



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2011

No. 41

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 17, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### PRAYER

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

Lord, may this celebration of the feast of St. Patrick give all people smiling eyes and grateful hearts.

Knowing that all work is sacred in Your sight, and well aware that work in government is very difficult in today's world, we pray that the following Celtic adage may be realized in all who work here in the Congress of these United States.

May you see in what you do, the beauty of your own soul.

May the sacredness of your work bring healing, light and renewal to those who work with you and those who see and receive your work.

May your work never weary you.

May every dawn find you alert, approaching the new day with dreams, possibilities and promises.

May every evening find you gracious and fulfilled.

And may every good work, wrapped in prayer, calm, console and renew you. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BARROW 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 five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### TRIBUTE TO PRIVATE FIRST CLASS ANDREW HARPER

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, this past week, West Virginia experienced a tremendous loss. Private First Class Andrew Harper from Madsville, West Virginia, died from injuries he sustained while serving in Afghanistan. He represented America with the utmost pride and dignity.

A graduate from University High School in Morgantown, Private Harper was stationed in Kandahar province when he sustained his fatal injuries during a noncombat incident.

The admiration our community felt for this 19-year-old man and his service are immense. So many are shocked by the news of Andrew's passing. This brave young man was so very promising. There is no question that Andrew

left a great legacy and his memory should be honored.

My wife, Mary, and I, as well as all West Virginians, will keep Private Harper, his family, his friends and his entire unit, the 3rd Squadron, 2nd Stryker Cavalry Regiment, in our thoughts and prayers.

### COMMEMORATING THE 46TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

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

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 46th anniversary of Bloody Sunday and to recognize the courage of my colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and the many other heroes of the civil rights movement.

A couple of weeks ago, I was privileged to retrace the footsteps of history with JOHN LEWIS and walk across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama. There, nearly 50 years ago, some 600 demonstrators marched to take a stand for African American voting rights. On the bridge, they were savagely attacked by State and local lawmen to prohibit their crossing. Journalists captured those brutal attacks, sparking outrage that led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Congressman LEWIS recently returned to the Edmund Pettus Bridge. Again he was met by a large group of police—this time as an honor guard.

We have come a long way in the last 50 years, and we still have a long way to go to ensure equality and justice for all. But we never could have come as far as we have without the courage and the devotion of countless men and women just like JOHN LEWIS.

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.

H1909

### VOTE “NO” ON TROOP WITHDRAWAL FROM AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in my nearly 27 years in the United States Air Force, I learned that one of the most critical elements necessary to overcome a determined enemy is the element of surprise. Based on my experience and the proven battle-tested history of the many successful conflicts that our Nation has endured over the years, I must stand in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 28.

Surprise is a tactical element best determined by field commanders based on battlefield conditions. As such, decisions on troop movements should be made by commanders in the field, not politicians in Washington. Should this bill pass, we give up the element of surprise, we break the trust and relationship we have built with the Afghan people and our allies, and the sacrifice of our young men and women in uniform would be meaningless if we simply walk away.

General Petraeus said, “The Taliban and al Qaeda obviously would trumpet this as a victory, as a success. Needless to say, it would completely undermine everything that our troopers have fought so much for and sacrificed so much for.”

I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

### GIVE HEALTH CARE REFORM A CHANCE TO WORK

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, President Obama signed the historic Affordable Care Act into law. Since that time, we have seen an all-out assault by the special interests and health insurance companies.

Americans are tired of this debate. They are tired of the misinformation. Congress must stand up for the middle class. We must protect families. We must stop companies from arbitrarily canceling coverage after patients become sick, prevent children from being denied coverage due to preexisting conditions, and never again let insurance companies place lifetime limits on health coverage.

Mr. Speaker, let's give the reform a chance to work. Reject the special interests and extreme rhetoric. Make sure every American family is protected when it comes to health care.

### DISCIPLINED SPENDING BY CONGRESS

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, the United States Congress is the only place that I know of that we talk about trillions of dollars, trillion with a “T.”

How much is \$1 trillion? It is a number so large it is hard to get your arms around it. But if you were to spend \$1 million a day, \$1 million every day, it would take you almost 3,000 years to get to \$1 trillion.

This Nation right now is more than \$14 trillion in debt. The country is going to spend more than \$3.5 trillion over 12 months. More than \$220 billion was added to our debt just last month.

Somehow, some way, this government has got to recognize that we are going to have to do more with less; that the proper role of government does not allow us to unilaterally use this, the voting card of the United States Congress, as the biggest credit card that has ever faced this planet. We have to do more with less. We have to be disciplined.

### CUTS TO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND STEM EDUCATION

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to talk about a crisis that our country is facing. We all know that our Nation's future strength is directly dependent upon our commitment to a robust science agenda. The cuts to our Nation's science programs in the CR threaten to set our Nation back even as we continue to look forward to our future.

An investment in science is about ensuring our Nation's memories are honored, by investing in dreams that are yet even brighter. As an author of the first bipartisan America COMPETES Act, we responded to many top academic, corporate and business leaders who knew that investments in STEM education is what will ensure that our Nation's future science and engineering leaders will never need to leave our shores in order to obtain a world-class education.

December 2010 was one of our finest hours when, as a Congress, we returned to our triumphant moment of passing the comprehensive, bipartisan America COMPETES Reauthorization Act, to provide our Nation with a roadmap for investing in our global economic competitiveness and our future growth.

Mr. Speaker, our country cannot afford to go backwards by giving up on science and innovation.

An investment in science is about ensuring America's memories are honored by investing in dreams that are even brighter.

We all have a responsibility to preserve this vision in order to help rebuild our economy.

□ 0910

### UNAFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE ACT

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues on

the other side of the aisle continue to refer to the so-called health care reform bill as the Affordable Health Care Act. There are a lot of questions 1 year after passage. But one question has been answered. It is not the Affordable Medical Care Act. It is the Unaffordable Medical Care Act.

Why do I say that? Well, HHS has decided to give over 1,000 waivers to businesses, to unions, and now even to States because they find they can't afford what is required in the bill. Secondly, I haven't met a single constituent whose health care cost by way of their insurance policies or programs has gone down. They have all gone up as a direct result of the bill passed on this floor and signed by the President.

So let's at least have some truth in labeling. It is not the Affordable Health Care Act. It is increasingly becoming the Unaffordable Health Care Act.

### WE WILL NOT GO BACK

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Friday, March 25, marks the 100th anniversary of the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire. The deaths of 146 workers—mostly young women—were avoidable. If the owners of the factory had not locked the doors to the stairwells and exits, if they had installed a stable fire escape or put in sprinklers, many of those lives would not have been painfully and tragically lost.

The International Ladies Garment Workers Union didn't just mourn the victims—they organized. Their activism resulted in the passage of major worker protections—not just new fire-safety laws but laws against the 7-day work weeks and child labor. The Triangle tragedy helped expand the right to union representation—a voice at work.

One hundred years later, we confront a coordinated effort to roll back those hard-fought gains. Just as the Triangle fire spurred people into action, the anti-working family agenda of Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker has mobilized millions. The message is clear: We will not go back.

### THE NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. FATTAH. Let me wish everyone a happy St. Patty's Day.

It is unfortunate that we have so much effort here in the House to recite the problem rather than to focus on solutions. We hear this discussion about our national debt. We have these paltry efforts. We cut \$6 billion on the same day that the debt went up \$72 billion. We have a proposal by the majority to address the debt by cutting 1½ percent out of a small corner of the budget, doing serious damage to our Nation's

efforts in education and science and innovation.

I would hope that we would think for a minute about what we could actually do to take America's exceptional past and create a real roadmap for our Nation's future, ensuring it on a fiscal footing that will be stronger.

I have introduced this morning H.R. 1125. It is a proposal to address the Nation's debt and create a debt-free America. I invite the House to debate on it.

**PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 112TH CONGRESS**

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 147 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 147

*Resolved,*

**SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$12,235,047; Committee on Armed Services, \$15,050,528; Committee on the Budget, \$12,066,370; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$16,692,508; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$22,409,582; Committee on Ethics, \$5,868,311; Committee on Financial Services, \$17,399,282; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$17,904,940; Committee on Homeland Security, \$16,887,448; Committee on House Administration, \$10,516,013; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$10,307,500; Committee on the Judiciary, \$16,802,812; Committee on Natural Resources, \$15,739,532; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$21,226,108; Committee on Rules, \$6,783,970; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$13,346,273; Committee on Small Business, \$6,874,000; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$19,830,446; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$7,285,256; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$19,602,731.

**SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2011, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2012.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$6,189,494; Committee on Armed Services, \$7,525,264; Committee on the Budget, \$6,033,185; Committee on Education and the

Workforce, \$8,346,254; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$10,980,940; Committee on Ethics, \$2,824,535; Committee on Financial Services, \$8,441,264; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$8,952,470; Committee on Homeland Security, \$8,443,724; Committee on House Administration, \$4,949,176; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$5,153,750; Committee on the Judiciary, \$8,401,406; Committee on Natural Resources, \$7,869,766; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$10,613,054; Committee on Rules, \$3,391,985; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$6,685,637; Committee on Small Business, \$3,214,891; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$9,915,223; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$3,602,745; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$9,801,365.

**SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2012, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2013.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$6,045,553; Committee on Armed Services, \$7,525,264; Committee on the Budget, \$6,033,185; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$8,346,254; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$11,428,642; Committee on Ethics, \$3,043,776; Committee on Financial Services, \$8,958,018; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$8,952,470; Committee on Homeland Security, \$8,443,724; Committee on House Administration, \$5,566,837; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$5,153,750; Committee on the Judiciary, \$8,401,406; Committee on Natural Resources, \$7,869,766; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$10,613,054; Committee on Rules, \$3,391,985; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$6,660,637; Committee on Small Business, \$3,659,109; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$9,915,223; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$3,682,512; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$9,801,366.

(c) REVIEW OF USE OF FUNDS IN FIRST SESSION.—None of the amounts provided for in section 1 for a committee named in subsection (b) may be available for expenses of the committee after March 15, 2012, unless the chair or ranking minority member of the committee appears and presents testimony at a hearing of the Committee on House Administration held prior to such date to review the committee's use of the amounts provided for in section 1 during the first session of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress and to determine whether the amount specified in subsection (b) with respect to the committee should be updated on the basis of the review.

**SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.**

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

**SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.**

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1076, PROHIBITING FEDERAL FUNDING OF NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO**

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 174 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 174

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1076) to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. NUGENT. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER). During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 174 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 1076. The rule provides for ample debate on this bill and gives Members of both the minority and the majority an opportunity to participate in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. H.R. 1076 prohibits direct funding to NPR—National Public Radio. In fiscal year 2010, NPR received over \$5 million in direct Federal funding from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Department of Education, the Department of Commerce, and the National Endowment for the Arts. Moreover, hundreds of public radio stations received direct radio grants in the amount of \$67 million. Radio stations can use these grants for whatever they want. It's unrestricted. Often, stations use these funds to pay dues to NPR and pay fees for NPR programming. According to NPR's Web site, they are "an independent, self-supporting media organization." However, they also admit their revenue "comes primarily from fees paid by their member stations." In fact, membership dues and station programming fees account for 36 percent of NPR funding.

