of the greatest ideas of history, and that by giving government back to the people, our Nation would become stronger and more prosperous.

Like Reagan, I too am optimistic. I believe that our best days are still

ahead of us and that a smaller government that answers to the people will let America thrive again. As we face the challenges ahead of us today, let us remember President Reagan, and with hard work we can get this country back on track to a brighter morning.

Mr. GALLEGGLY. I would now yield to my good friend and freshman Member from the great State of Florida, DENNIS ROSS, and also, I might add, a fellow member on our Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROSS of Florida. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to President Reagan on his centennial celebration. As our country's 40th President, no leader in modern history has had a more lasting and greater impact in shaping America's policy on economics, national defense, and social issues. Throughout his time as a public servant, President Reagan championed the core values of lower taxes and less burdensome government that stimulated the economy and brought this country out of a long recession.

Reagan's firm belief in a strong national defense inspired future democracies all over Europe and led to the defeat of the "evil empire," which ended the Cold War and brought peace with Russia.

He became a role model for all Americans with his sense of humor, his sense of compassion, untiring belief in unlimited freedom and respect for the unborn. President Reagan was a leader of extraordinary character, courage, and vision. He changed our great nation and never tired of firmly believing that America's best days were ahead.

Happy birthday, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLEGGLY. Thank you very much, DENNIS.

I would now yield to LARRY BUCSHON, a new Member from Indiana. Indiana is well represented here this afternoon for President Reagan.

Mr. BUCSHON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of our Nation's 40th President. Today, we honor Ronald Reagan's 100th birthday on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. This is the People's House, and Ronald Reagan was the people's President.

President Reagan championed the individual by lowering the tax burden on America's citizens and promoting free markets, actions that resonated with me as a young college student. As a 19-year-old in 1981, it was President Reagan's optimism about our future and clear conservative message that guided me to become a Republican.

What stood out the most to me about President Ronald Reagan was his conviction and steadfast leadership in pulling us out of the Cold War. I am honored to be able to stand here today on the House floor in celebration of a great leader, President Ronald Reagan.

Mr. GALLEGGLY. I would now yield to KEVIN BRADY from Texas, a longtime friend and one of our best baseball

players on the congressional baseball team.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks for your leadership as well.

"Before I refuse to take your questions, I have an opening statement."

Mr. Speaker, that was one of the many quips we remember from the Great Communicator, Ronald Reagan. As we mark the 100th anniversary of his birth this week on Capitol Hill, we reflect on President Reagan's many accomplishments, his leadership in tough economic times, and his ability to bring us together, which was good humor.

During his presidency, Ronald Reagan worked across the aisle to grow our economy by cutting tax rates and getting Washington off the backs of our job creators. He believed, as he said, "entrepreneurs and their small enterprises are responsible for almost all the economic growth in the United States." He said, "concentrated power has always been the enemy of liberty."

Those two statements of President Reagan's were never more true than today, as we have a much greater and bigger Washington bureaucracy than we could have ever imagined or could ever afford.

President Reagan believed that we grow our economy by getting Washington out of the way, not by spending more tax dollars borrowed from our children and grandchildren. President Reagan knew that fiscal responsibility was key to our freedom, and he said, "if we lose freedom here, there is no place to escape to."

The American economy is at a crossroads, and the good news is we have been here before, and we know the way to a stronger future, thanks to Ronald Reagan.

Mr. GALLEGGLY. May I again inquire of the time remaining, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. GALLEGGLY. I would now yield to TIM WALBERG, making his second tour as a Member from the great State of Michigan.

Welcome back, TIM.

Mr. WALBERG. Thank you, my friend and colleague from California. I am delighted to be here.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a great man and a great President, Ronald Reagan. Although President Reagan's 100th birthday would have been celebrated this year, I am reminded how clear and timeless his principles of limited government and individual freedom remain. Many of his ideas ring as true today as they did when I first heard him speak so many years ago.

Beginning in 1984, I had the pleasure of meeting President Reagan several times as a member of the Michigan legislature. The first time I met him was when I had the honor of welcoming him to Michigan on behalf of the House of Representatives and the Republican

caucus. Though I forgot most of my planned speech in greeting him, he treated me as a colleague and expressed a genuine interest in our agenda for the State.

His warmth and disarming kindness is what I will always remember about him personally. I always left, after subsequent meetings, believing more strongly in America's exceptionalism and knowing that his commonsense principles would always succeed here and abroad when attached to character, courage, and grace. I am certain that his timeless principles when followed will endure for many, many years to come.

May God bless the history and memory of Ronald Reagan and the country he loved.

Mr. GALLEGGLY. I would now yield to SCOTT DESJARLAIS from the great State of Tennessee, a new Member.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My colleagues have done an excellent job today in eloquently paying tribute to Ronald Reagan's life and the many accomplishments he achieved throughout his presidency. I would like to take a moment, though, to recognize one of the most instrumental figures in shaping the Reagan legacy, Nancy Reagan.

In the immutable words of John Donne, "No man is an island, entire of itself," and with all the accolades we bestow on President Reagan, we must remember that Nancy was a key part of the Reagan team.

□ 1550

She was an uncommon confidant and was always there to provide the President with unconditional support, which no doubt served as a source of his strength.

I believe President Reagan would find any tribute to him inadequate without also recognizing the person he described as the "companion without whom I'm never quite complete or happy." So, thank you, Mrs. Reagan for the role that you played in guiding our country through difficult times and ensuring that America forever remains a shining city upon a hill.

Mr. GALLEGGLY. I would now yield to BOBBY SCHILLING from President Reagan's home State. Illinois is very well represented today.

Mr. SCHILLING. Today, we remember our Nation's 40th President, President Ronald Wilson Reagan. He would have been 100 this year. President Reagan hails from my home State of Illinois. He spent much of his childhood growing up in the Dixon area and also worked with WOC Radio in Davenport, Iowa. And our area, we believe, had a little bit to do with forming the Great Communicator.

Ronald Reagan was famous for saying, Government is not the solution to our problem. Government is the problem. Reagan stared down the Soviet Union and demanded that they tear down the wall. He nominated the first female Supreme Court Justice in Judge Sandra Day O'Connor.

President Reagan is one of my heroes because he showed what can be accomplished when the best interest of the country are placed ahead of party affiliation. And we need more of this.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be standing here today to celebrate President Ronald Wilson Reagan's 100th birthday.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. Now it's my distinct honor and pleasure to recognize the gentleman from Illinois.

AARON, I don't know if you were even born when Ronald Reagan was first elected, were you?

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. GALLEGLEY, I was not.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. But you knew who he was, and I have heard you speak about him.

It is an honor to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, AARON SCHOCK.

Mr. SCHOCK. To my friend from California (Mr. GALLEGLEY), I appreciate the deference. No, I was not born when Ronald Reagan became President, but what a tribute to President Ronald Reagan this is. Rarely in Congress do we run out of time when we're talking about an issue, but Democrat-Republican time has expired. I had prepared all kinds of flowery remarks that I was going to make in tribute to the President who hails from my home State of Illinois that I represent—Eureka College, his alma mater—but I can't think of anything more to say other than the fact that so much has been said that we've run out of time. And I can't think of a greater tribute. It's why east coast, west coast, Midwest, Republican, Democrat, the oldest Member, the youngest Member have taken time to come to the floor today. And I thank you, Mr. GALLEGLEY from California for organizing this hour.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. I'd just also like to recognize your tribute to Ronald Reagan the other night at the Reagan Library. It was very inspiring. And it was an honor to have you there.

Mr. SCHOCK. I like California weather.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. I would now yield to the gentleman from Georgia, AUSTIN SCOTT.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I just want to say this about President Reagan. He understood that it is the American, not the government, that will make America the greatest Nation on Earth. It's time for this body to tackle some tough issues and follow through on tough decisions. And if I can just read his words, the Gipper's own words: Let us be sure that those who come after will say of us in our time that in our time we did everything that could be done. We finished the race; we kept them free; we kept the faith.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. Next, we have my good friend from the State of Virginia, and seat partner for the last 20 years on Judiciary, BOB GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I also want to tell him how much I en-

joyed visiting his congressional district less than 2 weeks ago and visiting the Reagan Presidential Library, which is a fabulous recounting of the life of the man who I think was the greatest President of the 20th century. He led America to win the Cold War. He re-instilled the economic greatness of this country from the malaise of the 1970s. And, most importantly, he instilled in us his eternal optimism in America.

In his farewell address, Reagan described how he envisioned the "shining city" he invoked countless times. He observed of his time in office, "We weren't just marking time. We made a difference. We made the city stronger, we made the city freer, and we left her in good hands. All in all, not bad; not bad at all."

"Not bad," reflects the modesty of the man but not the magnitude of his accomplishments.

Asked what Americans saw in him, Ronald Reagan replied, "Would you laugh if I told you that I think, maybe, they see themselves . . . ?"

Hardly would we laugh.

A few years ago I visited Rancho del Cielo, Reagan's beloved "Ranch in the Sky". The home reflects the man . . . with Nancy's and his TV trays still standing by their respective recliners, both facing the old black and white television. It seems they've just gone out for a trail ride and will return at any moment.

At purchase the ranch was a mere 600 sq. feet. Reagan labored diligently to remodel and expand it. Even so, the only thing grand about it is the natural surroundings. Asked once to explain the ranch's almost magnetic appeal for him, Reagan replied with a quote from the Psalms: "I look to the hills from whence cometh my strength."

Mikhail Gorbachev, Margaret Thatcher and Queen Elizabeth were among the notables he hosted there. Gorbachev was disappointed by the humble ranch, knowing the lavish palaces of European leaders. However, it's fitting that the place at which Reagan felt most at ease disarmed the world's dignitaries . . . he always related best with common folks.

And yet he was far from ordinary. To the contrary he lived an extraordinary life which had a profound impact on the span of human history.

He left us on the eve of the 60th anniversary of D-Day, and almost 20 years to the day of one of his most beloved speeches, where he offered a compelling picture of how "the boys of Point du Hoc," struck a death knell to the Nazism and Fascism gripping Europe.

He extended this same moral clarity to the great conflict of his day, possessing a steadfast commitment to not just contain communism, but defeat it. In rebuilding the military, and facing down the tyranny of communism, he relegated the Evil Empire to the ash heap of history. In restoring our faith in the free enterprise system through cutting taxes he encouraged innovation.

And most importantly he instilled in us his eternal optimism in America.

In his farewell address Reagan described how he envisioned the "shining city," he had invoked countless times. He observed this of his time in office, "We weren't just marking time. We made a difference. We made the city stronger, we made the city freer, and we left

her in good hands. All in all, not bad, not bad at all."

Not bad reflects the modesty of the man but not the magnitude of his accomplishments. He set this Nation on a new course that still inspires us. We have a right to dream great dreams he said . . . because after all we are Americans.

Yes, Mr. President we do see ourselves in you.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. Thank you very much, BOB.

At this time I yield to the gentle lady from New York, NAN HAYWORTH.

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, thank you so very much.

What inspires me about President Reagan so greatly is that the power of his vision was so strong that a mere 20 minutes after he took the oath of office on January 20, 1981, our Iranian hostages left the airspace of that hostile country because they knew when he was elected that America would not stand down from its commitment to them, nor its commitment to democracy. And now is the time for all of us to take renewed inspiration from President Reagan's example. He articulated American exceptionalism and the American Dream more eloquently than any President in decades. And now is the time for us to take his example and let it strengthen us as we face tremendous challenges in this country today.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. I would now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, STEVE SCALISE.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

It's such an honor to be able to pay tribute to Ronald Reagan here on the House floor, especially remembering his 100th birthday. It was special about a week and a half ago to be in the gentleman from California's district, going to the Presidential Library—Ronald Reagan's library; actually walking through that Air Force One plane that, among other places, took President Reagan to Germany, where he gave that famous speech and demanded, Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.

It was Reagan's optimism that pulled our country out of the malaise of the 1970s. We need some more of that optimism here today. But while he is no longer with us, Ronald Reagan's legacy still endures today as an example of how we can get to that "shining city on a hill" again.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. Thank you, STEVE.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that I would like to express, but I thought it was really important that we had this Nation represented from sea to shining sea. And I think we did that this afternoon with all of our speakers from States from California to New York and everywhere in between.

In closing, and it just seemed appropriate this morning as I was pulling into the Rayburn garage, I came in a little early this morning, and there was a car that had to stop for something for a minute—and I don't normally read bumper stickers, but that bumper

sticker said it all: I miss Ronald Reagan.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 100th birthday of Ronald Reagan. Or as he would have preferred 61st anniversary of his 39th birthday.

Our friendship began when he was Governor of California and I was a newly elected Assemblyman. We had a private meeting about a complex childcare issue. I walked away impressed by his grasp of the subject and how we shared a belief in the importance of the mother's involvement to early childhood development.

I was also impressed by Reagan's efforts to ease the impact of automobile exhaust in California. For too long, a dense layer of smog hid the gorgeous California landscape. Reagan worked tirelessly to make sure that, along with curtailing factory pollution, automobile emissions were kept in check.

President Reagan's leadership style blended deeply held conviction with an ability to transcend partisanship. His friendships with those across the aisle are a timely reminder of how the governing process should work. Reagan meant it when he said "There's no limit to what a man can do or where he can go if he doesn't mind who gets the credit."

Reagan's contributions on behalf of freedom around the world are unparalleled since the end of World War II. There is no more Cold War, there is no more Berlin Wall, there is no worldwide threat of Communist dictatorship because of the leadership of President Reagan.

When the history of our time is written, the accomplishments of President Reagan will shine out. He made America the land of opportunity once again, and brought the breath of freedom to millions of people around the world who had spent decades under the yoke of tyranny. His memory will live on among all the freedom-loving people around the world.

For me, the most endearing of his traits was his eternal optimism. Ronald Reagan truly believed that America was a "shining city on a hill." His ability to see that, despite tough times, America is a nation of limitless potential was an inspiration to all.

I am honored to have both known and worked with Ronald Reagan, one of the great leaders of the 20th century. On behalf of all my Congressional colleagues, I wish him the happiest of birthdays.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one hundred years ago, an ambitious little boy named Ronald Reagan was born in Tampico, Illinois; a little boy who was determined to be someone important. When that little boy became this nation's 40th president, he told us that America was too great for small dreams, and that there was purpose and worth in every life.

President Reagan believed in the individual character of the American people. He believed in the great power that human liberty and freedom had to change the lives of citizens not only in this country, but of those around the world. Ronald Reagan acknowledged that oppression, tyranny, and evil anywhere in the world was a threat to us all, and he was not afraid to call it by its proper name. He was determined to not merely contain communism, but to conquer it. In his 1982 speech to the British Parliament, President Reagan predicted "The march of freedom and democracy will leave Marxism-Leninism on the ash-heap of

history as it has left other tyrannies which stifle the freedom and muzzle the self-expression of the people." In his unwavering determination to defeat communism through initiatives like his foreign policy offensive, pro-democratic public diplomacy, along with what became known as the Reagan Doctrine, President Reagan brought communism to its knees. The most symbolic result of his efforts came on the 9th of November, 1989, when the Berlin Wall separating Western and Eastern Germany came crumbling down. Pieces of that wall can now be found beneath the feet of President Reagan's statue in the Capitol Rotunda, a reminder that Tyranny must be temporary in order for human liberty to prevail.

President Reagan also believed that a prosperous nation relied on economic freedom; that the entrepreneur and their small enterprises were the driving force behind economic growth in America. This belief was reflected in his policies of freedom and his "common sense" approach to economics that laid the foundation for a prosperous nation. On August 17, 1981, President Reagan signed the Economic Recovery Tax Act into law, cutting all income taxes by 25 percent and reducing the top marginal tax rate from 70 percent to 50 percent. President Reagan's policies reduced inflation, lowered unemployment, cut the prime interest rate in half, and increased economic growth by 6 percent only two years into his administration. In addition to those accomplishments, nearly 17 million new jobs were created by the time Reagan left office.

Mr. Speaker, today we not only honor a former President, but a remarkable American who truly loved his country. And through his impeccable character and leadership, his generosity and humor, the American people loved him. Throughout his eight years in office, we laughed together and we cried together. Even in its darkest days, President Ronald Reagan recognized that American character and generosity, ideas and ingenuity, liberty and individual freedom are the reasons that the United States of America is and always will be the shining city upon a hill. He believed that it is our inescapable destiny to be the leaders of the free world and that America's best days are yet to come; that our most glorious days are just ahead. On that note, Mr. Speaker, I end with this quote from President Reagan; "If you're afraid of the future, then get out of the way, stand aside. The people of this country are ready to move again."

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to speak today in remembrance of the life and legacy of our 40th President, Ronald Reagan.

Just prior to Ronald Reagan assuming the Presidency, many people wondered whether this country's best days were behind us.

"What I'd really like to do," he said after six months in the White House, "is go down in history as the President who made Americans believe in themselves again."

He created a sense of pride in our nation that was severely lacking following the Vietnam war.

His reforms to our tax code, tax cuts and a significantly lowered rate of inflation lead to the longest peacetime economic expansion in our history.

President Reagan's longest lasting legacy remains his role in winning the Cold War.

While the common doctrine of the time called for containing Communism, Reagan boldly predicted that it would soon be "left on the ash-heap of history."

During the journey that was the Reagan Revolution, he restored prosperity, confidence, optimism, faith, and pride in America.

We along with countless others around the world will be forever grateful.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to imagine what the world would be like today if Ronald Reagan had never come along. That is because so much of the past 100 years of American and world history was directly impacted by the courage and convictions of our 40th President.

As we all know, the course of the 20th century was not always a smooth ride for the United States or for freedom. At a time when we needed a hero, we got one in the Gipper.

When Ronald Reagan saw the country he loved succumb to the hubris of the welfare state, high taxation, rampant spending and crippling regulation, he set his sights on Washington to turn things around. He believed that government was not the solution but the problem. The status quo of the time begged to differ and he saw no choice but to challenge it. Against all odds, he succeeded.

That same misguided consensus also told us that Soviet communism would forever cohabit the globe with Western democracy. Again, President Reagan disagreed. To him, communism wasn't just flawed—it was evil. That conviction shaped his entire worldview. His forecast for the Cold War was simple: "We win, they lose." His optimism led him to predict a decade before the Cold War ended that "the West won't contain communism, it will transcend communism." Again, President Reagan was right.

All Americans live in a freer and more prosperous world because of Ronald Reagan.

One hundred years from now, President Reagan's legacy will continue to inspire Americans to believe in the greatness of our country. And as long as his principles are cherished and passed down to every new generation, America will remain that "shining city on a hill" and the last best hope for man on earth.

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Ronald Reagan this past Sunday, February 6th.

President Reagan has left a lasting mark on our world, inspiring people to turn to democracy. He often spoke of freedom and made it a driving force behind his foreign policy.

During his presidency, Reagan was instrumental in the collapse of the Soviet Union. He worked tirelessly and with the words "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall," he helped bring freedom to people under Soviet control, leaving behind a legacy known for the spread of democracy and freedom throughout the world.

Reagan also understood the value of conservative economic policies. In a 1982 address he said, "We don't have a trillion dollar debt because we haven't taxed enough; we have a trillion dollar debt because we spend too much." Thirty years later, this message couldn't be more true.

While Reagan may be best known for leading our country through a strong economic recovery or for the fall of the Soviet Union, the Great Communicator was also known for his optimism. I hope that Americans can once again find that optimism, as we move forward to put power back into the hands of the people.

By returning to the same conservative principles on which Reagan relied, I am optimistic that we can restore the honor, individual liberties, and economic prosperity that once defined our great Nation.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 514, EXTENDING COUNTER-TERRORISM AUTHORITIES

Mr. DREIER (during the Special Order of Mr. GALLEGLY), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-8) on the resolution (H. Res. 79) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 relating to access to business records, individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers, and roving wiretaps until December 8, 2011, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

D.C. VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to claim a half hour this afternoon to speak about the citizens of the Nation's Capital, who are full and equal citizens of the United States of America; that Nation's Capital that was born with the Nation itself, was born with the Constitution. Among the Nation's oldest citizens are the citizens of this very city where the Congress does its work.

□ 1600

Now, there is a complicated relationship between the Federal Government and the Nation's capital, but one thing has never been complicated: The Founders and every American ever since have understood that the citizens of the Nation's capital are entitled to the same constitutional rights and democratic rights as every other American citizen.

I have come to the floor because I think many Members who are incumbents may have forgotten, and the largest class of new Members may be surprised by what they may be about to experience on this floor with respect to a local jurisdiction that they know nothing of and that they have nothing to do with.

The new Members have come with a special distaste for Federal intervention, even into Federal affairs, and I respect that. I think that they, perhaps, would be among the first Members to recognize that the powerful Federal Government should never snatch local control from a local jurisdiction. Indeed, you may be about to experience

something that is so much of a surprise that it will be a kind of an out-of-body experience when you're asked to actually consider a budget that this Congress had nothing do with, a budget for which every living cent was raised by the people I represent. You may be asked to overturn local laws simply because they are different from the laws you would have passed in your own local jurisdictions and where there is no Federal imprimatur on these local laws at all.

Now, gradually, Congress has come to understand that the United States loses its own credibility as the leader of democracy around the world when it does not treat the citizens of a nation's capital as full and equal citizens. Congressional jurisdiction over the District of Columbia appears in the Constitution; but in 1973, Congress recognized that it was wrong—wrong—to rule the local jurisdiction from the Congress, so it delegated what we call home rule, or the right to self-government, to the District of Columbia. That marked an historic realization that local residents must govern themselves locally, that it was wrong that the Nation's capital was the only place—this place where Congress meets—with no local democracy, where hundreds of thousands of its citizens had no say on their own local affairs.

I know it's hard to believe that this could have ever occurred anywhere in the United States. Local control is among the very first principles of the founding of our country; but only in 1973 did your Nation's capital get an elected government, an elected Mayor, and an elected city council. A lot of that had to do with, to be fair, southern Democrats. Although the District for 150 years was a majority white district, the old-time southern Democrats saw the large African American population here as a reason to keep the District from having any local self-government. Republicans weren't much a part of that, and I hope they won't be much a part of it today.

The promise to delegate the same kind of local control to the residents of the Nation's capital, as we assume, even without thinking, is the case for every other local jurisdiction, has been mostly kept. Mayor Vincent Gray runs the city. The City Council passes the laws—except when Congress decides or, rather, when some Members of Congress decide to break the promise of democracy and intervene into the affairs of a local jurisdiction for one reason and one reason only: that they simply disagree with the decisions the local jurisdiction has made. Imagine if in your own districts, from this Congress, I disagreed with some of your decisions, and I could then overturn those decisions.

My colleagues, I am asking you not to do to us what you would not have done to you. We ask only that you apply the same standard of democracy here in the Nation's capital that you insist on in your own districts. You

cannot be for one standard of democracy for the Egyptian people, who are now rising up to demand democracy, without being for the same standard in your own Nation's capital. You wouldn't intervene and tell the Egyptians what to do even when you disagreed with it.

We ask you in the name of the Founders, in the name of American democracy: Do not do that to the residents of the District of Columbia. It is impossible to justify a standard for democracy that makes an exception when you disagree with the decisions that have been made.

I respect that new Members abhor Federal intervention even in areas of legitimate Federal concern. The new Members, some of them tea party members, would like to withdraw Federal intervention from areas long understood to be of some concern to the Federal Government. Their view is that, even in these Federal matters, there is too much Federal Government.

What about Federal intervention where there is no Federal concern whatsoever? What about Federal intervention where there is no Federal money whatsoever but only billions of dollars raised by the local taxpayers? What about Federal intervention where there is no Federal law involved but only the law of the local jurisdiction?

If you think there is too much Federal Government in what we do now, surely you would not tolerate any Federal Government in the local matters of a local jurisdiction, especially in your own Nation's capital. We raise our own funds, \$3 billion, which is more than that of several States. We want to spend it as we see fit, just as my colleagues do in their jurisdictions. Without any Federal intervention, they spend their own local funds as they see fit.

Yet, yesterday, there was a shameful, shameful experience here. There was a hearing on a Federal bill. The Federal bill had to do with restrictions on Federal funding for abortions, restrictions that some of us thought were airtight as it was. I happen to be for the right of a woman to choose, but I have always respected my colleagues who have another point of view. That matter is being decided, as it should be because it involves Federal funding, in several committees of the Congress.

What in the world was the District of Columbia doing in a bill having to do with Federal funding for abortions?

□ 1610

What was this language doing in that bill? And I am quoting: The term "Federal Government" includes the government of the District of Columbia.

It does not, my colleagues. We are a local government. We are not your colony. Declaring that the District of Columbia is part of the Federal Government for purposes of intervening into our local affairs, to tell us how to spend our local money, is an unprecedented violation of the District's right to self-government.

The District of Columbia provision was entirely unrelated to the Federal abortion funding purposes of the bill. If there is to be abortion funding in a local jurisdiction—and there is today local funding throughout the United States, using local money, in local jurisdictions—if it can be done anywhere in the United States with local funds, how could anyone justify keeping the people of the District of Columbia from using their own local funds in precisely the same way?

My Republican colleagues have come and taken control of the Congress on the wings of a promise of jobs—well, where's your jobs bill? That's what the people in my city want to know, some of them from poor wards which have 20 and 30 percent unemployment. Why are we looking at the District of Columbia, not for the jobs you said you would provide, but for how we spend our local funds on abortion for low-income women? What business is it of yours how we spend our local money?

Get out of our affairs. You've got enough to tend to here. Why focus on one local jurisdiction? If you want to deal with Federal funding of abortion, fight fair. Deal with it here, man to man, woman to woman. Don't cross the line between democracy and autocracy and dictate; because that's what you're trying to do, dictate to a local jurisdiction how it's to spend its own local funds which you had nothing to do with raising.

Shame on the Judiciary Subcommittee, because I asked for the right to testify simply to indicate why the District of Columbia should be taken out of this bill, and I was denied the right to testify. I have been in this body for two decades. I recall no circumstance in which a Member was denied the right to make a few remarks before the hearing, and certainly no circumstance of denial of a Member to make remarks when her district and her district alone was in the bill. What are you afraid of? Would not elementary fairness and say, All right, Congresswoman NORTON, we don't have a lot of time for you, but you're in the bill, so here's 2 minutes? I was entitled to that in the name of fairness.