In H.R. 1, we started the process of letting NPR operate on its own, without taxpayer involvement, by defunding it for the remainder of fiscal year 2011. However, H.R. 1 only addressed appropriated funds for the rest of the current fiscal year. The bill we have before us today addresses the authorized use of funds not just for the rest of fiscal year 2011, but going forward.

Under this bill, NPR will continue to provide its programming. They just can't use taxpayer dollars to subsidize it. Moreover, our goal on H.R. 1076 is that there won't be a need for this funding going forward. This is something the Appropriations Committee can factor into their funding decisions for fiscal year 2012 and the future. Let me stress again, this bill does not fully defund NPR.

□ 0920

What this bill does do is start weaning NPR off of Federal dollars. Local radio stations are still allowed to pay membership dues, and they can still buy NPR programs. They just can't use your and my hard-earned tax dollars to pay for them.

Instead, the grants that these local stations get will be used for local needs. They can create more original programming about issues happening in their areas that are important to their communities. They can pay for their staffs and even hire more local producers and hosts for their new programs.

The Federal Government's addiction to spending has driven us to our current \$14 trillion debt. We need to refocus on what our core mission is. We should not be using tax dollars that American citizens worked hard to earn for something that could be paid for privately.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my friend from Florida for yielding me the customary time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill yesterday was brought to the Rules Committee as an emergency meeting. Now, what would be an emergency in the United States? The cost of the war? The damage of the war? Unemployment figures? The deficit? Home foreclosure? The tragedy in Japan? A no-fly zone over Libya?

No. The emergency is that they want to destroy National Public Radio.

This is the latest in a long string of misplaced priorities by the Republican Party. It does nothing to fix the long-term fiscal condition. It doesn't create a single job. In fact, it will lose some. The Congressional Budget Office has determined that the legislation does absolutely zero to reduce the deficit.

When so many Americans want our representatives to create jobs to re-

sponsibly reduce the deficit and to bring our sons and daughters home from the battlefields overseas, why are we wasting valuable floor time on an ideological battle that does nothing to achieve any of those goals?

Because the bill is a political stunt, it is being rushed through Congress under draconian rules. Violating their own promises of transparency, the Republican majority held no hearings, no committee action of any kind, listened to no expert testimony, and provided no chance for the American people to weigh in. Just by saying it is an emergency, apparently, in many minds, it does become one. By not providing a true 72 hours and because the bill, itself, omitted the fact that the bill would lay over to allow all Members to review the legislation, they violated the spirit of the transparency they promised the American people just 5 months ago.

My colleagues on the other side know that they must pass this legislation quickly before the American people, at the rate of 69 percent, are allowed to speak and tell their representatives something they don't want to hear, for the American people, unlike the far right-wing, know that NPR is not an ideological news outlet and that NPR radio bases its reporting on fact, which is really an anomaly today in the United States.

NPR doesn't try to blur the line between opinion, fact, and political agenda. Instead, it takes the time and spends the money to do in-depth reporting across the country and around the globe and to go where no other news organization will go. Unlike commercial news outlets that are driven by the need to garner ratings and sell commercial advertising, National Public Radio concerns itself, first and foremost, with informing the Nation on the complex issues that face our country.

In stark contrast to the bare bones and often sensationalist reporting found elsewhere, National Public Radio operates 17 foreign bureaus. In fact, it is one of the few news outlets to maintain a full-time bureau in Afghanistan, reporting from the front lines of a largely forgotten war. It is also in the process of opening a bureau in Turkey in order to report firsthand on the democratic uprisings throughout the Middle East.

In the United States, it has correspondents spread out from Texas to Oregon, telling the stories not covered by the cable news pundits that we see on TV every day. In rural America in particular, NPR can often be the only, best source of news. Defunding NPR will cut off this valuable source of news from the southern tier of western New York to the plains of the upper Midwest, and will put rural communities at a major disadvantage in the information age.

It is because of their valuable and unique reporting that Americans are increasingly turning to NPR in order to learn about our ever-changing

world. In fact, despite the challenges facing the news media, a new report by the Pew Foundation has shown that NPR is strong and is growing more popular every day. According to the report, NPR's audience has grown to 27.2 million weekly listeners. This is a 58 percent increase since the year 2000. In addition, the Web site is a premier online news destination, garnering 15.7 million visitors a month, which is an increase of more than 5 million people over the course of a single year—and are those people really going to be angry.

I've been a proud supporter of NPR my whole life in public service. While serving in the New York State Legislature, I fought for the launch of news programming on my local public radio station, WXXI. From that humble beginning over 30 years ago, I find myself standing on the floor of the House of Representatives, fighting for NPR again today.

I stand here because, quite simply, facts matter. This Nation wasn't built because we huffed and puffed and wished it were so. We didn't become a global leader by bloviating on 24-hour cable news, and we aren't solving the fundamental issues that face our Nation by passing this politically driven legislation to appease the far right.

Our Nation was built and will be rebuilt by the quiet efforts of millions of Americans across the country who will never make it on cable news and who will never appear on national television. It is these very Americans whom NPR dedicates its resources to finding, to covering, and to sharing the world with. Their stories aren't simple, and their efforts don't sell advertising space, but their stories matter. NPR's work to find the stories that matter is the in-depth intelligent reporting that I fight for today.

No matter what I say, some will still believe that NPR isn't worth funding because they want it to be true. Some will find it in their interests to scare Americans into believing in an NPR straw man, while others will take comfort in watching the straw man fall.

Yet, deep in our hearts, all of us know that governing through fear and divisive legislation is not a responsible way to move this country forward. It is certainly no replacement for creating jobs. With millions of Americans who are unemployed and struggling to live, we can't waste another minute on the House floor without debating a bill that will put some Americans back to work. We should not waste another minute ignoring the needs of millions of Americans while playing cheap political games.

Yesterday, I asked, Why only National Public Radio? Why not television? I think I know the answer to that.

A few years ago, that was tried. The House of Representatives actually tried to kill Big Bird, to destroy Elmo, and to get rid of Bert and Ernie, but it didn't work. I think they didn't want to try that one yet again.

The backers of this bill said to me yesterday that taxpayers shouldn't have to fund with their hard-earned money what they don't believe in. Well, that's an interesting theory, but democracies don't operate that way. If they could, my husband and I and two-thirds of the people in America would gladly be excused from paying the \$8 billion a month that we pay for a war which we profoundly do not believe in. We simply must stop this nonsense. It makes us look ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

National Public Radio is something that you could turn off if you don't want to hear it, but for the millions of Americans who depend on it, this just cannot be done. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this rule. I think the American people deserve an opportunity to have their Representatives vote on the funding of NPR.

Now, let's also make sure we keep this in context because really what this is ultimately going to do is talk about the funding of less than 5 percent of NPR. It's not as if this is going to go off the radio right away. I'm not here to debate the content or make some editorial comment about their editorial comment, but we have to deal with the fiscal reality of this country.

Every time we turn around, nobody wants to cut anything. We're going to have to figure out in this country how to do more with less. The reality is we're \$14 trillion in debt. We pay more than \$600 million a day on interest on that debt. We can't be all things to all people. We have to understand the proper role of government.

Every time we make a decision about spending, what we're talking about is, should we go into somebody's pocket, pull money out, and give it to somebody else? And in the case of our Federal Government now, we're also doing that, but we're also borrowing the money. We're borrowing the money.

And so in the case of NPR, which has been wildly successful, as the gentleman properly accounted for, Mr. Speaker—their listenership is rising—which gives a lot of us the belief that, really, they should be moving towards a model where they can sustain themselves through their donations and other funding mechanisms rather than relying upon the taxpayers to fund them, because we don't have any money. We're broke.

And so I'm proud of the fact that early in this Republican control of the House of Representatives that we're going to bring this up for a vote, let the will of this body take its course, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes"

on the rule so we can have that opportunity to vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for the time, and I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule and to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, the process in this House is awful. On this bill, H.R. 1076, there were no hearings at all; and to top it off, we had an emergency Rules Committee called last night for consideration, an emergency. Do you think it was about jobs? Do you think it was about health care? No, it was about defunding NPR. That's what this new majority thinks is an emergency, not jobs, not the economy, but defunding the National Public Radio.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1076 is a horrible idea, and I hope everybody in this Chamber realizes that this bill doesn't cut \$1, not one dime, not one penny from the Federal deficit.

We all know what's going on here. The reason this bill is before us is that a discredited, right-wing activist recently made a selectively edited, misleading, 11-minute video of a 2-hour conversation. The target of his little sting was a fund-raising executive at NPR who no longer works there.

Mrs. BLACKBURN from the Energy and Commerce Committee made it clear in the Rules Committee last night that their justification for this bill is that the American people should not be forced to subsidize content with which they might not agree. Well, that's a lousy way to make decisions, in my view; but if my Republican friends insist on going down this road, Mr. Speaker, then we should be fair and balanced in the way we do it.

Over the past several years, it has become clear that the Fox News channel is widely biased. They continue to employ a talk show host who called President Obama a racist. They continue to employ several prospective Republican Presidential candidates as "analysts," giving them hours and hours of free air time, and their parent company has donated millions and millions of dollars to GOP-linked groups.

Yesterday, I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee to prohibit Federal funds, taxpayer dollars from being used for advertising on the partisan political platform of Fox News. If my friends on the other aisle want to strip funding from NPR because they believe wrongly, in my view, that NPR is biased, then we should be given the same opportunity. Unfortunately, my amendment was defeated on a party-line vote. Again, this is a closed rule. So much for the open process that we were promised.

I also offered an amendment to determine how and where hundreds of millions of dollars are spent on television advertising, not particularly controversial. According to a Rand study,

the Department of Defense alone spent over \$600 million in taxpayer money advertising in 2007, and I believe we should figure out whether that spending is a good use of taxpayer dollars. That amendment was also blocked on a party-line vote. Again, this is a big fat closed rule that we're dealing with here.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was rushed to the House floor again without a single hearing, without a single markup. So much for regular order.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, over the last few days, my office has been flooded with calls from constituents urging me to reject this bill and to continue to support programming on National Public Radio.

My friends talk about the will of the American people. The will of the American people want us to reject what you are doing here today, and that's exactly what I will do today. I urge my colleagues to reject this closed rule and vote "no" on the underlying bill.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Thank you very much.

I was actually not going to speak on this rule until I heard the ranking member of the Rules Committee speak, and she made our point so eloquently I wanted to underscore it. I couldn't believe that she suggested that there was somehow a parity between national defense and NPR. She said, if we're going to come here and talk about defunding NPR, then why shouldn't she get a shot at denying the Defense Department \$8 billion or whatever it is.

That's the point we're trying to make. We have a huge deficit, \$228 billion in 1 month. In fact, it was the shortest month of the year, which just happened to be the total deficit for, I think, the entire year of 2007. You know, I don't know, I heard people on the other side of the aisle criticizing President Bush for deficits. He's a piker compared to what we're seeing right now in the White House.