But you have, many of you in this Congress have given disproportionate time to the District of Columbia. There's been introduced a bill to impose private school vouchers on the District and the District alone. What's wrong with you? What are you afraid of? If you're for vouchers, put a national vouchers bill on the floor.

I know why there is no national vouchers bill on the floor; because there have been referendums in many of the States on vouchers, and every last referendum has been defeated because the people of the United States say over and over again that if you have one red cent, you better spend it on our public schools.

There's already been a compromise on this issue. The District of Columbia was singled out for vouchers, even

though we have the largest alternative public charter school system in the country. Would that the Members of this body, on either side of the aisle, had almost half of their children in alternative schools, public charter schools, that residents themselves have come forward to establish as an alternative to their public schools.

Why pick on us? If vouchers are so good, I challenge you, put a bill on the floor. Let those who want it come forward. You are afraid. You don't have the guts. You pick on us because you can. It's wrong. A compromise was reached. The compromise allowed those who are now attending voucher schools to remain in those schools until they graduate. No compromise is enough for those who believe in a zero sum game.

The District's home rule public charter school alternative is a model for the Nation. Moreover, charter schools enjoy the strongest kind of bipartisan support in this Congress. What's wrong with what we're doing? Why aren't we being complimented and commended for having a public charter school system where almost half our kids attend?

In your district, you will find that your local school boards, your States keep charter schools from coming forward. That's not happened here, in part because during the last Republican Congress, under Speaker Gingrich, when he came and also discussed vouchers with me, I asked that we do a bill for charter schools instead, and out of respect for home rule, he did. Where is that respect for local control in this body today?

Our charter schools have long waiting lists. We could use any money that the Congress has to help these children find places in our own charter schools. This is the last district you want to impose vouchers on, precisely because we've heard the call that when there are children who are not being well educated in at least some of your public schools—and I am a strong supporter of our public schools. I'm a graduate of the D.C. public schools, but I do concede that there are some children who don't have access to the best education. Well, we've done something for them. Don't punish us for it by imposing a voucher system on us that we do not want.

Last year, I had asked that there be placed in the omnibus bill \$5 million for voucher parents to go to public charter schools, because when I met with my voucher parents, they said—or many of them said—they had tried to get into our public charter schools and could not because of long waiting lists. That's where the demand is. That's where the need is.

We want our choices to be respected. Sure, we respect that there may be jurisdictions who would, in fact, wish vouchers. Give them the opportunity. Don't impose vouchers on people who have chosen another alternative.

I'm not sure why one local jurisdiction would command so much atten-

tion from a new majority who convinced the American people that they would put jobs first. I'm not sure why, but I am sure of this, that if you want to direct your attention someplace else, there must be a lot of places you can go besides the District of Columbia. I am going to be on this floor often making sure that Members understand who the District of Columbia is, what it expects, and how it expects to be treated.

Now, I see on the floor the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), and I appreciate that he's come down, because it's one thing for me to try to get all of the riders, the anti-home rule riders, unfair home rule riders off of the District of Columbia, but I certainly could not do that by myself.

□ 1620

I'm not even a member of the Appropriations Committee, but we sure had a true patriot on that committee who did not rest until he saw to it that all the riders, riders which violated the self-government rights of the District of Columbia in the worst way, were removed.

So citizens of the District of Columbia will be forever grateful for the work of Representative SERRANO, the then chairman, now ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services which has jurisdiction over the District of Columbia as well. We will be forever grateful for the extraordinary way that he kept at it year by year until he had removed each and every one of those attachments.

And I am pleased to relinquish some time to the gentleman, but I do need to know how much time I have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 9 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. I thank you for the time, and I congratulate you for continuing to be the Representative that you are for the District of Columbia.

Let me, in the short time that I have, be very brief and to the point. This may be one of the least-known issues in the United States, the whole issue of how Congress treats the District of Columbia. It is understood that there are constitutional provisions, but constitutional provisions for Congress to oversee the District of Columbia do not mean that you should mistreat the District of Columbia.

And I think it's important to note something that happened when I became chairman of the subcommittee that oversees the District of Columbia, and that is that I took it very personal. For you see, like so many New Yorkers, I was not born in New York. I was born in Puerto Rico and I was raised in New York, and I represent the Bronx in Congress. Puerto Rico, as everyone should know, is a territory of the United States; some would say a colony of the United States. So the one

thing I didn't want to do was be chairman of this committee and treat Washington, D.C., the way the Federal Government sometimes has treated my birthplace.

Where I found myself, as so many other folks, was with the United States as this country you love and then Puerto Rico as your loving birthplace, knowing they are attached, but somehow Puerto Rico doesn't get treated equally. So I said publicly, to the amazement of some and to the laughter of others, that I was going to be the first Member of Congress to ever relinquish power. I didn't want more power. I wanted to give up power. I wanted less and less to do with the District of Columbia. Let them govern themselves.

And so the first thing we did is we found out that we were not allowing the District of Columbia to have a sensible approach to the HIV/AIDS issue epidemic by not allowing a syringe exchange program. Now, it's important to note what we're talking about here. You have moneys that are raised locally by Washington, D.C., and then you have Federal dollars. And what happened was that Congress, for years, was saying that you can't use Federal dollars for certain programs, and you can't use local dollars either for certain programs. Now, this is the part that gets a little political, and I am going to try to be as fair and as balanced as possible, to quote somebody else.

I believe that some Members of Congress who did not wish to discuss these issues back home or could not fight these issues back home used the District of Columbia as the experiment by which they could say, "Abortion, I'm against abortion."

"Where?"

"In the District of Columbia."

"Needle exchange."

"Oh, I don't accept that."

"Where?"

"In the District of Columbia."

"Same-sex marriage?"

"Oh, I'm totally against that."

"Where?"

"In the District of Columbia."

And they couldn't go back home and accomplish these things in their districts, but they imposed it on the District of Columbia.

My role, I felt—and I did accomplish it, but unfortunately that may change soon—was that little by little I got bipartisan support from both parties to remove, under your leadership—and I'm being honest about that because you pushed, and you pushed and you pushed under your leadership—to remove these riders, to let them decide what to do with the HIV crisis, to let Washington, D.C.-elected council members and Mayor decide what to do with so many issues. That's all we did. We still kept the constitutional provisions. I don't go around rewriting the Constitution.

Now what I think will happen—and we begin to see—is a desire to once

again use Washington, D.C. as the experiment or the place where you do these things that you can't do back home.

So I would say to my colleagues, if you're strong—and I respect you on the issue of school vouchers. If you are strong on the issue of not letting women make choices in their lives, if you're strong on the issues of what rights or lack of rights gays should have, if you're strong on all of these issues, fight them at the national level, fight them back home. Don't single out the District of Columbia as this experimental ground by which you can say that you accomplished these things when, in fact, you did not.

The last one we had is the one that the public would really understand. The last one, which got lost in this budget that we just did, is the one that simply said that they could approve their own local budget without having Congress say "yes" or "no."

Now, picture throughout this country—there are people watching us right now throughout this country who have local school board budgets, who have local fire department budgets, who have local town and city and county budgets. They get their dollars from Federal funds, from local funds, from State funds, but they don't come at the end of the budget process and say, Members of Congress from all over the world, can you please approve my budget? No. And I don't think they should be treated that way.

So I hope that the changes we made remain in place. But above all, I hope that we respect the citizens, the American citizens who live in the District of Columbia, the residents who live here.

And lastly, we were elected to be Members of Congress. But I was not elected to be the Mayor of Washington, D.C., and I was not elected to be a member of the Washington, D.C. City Council. They have their own government. They can govern themselves well. They have their own finances. Let's give them the respect they deserve. And I hope as time goes on, these victories that we had, not for us—it's not going to get me reelected in my district—but for the people in Washington, D.C., that they stay in place.

And again, to my colleagues, if you want to make these points, make them back home, make them on the national level. Don't pick on the residents of D.C. to make your point.

Ms. NORTON. I very much thank the gentleman not only for his remarks today but for the extraordinary work he did. He's right. I was pushing, but he was the real pusher. He was the man at the steering wheel, and he kept doing it until all those riders got off. And I want to thank the gentleman, yes, from New York, but who has not forgotten his roots, the gentleman's roots in Puerto Rico, because his roots have enabled him to empathize with people who may not have the kind of democracy he holds to be emblematic of this country.

So you don't have to be one of us, it seems to me, to feel what we are feeling. You have to think about your own roots, about what matters to you, and particularly about the issues that have driven you in your life. And I think you will come to the conclusion that you should not expect for others what you would not have wanted for yourself.

And when the gentleman from New York mentioned Puerto Rico, he also reminds me—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has expired.

□ 1630

THE UPCOMING CONTINUING RESOLUTION AND REPEAL OF OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege of being recognized to address you here on the floor of the House. And there's been some dramatic changes that have taken place in this country and dramatic changes that have taken place in this Congress.

I believe that as we move forward we're going to have some significant debates here on the floor. I look forward to the regular order component of this that's being initiated by Speaker BOEHNER, the process of using the committee process, the hearing process before committees, the markup before subcommittees, the markup before full committees, and bills going up to the Rules Committee after they've been approved by the actual standing committees, and that be the same bills that are passed by the committees that arrive at the Rules Committee where the Rules Committee can work their will and, wherever possible, provide for an open rule so that we can have the maximum amount of debate on the floor, so that Members can have their will debated and require an up-or-down vote, recorded vote on their issues.

That's not something that has been going on in this Congress. It's diminished each of the last 4 years. And the more than two centuries old, not necessarily a rule, not necessarily something written into the rules, but the practice and the tradition of open rules on appropriations has been essential to allow Members to have their voice. And I am thankful that that's the new tone of this Congress. It's been a great frustration to me and many other Members, Democrats and Republicans alike.

So we're here today, Mr. Speaker, on the cusp of a great big decision for this Congress; and as we make this transition from the era of Speaker PELOSI to the era of Speaker BOEHNER, and as he lays out the parameters of let the House work its will and let's go back to a regular order as it was devised and

approved in the constitutional structure by our Founding Fathers, with all of those parameters in mind, we have coming up before us a continuing resolution. And the pressure points that we have, the opportunity to bring leverage has been envisioned as the Constitution sets up article I, II, and III of the Constitution. And here we are. Taxes and appropriations need to start here in the House of Representatives.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'd just make this point, and it's an unequivocating point, and that is that unless the House approves of Federal appropriations, there shall be not a dime spent by the Federal Government otherwise. So whatever we do here, and we will bring a budget through and it will be a far more fiscally responsible budget than the nonbudgets that have been processed in previous Congresses and the extension by CR, not by the legitimate appropriations process, but there will be a budget and that budget will cut current spending significantly. And it probably won't be enough to satisfy me, but the budget process is another essential component of what we're doing here.

And another component of it is to be able to legitimately fund the balance of this fiscal year. If we do nothing, if this Congress doesn't act, if the House of Representatives doesn't act, Mr. Speaker, then the Federal Government will go into an immediate and automatic shutdown at midnight on the night of March 4 of this year. That was the provision that was written into the continuing resolution last December, when Democrats and Republicans got together and compromised.

If you remember, the Senate was going to pass that huge omnibus bill, all of the wish lists of the departing Senators and those that hadn't been up for election, the big spending bill that was just grotesque in its vision when you look through all the dollars they were going to spend in the Senate and send it over here.

Thankfully, the American people rose up, jammed the switchboards in the Senate, and even those hanging on the fence decided that they would get a hold of their better responsible nature and they decided to pull down that huge omnibus spending bill. And so we ended up with a small continuing resolution, a continuing resolution that funded the government from, I don't remember the exact date of the expiration of the last one, but in December, whenever we passed this, through January and February and into the 4th of March.

Now, some of us anticipated they would try to pass a CR for the end of the fiscal year, and that didn't happen. And a lot of us would have liked to have spent less money up to this point. But in that CR there isn't any funding that funds ObamaCare. Even though ObamaCare has passed and it's been signed into law and it's the law of the land, there's not funding going forward in the CR that we're operating the gov-

ernment on today. If that had been, the funding that was called for had been in the CR, there would have been about a billion dollars appropriated in the continuing resolution that passed last December and expires this March 4.

That money was not put into the bill because they needed the votes of then the seated Republicans and some Democrats to vote for the continuing resolution. So the old Congress, the 111th Congress, didn't vote to willfully fund the implementation of ObamaCare.

Now we're faced with the prospect of a continuing resolution coming before this Congress that's been announced to be five times greater than any appropriations bill ever voted on by this Congress before, and perhaps four times greater than any cuts that have been offered before. Well, that's because the whole string of 13-or-so appropriations bills gets packed up into one, and all that spending that's normally spread out over about 13, and perhaps a supplemental or two, packaged up into one bill with all that money in it. That's why it's that big.

Now in it, well, I think it's unlikely that there will be a line item anywhere in it that will fund ObamaCare. But I don't see resistance either from someone bringing an amendment that would declare that none of the funds in this CR shall be used to implement or enforce ObamaCare. That's pretty close to the language that I have advocated for, oh, ever since last March when I first introduced the repeal legislation to ObamaCare.

And by the way, MICHELE BACHMANN and I were within 3 minutes of each other in exactly the same language to initiate the repeal of ObamaCare. We've worked together on this, with others, CONNIE MACK and others. JERRY MORAN of the United States Senate today has been one of the leaders on repealing ObamaCare without hesitation and actively and aggressively. There are a lot of supporters across the board.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to lay out the strategy that I have planned here on the repeal of ObamaCare in sequence so that people that think chronologically like myself can put this into the right context, and that is this:

I spent about a half a year of my life fighting the passage of ObamaCare. When it finally passed and was signed by the President, the night it passed here, I went out off the balcony and down into the lawn on the south lawn where there were thousands of people yet there pleading, keep your hands off my health care. And I said to them that night that we would start the repeal process the next day.

Now, I went home exhausted, thinking I would sleep until I was rested up. That didn't last very long. I got up and wrote the request for the repeal, as did the Congresswoman from Minnesota, Mrs. BACHMANN; and we submitted those repeal requests at the opening of

business that same day because it was after midnight when ObamaCare passed.

It was on that time, the strategy that I put together then was that we would file a repeal bill, seek the maximum number of cosponsors to repeal ObamaCare and then, Mr. Speaker, move forward with the discharge petition to seek to get 218 signatures on that so that then-Speaker PELOSI couldn't block the repeal from coming to the floor. We followed through on all of that to the point where we peaked out at 178 signatures on the discharge petition that could have circumvented the Speaker seeking to block the repeal of ObamaCare.

That discharge petition was one of the tools that was useful in winning the majority on November 2 of this past year. And there are Members here that openly say they wouldn't be here if they didn't have the discharge petition to point to their opponent and say, sign the discharge petition if you're serious. If you're against ObamaCare, here's the vehicle to repeal it. Sign it.

□ 1640

A number of those who did not and would not be voted out of office, and we have a new freshman class here that is 96 strong, 87 of them are Republicans, and I know of none of the 87 that did not run on the repeal of ObamaCare. I don't have confirmation, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that every one of the freshmen Republicans, the 87, ran at least in part, if not centrally, on working to repeal ObamaCare.

After winning the majority, so we could actually bring legislation to repeal ObamaCare, the next phase was to bring a repeal bill here to the floor of the House. I wanted it to be H.R. 1. It turned out to be H.R. 2. I don't know what H.R. 1 is yet, Mr. Speaker, but I'm very, very happy that the leadership took that high a priority to hold a vote here in the House to repeal ObamaCare so early in the first session of the 112th Congress. We saw a vote here that was bipartisan and it was unanimous among Republicans to repeal ObamaCare.

That is a very sound, a ringing, sound rejection of ObamaCare by the American people as a result of the election of November 2, by the people they sent here, 87 new freshmen Republican, many of them very, very solid.

Then, after H.R. 2 passed the House with unanimous Republican support and bipartisan support, Mr. Speaker, it went over to the Senate, where they said, "It could never pass over here, and it's a symbolic vote." Well, the Republican leader MITCH MCCONNELL did force a vote on the repeal of ObamaCare. It would have taken 60 votes to break the filibuster under those rules. Well, every Republican in the United States Senate voted to repeal ObamaCare.

So we are in this situation today, Mr. Speaker, where, if you look in the House and in the Senate, with far larger Republican numbers than we have

had in past years, every Republican in the House and the Senate has voted to repeal Obamacare. Every single one. They are serious, and they want to get the job done, and their constituents insist that we get the job done as well.

So now that we have taken this position that we are, all of us, for repealing Obamacare, and consistent with two thirds of the American people, if we voted to repeal it, it would be completely inconsistent for us to vote then to turn around and fund Obamacare.

Well, if the CR has language in it that allows for funding of Obamacare, then a vote in support of the continuing resolution is a vote that funds the very thing that we voted to repeal, which would be inconsistent. And I do not believe that we will have inconsistent members here in the House of Representatives.

I think they voted to repeal Obamacare, I think they are happy to vote to cut off the funding to Obamacare, and I believe that we will have universal support for that among our conference. And I believe the Senate, if they have an opportunity for the vote, would do the same thing. Down party lines, perhaps, but they would do the same thing.

But herein is the difficulty, Mr. Speaker, and it's this: That the funding that might otherwise be in this continuing resolution or may perhaps actually come out tomorrow in it is not very large in comparison to the overall cost.

The chairman of the Budget Committee has said that the spending under Obamacare is \$2.6 trillion—\$2.6 trillion. Now, there are taxes enacted by it, and we know how the CBO scored the information that they were given. But \$2.6 trillion in spending would be shut off if we repealed Obamacare today. We have voted to do so in the House. The Senate wasn't successful. The President likely veto. It is his signature bill; it is his identity. He is the one that called it "Obamacare" at the Blair House February 25, and now it's in our dictionary. My spell check spells it out for me: Obamacare.

But in any case, the \$1 billion or so that might be cut out of Obamacare in the CR, if we say none of the funds that are written into this bill can be used to implement or enforce Obamacare, that \$1 billion pales by comparison to the funds that are automatically appropriated that are written into the Obamacare bill itself, and it is an unusual practice to have that happen.

When you have a large authorization bill like Obamacare come through, generally it authorizes the appropriations. They are authorized to be appropriated under this section, X many dollars, to go to implement or enforce the various provisions of Obamacare. That's where the money is. And the real money that's up in that, that's automatically appropriated, Obamacare anticipates and authorizes trillions of dollars to be appropriated to fund it, and it authorizes the collection of, I believe, tril-

lions of dollars in fees and taxes to fund it over time. But the automatic appropriations that are unusual but written into Obamacare that a lot of people didn't know was in there when it was voted on, they will automatically appropriate a number that approaches or exceeds \$100 billion in automatic appropriations.

We are crunching these numbers now, and I have to qualify these numbers, Mr. Speaker. Our low number is down around \$65.3 billion; our upper number is up around \$107 billion. CRS doesn't have a number, CBO doesn't have a number. Apparently, nobody has pressed them to produce the numbers of the automatic appropriations in Obamacare in all this time. So we are taking this apart and putting it back together, and that's why the range is, it's my shop doing the math on this range, \$65.3 billion on the low side, \$107 billion on the high side. Let's just call it around \$100 billion for round figures, Mr. Speaker.

We could come here on the floor next week and debate a CR, and we could see an amendment come that's in order that would cut off all funding in the CR that would be used to fund Obamacare. If we do that, we are cutting off about \$1.2 billion in spending.

If we bring an amendment that shuts off all the funding that's automatically appropriated in Obamacare, and if we are successful, we shut off maybe \$100 billion that would be used to implement and enforce Obamacare.

One billion versus \$100 billion. A 1 percent solution versus a 100 percent solution. And if we don't use the 100 percent solution, then \$100 billion, as much as or perhaps more, will be aggressively used by the Obama administration to implement and enforce Obamacare. And if they do that, the cancerous tumor that's growing because of what it does to our liberty and our freedom sends its roots down deeper, and it gets bigger and stronger and harder to eradicate. That is part of the strategy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that leadership and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee will get together, and sometime tonight, as they put the finishing touches on the CR legislation that they say will come out tomorrow, that they will write into the bill the language that I have proposed. And since we deal with 2,500 page bills here in the House, and we are chastised if we don't read and understand every word of them, I have an amendment here that I can read every word of, and perhaps it could be understood by everyone in America. This is the amendment that shuts off the automatic appropriations to Obamacare. It is this, and I quote:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this act or any previous or subsequent act may be used to carry out the provisions of Public Law 111-148, Public Law 111-152, or any amendment made by either such public law."

That's the amendment, Mr. Speaker, that shuts off not just the funding in the CR to Obamacare, but it shuts off the self-enacting automatic appropriations that were, I believe, inappropriately written into the Obamacare bill and the reconciliation package that came over from the Senate as part of their deal. That is why I gave you two bill numbers instead of one, but they encompass what we commonly refer to as Obamacare.

That is the amendment that needs to be made in order here on the floor that allows the House to work its will, that allows the House to work within order under the rules. And, by the way, regular order is holding committee meetings, holding hearings, holding subcommittee markups and subcommittee appropriations. Chairman REHBERG would be seated at one of those markups, I would think, and that would be useful, a full Appropriations Committee markup at all of those stops. There would be an opportunity to introduce this language in committee, and then succeed, I believe, in dealing with a parliamentary challenge. Or, if it's written into the base bill, certainly there would be no parliamentary challenge. And if this goes out of the Appropriations Committee up to the Rules Committee and doesn't have my language in it, at that point the Rules Committee can protect this language, Mr. Speaker, from a point of order.

But if I bring this language to the floor under an appropriations bill, I know that I am facing a parliamentary challenge to this language. And it will be hard for the House to work its will if we get to the point where we have a parliamentary challenge on a piece of language that mirrors the will of the American people, mirrors the wishes of the American people, and mirrors the will and wishes of the Members of Congress, the majority of the Members of Congress, and mirrors the will and the wishes and the votes of 100 percent of the Republicans in the United States House and the United States Senate, and is bipartisan, at least in the House.

□ 1650

That is the endeavor that we need to be successful with, Mr. Speaker, and I am very determined to have this kind of debate and find a way to have this vote. If we are blocked from a vote that is essential to work the will of the House, how then can we say, how then can we say that the House has worked its will, if the House has been denied an opportunity to work its will?

I know there are arguments on both sides, Mr. Speaker, but I would point out that the language that I have read into the RECORD is not a precedent. It doesn't stretch the rules or the history or the traditions of this House. It doesn't stretch any written rule that I know of, and it is this. There is ample precedent, ample precedent in the form of the appropriations bills that were used to shut off the funding for the Vietnam War.

Now, I disagreed with the decision back then. I remember reading about it in the news in 1973 and 1974. In fact, my recollection says also 1975, but I don't happen to have those notes, Mr. Speaker, but I do have the notes to draw from a report by CRS out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am saying that we can bring an amendment that shuts off all funding, notwithstanding any other section. All of the automatic funding that was enacted by ObamaCare can be shut off in an appropriations bill in a continuing resolution. It can happen next week in the United States Congress, and we can put an end to ObamaCare then until such time as we elect a President who will sign the repeal as, hopefully, the first act of office in January of 2013. That is my hope and my wish and my work.

But for those who might wonder that this is language that stretches the parameters of tradition, it completely does not; and here are two examples of the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring.

Here is one, a supplemental appropriations bill, not a CR, but a supplemental appropriations bill that is in 1973, and actually the date on it is August 15, 1973. It says this: "None of the funds herein appropriated under this act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in or over Cambodia, Laos, North Vietnam and South Vietnam by United States forces, and after August 15, 1973, no other funds heretofore appropriated under any other act may be expended for such purpose."

So, Mr. Speaker, this supplemental appropriations bill that is dated enactment of August 15, 1973, and signed by the President July 1, 1973, says that none of these funds and no funds in the pipeline can be used to support directly or indirectly combat activities in Vietnam. If there were bullets that were on the way to be unloaded on the dock at Da Nang, they put the brakes on them and they went back. Those funds were on the way. They shut them down.

That doesn't mean they stopped everything, but none of those funds that were unobligated, would be a better way to put that, were allowed to be used by this act of Congress in a supplemental appropriations bill. Yes, the precedent exists. Yes, we can do this. Yes, it is a common practice, Mr. Speaker.

Those who might think this is a rare exception, I would go on down the line to another piece of legislation which actually was a CR, a continuing resolution. This is dated 1974, July 1, 1974; and this language in the continuing resolution then says this: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or after August 15, 1973, no funds herein or heretofore appropriated may be obligated or expended to finance directly or indirectly combat activities by United States military forces in or over or from off the shores of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia."

There is the language again: "No funds herein and no funds heretofore appropriated may be obligated or expended directly or indirectly." That is an all-encompassing example of language that we have used as a template to shut off the funding that is automatically appropriated within ObamaCare and, I think, inappropriately automatically appropriated within ObamaCare.

That is where I stand on this, Mr. Speaker. And for those who think that is an ancient piece of legislative history and something that hasn't been used in the modern era and so therefore isn't a model or precedent, we go back 200-plus years for those things. I don't have trepidation about the Constitution that was ratified in 1789.

But just in the 110th Congress, the first 2 years of NANCY PELOSI's Congress, Mr. Speaker, she forced 44 votes. They might have been some in the Rules Committee, most of them came to the floor; 44 votes by this United States Congress that were designed to unfund, underfund or undermine our troops. I have those all on record and spreadsheet with hyperlinks to the language and the vote results.

We stood here and fought this off through the 110th Congress because the effort by the then-Speaker was to end the war in Iraq by shutting off all the funding and forcing us to bring our troops back home again. I am very thankful that George Bush prevailed in the surge and we have the optimistic situation in Iraq that we have today because of that decision that was made by George Bush. But it wasn't with any help from Speaker PELOSI, who forced 44 votes. Many of them, and I have not scored it in this fashion, but probably most of them follow down the same lines as the legislative procedure that I am advocating here.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a very sound practice. It is a very constitutional practice. It is tried and it is true and it has been effective. It put the end to the Vietnam War, and we can put an end to ObamaCare if we bring language either as written into the bill or if we go back and have an Appropriations Committee, which I don't expect will happen, or if the Rules Committee protects my language so that the amendment can be legitimately debated here on the floor of the House and we can have a recorded vote. We can shut off 100 percent of the implementation and enforcement of ObamaCare.