But the point is, how do we do anything here on the floor with respect to trying to bring spending under control if, as the gentlelady from New York suggests, we should treat equally the question of national defense and NPR? That's what the American people are rejecting. They're saying to you, why don't you establish priorities the way we establish priorities. And to come to the floor and suggest that somehow NPR is contained in the Constitution, as is the subject of national defense, I think is, frankly, ludicrous.

So I hope the American people are listening. This is a debate on the rule to allow the bill to be brought to the floor. The gentlelady from New York has done a very good job of crystalizing the issue. If you don't believe we

ought to set priorities, if you believe NPR is as important to this Nation as national defense, then reject the rule and reject the bill because the gentlelady is correct. If they're of equal weight, this is unfair because we are talking about NPR. We're not talking about somehow gutting national defense.

But if you believe that somehow national defense has a slightly higher priority in the Constitution and in our constitutional governmental structure than does NPR, then you would reject the gentlelady's suggestion and say we came here to try and change things. We came here to try and somehow balance our books at some point in time in the future, but the way to do that is to establish priorities.

If we, in fact, believe that saving NPR or giving NPR Federal funding is the same as funding our troops, then all is lost, all is lost; but I frankly was surprised to hear the comparison of us debating on money to keep our troops in the war zone versus NPR. That is the best example I have seen on the floor, perhaps the most honest example I've seen on floor, of the difference of the two parties and the difference in, I think, what the American people want us to do and what some in the leadership on the Democratic side want us to do.

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

Mr. NUGENT. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am, as many are, going home hopefully this afternoon and will have town halls when I'm home, and maybe I will ask the question at my town halls: Do you believe that funding NPR is of the same importance or moment as funding our troops in the war zone? I believe that I will have an overwhelming response by the people of my district who suggest what we are doing with this rule is to allow us to deal with those kinds of issues, setting priorities that they sent us to Washington to do.

□ 0940

So I again thank the gentleman for his time. I thank the gentlelady for explicating the difference between the two parties' approaches on this and understanding the sense of priorities that either exist or don't exist on this floor.

For me, I will easily say that even though it may be a tough decision, I would vote to take Federal funding away from NPR in order to try to balance our books in the future and do what is necessary to defend this country and those other things that are contained in the Constitution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am going to yield myself 30 seconds to tell my colleague from California to calm himself. He doesn't have to worry. We are not equating war and NPR. What I had said was that the basis of this bill today was that people should not have to pay

for what they don't believe in. If that's going to be the way the majority is going to run this House, then 66 percent of Americans would like to not pay for the war.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for at least 15 million Americans, this is another day without a job, and tomorrow will be another Friday without a paycheck. What are we doing?

After 11 consecutive weeks of this majority producing not a word, not a bill, not one idea about how to create jobs, what we're doing this morning is debating whether or not to defund and get rid of National Public Radio. Now, the excuse that we've heard is that, well, this will save money. A preliminary estimate from the Congressional Budget Office says this will save zero. So what we are doing is spending the time of the country on whether to defund National Public Radio.

Here is what we should do instead: With gasoline prices approaching \$4 a gallon at the pump, why don't we cancel out \$40 billion in giveaways to the oil industry. Why don't we take most of that money and use it to reduce the deficit, and why don't we take some of that money and use it to put Americans back to work, building clean water systems, schools, roads, research facilities, and other things that we need? Why aren't we debating that bill? Now, Members of Congress can say they disagree with that bill. They could amend it. They could vote for it or against it. Why don't we debate that bill instead of whether or not to pull the plug on National Public Radio?

Eleven weeks, not one idea on jobs, not one word of debate on jobs, and abandonment of the issue Americans care most about. I am hopeful that the leader on our side of the Rules Committee will give us a chance to vote on a real bill to create jobs for the American people.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady.

There are really two questions that this bill raises. The first: Is this a way to deal with the serious problem we have in this country, which is the deficit? And the answer is: It isn't.

I salute the Republicans in this Congress for focusing attention on the need to restore fiscal balance. You are right. But the plan you are pursuing to receive it is dead wrong. You cannot, by cutting 12 percent of the budget, the non-defense discretionary budget, achieve the fiscal balance that we need. And why you have a plan where you attack Vermont Public Radio, where you attack Planned Parenthood,

where you attack home heating assistance, but you leave exempt tax expenditures for oil companies, a swollen Pentagon budget, that means that this is not going to succeed. Even if we wiped out the entire non-defense discretionary budget, we would still have a deficit of \$1 trillion. So, serious budget cutters have a serious plan that puts everything on the table.

Secondly, why have a proposal that destroys institutions? Vermont Public Radio is the link between 251 towns, cities, and villages in the State of Vermont. Farmers listen to it in their barns. Parents listen to it on their way to bringing their kids to school. People at work listen to it for the weather reports, and it welds together the political discussion in the State of Vermont which is vibrant, which is varied, which has people with different points of view having a common reference point. Public radio is an institution that allows democracy to thrive.

And why do we have to have a budget plan that, A, by its design, will fail; and, B, by its application and implementation, will destroy institutions that democracy depends on? Vermont Public Radio is an essential institution to all of the people in the State of Vermont: Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. We need to preserve it.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by extending congratulations to my very good friend, the gentleman from Spring Hill, a former sheriff, Mr. NUGENT, for his maiden voyage in managing this rule. He has done a superb job in taking on this issue.

Let me say at the outset, having listened to the debate from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, every single thing that we have been doing on the floor of the House of Representatives is focused on job creation and economic growth. Virtually everything that we have done is focused on job creation and economic growth.

Now, some say, Why is it you are talking about National Public Radio now? What does that have to do with creating jobs? Well, the fact of the matter is, if we don't take on the \$14 trillion national debt that we have in this country and the \$1.6 trillion annual deficits that we have as far as the eye can see, we are not going to be implementing pro-growth economic policies.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle might argue that bringing about some kind of reduction in funding for National Public Radio will cost jobs. The disparity is that my friends on the other side of the aisle tend to focus on government-created jobs, and we want to focus on what it is the American people desperately want and

need, which is long-term, good private sector jobs. And so everything that we do to try to reduce the size and scope and reach of government is focused on getting, as my friend from Vermont has just said, getting our fiscal house in order so that we can create jobs.

Yesterday up in the Rules Committee, my California colleague Ms. ESHOO referred to National Public Radio as a “national treasure.” Now, Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a fan of National Public Radio. I think that the term “national treasure” may just be a little bit of a stretch. I have been proud to support three local stations, two in Los Angeles, KPCC and KCRW; here in Washington, D.C., WAMU. I have been proud to participate in pledge drives for all these stations. I have done it for public television. I believe in voluntary contributions.

Now, yesterday Ms. ESHOO said that every American pays 77 cents for the benefit of National Public Radio. And while I am a proud listener of National Public Radio, I will say that I reckon that there are probably half the American people—that’s just a wild guess on my part—maybe half the American people who have never even heard of, much less even listened to, National Public Radio. And the notion of taking 77 cents from them for National Public Radio is, to me, anathema to the whole concept of what it is that we are trying to do as a Nation.

Now, my friend from Rochester, the distinguished ranking member of the committee, the former chairman of the Rules Committee, referred to National Public Radio as—and this is not the exact word that was used—but sort of a paragon of virtue. Rather than bloviating on cable television, we have this great, great model of National Public Radio up there, something to which we can all bow and listen to as the one truth before us.

□ 0950

Well, with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I’ve got to say that I’ve heard some inaccurate things on National Public Radio before, not just things with which I disagree, but there have been inaccuracies. And so, with all of the choices out there, I believe that National Public Radio should be one of them; but they are only one of the choices that people have.

And since National Public Radio and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting came into existence, we all know that we’ve experienced this explosion of information from all kinds of sources.

So that’s why, Mr. Speaker, while this measure doesn’t obliterate funding for National Public Radio, what it does is it puts us, as my friend from Spring Hill has said so well, on a glide path towards recognizing that since National Public Radio receives a very small amount of its funding that they utilize totally from the Federal Government, this puts them on a glide path towards something that I believe will dramati-

cally enhance the quality of coverage and the credibility of National Public Radio, and that is to have voluntary support.

And I will say right here that when we are successful, when we are successful at weaning National Public Radio and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting away from compulsory taxpayer dollars used to fund them, I personally will increase my level of contributions, my level of contributions to those local stations and to other aspects.

We need to look at ways in which this shortfall that will exist is addressed, and I believe that we can do that.

And I have to say that, procedurally, it’s very interesting to listen to people talk about the characterization of this rule that has come down before us. It’s simply because less than 48 hours was provided for the announcement of simply the Rules Committee meeting, not the fact that we’re here on the floor. And my distinguished friend from Rochester had, on nearly 70 occasions, when she was chairman of the Rules Committee, including the several scenic river studies that were put into place, and other legislation like that called emergency meetings of the House Rules Committee. And so I think that to characterize this procedure as it’s been is not quite as appropriate as it should be.

And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, I wish this could have been handled a little differently. We all know that we passed H.R. 1 as it is, that, in fact, does defund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. But this measure, in and of itself, focuses on a problem that is out there. It needs to be addressed. And I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is our office is being flooded by calls from people who are saying, I thought you all were working on creating jobs for the American people, on making sure that working class families can support their families. And, instead, we’re de-funding Federal funding of National Public Radio. And that seems like just a terrible distraction to the calls that we’re getting.

For many people in the San Diego region, we have KPBS radio, it’s an NPR station; and it’s a way to connect people to local community issues and world events. Where else can you find that kind of in-depth reporting? I don’t think we can point to other stations that do that.

So I’m not up here just to defend NPR, but my colleague said it’s not a treasure. Well, to a lot of people that participate, yes, they will continue to fund it with their own dollars. But there is a consistency, there is a continuity, there is an expectation that this is something that is important to

our communities. And it would endanger over 9,000 jobs at local radio stations if this funding goes away.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my good friend from Florida for yielding, and I’m pleased to serve beside him on the Rules Committee.

And I went to work on the Rules Committee because of my enthusiasm about openness in this process. One of the very first things we learned during freshman orientation was that we have a leadership team that is committed to openness the likes of which this Congress hasn’t seen in decades, decades.

I didn’t plan to come down and speak this morning, but I’m sitting back in my office, and I’m listening to the characterization of what’s happening down here today, and it caused me to think about my 65 days here in Congress so far.

You know, the process was more open and involved more debate on the repeal of health care than it did the implementation of health care. I happen to have brought down the NPR bill today.

Now, I’m here in strong support of the rule that’s bringing this bill to the floor, and I hope folks will vote their conscience on the underlying bill. That’s what we all came here to do, and I hope that happens.

One, two, three, four, five, six, seven—seven pages here today that we’ve asked Members to read and digest in 3 days. Seven pages. Now, I wasn’t here in the last Congress when thousand-page bills rolled through this body under the same closed process and the same closed length of time.

But I can tell you this: my constituents sent me to read seven pages, and I’ve read them; and I’ll be voting my conscience on the underlying bill. But, folks, we are involved in a process here that we need to be applauding, not condemning. We’re involved in a process here that we need to be nurturing, not undercutting.

Have you seen the debate on the floor of the House over the last 2 months? Have you experienced the back-and-forth on the floor of the House in the last 2 months, and do you feel the difference? Because I do. I absolutely do. I don’t just feel it; I hear it when I go back home.

We are in the people’s House. The chain across the front steps—must be a photo op going on out there this morning. The chain was down. It just felt different walking in this morning because you could just walk up the steps free.

Folks, the chains have come down in this House. The chains have come down in the House, and we’re free to engage in this debate, and that’s what we’re doing. Right here today we’re engaged in this debate.

Should we have extensive committee hearings on absolutely everything that comes to the floor? I believe we should. Should we have an open process for absolutely everything that comes to the floor? I think that’s a laudable goal.

Do we have constraints that require the rules of the House, because there are 435 of us. It's not like that well-ordered body across the Hall where they only have 100 Members and they get along so well together. We've got 435 folks with lots of passion and lots of opinion, and we need some structure to make that happen.

But this leadership team, with this Congress, both on the left and on the right, has created the most open process with the most extensive amendment process, with the most full debate process that this body has seen in years. And I thank the leadership team for doing that. And I rise in strong support of the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. We need to go back to basic principles here. In 1934, when the Federal Communications Act was passed, people were given broadcast licenses to serve in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. The public owns the airwaves.

In a country that wasn't run by corporations, we wouldn't be having this debate because the public has the inherent right to ownership of the airwaves. Theoretically, it should all be public radio, but it's not. There's just a small segment now of the airwaves we're talking about here. And this bill would stop that from being funded.

It is absolutely unimaginable that Members of Congress are not aware of the history of how broadcast radio and TV came into being. This isn't about private ownership of the airwaves. This is about a basic public right; and if you take that right away, what you've done is totally capitulate to corporations in America.

Protect NPR.

□ 1000

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support this rule, H. Res. 174, and the underlying bill, my legislation, H.R. 1076, to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content. It is time for American citizens to stop funding an organization that can stand on its own feet.

Long before any of the recent news stories on videos or the Juan Williams fiasco, I sponsored legislation in Congress to pull the plug on taxpayer funding for NPR. I enjoy some programs on NPR, but I have long believed that it can stand on its own.

The point at issue is not the quality or content of programming on NPR. The point is not the degree to which Americans support the arts, radio, news, and educational programs. The point today is whether government programs and services that can be funded privately or that are otherwise

available in the private sector should receive taxpayer funding.

Apart from constitutional concerns, as a country we no longer have this luxury anymore. With the national debt over \$13 trillion, the government simply can't continue to fund non-essential services.

Let me add that no one can really argue that these programs will disappear if Americans are no longer forced to subsidize them with Federal tax dollars. NPR can survive on its own.

This bill will accomplish three things:

One, it will prohibit direct funding of NPR. It now receives money from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Department of Education and Commerce, and the NEA, among others.

Two, it prohibits the use of Federal funds provided to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for the payment of dues by local radio stations to NPR.

And, three, it prohibits the use of Federal funds provided through Corporation for Public Broadcasting for acquiring or producing programming.

Now, local stations could use Federal funds from the corporation for their operating expenses, but they would have to produce their content or acquire it with non-Federal funds.

Unemployment is now about 9 percent. When we get Federal spending under control, the economy will be stronger and there will be more jobs. That is why we are doing this.

NPR reports that only 2 percent of its funding comes from the Federal Government; however, that is only half the story. NPR local radio stations directly received congressionally appropriated funds that reached \$64 million in 2010 alone. Plus, local stations directly receive grants from other Federal sources such as the National Endowment for the Arts. NPR stations then use these taxpayer dollars on licensing fees for NPR programming which goes back to the headquarters in Washington. Taking this indirect funding into account, Federal funds now make up, I would say, closer to 20 percent of their annual budget.

But let me be clear. This measure will not prohibit local stations from receiving any funding. It will just not allow them to use taxpayer dollars to pay NPR programming and pay NPR dues. They can do it without Federal dollars by embracing the private sector. I want NPR to grow on its own. I want to see it thrive. Just remove the taxpayer from the equation.

I thank the Rules Committee for this resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and to vote "yes" on the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and her advocacy here.

I just finished listening to my friend from Colorado, and he gets it half

right. First of all, it is ironic that the new Republican majority, having been touted on the floor for its openness, did, in fact, rush this to the floor without the 72-hour notice, not any substantive committee work. If it had been subjected to careful committee analysis, the flaws in the argument would have been revealed.

It is not going to save a single penny of taxpayer dollars, not one, even in the unlikely event that this legislation passed through Congress, which it won't. It won't defund NPR. NPR will exist. And those of us who are in Cleveland or New York or Los Angeles or Washington, D.C., will be able to enjoy it, although it will be diminished a little bit. But what it does is hammer small rural American stations, small town and rural America, where it is more expensive to broadcast and where they rely on this funding to be able to purchase the programs.

It would not just hammer NPR, but it would deny them the ability to use the funds for that subversive show "Prairie Home Companion," for "This American Life," for the car guys. It would prohibit them from purchasing locally produced content from other public broadcasting stations.

This is lunacy. It unravels a carefully crafted partnership that has delivered year after year. It is why the American public strongly supports this investment, less than one-half cent per day per American. In fact, 78 percent of the American public want it maintained or increased. And, most interestingly, that same bipartisan poll showed that two-thirds of American Republicans support keeping the funding or increasing it.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. This bill would wipe "Car Talk" off the road. It would wipe "Lake Wobegone" right off the map. It would close down "Marketplace," and tell "Wait Wait . . . Don't Tell Me!" to take a hike.

GOP used to stand for "Grand Old Party." Now it stands for "Gut Our Programs."

This bill prohibits public radio stations from using Federal funds to buy these programs and others produced by National Public Radio or its competitors. As a result, this bill would silence public radio stations across the country, depriving listeners of the news and information they depend on.

Public radio stations can just raise the money from private donors, some say. Not likely. Local public radio stations need signature NPR programs like "Morning Edition" and "All Things Considered" to attract audiences. By drawing listeners to local stations, these programs and others generate strong financial support from the local listening area. Without these



prominent NPR programs, local stations won't be able to attract the audience and sufficient fundraising base to keep running.

Every month, more than 170 million Americans turn to their local public broadcasting stations for free high-quality programs that focus on the issues most important to them. This bill would pull the plug. It would snuff out stations from coast to coast, many in rural areas where the public radio station is the primary source of news and information. This makes no sense. Public radio is widely supported by large majorities of Americans regardless of party affiliation. It is increasingly relied upon while fewer Americans watch broadcast TV and read newspapers.

This bill was rushed to the floor without a single hearing, completely bypassing the committee process. It is unwise, ill-conceived.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition today to this bill.

Today, Republicans are trying to modify the funding structure of National Public Radio, one of the most widely used, universally supported, and efficient journalistic institutions in the country. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that no one can figure out what my Republican colleagues are trying to accomplish and what they are trying to do with this trivial and misguided legislation. Why are we wasting our time on this? Instead of creating jobs, instead of cutting spending, here we are changing the funding structure for something that fundamentally works.

Mr. Speaker, America is \$14.2 trillion in debt. Yet instead of working with Democrats to come to an agreement on reducing our expenditures and getting the economy going, Republicans have decided to use their taxpayer-funded time on symbolic legislation that doesn't address America's fiscal situation, doesn't save money, and, most importantly, won't create a single job.

Mr. Speaker, this is very transparent what is happening here. This bill is a response to a far right agenda based on a manipulative "got you" video propagated by conservative activists.

□ 1010

Don't the American people know where this Republican policy agenda comes from? I believe they do.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a distraction, not a serious piece of legislation. The Republican Caucus can't get themselves to agree on anything substantial, so instead they're bringing this frivolous measure that doesn't save any money or create jobs before us.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Happy St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. Speaker, today we debate the rule on whether or not to fund National Public Radio. This is an ideologically driven attempt at defunding a revered American institution, and the reason is because you don't like its content. You can't stand balanced, objective news. So let's defund it.

Regardless of whether one supports NPR or not—and I do—we can all be clear this bill does not do one thing: It does not create jobs. We have been here for 11 weeks, Mr. Speaker, and the Republican majority has yet to bring a single jobs bill to the floor of the House. That's why I introduced the Build America Bonds Now to Create Jobs Act, legislation to extend the successful Build America Bonds program—a jobs bill. Creating jobs grows the economy, encourages American innovation and positions us to remain the global economic leader. During the last 2 years, \$4.4 billion from the Recovery Act leveraged \$181 billion to construct and repair schools, bridges and roads in more than 2,270 projects in every State in the Union.

According to Moody's Analytics chief economist and Senator MCCAIN's 2008 Presidential adviser, infrastructure investments in the Recovery Act resulted in 8 million additional or preserved jobs between 2009 and 2010. By extending the Build America Bonds program, we can do even more.

I ask my colleagues, turn away from this ideologically driven debate on National Public Radio and let's get down to basics. Let's pass a jobs bill. Let's defeat this rule and give ourselves an opportunity to address the underlying issue of the American economy.

I thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Good morning to the "fend for yourself" bill. That's the message of my friends on the other side of the aisle—with short-term CRs, \$61 billion in reckless and ludicrous cuts that don't make sense on 20 percent of the budget which is discretionary funding.

But NPR. This morning, I listened to NPR, as I usually do, and someone who designates themselves as a Republican called in and said, "I'm through. I'm a registered Republican, but I'm leaning Democrat. I've been listening to NPR for most of my life."

Biased? No. Unbiased. NPR is a voice of reason. Federal funding frivolous? No. Federal funding allows the objectivity. And no one can account for the fact that we believe in the First Amendment, but yet we want to defund NPR.

NPR, National Public Radio, speaks the truth on all of our cases. It provides the American people far and wide an opportunity to hear a fair and balanced presentation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you very much.

The resolution speaks nothing of fact why do you desire to cut NPR. Why do you want to put the burden of a budget or a CR on the NPR? The real issue is that no matter how much they keep doing, no one on the other side wants to address the cause of the issue of the deficit or the debt, that we have to balance, we have to bring in a number of issues that we have to address.

We can't scapegoat. I refuse to scapegoat the National Public Radio, a reasoned and responsible voice for the people, no matter who you are. It is a ridiculous legislation. In my District, KPFT and KTSU are great public communicators for many of the poor in my district—don't shut them down! I ask my colleagues to vote against it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 7 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. My inquiry is to the gentlewoman from New York, do you have any more speakers?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I do not. May I inquire if you have more?

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am prepared to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

We have had a vigorous debate here this morning, just as we had in the Rules Committee. A lot was said, I guess, because it needed to be said. A lot was said, I think, that we could argue with.

One is that we are doing this because it puts us on the road to deficit reduction. It is clear to everybody who reads, or maybe who listens to good programming, that this bill has no effect whatsoever on the deficit and saves no money. Not a dime. This is purely an ideological bill so that our Members can go home and brag about what they have done to public radio.

I want to talk a moment about what's in a New York Times editorial this morning. This bill is, says the Times, "The latest example of House Republicans pursuing a longstanding ideological goal in the false name of fiscal prudence."