If we don't take those steps, this Congress will not be allowed then, will not have been allowed at that point to work its will; and we have at best the chance to shut off \$1 billion, which amounts to 1 percent of the overall appropriations that are automatically enacted by ObamaCare. So we can come with a 1 percent solution and posture ourselves as we provided a solution, or we can come with a 100 percent solution with the best tools that the House has now to do the best job, to write the toughest bill that we can, send it over

to the Senate, because we know this: it is going to get worse in the Senate, and they are going to leverage back on us.

If it were just me, we could hold our ground. But; it isn't just me. So, Mr. Speaker, my advice to my colleagues whom I adore the privilege of serving with and whose judgment and statesmanship I greatly respect is this: We can't have people blink in this Congress, not when the destiny of America is at stake. And if you are wondering about blinking, just sign up with me, wait until I blink, and when I do, I guarantee my eyeballs will be dry and so will yours. But we must hold our ground. We must not blink.

We must send the language over to the Senate that cuts off all of the funding of that up to and perhaps exceeding \$100 billion that would be used to implement and enforce ObamaCare, that will be used aggressively by the Obama administration to send the roots down and grow this malignant tumor and metastasize this malignant tumor. We can pull it all out by the roots. We can do so if we move my amendment and make it in order under the rule or write it into the bill. If not, the America people will look back on this time and say, Where were you when it was time to stand up for the will of the American people?

Mr. Speaker, I have had my say. I appreciate the privilege of addressing you here this afternoon, to be on the floor of the House of Representatives. I entreat my colleagues to join with me, and let's get this job done. Let's repeal ObamaCare; let's pull it out by the roots, lock, stock and barrel, a 100 percent repeal, not a 1 percent repeal.

□ 1700

THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Over the past several weeks, I have had the incredible privilege and honor to be traveling up and across my district, the First District of Minnesota, from the plains of Worthington to the Mississippi River Valley at Winona, listening and holding grocery store stops and hearing what the American people are talking about. They're not talking a lot about ObamaCare. They're talking a lot about jobs. They're talking a lot about moving the country forward. And this is a place that, I have to tell you, it was 18 below zero yesterday when I left. These are hardy folks. They're used to weathering tough times.

They're also the place that gave root to, in a collective effort, the Mayo Clinic. They're also a place that is one of the top leading producers of food in this Nation in feeding the world. Also, a place where we generate—the fourth

largest of any State in the country—the fourth largest amount of wind power and innovating down that road. To be able to walk those streets, to go to those grocery stores—and in Mankato, where my office is located, you hear a lot of people talk about Main Street. That was the Main Street Sinclair Lewis was talking about. That's where he lived when he wrote his famous novel about what it means to grow up in rural America and what it means to collaborate together to grow this country.

And listening to those folks talk about things like the national debt, talk about how we invest in our infrastructure, how do we keep our schools strong, how do we make sure we care for our veterans, how do we keep this Nation safe by adhering to our ideals of freedoms and liberties and being that beacon for the rest of the world, those are things that people are talking about while we're seeing improvements in the economy that no one would argue by early 2008 was the worst economy we had seen since the Great Depression. And for those who said, I guess we should have done nothing, I'm here to tell you today I'm glad we're not repeating the Great Depression. I'm glad we're not seeing our markets collapse all the way. And I'm proud of the work we did to move back.

Now we're seeing exports grow. We're seeing GDP grow. We're seeing consumer spending strong over the holidays. But I have to be very honest with you. The people who came to see me in those groceries stores in Owatonna and Worthington, Minnesota, those don't really matter if you don't have a job. If you don't have a job to pay for groceries, if you don't have a job to pay for the gas in your car to get to work, those are the things that matter.

So I have to tell you these people know something about struggling through tough times. Their ancestors went to those plains of Minnesota and carved out not only a living, they carved out world-class agriculture production, world-class delivery of health care, world-class innovations in manufacturing and energy on the premise that this country provided incredible opportunities. But we couldn't do it alone. We needed to do it in a collective effort to view the future and to bring the best out in individuals.

So as we face these challenges and as we pay down debts that have been generated for decades, and when Dick Cheney sat in the Vice President's office and said, We proved deficits and debt don't matter, he couldn't have been more wrong. They do matter. But we can't be penny wise and pound foolish with our children's future. It makes no sense to talk about paying down the debt if we're going to collapse our education system, our investment in science and technology. If we're going to let our infrastructure deteriorate, we will never pay the debt down, because what's happened is the revenues have shrunk. The pie has shrunk.

Instead of trying to figure out how to carve up a smaller and smaller pie, let's bake a bigger pie. Let's get a handle on our energy needs. Let's create homegrown energy and quit sending a billion dollars a day to foreign nations who hate us. They will hate us for free. We can keep the money at home and create jobs. We can create the security we need to make sure that when great revolutions on democracy rise up in Egypt, we're watching it based on what's best for human rights, what's best for the stability of the world, not worrying about what the price of oil is going to do when we can get that right out of the Midwest with our innovation.

I do think there's lessons to be learned there. Going out and getting back to traveling throughout my district, the one thing I can tell you, the countries watch this, and the folks who sit in this institution we get even enamored with.

I had no illusions. When I was elected in 2006, with no elected experience—a high school teacher; never ran for office, didn't know my county chair, and I think most of my students didn't know my political affiliation. What they knew was I cared for the community, I served in the National Guard, and I wanted to get things right. I wasn't under any illusion that people elected me based on Democratic ideology. They elected me because they wanted to hear about solutions; they wanted to hear how we work together to solve things.

And when they did that in 2008 and expanded that, and then when the country swung back in 2010, I think my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, need to recognize the American public wasn't talking about critiques on ObamaCare. And I heard my colleague mention we need to rip that cancer out by its roots. The cancer being treated is a young boy who sits in New Hope, Minnesota, who didn't have care before and now is seen at the Mayo Clinic and is actually having a real cancer treated with the best quality care. And the Mayo Clinic said this bill was a step forward and we should not step backwards.

So I think what I'm hearing from my constituents is, Can't we get beyond the partisanship? Can't we focus on those things that aren't imagined about ourselves and find the 90 percent of things that we share in common? And we should never give our passions on differences. We should never compromise on our core principal values. But we should always recognize the interesting thing about this great country is the previous Speaker's district—and is a good friend of mine—borders mine. You might, when you hear us speak, think we're on opposite sides of the world. We are not. Neither are our constituents. But we need to come together with a recognition that the things we do here are meant to lay the framework, and that framework is the thing that's always made this country great—opportunity.

Yes, there's safety nets when we're down. Yes, those things need to be there. And we talk about those things in a tough economy. But what the middle class cares about is opportunity. No one guarantees you success in this country. But we should guarantee the opportunity to achieve success on your own. And the way we do that is by ensuring we have world-class educational institutions. That no matter if you're in Windom, Minnesota, New York City, or Tampa, Florida, that child has access to it. Not only is it the right thing to do; it strengthens our Nation.

We can bring those things today. We can continue to innovate. The can-do spirit that has been here since the inception of this country understood that's how we needed to move forward. We need to find those common grounds. We need to lay the groundwork. Unfortunately, that rung of opportunity, that ladder of opportunity by having safe and quality schools, by having transportation systems that serve all, by having affordable housing, by having access to basic health care, those were the rungs that allowed a person to pull themselves up and achieve success.

I think of my own family in this case. When my father died and my brother was 8 and I was a young man out of high school, Social Security survivor benefits were there for my mother and my young brother. When people say in this country you should pull yourselves up by your bootstraps, I agree. We just didn't have any boots. They were lent to us by Social Security. And we have paid it back ever since—my mother going on becoming a nurse, my younger brother going in and becoming a teacher like myself. I used the GI Bill that was afforded that was not just about enticing people to serve their Nation. It was the idea that those who are willing to serve are going to be assets to our community and to our country.

At this time of tough economic solutions the easy thing to do is say, Posture. We're going to have spending freezes. Well, here, that's fine. We have to get a control on spending. But don't leave the other side of the ledger out. The economy shrunk. And don't tell people this. If you freeze those numbers, be honest. You have just frozen programs that should be cut to zero, and you've just frozen programs that provide opportunity.

We've got people now that seem to think after they climb that ladder, after they believe they built that ladder themselves, they want to pull it up behind them. What we're talking about here is creating those opportunities, unleashing the American spirit, and winning the future. And I have seen it. I heard it in my district.

There's a company called Angie's Kettle Corn. Somebody might have seen it—my colleagues here, Mr. Speaker. It's sold in Costco and sold across the country. It started as a mom-and-pop business literally in a garage in Mankato, Minnesota. And this

last week they were on with Martha Stewart. They sold it at the Twins Stadium, and it's selling across the country now. That started with a passion, with a dream. It started with the ability to have local input and local ability to entice businesses to be there. It started by investments in transportation that allow you to move goods made and manufactured in Mankato, Minnesota, to the coast as efficiently as possible. That's how we've always competed. That's how we've always out-produced the rest of the world.

And at this tough time when people are saying, We can't spend any money now because we have a national debt, I agree we need to get a handle on the debt. I have been saying it needed to be paid down for years. But if we make the mistake and don't invest in infrastructure, don't invest in the correct ways in the future of providing opportunities, we are going to make drastic mistakes that will be hard to overcome.

□ 1710

There is another great company in my district, a company called Peerless Chain. This one is fascinating because I think these are things that people forget about, one of which is the idea that you can no longer compete in manufacturing in America because other countries simply are going to pay their workers less.

Well, I'm not interested in a race to the bottom. Yeah, we're probably never going to be able to pay low enough wages to compete with China on its wages, but we can beat them on innovation; we can beat them on quality products; we can beat them on moving things to market.

Peerless Chain is now one of the top producers of all forms of chain in the world. In fact, they provided all the chain to the booms after the oil spill in the gulf, protecting the gulf coast. This is a company founded by immigrant veterans after World War I, a company which is now hiring veterans and is manufacturing large, heavy-duty steel chains in Winona, Minnesota, stamping them "made in America," and shipping them to China.

That's a future that makes sense. That's a future that creates jobs. That's something we can embrace. I've got to tell you, as to the people working there, I don't give a dang if they're Democrats or Republicans. They don't care either. They have American jobs with American security. They are living the American Dream.

Do you know what that dream is? Having the chance for an opportunity to maybe own your own home, to maybe make it and, by the time you get there, to be able to buy a boat—or a snowmobile in our case—and be able to put your kids through school, and know that those children have that opportunity.

It's not good enough for us in this place to make policies that incentivize work to go overseas, to give tax breaks

to those companies, and to make it harder for Peerless Chain to produce right here. Those are the things that we can do together. Those are the things that we can agree upon. Small businesses make it. They're the things that make it in America. They've provided the jobs. They've done the things that need to be there.

What you're hearing here—and I have to be very honest with you—and what the false dichotomy of choices here is that the government can't do anything right—the government is us. It's the schoolteacher from Mankato. It's the construction manager from Iowa. It's all of us together trying to decide. No, we're not going to do everything right, but together we can create something that is bigger than any individual person here. I think, as we move forward, we're going to have to be willing, all of us—myself looking in the mirror first—to be able to reach across and find common ground, to be able to find those things that create opportunity and to then have the courage to go forward and talk about investing.

I want to give a couple of examples of this investing. When people say that the government can't do anything right, the trick is not to have the argument about big versus small government. The argument is about effective government. Does it do what the people want at the most efficient/effective cost available? Anything less, and now the police don't respond when you call 911. Now we aren't correctly making sure we're managing the ingredients in the food that people eat, and we have contaminated food, or we have lead in our children's toys as anything more will hamper business growth.

So, when I watched the President sit right up here underneath where the Speaker is and talk about "let's get smart reforms," it's not an either/or about getting regulation one way or adding regulation on.

An example of what we can do together to make things work happened in a hearing today. One of this Nation's major banks, for whatever reason—and it will be determined in time—was foreclosing on the houses of servicemembers who were deployed overseas. This Congress has determined that one of the things we will do if you're willing to serve this Nation is to give you protections while you're there, serving in a war zone, against excessive interest rates, foreclosure and things like that.

Since the beginning of this country, we've understood if you're fighting in a war zone and if you're worried about your family—your wife and child—being thrown out of your house, it's pretty difficult to focus on your job. Yet they continue to do it, and they continue to make it happen.

Well, that young marine and his wife came today to testify in front of Congress, Democrats and Republicans. They said, no, there need to be safeguards over that; there needs to be oversight; and yes—a horrible word I'm

hearing here—there need to be some regulations enforced so that we don't do that to our members. That's not antibusiness. That's not hampering business growth. That's coming up with the collective decision that, if you're going to serve this Nation in war, then we should have a business ethic that says we're going to do the right thing since it's law. I have to tell you those are compromises we can come to.