The Times says, "This is not a serious bill. It will never survive the Senate or a Presidential veto."

And further, "Cutting off that flow would have no effect on the deficit, but it would allow certain House Members to pretend for the folks back home that they struck a blow for liberty."

I really don't understand this. I know that the present chair of the Rules Committee this morning said that all the legislation that we have done this

term has been on job creation. I don't believe there's enough evidence to convict on that, Mr. Speaker.

This, again, will cause jobs to be lost and does nothing for the deficit. I don't care what you want to say about it and how you want to dress it up, those are the absolute facts.

In a few moments, I will be calling for a vote on the previous question. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat that previous question, I want to do a real jobs bill here. I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts the rule, it will bring up H.R. 11, the Build America Bonds To Create Jobs Now Act.

This bill will spur job creation here at home by extending through 2012 the successful Build America Bonds program to help State and local governments finance the rebuilding of American schools, hospitals, water systems and transit projects at significantly lower costs. It has been calculated that every \$1 billion in Federal funds will create 34,800 jobs and \$6.2 billion in economic activity. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, weigh that against taking the little bit of money away from National Public Radio.

Build America Bonds are broadly supported by American business, the construction industry, and State and local governments. At a time of fiscal restraint, they are a good deal for the American taxpayer, wisely using small public investments to leverage significant private funds to rebuild America and create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so that we can debate and pass jobs legislation today, and I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to bring to your attention that the public watching this today on C-SPAN does not receive a single Federal dollar in regards to the operation of C-SPAN.

We're not closing down local radio stations. We're actually giving them the ability to liberate themselves from Federal dollars.

My good friends on the other side of the aisle continue to refuse to prioritize about what's important for America. They continue on a path of just spend, because all programs are inherently good.

While you've heard a lot of us like NPR in regard to certain programming, there's others that we do not. Mr. Speaker, I was reminded the other day of a quote by Thomas Jefferson:

"To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical."

With that in mind, I can't in good conscience support continuing to fund NPR with tax dollars.

□ 1020

A large number of Americans fundamentally disagree with the content and mission of NPR. Moreover, this is a program that can be privately funded. NPR's own officials said they don't need Federal dollars to continue.

We are not trying to harm NPR. We are actually trying to liberate them from Federal tax dollars. We need to get back to the core mission of the Federal Government. As much as any of us here, including myself, may enjoy programs like "Car Talk" and "Wait, Wait, Don't Tell Me," you can't tell me that that is a core mission of the Federal Government. Our good friends in the same sentence talked about war, national defense, and NPR. They don't equate. The Constitution is clear about our requirement to protect the American people.

H.R. 1076 is a return to the normal procedure of the House. Authorizing committees provide us with bills that set out the priorities for the House and the Appropriations Committee funds based on authorizations.

With H.R. 1076, we let the Appropriations Committee know that National Public Radio doesn't need Federal tax dollars anymore. Local stations can create their own programs. They can reorganize their financing so that grant money they might use for membership and programming fees can go elsewhere, and they can do private fund-raising they need for the dues and programming from NPR.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 174 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to cause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 11) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Build America Bonds program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole

rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous

question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 179, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

YEAS—233

Adams	Emerson	King (IA)
Aderholt	Farenthold	King (NY)
Akin	Fincher	Kingston
Alexander	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Amash	Flake	Kline
Austria	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Bachmann	Fleming	Lance
Bachus	Flores	Landry
Barletta	Forbes	Lankford
Bartlett	Fortenberry	Latham
Barton (TX)	Fox	LaTourette
Bass (NH)	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Benishek	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Berg	Gallely	LoBiondo
Biggart	Gardner	Long
Billray	Garrett	Lucas
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Black	Gibbs	Lummis
Bonner	Gibson	Lungren, Daniel
Bono Mack	Gingrey (GA)	E.
Boustany	Gohmert	Mack
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Brooks	Gosar	Marchant
Broun (GA)	Gowdy	Marino
Buchanan	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Bucshon	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Buerkle	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Burgess	Griffin (AR)	McCotter
Burton (IN)	Griffith (VA)	McHenry
Calvert	Grimm	McKeon
Camp	Guinta	McKinley
Campbell	Guthrie	McMorris
Canseco	Hall	Rodgers
Cantor	Hanna	Meehan
Capito	Harper	Mica
Cassidy	Harris	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Hartzler	Miller (MI)
Chaffetz	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Coble	Hayworth	Mulvaney
Coffman (CO)	Heck	Murphy (PA)
Cole	Heller	Myrick
Conaway	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Cravaack	Herger	Noem
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	Nugent
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Nunes
Davis (KY)	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Denham	Hultgren	Olson
Dent	Hunter	Palazzo
DesJarlais	Hurt	Paul
Diaz-Balart	Issa	Paulsen
Dold	Jenkins	Pearce
Dreier	Johnson (IL)	Pence
Duffy	Johnson (OH)	Petri
Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Duncan (TN)	Jones	Platts
Ellmers	Kelly	Poe (TX)

Pompeo	Ryan (WI)
Posey	Scalise
Price (GA)	Schilling
Quayle	Schmidt
Reed	Schock
Rehberg	Schweikert
Reichert	Scott (SC)
Renacci	Scott, Austin
Ribble	Sensenbrenner
Rigell	Sessions
Rivera	Shimkus
Roby	Shuler
Roe (TN)	Shuster
Rogers (AL)	Simpson
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)
Rokita	Southerland
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns
Roskam	Stivers
Ross (FL)	Stutzman
Royce	Sullivan
Runyan	Terry

NAYS—179

Ackerman	Gonzalez
Altmire	Green, Al
Andrews	Green, Gene
Baca	Grijalva
Baldwin	Gutierrez
Barrow	Hanabusa
Bass (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Heinrich
Berkley	Higgins
Berman	Himes
Bishop (GA)	Hinchev
Bishop (NY)	Hirono
Blumenauer	Holden
Boren	Holt
Boswell	Honda
Brady (PA)	Hoyer
Bralley (IA)	Inslee
Brown (FL)	Israel
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)
Capps	Jackson Lee
Capuano	(TX)
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN)	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Keating
Chandler	Kildee
Chu	Kind
Cicilline	Kissell
Clarke (MI)	Kucinich
Clay	Langevin
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)
Connolly (VA)	Lee (CA)
Conyers	Levin
Cooper	Lewis (GA)
Costa	Lipinski
Costello	Loebsack
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe
Critz	Lowe
Crowley	Lujan
Cuellar	Lynch
Cummings	Markey
Davis (CA)	Matheson
Davis (IL)	Matsui
DeFazio	McCarthy (NY)
DeGette	McCollum
DeLauro	McDermott
Deutch	McGovern
Dicks	McIntyre
Dingell	McNerney
Doggett	Meeks
Donnelly (IN)	Michaud
Doyle	Miller (NC)
Edwards	Miller, George
Ellison	Moore
Eshoo	Moran
Farr	Murphy (CT)
Fattah	Napolitano
Finler	Neal
Frank (MA)	Oliver
Fudge	Owens

NOT VOTING—20

Bilirakis	Engel
Blackburn	Garamendi
Carney	Giffords
Carter	Hinojosa
Clarke (NY)	Jordan
Cohen	Labrador
Culberson	Maloney

Thompson (PA)	□ 1046
Thornberry	
Tiberi	
Tipton	
Turner	
Upton	
Walberg	
Walden	
Walsh (IL)	
Webster	
West	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Wolf	
Womack	
Woodall	
Yoder	
Young (FL)	
Young (IN)	

Pallone	Richardson
Pascarella	Richmond
Pastor (AZ)	Ross (AR)
Pelosi	Rothman (NJ)
Perlmutter	Roybal-Allard
Peters	Ruppersberger
Peterson	Rush
Pingree (ME)	Ryan (OH)
Polis	Sanchez, Linda
Price (NC)	T.
Quigley	Sanchez, Loretta
Rahall	Sarbantes
Rangel	Schakowsky
Reyes	Schiff
Richardson	Schrader
Richmond	Schwartz
Ross (AR)	Scott (VA)
Rothman (NJ)	Scott, David
Roybal-Allard	Serrano
Ruppersberger	Sewell
Rush	Sherman
Ryan (OH)	Sires
Sanchez, Linda	Slaughter
T.	Smith (WA)
Sanchez, Loretta	Speier
Sarbantes	Sutton
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)
Schiff	Thompson (MS)
Schrader	Tierney
Schwartz	Tonko
Scott (VA)	Towns
Scott, David	Tsongas
Serrano	Van Hollen
Sewell	Velazquez
Sherman	Visclosky
Sires	Walz (MN)
Slaughter	Waters
Smith (WA)	Watt
Speier	Waxman
Sutton	Weiner
Thompson (CA)	Welch
Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)
Tierney	Woolsey
Tonko	Wu
Towns	Yarmuth
Tsongas	
Van Hollen	
Velazquez	
Visclosky	
Walz (MN)	
Waters	
Watt	
Waxman	
Weiner	
Welch	
Wilson (FL)	
Woolsey	
Wu	
Yarmuth	

Ms. ESHOO and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. AKIN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

Stated against:  
Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 189, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of this bill because it violates rule XXI, clause 11, which requires a 72-hour layover of the bill and for it to be electronically noticed in order for it to be considered by this House. This bill did not lay over for 72 hours. It was noticed at 1:42 p.m. on Tuesday; therefore, it has to wait until 1:42 on Friday to be in compliance with the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order against consideration of H.R. 1076 is not timely until such time as the bill is called up.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRES

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, we are about to consider the rule. Members, if they are to vote on and understand it, need to know that they are waiving the rule. This is the statement of the Speaker of the House: "I will not bring a bill to the floor that hasn't been posted online for at least 72 hours."

Would the Speaker please clarify for the body that the 72-hour rule is either being waived or does not exist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The period of time on which the rule is predicated is not a number of hours but, rather, a number of days, specifically calendar days other than weekends or holidays when the House is not in session. For the sake of brevity, the Chair will call these "working days."

Under clause 11 of rule XXI, an unreported measure may not be considered until the third working day on which it has been available to Members.

For example, a measure that was publicly available in electronic form in consonance with clause 3 of rule XXIX as of Tuesday, March 15, 2011, would qualify on or after Thursday, March 17, 2011.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WEINER. For the clarity of the House, did this bill age for 72 hours, "yes" or "no"?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not enter findings on questions not actually presented..

Nadler
Payne
Rooney
Stark
Wasserman
Schultz
Young (AK)

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 181, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

AYES—236

Adams	Gardner	McMorris
Aderholt	Garrett	Rodgers
Akin	Gerlach	Meehan
Alexander	Gibbs	Mica
Amash	Gibson	Miller (FL)
Austria	Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)
Bachmann	Gohmert	Miller, Gary
Bachus	Goodlatte	Mulvaney
Barletta	Gosar	Murphy (PA)
Bartlett	Gowdy	Myrick
Barton (TX)	Granger	Neugebauer
Bass (NH)	Graves (GA)	Noem
Benishkek	Graves (MO)	Nugent
Berg	Griffin (AR)	Nunes
Biggert	Griffith (VA)	Nunnelee
Bilbray	Grimm	Olson
Bilirakis	Guinta	Palazzo
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Paul
Black	Hall	Paulsen
Blackburn	Hanna	Pearce
Bonner	Harper	Pence
Bono Mack	Harris	Petri
Boustany	Hartzler	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Platts
Brooks	Hayworth	Poe (TX)
Broun (GA)	Heck	Pompeo
Buchanan	Heller	Posey
Bucshon	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Buerkle	Herger	Quayle
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Burton (IN)	Huelskamp	Rehberg
Calvert	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert
Camp	Hultgren	Renacci
Campbell	Hunter	Ribble
Canseco	Hurt	Rigell
Cantor	Issa	Rivera
Capito	Jenkins	Roby
Carter	Johnson (IL)	Roe (TN)
Cassidy	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Chaffetz	Jones	Rogers (MI)
Coble	Kelly	Rohrabacher
Coffman (CO)	King (IA)	Rokita
Cole	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Conaway	Kingston	Roskam
Cravaack	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross (FL)
Crawford	Kline	Royce
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Runyan
Culberson	Lance	Ryan (WI)
Davis (KY)	Landry	Scalise
Denham	Lankford	Schilling
Dent	Latham	Schmidt
DesJarlais	LaTourette	Schweikert
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Scott (SC)
Dold	Lewis (CA)	Scott, Austin
Dreier	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Duffy	Long	Sessions
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Shimkus
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Shuler
Ellmers	Lummis	Shuster
Emerson	Lungren, Daniel	Simpson
Farenthold	E.	Smith (NE)
Fincher	Mack	Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Flake	Marchant	Southerland
Fleischmann	Marino	Stearns
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Stivers
Flores	McCaul	Stutzman
Forbes	McClintock	Sullivan
Fortenberry	McCotter	Terry
Fox	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Thornberry
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Tiberi
Galleghy		Tipton

Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster

West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf

NOES—181

Ackerman	Fudge
Altmire	Gonzalez
Andrews	Green, Al
Baca	Green, Gene
Baldwin	Grijalva
Barrow	Hanabusa
Bass (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Heinrich
Berkley	Higgins
Berman	Himes
Bishop (GA)	Hinchev
Bishop (NY)	Hirono
Blumenauer	Holden
Boren	Holt
Boswell	Honda
Brady (PA)	Hoyer
Braley (IA)	Inslee
Brown (FL)	Israel
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)
Capps	Jackson Lee
Capuano	(TX)
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)
Carmanan	Johnson, E. B.
Carney	Kaptur
Carson (IN)	Keating
Castor (FL)	Kildee
Chandler	Kind
Chu	Kissell
Cicilline	Kucinich
Clarke (MI)	Langevin
Clay	Larsen (WA)
Cleaver	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Lee (CA)
Connolly (VA)	Levin
Conyers	Lewis (GA)
Cooper	Lipinski
Costa	Loeb sack
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe
Courtney	Lowey
Critz	Lujan
Crowley	Lynch
Cuellar	Markey
Cummings	Matheson
Davis (CA)	Matsui
Davis (IL)	McCarthy (NY)
DeFazio	McCollum
DeGette	McDermott
DeLauro	McGovern
Deutch	McIntyre
Dicks	McNerney
Dingell	Meeks
Doggett	Michaud
Donnelly (IN)	Miller (NC)
Doyle	Miller, George
Edwards	Moore
Ellison	Moran
Eshoo	Murphy (CT)
Farr	Napolitano
Fattah	Neal
Finer	Olver
Frank (MA)	Owens

Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

Pallone	Sanchez, Loretta
Pascarell	Sarbanes
Pastor (AZ)	Schakowsky
Payne	Schiff
Pelosi	Schrader
Perlmutter	Schwartz
Peters	Scott (VA)
Peterson	Scott, David
Pingree (ME)	Serrano
Polis	Sewell
Price (NC)	Sherman
Quigley	Sires
Rahall	Slaughter
Rangel	Smith (WA)
Reyes	Speier
Richardson	Stark
Richmond	Sutton
Ross (AR)	Thompson (CA)
Rothman (NJ)	Thompson (MS)
Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Ruppersberger	Tonko
Rush	Towns
Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Sanchez, Linda	Van Hollen
T.	Velázquez
Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Sarbanes	Walz (MN)
Schakowsky	Walters
Schiff	Watt
Schrader	Waxman
Schwartz	Weiner
Scott (VA)	Welch
Scott, David	Wilson (FL)
Serrano	Woolsey
Sewell	Wu
Sherman	Yarmuth
Sires	
Slaughter	
Smith (WA)	
Speier	
Stark	
Sutton	
Thompson (CA)	
Thompson (MS)	
Tierney	
Tonko	
Towns	
Tsongas	
Van Hollen	
Velázquez	
Visclosky	
Walz (MN)	
Walters	
Watt	
Waxman	
Weiner	
Welch	
Wilson (FL)	
Woolsey	
Wu	
Yarmuth	

from Afghanistan, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 16, 2011, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 28

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

**SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM AFGHANISTAN.**

Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress directs the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan—

(1) by no later than the end of the period of 30 days beginning on the day on which this concurrent resolution is adopted; or

(2) if the President determines that it is not safe to remove the United States Armed Forces before the end of that period, by no later than December 31, 2011, or such earlier date as the President determines that the Armed Forces can safely be removed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 2 hours, with 1 hour controlled by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) or his designee and 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) be allowed to control half of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) will control half the time allocated to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

□ 1100

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution, as it would undermine the efforts of our military and our international partners in Afghanistan and would gravely harm our Nation's security.

Insanity has been described as doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. Three thousand people died on September 11 because we walked away once from Afghanistan, thinking that it didn't matter who controlled that country. We were wrong then. Let us not make the same mistake twice. Completing our mission in Afghanistan is essential to keeping our homeland safe.

As Under Secretary of Defense Michele Flournoy stated in testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee earlier this week, "The threat to our national security and the security of our friends and allies that emanates from the borderland of Afghanistan and Pakistan is not hypothetical.

NOT VOTING—15

Clarke (NY)	Hinojosa	Schock
Cohen	Jordan	Wasserman
Engel	Labrador	Schultz
Garamendi	Maloney	Young (AK)
Giffords	Nadler	
Gutierrez	Rooney	

□ 1057

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AFGHANISTAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION**

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of March 16, 2011, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 28) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces

There is simply no other place in the world that contains such a concentration of al Qaeda senior leaders and operational commanders. To allow these hostile organizations to flourish in this region is to put the security of the United States and our friends and allies at grave risk."

To quit the area before we have routed out the terrorists would not only hand al Qaeda a propaganda victory of immeasurable value, it would cede them a sanctuary from which they could mount fresh strikes at the west with virtual immunity. To withdraw from Afghanistan at this point, before we finish the job, is to pave the way for the next 9/11. Therefore, the question that we must consider is, Can we afford to abandon our mission in Afghanistan? General David Petraeus, commander, International Security Assistance Force, ISAF, commander, U.S. Forces Afghanistan, stated, "I can understand the frustration. We have been at this for 10 years. We have spent an enormous amount of money. We have sustained very tough losses and difficult, life-changing wounds. But I think it is important to remember why we are here."

This is about our vital national security interests, Mr. Speaker. It is about doing what is necessary to ensure that al Qaeda and other extremists cannot reestablish safe havens such as the ones they had in Afghanistan when the 9/11 attacks were planned against our Nation and our people. The enemy, indeed, is on the run. It is demoralized and divided. Let us not give up now.

Let us not betray the sacrifices of our men and women serving in harm's way, and they ask for nothing in return, except our full support. Dedicated servants such as my stepson Douglas and daughter-in-law Lindsay, who served in Iraq—and Lindsay also served in Afghanistan. Dedicated servants such as Matt Zweig and Greg McCarthy of our Foreign Affairs Committee majority staff, who just returned from serving a year in Kandahar and Kabul. And we thank them for their service. Let us follow the lead of our wounded warriors who, after long and arduous recoveries, volunteer to return to the battlefield to finish their mission. I urge our colleagues to oppose this dangerous resolution.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 2 minutes.

In the next 2 hours, we are going to demonstrate that the American people oppose this war by a margin of two to one. I will enter into the RECORD this Washington Post poll that was published on March 15 which says that nearly two-thirds of Americans say the war isn't worth fighting.

In the next 2 hours, we are going to demonstrate that we are spending \$100 billion per year on this war. There are those who are saying the war could last at least another 10 years. Are we willing to spend another \$1 trillion on a

war that doesn't have any exit plan, for which there is no timeframe to get out, no endgame, where we haven't defined our mission? The question is not whether we can afford to leave. The question is, can we afford to stay? And I submit we cannot afford to stay.

In the next 2 hours, we are going to demonstrate that the counterintelligence strategy of General Petraeus is an abysmal failure, and it needs to be called as such. So I want to conclude this part of my presentation with an article by Thomas Friedman in *The New York Times*, which says, "What are we doing spending \$110 billion this year supporting corrupt and unpopular regimes in Afghanistan and Pakistan that are almost identical to the governments we are applauding the Arab people for overthrowing?"

[From *The Washington Post*, Mar. 15, 2011]

POLL: NEARLY TWO-THIRDS OF AMERICANS SAY AFGHAN WAR ISN'T WORTH FIGHTING

(By Scott Wilson and Jon Cohen)

Nearly two-thirds of Americans now say the war in Afghanistan is no longer worth fighting, the highest proportion yet opposed to the conflict, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News poll.

The finding signals a growing challenge for President Obama as he decides how quickly to pull U.S. forces from the country beginning this summer. After nearly a decade of conflict, political opposition to the battle breaks sharply along partisan lines, with only 19 percent of Democratic respondents and half of Republicans surveyed saying the war continues to be worth fighting.

Nearly three-quarters of Americans say Obama should withdraw a "substantial number" of combat troops from Afghanistan this summer, the deadline he set to begin pulling out some forces. Only 39 percent of respondents, however, say they expect him to withdraw large numbers.

The Post-ABC News poll results come as Gen. David H. Petraeus, the U.S. commander in Afghanistan, prepares to testify before Congress on Tuesday about the course of the war. He is expected to face tough questioning about a conflict that is increasingly unpopular among a broad cross section of Americans.

Petraeus will tell Congress that "things are progressing very well," Pentagon spokesman Geoff Morrell said Monday. But because of battlefield gains made by U.S. and coalition forces since last year, Morrell told MSNBC, "it's going to be heavy and intensive in terms of fighting" once the winter cold passes.

The poll began asking only in 2007 whether the Afghan war is worth fighting, but support has almost certainly never been as low as it is in the most recent survey.

The growing opposition presents Obama with a difficult political challenge ahead of his 2012 reelection effort, especially in his pursuit of independent voters.

Since Democrats took a beating in last year's midterm elections, Obama has appealed to independents with a middle-of-the-road approach to George W. Bush-era tax cuts and budget negotiations with Republican leaders on Capitol Hill. He called a news conference last week to express concern about rising gasoline prices, an economically pressing issue for many independent voters.