Investments. We have a project in southwest Minnesota. It's in combination with the gentleman who spoke before me and with our friends in South Dakota. In southwest Minnesota, northwest Iowa and southeast South Dakota, about 800,000 people altogether in rural areas do not have access to drinking water.

In 2009, I met with a woman who, still today, gets her drinking water by collecting it in a cistern when it rains and snows. It's not poverty. It's necessity. There is no wealth. So a project was designed, an incredible project, of bringing together local municipalities, States, and the Federal Government to divert water from the Missouri River to the Lewis and Clark Rural Water Project. This is not a "nice to have" thing if you think it's an amphitheater or something. This is drinking water and water for businesses. I have communities in my district that cannot add one single home because they don't have the capacity for water in order to hook up to the sanitary sewers. I have businesses, large ones—some of the largest packing plants in the country—that can't continue to expand and create jobs because they don't have access to water.

So we came together on this, and here is what happened: the local municipalities and the States agreed in concert with the Federal Government to pay their taxes ahead to accelerate a project with the promise that the Federal Government would fund the program. Those promises were made, and then they were broken.

What ends up happening then, as a Member of Congress and those who posture on this floor that we certainly can't have earmarks, is elected Representatives of the people of South Dakota, Minnesota and Iowa don't have the access to redress the grievance that we have invested millions of dollars, with our citizens paying ahead, with the idea there would be some help.

Yes, those tax dollars will come from across the country, but my State is one that is a net return on tax dollars. We send more to the rest of the country, but I understand how that benefits us all. We can create food and export it elsewhere. Manufactured goods are created elsewhere and sent to my district. That's the idea of the 50 United States. That's the idea of federalism. In many cases, I think some of my colleagues get confused, between the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution, of where we're at. That's a project where people say, We can't spend a penny on

that. Now we will end up spending more money, stopping economic growth, and making sure that people in this country don't have access to drinking water, all with the idea that we're going to be fiscally responsible.

It will do nothing but add to the debt. It will do nothing but deprive people of a basic commodity in this country, a basic commodity that you'd like to believe you have access to, which is water, and it was paid for ahead of time locally.

Those are the types of things that we need to have honest discussions about. There is no doubt that we've got budgeting situations. If we do not handle the national debt, our children and grandchildren will pay a heavy price for it. They will pay a price in some very simple things. As interest rates begin to climb, their buying power will become less. Their ability with the dollars they make are already shrinking for the middle class. As our real wages decline, they will have a lower standard of living. It will be harder to go to college. It will be harder to buy a house. It will be harder to buy a car. That all translates into the American Dream slipping a little further away.

So we have a responsibility to pay our fair share. That's why, when the bill came up in December, asking for changes to the Tax Code or whatever, I don't think it was that bad to ask for 140 million people to get the tax cut in a time of economic downturn. That had to happen. That cost us money. There is no doubt about that. It will add to the debt. The idea behind that is that money will be spent. Businesses will only grow if consumers spend money and if there is a demand for goods. The problem many of us had was that the other half of that money went to 6,600 families; \$154 million to 6,600 families. Yeah, let's slice it down the middle.

There has always been a sense of fairness in this country. We applaud success. We applaud people who achieve greatness. If you have a large business and if you're employing a large number of people, we're happy for you, but keep in mind we're educating those children in our schools; we're getting those people to your jobs on our roads that all of us are paying for. There has always been the assumption that there would be a fairness to our Tax Code, that you would pay it back.

All of those things create a balanced budget; they create economic growth, and they have done the one thing that America has done better than anybody else—provided innovation and opportunity for growth for the middle class to continue to be able to achieve.

So what we're going to see over the next couple of years is a turning point in this country. I believe we are going to get it and are going to figure out what the American people said on November 2. I'll tell you they didn't say in 2006, "Do it all the Democratic way." They didn't say in 2008, "Do it all the Democratic way." I can tell you they did not say on November 2 of last year, "Do it the Republican way."

They said, Solve problems. Get together. Move us forward. Create the infrastructure and the opportunities for the middle class. Then get out of our way. Stay out of our civil liberties. Stay out of our personal business. Allow us to do that and create the type of country that we were founded on, one that understood that the Constitution was not a static document.

The Constitution was one about the birth of a new Nation and the idea, the audacious idea, that you could take a high school teacher from Minnesota and plop him down in the very place where Abraham Lincoln spoke and say, Go and speak.

I will tell you, when you sit down on this floor, Mr. Speaker, and when you wonder, how in the world did I ever get here? the good thing is you meet all of your other colleagues, and you say, how did they get here? Then you understand the great diversity of this country. Then you understand that our strength lies in our ability to have different and competing opinions with a common goal—a strong, fair country with equal opportunities, a country that rewards hard work, that rewards achievement, but that understands you can't always control life's circumstances.

□ 1720

At times, there is going to need to be a safety net, and the idea that we're going to rip out ObamaCare, please keep in mind, I don't want to go back to the days when 47 million of my fellow citizens had no access to health care, for several reasons. One, I don't think it's ethically right. Two is I know I'm paying for it anyway when they go to the emergency room and it's more expensive. So why not get the preventive care in the best possible manner, deliver that care, and quit spending twice as much as any other nation, and start using that money to invest in innovation and job creation. That's how we pay down the debt. That's how we move forward. That's how we start to get a handle on what the core values of this country are and the things that have always made us great.

So we're going to have an opportunity to discuss these issues. I'm disappointed. When I was back home and I heard people talk about all these things, jobs, jobs, jobs, the economy and the future, I came back last night to a bill that was never debated. You heard about this new open rule. Well, here is the fact: not a single debate on it, not a single amendment, not a single minute of discussion on this floor, and you know what that bill was? The Patriot Act, determining if you as an American citizen, if the government can listen on you. I don't know about you, but I hold a lot of those values that I am very, very nervous when somebody is listening to my conversation. And I don't buy this, you don't have anything to hide, you don't have anything to worry about. That's no-

body's business. There's legal ways to go about this. We can keep this Nation safe by doing that.

But the new majority, who told us about how things have been done so poorly, the first time we had the Patriot Act up on the floor, we debated it for weeks. We talked about it. It was discussed. Last night, it came in on a suspension calendar, and I have to tell you this, I applaud the people here who said "no" and those people didn't say "no" to national security. They didn't say "no" to stopping terrorists. What they said "no" to was we are not willing to sacrifice our liberties for a little bit of false security. We want that balance to be struck, talked about here, and agreed upon.

So as we talk about jobs, as we talk about what's going to be going forward, bringing in the Patriot Act on Tuesday evening with no debate and voting for it on the floor just that quickly, when a Member of the Republican majority, a new Member, somebody who I know because they ran against me on this, asked, did you read the bill, did you read the bill, said he hadn't read the bill, but he voted "yes" anyway, and he said, well, we will have time to work it out.

That's what America was tired of. That's what America, if they were speaking out on November 2, was; and here's the thing. We have a choice and I say "we" being me. We have a choice that's said on this floor: Are we going to be part of the solution, or are we going to continue to push problems forward? I think the American people deserve better.

I think that listening to that soldier today who did his duty, he needs a government that's speaking for him. It doesn't matter how big that bank is to get it right, and then here's the thing. I'm not saying that bank can't do good. In this instance, they did not, and I simply don't want to leave it to them to make the decision.

So together we've got some opportunities. We're going through some growing pains, but here's the thing. Our grandparents and our forebearers made it through civil wars. They made it through the Great Depression. They made it through the civil rights movement. They made it through there. We are the product of all that struggle. We are the ones that now have to rise to that challenge. We are the ones that have to get beyond the petty political bickering that can divide us for short-term political gain that's not looking towards the next generation.

We have an opportunity. I saw it everywhere across southern Minnesota last week. I saw Republican and Democrat come together, and those people coming in that grocery store, one man came to me and said, at least I got the courage to come up here and tell you, Tim, I didn't vote for you. I'm like, well, that's no big deal, almost half the people didn't vote for me, but you're here. You're expressing your citizenship. You're expressing solutions that

can go forward. That's how the country gets back together, and we shook hands. We talked about things that can be better, and we walked out of that grocery store thinking that tomorrow can be a better day.

That's what the thought in this country has always been. The future and the ability for our children can be better than we're at today. We can handle our energy needs, and we can create those jobs at home. We can make health care accessible, pay for it, continue to innovate. We can manufacture and make it here at home and out-compete any nation in the world if we choose to invest in our greatest natural resource, our people.

So now is the time to be smart on budgeting, pay the debt down, get a handle on things, get a handle on spending, make taxation fair but don't shortchange the next generation, invest in education, invest in infrastructure, invest in research.

And I'm looking forward to the next 2 years, and I think the American public deserves nothing less than the best that we have to offer here, the voices across this country offering up solutions, debating them in a fair manner on this floor, voting for them, and then realizing that just because you disagree with someone doesn't mean they don't love this country. Just because they don't vote the way you wanted to doesn't mean they're a communist or a socialist or un-American.

What it means is we have the golden gift of being able to disagree, to debate on this House floor, and to take that debate to the American public in a civil, respectful manner with the understanding our neighbors love this country every bit as much as we do.

HOW BUSINESS GETS DONE IN WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to take some time to talk about how business gets done here in Washington. Now, I guess you can call this the lessons of a rookie. I'm starting my third year here, my second term; and during my first two years in the 111th Congress, frankly, it was like it was politics as usual, and I think the American people have had enough of that.

The American people are at a point where it's not about Republicans, it's not about Democrats. What they're looking for are problem solvers; and, fundamentally, I think that is what's most important as we go forward as problem solvers because we know this country is facing some tremendous issues. We are at record unemployment, the highest sustained level of unemployment since the Great Depression. We have a national debt that has amassed to over \$14 trillion, impacting

our children and our grandchildren's future.

We have all kinds of significant issues facing this Nation, and we need solutions; but the solutions, they have to be solutions, I believe, that are not politics as usual. They need to be solutions that are, frankly, based on what I call the principle of leadership. It's the very foundation of how we make our decisions, not based on a political agenda, not based on the whims or the will of a few or many but, frankly, based on principles; and that's what I want to spend some time this evening talking about, principled leadership.

In my time in Congress, I've seen us make a lot of decisions, an awful lot of decisions. Many of those impact not just the Nation but the world, and I see decisions made by different Members using different methodology. For me, I really do fall back on principled leadership. I actually fall back on values, principles that I learned as a youth. Frankly, I take them from my experience in Scouting, 41 years. This is my 41st year in Scouting. It's a great organization. It serves boys and girls and develops them into fine young people, productive, active citizens.

When I make a decision, I ask myself four questions, and it may sound a little old fashioned for some folks, but, frankly, it works for me and it works consistently. I ask myself four questions, principles that come from the Scout promise, actually. The first question I take from that Scout promise, that first question is when I'm making a decision, I'm faced with an issue and I need to decide, first question is, what is my duty to God? Is the decision I'm making, is it righteous according to God's word? Is it according to my faith? Frankly, if the answer is "no," I don't go any further on to question two, three, and four.

If I do go on, the next question is, what is my duty to the country? That is, frankly, what does the Constitution say about the decision that I'm about to make?

□ 1730

Is it according to the rule of law? Is it according to those liberties, those freedoms, those rights, and the distribution of powers that are outlined within the Constitution? Because there are certain things the Federal Government is supposed to do, according to the Constitution. That amount of responsibility is literally very tiny, though, compared to what the States have retained for rights; and that is small compared to what we, as individual citizens, have as all those rights that are provided through our creator.

So my second question I ask, what is my duty to country? The third question I ask myself in terms of principles is, what is my duty to others? Now, others for me are what I call the 660,000 really smart people that I work for in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District. It's pretty easy to determine what the intended consequence is and

the intended impact on the citizens that I serve and, frankly, that all of my colleagues serve. Because on the first page of any bill—I don't care if it's a one-page bill or it's 2,000 pages, that intended consequence is pretty easily and clearly articulated. It's the unintended consequences, however, that you have to work at. It's the unintended consequences that can have the most impact on the lives of the people that we serve. And that's why communication is such an incredibly important responsibility with our constituents, including why we're here in Washington using different methods and an open-door policy and receiving, soliciting input, feedback from our constituents.

But also certainly when we're back in the district, and we're in those communities and we're communicating with people, and they're talking about the situations that they're in, and how the Federal Government—the things that are going on are impacting their lives. That is tremendous, valuable information that we gain when we are back in the district, and that is what district work weeks are all about. It's about communications and feedback with your employer, and it's the people that you work for.

Finally, for me, the fourth question I ask myself in terms of principles and principled leadership has to do with duty to self. And, again, I borrow from Scouting, my years and decades in Scouting. The questions I ask myself are: am I prepared to do my best on each and every decision I make? And that is, have I worked hard to get all the information that I need? Have I worked hard to reach out to my constituents to find out, as I've read a bill, to make sure that they have access to it so that they understand and I can determine and solicit from them their feedback and what the unintended consequences are. Am I prepared to do my best?

Those are principles that have served me well these first 2 years, and I certainly continue my commitment and follow principled leadership going forward in serving both this country and certainly the citizens of the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District.