But his approach to the Afghan war has not won over the independents or liberal Democrats who propelled his campaign two years ago, and the most recent Post-ABC News poll reinforces the importance of Re-

publicans as the chief constituency supporting his strategy. The results suggest that the war will be an awkward issue for the president as he looks for ways to end it. Nearly 1,500 U.S. troops have died since the fighting began in 2001.

During his 2008 campaign, Obama promised to withdraw American forces from the Iraq war, which he opposed, and devote more resources to the flagging effort in Afghanistan, which he has called an essential front in combating Islamist terrorism targeting the United States.

After a months-long strategy review in the fall of 2009, he announced the deployment of an additional 30,000 U.S. troops to Afghanistan—taking the total to more than 100,000—and a July 2011 deadline for the start of their withdrawal.

The number of respondents to the Post-ABC News poll who say the war is not worth fighting has risen from 44 percent in late 2009 to 64 percent in the survey conducted last week.

Two-thirds of independents hold that position, according to the poll, and nearly 80 percent said Obama should withdraw a "substantial number" of troops from Afghanistan this summer. Barely more than a quarter of independents say the war is worth its costs, and for the first time a majority feel "strongly" that it is not.

Obama, who met with Petraeus on Monday at the White House, has said he will determine the pace of the withdrawal by assessing conditions on the ground.

At the same time, U.S. and NATO forces have come under sharp criticism from the Afghan government. Over the weekend, after a NATO bombing killed nine children, Afghan President Hamid Karzai demanded that international troops "stop their operations in our land," a more pointed call than previous ones he has made following such deadly NATO mistakes.

The telephone poll was conducted March 10 to 13 among a random national sample of 1,005 adults. Results from the full poll have a margin of sampling error of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points.

The survey also asked respondents to assess Obama's performance in managing the political changes sweeping across the Middle East and North Africa. Overall, 45 percent of respondents approve of his handling of the situation, and 44 percent disapprove.

In Libya, where Moammar Gaddafi is battling a rebel force seeking to end his 41-year rule, Obama is under increasing pressure to implement a no-fly zone over the country to prevent the Libyan leader from taking back lost territory and to protect civilians from government reprisals.

Nearly six in 10 Americans say they would support U.S. participation in a no-fly zone over Libya, the poll found, despite recent warnings from Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates that doing so would be a "major operation."

But the survey found that American support dips under 50 percent when it comes to unilateral U.S. action, as Democrats and independents peel away.

When told that such a mission would entail U.S. warplanes bombing Libyan anti-aircraft positions and "continuous patrols," about a quarter of those initially advocating U.S. participation turn into opponents.

After a meeting Monday with Danish Prime Minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen, Obama said, "We will be continuing to coordinate closely both through NATO as well as the United Nations and other international fora to look at every single option that's available to us in bringing about a better outcome for the Libyan people."

In general, Americans do not think that the changes in the Middle East and North Africa will prove beneficial to U.S. economic and security interests.

More than seven in 10 respondents said demonstrators are interested in building new governments, although not necessarily democratic ones. Almost half of those surveyed view the turmoil as undermining the United States' ability to fight terrorist groups in the region.

[From the New York Times, March 6, 2011]

THE \$110 BILLION QUESTION  
(By Thomas L. Friedman)

When one looks across the Arab world today at the stunning spontaneous democracy uprisings, it is impossible to not ask: What are we doing spending \$110 billion this year supporting corrupt and unpopular regimes in Afghanistan and Pakistan that are almost identical to the governments we're applauding the Arab people for overthrowing?

Ever since 9/11, the West has hoped for a war of ideas within the Muslim world that would feature an internal challenge to the violent radical Islamic ideology of Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda. That contest, though, never really materialized because the regimes we counted on to promote it found violent Muslim extremism a convenient foil, so they allowed it to persist. Moreover, these corrupt, crony capitalist Arab regimes were hardly the ideal carriers for an alternative to bin Ladenism. To the contrary, it was their abusive behavior and vicious suffocation of any kind of independent moderate centrist parties that fueled the extremism even more.

Now the people themselves have taken down those regimes in Egypt and Tunisia, and they're rattling the ones in Libya, Yemen, Bahrain, Oman and Iran. They are not doing it for us, or to answer bin Laden. They are doing it by themselves for themselves—because they want their freedom and to control their own destinies. But in doing so they have created a hugely powerful, modernizing challenge to bin Ladenism, which is why Al Qaeda today is tongue-tied. It's a beautiful thing to watch.

Al Qaeda's answer to modern-day autocracy was its version of the seventh-century Caliphate. But the people—from Tunisia to Yemen—have come up with their own answer to violent extremism and the abusive regimes we've been propping up. It's called democracy. They have a long way to go to lock it in. It may yet be hijacked by religious forces. But, for now, it is clear that the majority wants to build a future in the 21st century, not the seventh.

In other words, the Arab peoples have done for free, on their own and for their own reasons, everything that we were paying their regimes to do in the "war on terrorism" but they never did.

And that brings me back to Afghanistan and Pakistan. Last October, Transparency International rated the regime of President Hamid Karzai in Afghanistan as the second most corrupt in the world after Somalia's. That is the Afghan regime we will spend more than \$110 billion in 2011 to support.

And tell me that Pakistan's intelligence service, ISI, which dominates Pakistani politics, isn't the twin of Hosni Mubarak's security service. Pakistan's military leaders play the same game Mubarak played with us for years. First, they whisper in our ears: "Psst, without us, the radical Islamists will rule. So we may not be perfect, but we're the only thing standing in the way of the devil." In reality, though, they are nurturing the devil. The ISI is long alleged to have been fostering anti-Indian radical Muslim groups and masterminding the Afghan Taliban.

Apart from radical Islam, the other pretext the Pakistani military uses for its inordinate grip on power is the external enemy.

Just as Arab regimes used the conflict with Israel for years to keep their people distracted and to justify huge military budgets, Pakistan's ISI tells itself, the Pakistani people and us that it can't stop sponsoring proxies in Afghanistan because of the "threat" from India.

Here's a secret: India is not going to invade Pakistan. It is an utterly bogus argument. India wants to focus on its own development, not owning Pakistan's problems. India has the second-largest Muslim population on the planet, more even than Pakistan. And while Indian Muslims are not without their economic and political grievances, they are, on the whole, integrated into India's democracy because it is a democracy. There are no Indian Muslims in Guantanamo Bay.

Finally, you did not need to dig very far in Egypt or Jordan to hear that one reason for the rebellion in Egypt and protests in Jordan was the in-your-face corruption and crony capitalism that everyone in the public knew about.

That same kind of pillaging of assets—natural resources, development aid, the meager savings of a million Kabul Bank depositors and crony contracts—has fueled a similar anger against the regime in Afghanistan and undermined our nation-building efforts there.

The truth is we can't do much to consolidate the democracy movements in Egypt and Tunisia. They'll have to make it work themselves. But we could do what we can, which is divert some of the \$110 billion we're lavishing on the Afghan regime and the Pakistani Army and use it for debt relief, schools and scholarships to U.S. universities for young Egyptians and Tunisians who had the courage to take down the very kind of regimes we're still holding up in Kabul and Islamabad.

I know we can't just walk out of Afghanistan and Pakistan; there are good people, too, in both places. But our involvement in these two countries—150,000 troops to confront Al Qaeda—is totally out of proportion today with our interests and out of all sync with our values.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, and I do so as one who does firmly believe that we need to, as soon as we responsibly can, end our military engagement in Afghanistan. The cost is very real.

I represent Joint Base Lewis-McChord, which includes Fort Lewis Army Base, and we have lost many soldiers in Afghanistan. The families understand the cost. We need to wind down this war as quickly and as responsibly as we can. Unfortunately, this resolution does not give us the opportunity to do that. And we have clear national security interests in Afghanistan.

While I may agree with many of the statements about the troubles and challenges that we face in that region, the one thing that you will hear today that I cannot agree with is the idea that we have no national security interests in Afghanistan and Pakistan, or that we somehow do not have a clear mission. We have a clear mission. We

do not want the Taliban and their al Qaeda allies back in charge of Afghanistan or any significant part of Afghanistan from which they could plot attacks against us, as they are still trying to do in the parts of Pakistan that they are in.

We need to get an Afghanistan Government that can stand up, and they are going to need our help to get there. Now there are many who have argued—and I am sure some on both sides of the aisle would be sympathetic with the notion that we need to reduce our commitment there—that a full-scale counterinsurgency effort, or 100,000 U.S. troops and 150,000 NATO and U.S. troops combined, is too much. Let's go with a much lighter footprint. Many have advocated that. Focuses on counterterrorism, focuses on going after the terrorists, and allows the Afghans to take the lead on everything else. And there is a plausible argument for that. This resolution does not allow that.

I want the Members of this Chamber to understand this resolution requires complete withdrawal of all U.S. forces by the end of this year. And I can tell you, as the ranking member on the Armed Services Committee, that is not in the national security interest of this country.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. We may have a legitimate debate about what our presence should be, how we should change it, but the notion that we can simply walk away from this problem, as Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN pointed out, is simply not true. And it is a problem that, believe me, I, as much as anyone in this body, would love to be able to walk away from. It is an enormous challenge. And what Mr. Friedman has to say about the governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan is spot on. But the problem is, we can't simply walk away from them and let them fall because of the national security implications that that has for us right here at home, given what the Taliban and al Qaeda would plan. I am all in favor of a more reasonable plan for how we go forward in Afghanistan, but simply heading for the hills and leaving is not a responsible plan. It's not even really a plan for how to deal with the very difficult challenges that we face in that region, and I urge this body to oppose this resolution.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for yielding me half of his time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1110

Mr. Speaker, we are debating how long we are going to be in Afghanistan. Recently, Secretary Gates testified before the Armed Services Committee, which I serve on, and said that he thought by 2014 we could start substantial reduction in our troop strength in

Afghanistan, 2014, that it might be 2015, 2016.

That's why this debate and this resolution is so important, not important for those of us in the House, but important for our military and the American people.

And Mr. KUCINICH did make reference to The Washington Post-ABC poll that was taken a couple of days ago that said 73 percent of the American people said it's time, this year, to bring our troops home.

In addition, I would like to share a quote from the leader of Afghanistan, Mr. Karzai. He's our man in Afghanistan. All right, now, he's our man. This was his quote 3 days ago: "I request that NATO and America should stop these operations on our soil," Karzai said. "This war is not on our soil. If this war is against terror, then this war is not here. Terror is not here."

The number of al Qaeda and their presence in Afghanistan is about 20 or 30. Most of them are in Pakistan. I would agree with that. But this debate is critical.

Before I reserve the balance of my time, I want to share very quickly a letter from a retired colonel who's a marine that lives in my district: "I am writing this letter to express my concern over the current Afghanistan war. I am a retired marine officer with 31-plus years of active duty. I retired in 2004 due to service limitations, or I am sure I would have been on my third or fourth deployment by now to a war that has gone on too long."

And I'll go to the bottom of this: "It makes no sense if we're there 4 years or 40. The results will be the same."