Another set of principles that I'm pleased to share tonight came from a group of citizens within the area of the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, and these are principles that were outlined by citizens who were concerned. They were concerned over the past 2 years with the things that they saw going on in their Nation, in their country. They came together because they were afraid. They were afraid of what the future held. And this was in Lycoming County of the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District. But you know what, these are principles that I have actually seen put forward by everyday citizens all over the Nation, certainly throughout my congressional district.

And I appreciate the fact that they took the time to put this together. I

have a scroll here with—I'm not going to roll this out completely because it would definitely be a hazard. It is a wonderful scroll with over 4,000 names on it of individuals who have put their signatures to standing for principles and expectations from government.

The principles, as put forward, were: "We, the people of the city of Williamsport, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the United States of America, declare that we are free and independent citizens, and that we are entitled to inherent and inalienable rights for which our ancestors fought to protect and for which they established governments to ensure." Rights that, within our founding documents, come from our creator.

"In the charters of those governments, our rights have been clearly and undeniably established to the exclusion of any encroachment by the civil servants elected to carry out the people's business. However, a long train of abuses and usurpations has evinced a clear trend which, if followed to its logical conclusion, would reduce the People under absolute Despotism. We protest these encroachments upon our natural and inalienable rights and liberties and demand that they be redressed." And among the abuses, they outlined seven principles, you know, principles that I think are incredibly important, things that you've heard about already on the floor tonight. And as you tune in, these are issues that have taken front stage in terms of our national debate.

Starting with taxation. You know, taxes have grown both continuously and geometrically both in the number and scope, such as greater than half of all of one's income is now claimed by the government. Taxes are something that we battle on here. And it's a fundamental decision of, first of all, the scope of government, what government should be in the business of doing, what constitutionally are those issues that should be funded. We are going to be engaging in significant debate through the rest of this week and certainly next week as we look at a continuing resolution of what is the proper role of government, and we will certainly be looking at how we fund that and the amount of taxes that are levied on individuals.

We had that debate at the end of the 111th Congress. In the 111th Congress, this country was facing the largest tax increase in its history, and it would have been devastating. It would have raised taxes on every American. It would have raised taxes on individuals, on families, on job creators, on small businesses. And I am pleased that in the 12th hour we were able to at least extend what's called the "Bush-era tax cuts," and that's been good for America. Frankly, we should have been able to make them permanent. That is something I think we need to obviously continue to work towards.

But at least by extending those, we were able to restore some certainty,

some certainty for families, for individuals and, frankly, for job creators so that they could do their business plans and at least restore some confidence going forward in this economy, confidence to allow small businesses to be able to invest their resources, to invest in capital, expanding and building a new site or business by expanding a product line or a service line, and hiring, creating jobs.

Frankly, many of the individuals over the past year and a half, as I've traveled around in my congressional district—and I talk with folks who I know are the job creators. These are individuals that every year would take their resources, their profit—and that's not a bad word; that's a good sign of good economic times—and they would reinvest a good portion of that profit back into their businesses, and they would create jobs.

You know, in the past 2 years, because of uncertainty—much of it around taxation—they have been sitting on the sidelines. They didn't know what was coming. Health care, the ObamaCare that would raise taxes would put mandates. If you are an employer with more than 50 employees, that means that more financial burdens are going to be placed on you, more mandates, so there is no encouragement to grow your business. I was very pleased when we were able to extend those tax cuts. That's the American people's money. They have had that for almost a decade, so we need to continue that.

The second principle that these good folks have identified is national debt. The public credit has been tapped beyond any reasonable ability to repay within the current generation. I think our national debt is somewhere around—every man, woman, and child. I go out into schools, and I like to read to the kindergarten kids. But I love getting out to the seniors because they are getting ready to go out into the world. They are just on the threshold of life. And I usually open up by saying, First of all, I work for you. I'm your Member of Congress. I work for you. And each of you owes \$143,000, and I don't take checks.

□ 1740

And that's a good icebreaker, for a sad notation of that really is how much each of them, each of them owes towards our national debt. And so we are approaching over \$14 trillion at this point. What that does, I think, is, frankly, it's probably our largest threat that we have to national security, the fact that we have that much debt accumulated, and that 60 percent of that debt is held by foreign countries. Our number one lender is China. And I think that just puts us in a very, very dangerous situation for the future.

So I am joined this evening by a good friend of mine who lives in Lycoming County. Mr. MARINO, if you want to step up and talk a little bit about your

thoughts on national debt and what that means to us going forward that would be great. Go ahead and join me at the podium there. This is a great Member, TOM MARINO. He represents a neighboring district of mine. We share two counties. I've known TOM for a long time. I worked in health care in Lycoming County for about 28 years. TOM's a former district attorney there, a native son, and I was real glad, real proud to see him come to Congress. And so I'm going to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to applaud my good colleague and friend from Pennsylvania. In fact, our districts border one another. And we have the same philosophies because we're so close—our districts overlap. We share a couple of counties. And we both share the sentiments of our constituents, the people who voted for us, the people who didn't vote for us. We have a job to do. We've been hired and directed to be sent to Washington and very clearly told what we need to do, and that is, to continue to cut taxes, cut the spending, and downsize Washington, which a combination of those three will create jobs.

Like my good friend from Pennsylvania, we need to get back to a simple time when we look at the Constitution, we apply the Constitution, we follow the Constitution, and in doing that, I'm confident that we are on the right track. I know our constituents from Williamsport may be watching us and from around the district. And I want to tell those individuals, as well as anyone else watching around the country, that we work for you. We know what the message was, and we have started that process.

I look forward to, as my good colleague does, us reaching across the aisle, working with our colleagues there to improve the quality of life for people in this country, to make sure that our children hopefully have a better life than we do, and to make certain that we do not strap them with this unbelievable cost and debt that I'm afraid if we do not take control of this now, we will absolutely lose total control of it. And we just have no idea of how far our finances can be plunged into total chaos.

So, again, I want to thank my colleague for having me here. I'm going to sit and listen to more of this debate. I appreciate the time.

I want to say hello to my friends back in my hometown of Williamsport, Pennsylvania, and the people in the 10th Congressional District, and also my friends in the adjoining district of my good colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for joining me tonight on the floor to kind of share about principles and the needs that we have there that we're faced with. Again, these are difficult times. One of the things in terms of this much debt that's out there, it reminds me of, we just hit kind of a milestone of being

married for 30 years not long ago. And soon after my wife and I were married, we bought a house, and it was a time where the country was facing a similar situation, such high unemployment and, frankly, high inflation. And this is a tremendous concern that I have that with all this borrowing and this debt, inflation will naturally follow. And, in fact, frankly this was at the term of President Jimmy Carter. We were looking at real estate. It was a time of stagflation, both high inflation and high unemployment. And my wife and I bought a home. We got a great deal because real estate wasn't selling, much like today. And we thought we got a—we got a first-time state mortgage rate, and we thought we were just doing great because we got this interest rate. I believe it was 18 percent, which was pretty good because at the time the banks under this type of inflation that naturally comes from this kind of borrowing and spending, the banks were lending at 20, 21 percent interest. So it's something we have a responsibility, not just to today's generation, but our children, our grandchildren, to get this national debt under consideration.

The next principle I wanted to touch on was national defense. And the principles as presented here talk about, you know, frankly the placement of troops without formal acts of war and the concern with that. But it also goes on the fact that we put so much into fears of war. I happen to believe—I've got a son and a daughter-in-law in the United States Army. They were just married yesterday, actually. They're in Washington here with us a couple of days. And I'm very proud of our troops and what they do. I believe that constitutionally, the national defense really is our most important job. It's up front in the Constitution that that's what we should do.

Within the principles outlined here before you, it also—this is the finer print, it's hard to read, but it talks about the fact is we can't ignore national defense here at home. And we've got threats here. We know that. When you look at the southern border, in particular, and just the unchecked illegal immigration into this country, and I realize many of those folks are coming in search of a better way of life. But frankly, there are folks coming in here that I think could easily come across the borders, and probably have, that seek to do us harm, and the things that they can carry across that border. And so we need to make sure that we are securing that border. We should be doing everything we possibly can. I think that this principle speaks to that. And I think that this country's been failing at making sure that our ports and our borders are ultimately safe. This is a different day. This is when our enemies don't wear a uniform and don't march under a specific flag. We have to take the measures and the precautions to make sure that the American people stay safe. That is our

number one job in this country, safety and security.

The fourth principle under here to be addressed is political corruption. That is something that, frankly, we need individuals at all levels of government that are public servants, that approach their jobs with a servant's heart, as opposed to being self-serving. And I know that Mr. MARINO, who is now in Congress, has that servant's heart. Many of my new Members, new colleagues, and certainly folks I've served with for the past 2 years have that focus and commitment, frankly, of service and sacrifice to our constituents. And so I think that is something that I respect, the fact that that is on here. That is certainly something that's important; that the people that are here are serving, not just at the Federal level but the State level and local level, for the right reasons.

Central banking and money. I'm going to switch these charts just to be able to read them a little better.

□ 1750

The fact that the U.S. Congress really has delegated, and I think illegally, their vested powers, coining money, taxation, regulation of commerce, making treaties, appropriating public money, all of the things that the powers of the House in particular is in the legislative branch.

We have three branches of government, but they are not equal. They are cosovereign, but they are not coequal. And we have delegated over, not just 2 years but many years, much of our authority, much of our responsibility as the legislative branch to the administrative branch. Much of that has been very inappropriate, and I think it's a time of going back to our roots and making sure we go back to those founding principles and looking at what is it that we are supposed to be doing that we have deferred, that we have designated and allowed the administrative branch to now do.

Certainly principle number six, the central planning: The constant intervention of the economy through regulations, subsidies, tariffs, taxes, policies have altered the fabric of the Nation's free market economy in just these past 2 years, and we are dealing with it now. We voted to repeal the Patient Protection Affordable Health Care Act. The media sometimes refers to that as the Obamacare plan, and we voted and passed on a bipartisan way to repeal that bill for that very reason of that top-down approach. Washington is famous for a top-down approach, a cookie-cutter approach. I have seen that in my service on the Education Committee where it is a cookie cutter.

No Child Left Behind believes that every child should go to college. Well, that's great. If that child has that aspiration and those attributes, that's wonderful. I'm going to be dedicated to making sure we make that as affordable and as accessible as possible. But not every child is on that path. Some

children, it will be technical training. Some children, it will be going into the military and learning a skill or trade there. Some will be going right into the workforce.

We need to be empowering through education, not top down from a central planning way from the national government. We should be empowering our best resources for making sure that every child's individual potential is developed. Do you know who that is? That's the parents, the teachers, the administrators. It's the local school board members, that governing body and the local school boards. That's the way the founders intended it, because they knew which way it would work best.

Well, I am joined by another neighbor of mine across the State line to the north, Mr. TOM REED from the great State of New York. Mr. REED, thanks for joining us tonight.

Mr. REED. Thank you very much.

I stand today to join my colleague and applaud my colleague for coming to the floor of the House to articulate what are truly our founding and our core principles. We should be going back to our Constitution on a regular basis and always recognize that what our Founding Fathers envisioned for America was a limited Federal Government; not an America that guarantees everyone success in life, but, rather, a government that guarantees that every American, every man, woman, and child in America has the opportunity to succeed.

We do not at the Federal Government level pick winners and losers. What we should do is always guarantee that the opportunity in America is there for our young men, women, and children of the generations of today and the generations of tomorrow to have the opportunity to succeed and control their own destiny.

I see an America right now, my good friend from Pennsylvania who is articulating here today, the concerns that the Nation of America truly is fighting for its existence.

We see a national debt that is at \$14 trillion in publicly held debt. You talk to people about the unfunded liability of putting that national debt at \$200 trillion, plus or minus. That's \$242,000 for each man, woman, and child in America. That is not sustainable. That will not protect this Nation for generations of today and of tomorrow and for generations that are not even contemplated as we sit here tonight.

We have an obligation to stand for this wonderful Nation, and I am proud to join my colleague from Pennsylvania and come here tonight and cry out for America to say we need to stand once again.

We need to fight for our very existence, because that existence is threatened from that financial insecurity that is brought on by this national debt. And I am so confident that when we stand together, when we come into this Chamber and we have the open and

vigorous debate that we are going to have and that we will have, America will prosper. We will make the hard decisions, and we will stand proudly as one Nation for many generations to come that will be the beacon and the light to the world for so many who so need us and who so want us to succeed, and we are committed to that effort.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend for joining us tonight.

The last principle is one I am proud to say we have taken some action on here. It has to do with legislation, the common practice for Congress to shortcut things, shortcut the process, not follow regular order, open rules, allowing all Members of Congress to offer amendments.

In my first 2 years of Congress, I never experienced one open rule. I didn't know what it was like. And I was shocked to find out that that is normally how you do business; that predominantly, most of the time, it's under open rule.

Some of the things we put in place with the rules package is requiring bills to be published ahead of time so that not only us as Members of Congress but our constituents can read them, and we have that chance to solicit input from them, to get that feedback on the unintended consequences and how it may impact them; the fact that we are now requiring you have to give some evidence, some documentation of where the constitutional authority is for doing this bill now, trying to keep germaneness in terms of what we put forward versus these thousands-of-pages bills that are just a mismatch of different topics.

So I thank my colleagues tonight for joining me in this. I certainly thank the patriots, like those folks from Williamsport, Pennsylvania, who joined in sharing those principles that we have, those patriots like that all over this Nation. We are just so appreciative for what they do for this country as well.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 9, 2011.
Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby give notice of my resignation from the United States House of Representatives, effective 5:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, Wednesday, February 9, 2011. Attached is the letter I submitted to Governor Andrew Cuomo.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER J. LEE,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 9, 2011.
Hon. ANDREW M. CUOMO,
Governor of New York State, State Capitol
Building Albany, NY.

DEAR GOVERNOR CUOMO: I hereby submit my resignation as United States Representative of the 26th District of New York, effective 5:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, Wednesday, February 9, 2011. Attached is the letter I submitted to Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER J. LEE,
Member of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from New York (Mr. LEE), the whole number of the House is 434.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACHUS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending the funeral of a very close friend in Athens, Georgia.

Mr. BILBRAY (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family medical emergency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 10, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

297. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report for fiscal year 2010 on the quality of health care furnished under the health care programs of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

298. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report entitled "Macroeconomic Effects of Risk Retention Requirements"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

299. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting A Study of the Effects of Size and Complexity of Financial Institutions on Capital Market Efficiency and Economic Growth; to the Committee on Financial Services.

300. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report entitled "Study and Recommendations Regarding Concentration Limits on Large Financial Companies"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

301. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Health, United States, 2010"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

302. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's report on Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls for 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

303. A letter from the President, African Development Foundation, transmitting a letter fulfilling the annual requirements contained in the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, covering the period October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

304. A letter from the Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (FAIR Act), the Commission's inventory of commercial activities for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

305. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-656, "District of Columbia Housing Authority Board of Commissioners Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

306. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-690, "Not-for-Profit Hospital Corporation Personnel Administration Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

307. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

308. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

309. A letter from the Legal Counsel, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

310. A letter from the General Counsel, Institute of Museum and Library Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

311. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's report on the actions taken to ensure that audits are conducted of its programs and operations for fiscal year 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

312. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Models Jetstream Series 3101 and Jetstream Model 3201 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0942; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-049-AD; Amendment 39-16535; AD 2010-25-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

313. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness

Directives; Airbus Model A300 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0850; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-076-AD; Amendment 39-16536; AD 2010-25-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

314. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Corporation Model DC-9-30, DC-9-40, and DC-9-50 Series Airplanes, Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), and DC-9-87 (MD-87) Airplanes, and Model MD-88 and MD-90-30 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0934; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-113-AD; Amendment 39-16537; AD 2010-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

315. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Models DA 40 and DA 40F Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0845; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-044-AD; Amendment 39-16534; AD 2010-25-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

316. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-111 and A318-112 Airplanes and Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0670; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-339-AD; Amendment 39-16526; AD 2010-24-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

317. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DASSAULT AVIATION Model MYSTERE-FALCON 50 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1155; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-238-AD; Amendment 39-16527; AD 2010-24-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

318. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-201, -202, -203, -223, and -243 Airplanes; Airbus Model A330-330 Series Airplanes; and Airbus Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0952; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-131-AD; Amendment 39-16555; AD 2011-01-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

319. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-500 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1023; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-055-AD; Amendment 39-16557; AD 2011-01-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

320. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; 328 Support Services GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held by AvCraft Aerospace GmbH; Fairchild Dornier GmbH; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH) Model 328-100 and -300 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0955; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-013-AD; Amendment 39-16560; AD 2011-01-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64)

received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

321. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0854; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-261-AD; Amendment 39-16559; AD 2011-01-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

322. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Model F.28 Mark 0100 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0701; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-017-AD; Amendment 39-16561; AD 2011-01-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

323. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model MD-90-30 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0953; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-010-AD; Amendment 39-16565; AD 2011-01-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

324. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; B/E Aerospace Protective Breathing Equipment (PBE) Part Number 119003-11 Installed on Various Transport Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0797; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-141-AD; Amendment 39-16562; AD 2011-01-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

325. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company (Cessna) (Type Certificate A00003SE Previously Held by Columbia Aircraft Manufacturing (Previously The Lancair Company)) Models LC41-550FG and LC42-550FG Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1297; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-068-AD; Amendment 39-16569; AD 2010-26-54] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

326. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model BD-700-1A10 and BD-700-1A11 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0959; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-119-AD; Amendment 39-16564; AD 2011-01-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

327. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; the Boeing Company Model 737-300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0855; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-066-AD; Amendment 39-16566; AD 2011-01-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

328. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ROLLADEN-SCHNEIDER Flugzeugbau GmbH Model LS6 Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1286; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-064-AD; Amendment 39-

16563; AD 86-25-07 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

329. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. Models AT-802 and AT-802A Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0827; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-029-AD; Amendment 39-16552; AD 2010-17-18 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

330. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 737-200, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0437; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-130-AD; Amendment 39-16539; AD 2010-25-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

331. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model DHC-8-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0805; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-042-AD; Amendment 39-16553; AD 2010-26-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

332. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Model PA-28-161 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1006; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-057-AD; Amendment 39-16543; AD 2010-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

333. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's quarterly report to Congress on the Status of Significant Unresolved Issues with the Department of Energy's Design and Construction Projects (dated December 30, 2010); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services.

334. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Evaluation of the Rural PACE Provider Grant Program", pursuant to Public Law 109-171, section 5302; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

335. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report entitled "Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act Pilot Project"; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture.

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. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 79. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 relating to access to business records, individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers, and roving wiretaps until December 8, 2011 (Rept. 112-8). Referred to the House Calendar.

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 Mrs. BONO MACK:

H.R. 566. A bill to close the National Drug Intelligence Center; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. NUNES (for himself, Mr. RYAN

of Wisconsin, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MACK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 567. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for reporting and disclosure by State and local public employee retirement pension plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELLER:

H.R. 568. A bill to require that the Government give priority to payment of all obligations on the debt held by the public and payment of Social Security benefits in the event that the debt limit is reached; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 569. A bill to end unemployment payments to jobless millionaires; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr.

TERRY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. DOLD):

H.R. 570. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance the roles of dentists and allied dental personnel in the Nation's disaster response framework, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 571. A bill to require a heightened review process by the Secretary of Labor of State occupational safety and health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WU, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MORAN,

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHARKOWSKY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SIREs, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 572. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide certain port authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SUTTON (for herself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 573. A bill to amend section 310 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 to extend the period of time during which claims for retroactive stop-loss special pay may be submitted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 574. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce from authorizing commercial finfish aquaculture operations in the Exclusive Economic Zone except in accordance with a law authorizing such action; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 575. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with community health care providers to improve access to health care for veterans in highly rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 576. A bill to amend section 9A of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require each local educational agency participating in a program authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to include under the local school wellness policy established by the agency a requirement that students receive 50 hours of school nutrition education per school year; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

H.R. 577. A bill to prevent the abuse and exploitation of older individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

H.R. 578. A bill to ensure that sex offenders and sexually violent predators are not eligible for parole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 579. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of action plans aimed at reducing reliance on imported fossil fuels and increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 580. A bill to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site at St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 581. A bill to convey certain submerged lands to the Government of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 582. A bill to extend the supplemental security income benefits program to Guam and the United States Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 583. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen enforcement of spousal court-ordered property distributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Ms.

BERKLEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REYES, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHARKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 584. A bill to repeal the information reporting requirements added by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 585. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for the establishment and approval of small business concern size standards by the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr.

PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. QUAYLE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 586. A bill to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 98 West First Street, Yuma, Arizona, as the "John M. Roll United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. MARKKEY):

H.R. 587. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Education and the Workforce, 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. HARPER:

H.R. 588. A bill to redesignate the Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge as the Sam D. Hamilton Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. STARK, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HINCHAY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BACA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 589. A bill to amend title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 to provide for additional weeks of first-tier emergency unemployment compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 590. A bill to prohibit States from carrying out more than one Congressional redistricting after a decennial census and apportionment, to require States to conduct such redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 591. A bill to require criminal background checks on all firearms transactions occurring at gun shows; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 592. A bill to amend chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, relating to protective orders, sealing of cases, disclosures of discovery information in civil actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 593. A bill to require States to report information on Medicaid payments to abortion providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 594. A bill to promote coastal jobs creation, promote sustainable fisheries and fishing communities, revitalize waterfronts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. REED (for himself, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 595. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to designate the musical piece commonly known as "Taps" as the National Song of Remembrance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H.R. 596. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit certain revenues of private providers of public transportation by vanpool received from providing public transportation to be used for the purpose of acquiring rolling stock, and to permit certain expenditures of private vanpool contractors to be credited toward the local matching share of the costs of public transportation projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 597. A bill to restore the Federal electoral rights of the residents of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and 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. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 598. A bill to eliminate the preferences and special rules for Alaska Native Corporations under the program under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. WOODALL:

H.R. 599. A bill to repeal the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and rescind all unobligated funds made available in such Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.J. Res. 25. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding presidential election voting rights for residents of all United States territories and commonwealths; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service should incorporate consideration of global warming and sea-level rise into the comprehensive conservation plans for coastal national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H. Res. 78. A resolution electing certain Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H. Res. 80. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Marine Awareness Day; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STARK:

H. Res. 81. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 12, 2011, as Darwin Day and recognizing the importance of science in the betterment of humanity; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

1. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 28 memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to have the 2020 Census gather data on sexual orientation and gender identity; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 3 decrying the recent shooting in Tucson; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas introduced A bill (H.R. 600) for the relief of Enrique Soriano and Areli Soriano; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 Mrs. BONO MACK:

H.R. 566.

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

The authority for enactment of this Bill flows from Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution. Congress may prescribe by statute the procedures which are reasonably necessary to effectuate its constitutional purpose of spending for the general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 567.

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

Clauses 1 and 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HELLER:

H.R. 568.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution enumerates the power of Congress to pay the debt.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 569.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 570.

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

Congress has the authority to provide this coordination under the power to "provide for the common defence" as articulated in the Preamble as well as the power of Congress to make rules for the government, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 571.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 572.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. SUTTON:

H.R. 573.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 574.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 575.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 576.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

H.R. 577.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

H.R. 578.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 579.

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

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 580.

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

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 581.

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

Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 582.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 relating to expending funds for the general welfare of the United States and Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States granting Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 583.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 584.

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

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that "All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 585.

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

Art. I, §1; Art. I, 8, Cl. 1; Art. I, §8, Cl. 3; and Art. I, §8, Cl. 18.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 586.

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

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 587.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate commerce among the several states), and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 588.

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

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 589.

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

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H.R. 590.

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

Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to enact laws governing the time, place, and manner of elections for Members of the House of Representatives.

Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution gives Congress the power to enact laws to enforce Section 2 of such Amendment, which requires Representatives to be apportioned among the several States according to their number.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 591.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 592.

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

Clauses 9 and 18 of section 8 of Article I and Section 1 of Article III of the Constitution.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 593.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. (Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers).

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 594.

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

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 595.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces."

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 596.

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

Our nation's workforce plays a vital role in commerce and getting them to and from work safely and efficiently is granted in the constitution under "instrumentalities of commerce" within the Commerce Clause (Art. I, §8, Cl. 3).

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 597.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, granting Congress the power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the District constituting the Seat of Government of the United States;

Section 2 of the 14th Amendment, providing that Representatives shall be apportioned among the several states according to their respective numbers; and

Both sections of the 23rd Amendment, which grant Congress the authority to direct the appointment of presidential electors from the District of Columbia and to enforce the 23rd Amendment by appropriate legislation.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 598.

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

The U.S. Constitution, including Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. WOODALL:

H.R. 599.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the procedural power granted to the House of Representatives pursuant to Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

This bill is enacted pursuant to the appropriations powers enumerated to Congress in Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

This bill is enacted in fidelity to the powers vested in Congress in Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution and to prohibit encroachment of individual rights granted in Amendment IX and state's rights granted in Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 600.

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

Nationalization Clause: Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution. The Congress shall have Power * * * To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.J. Res. 25.

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

Article V of the United States Constitution relating to Congress proposing Amendments to the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 5: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 10: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 21: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 27: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 29: Mr. BACA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 49: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 64: Mr. HONDA and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 85: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 121: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 123: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 178: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BARROW, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. KIND, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 179: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 181: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 186: Mr. WEST and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 187: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BISHOP of Utah,

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LATTA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 198: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 207: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 217: Mr. MARINO, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 238: Mr. BARROW, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 263: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 264: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 303: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MICA, Mr. BONNER, Mr. WU, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. McINTYRE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 344: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. McCLINTOCK.

H.R. 350: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 358: Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MARINO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. YODER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BERG, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 365: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 384: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 390: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 401: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 406: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 412: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 413: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 414: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 418: Ms. NORTON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 421: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. REED, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KELLY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 432: Mr. KILDEE and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 436: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JONES, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 439: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 445: Mr. HECK, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 452: Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. HECK, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 455: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 458: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 470: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. HELLER.

H.R. 484: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 509: Mr. CRAVAACK and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 512: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 539: Mr. OLVER and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 547: Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. KEATING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.J. Res. 23: Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Res. 61: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HOLT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. REYES, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Judiciary in H.R. 514 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETION 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. 536: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.