And he closed his letter this way: "This war is costing the United States billions of dollars a month to wage, and we still continue to get more young Americans killed. The Afghan war has no end state for us.

"I urge you to make contact with all the current and newly elected men and women in Congress and ask them to end this war and bring our young men and women home. If any of my comments will assist in this effort, you are welcome to use them and my name.

"Respectfully, Dennis G. Adams, Lieutenant Colonel retired, United States Marine Corps."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in absolute support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The war in Afghanistan, almost 10 years old, has been an utter failure in every possible way. It hasn't eliminated the terrorist threat. It hasn't destroyed the Taliban. It hasn't advanced national security objectives. It hasn't promoted a vibrant democracy in Afghanistan. It hasn't done any of the things it was supposed to do.

And General Petraeus' testimony this week didn't inspire much confidence either. He continues to offer

the same vague reassurances about progress we've supposedly made, while being sure to say that challenges remain so he can continue justifying a substantial troop presence in Afghanistan. But I'm not reassured in the least. And much more importantly, the American people aren't reassured.

After 9½ years, after seeing 1,500 of their fellow citizens killed, after writing a check to the tune of \$386 billion, they've had enough. They are angry, they are frustrated, as well they should be.

A new poll shows that nearly two-thirds of Americans, 64 percent, think the war isn't worth fighting. This is one of the least popular things our government is doing, and yet it's just about the only one Republicans don't want to cut.

I think it's about time the people's House listened to the people on the issue of war and peace and life and death. We need to negotiate, and we need to sign the Status of Forces Agreement, SOFA, with Afghanistan.

We need to move quickly toward the massive redeployment in July, as the President promised more than a year ago. In the name of moral decency, fiscal sanity and constitutional integrity, it's time to bring our troops home.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, it is important to underscore, as the Under Secretary of Defense Michele Flournoy has, that to withdraw from Afghanistan at this time, before we finish the job, is to pave the way for the next 9/11.

She and other U.S. and allied officials note that we need look no further than the example of Ahmad Siddiqui, a 36-year-old German of Afghan origin who U.S. interrogators talked to, and he revealed Osama bin Laden was planning an attack on Europe. Without our boots on the ground in Afghanistan the plot against Europe might never have been uncovered. Without our boots on the ground, we will not be able to stop the next wave of attacks against our homeland, our citizens, our families, and ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the esteemed chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from the Foreign Services Committee, Foreign Affairs Committee, and my colleagues from the Armed Services Committee in opposition to this resolution. This resolution would undermine the efforts of our military commanders and troops as they work side by side with their Afghan and coalition partners.

Yesterday, in his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, General Petraeus, commander of the U.S. and allied forces in Afghanistan, described significant progress made by our troops and Afghan forces. But while the United States is on track to

accomplish our objectives by 2014, the general also warned that this hard-fought progress is fragile and reversible; and he urged that continued support from this Congress for our mission in Afghanistan is vital to success.

When asked specifically how our troops and enemies would view the resolution before us today, General Petraeus stated: The Taliban and al Qaeda obviously would trumpet this as a victory. Needless to say, it would completely undermine everything our troopers have fought so much and sacrificed so much for.

Mr. Speaker, when the President authorized a surge of 30,000 additional troops, he reminded us of why we are in Afghanistan. It's the epicenter of where al Qaeda planned and launched the 9/11 attacks against innocent Americans. It remains vital to the national security of this country to prohibit the Taliban from once again providing sanctuary to al Qaeda leaders.

Moreover, withdrawing before completing our mission would reinforce extremist propaganda that Americans are weak and unreliable allies and could facilitate extremist recruiting and future attacks.

Like most Republicans, I supported the President's decision to surge in Afghanistan. I believe that with additional forces, combined with giving General Petraeus the time, space and resources he needs, we can win this conflict.

During a visit last week with our troops in Afghanistan, Secretary Gates observed the closer you get to this fight, the better it looks. Having just returned myself from Afghanistan a few weeks ago, I couldn't agree more.

Our delegation to Afghanistan met with senior military commanders and diplomats, talked to airmen at Bagram, marines in Helmand and soldiers in Kandahar. It was clear to our delegation that our forces have made significant gains and have reversed the Taliban's momentum.

□ 1120

Our forces and their Afghan partners have cleared enemy strongholds, swept up significant weapons caches, and given more Afghans the confidence to defy the Taliban. We have made considerable progress in growing and professionalizing Afghanistan's army and police so these forces are more capable and reliable partners to our own troops.

As significant as our troops' achievements in the fields are, they can easily be undone by poor decisions made here in Washington. Today's debate is not being conducted in a vacuum. Our troops are listening. Our allies are listening.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MCKEON. The Taliban and al Qaeda are also listening. And, finally, the Afghan people are listening.

Mr. Speaker, I want to send a clear message to the Afghan people and government, our coalition partners, our military men and women that this Congress will stand firm in our commitment to free us from the problems that the Taliban created for us on 9/11. We will not have this sanctuary ever happen again.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this resolution.

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

I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third debate we have had pursuant to a war powers resolution in the last year.

I completely agree with the gentleman from Ohio that as we are moving into the 10th year of this conflict, it is critical—not just nice, it is really critical for the House to have an open and honest debate on the merits of our ongoing military operations in Afghanistan, and that debate should be outside of the context of a defense spending bill.

But what I also do is take strong issue with the invocation of section 5(c) of the War Powers Act as the basis for this debate. If we are here to respect the law and the procedures, you have to remember that it is that section which authorizes a privileged resolution, like the one we have before us today, to require the withdrawal of U.S. Forces when they are engaged in hostilities and Congress has not authorized the use of military force.

There may be aspects of our operations around the world that people can claim under section 5(c) have not been authorized. No one can make a contention that what we are now doing in Afghanistan was not authorized by the Congress. There can be no doubt this military action in Afghanistan was authorized. It was authorized in 2001, soon after 9/11.

But let's set aside the procedure and the specific dictates of the statute. I do think and share my concerns, well articulated by the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee, that it is not responsible to demand a complete withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan by the end of the year without regard to the consequence of our withdrawal, without regard to the situation on the ground, including efforts to promote economic development and expand the rule of law, and without any measurement of whether the current strategy is indeed working.

I am very sensitive to the arguments posed by the gentleman from Ohio. The cost of human life due to the war and the heavy costs incurred by our country at a time of great economic hardship should give any Member of Congress pause.

I am also keenly aware of the concerns regarding our overall U.S. strategy in Afghanistan. It remains to be seen whether a counterinsurgency strategy will succeed there and, equally important, whether the Afghans are taking sufficient responsibility for this

war. I am troubled that the war very much remains an American-led effort and that the U.S. presence has created a culture of dependency in Afghanistan.

Notwithstanding all that, I won't support a call for a full withdrawal until we give the President's strategy additional time, at least through the spring, to show results or, without a responsible withdrawal strategy, to ensure gains made thus far will not be lost.

A number of positive developments make me unwilling to throw in the towel just yet. For example, as noted by General Petraeus in testimony yesterday, coalition forces have been making some progress against Taliban forces in southern Afghanistan. In addition, the training of Afghan security forces has exceeded targets, and we are inching slowly toward the point at which they may be able to secure their own borders.

A final plea to my colleagues, and that is to some of my colleagues who are joining me in opposing this resolution. I am sure we are not going to succeed in Afghanistan unless our civilian efforts are fully resourced. When I traveled to Afghanistan last April, I was encouraged to see our military forces, diplomats, and development experts working closely together in the field.

General Petraeus couldn't have been more clear in his testimony: We are setting ourselves up for failure if we fully fund the clear part of the President's counterinsurgency strategy, the part carried out by the military, but shortchange the hold-and-build portions of the strategy, like economic development and building good governance. These are the keys to lasting success in Afghanistan. These are the keys to a successful counterinsurgency strategy. And when we meet those tests and do those works, we may be able to create the environment that will allow our troops to return home.

For all these reasons, I oppose the resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, we will be debating this probably in 2015 or 2016. If I am not here, somebody else will be, because that is how long we are going to be there.

This general that served in the Marine Corps that has advised me for 11 months, back in November I asked: “What do you think about 4 more years?”

I am just going to read part of his email:

“I do not believe that 40 more years would guarantee victory, whatever that is; so 4 will do nothing. The war is costing money and lives, all in short supply.”

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

First, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me

this time. And I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), who is one of the kindest, most sincere, and most courageous Members that we have in this body.

I voted, Mr. Speaker, for this war, but I sure didn't vote for a 10-year war or a forever or a permanent or an endless war.

There is nothing fiscally conservative about this war, and I think conservatives should be the people most horrified by this war.

Alfred Regnery, the publisher of the Conservative American Spectator magazine, wrote last October: “Afghanistan has little strategic value, and the war is one of choice rather than necessity.” And he added that it has been a “wasteful and frustrating decade.”

The worst thing about Iraq and Afghanistan is all the young people who have been killed. But it is also very sad, Mr. Speaker, that we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars—in fact, some estimates are \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion now in indirect costs—to carry on these two very unnecessary wars.

Our Constitution does not give us the authority to run another country, and that is basically what we have been doing. We have been doing more nation building and more civilian functions than anything else, and we have been turning the Department of Defense, at least in Iraq and Afghanistan, into the Department of Foreign Aid.

I had a conservative Republican elected official from my district in my office this past Monday. His son is in Afghanistan in the Army, and he said he asked his son recently what we were accomplishing there, and he said his son said, “Dad, we're accomplishing nothing.”

We seem to be making the same mistakes in our policies toward Afghanistan that we made in Iraq. Even General Petraeus has said some time ago that we should never forget that Afghanistan has been known as the “graveyard of empires.”

George C. Wilson, a military columnist for the Congress Daily, wrote a few months ago: “The American military's mission to pacify the 40,000 tiny villages in Afghanistan will look like mission impossible, especially if our bombings keep killing Afghan civilians and infuriating the ones who survive.”

The Center for Defense Information said late last year we have now spent \$439.8 billion on war and war-related costs in Afghanistan, and \$1.63 trillion so far on the war and war-related costs in Iraq. As I said a moment ago, these figures should astound fiscal conservatives.

Georgie Anne Geyer, a syndicated columnist, wrote a few years ago: “Critics of the war have said since the beginning of the conflict that Americans, still strangely complacent about overseas wars being waged by minorities in their name, will inevitably come to a point where they will see they have to have a government that provides services at home or one that seeks empire across the globe.”



I just finished, Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago doing field hearings around the country in relation to the transportation and highway bill. These were done in Oklahoma, Arkansas, West Virginia, and west Tennessee—very conservative districts. And in each of those places, I said that it's time that we stop spending hundreds of billions on these unnecessary foreign wars and stop rebuilding in Iraq and Afghanistan and start rebuilding the United States of America.

□ 1130

In each of those conservative districts, the people erupted into applause. Only 31 percent of the American people, according to the latest ABC/Newsweek poll that just came out, think this war is still worth it.

William F. Buckley, the conservative icon, wrote a few years ago that he supported the war in Iraq and then he became disillusioned by it, and he wrote these words:

"A respect for the power of the United States is engendered by our success in engagements in which we take part."

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

Mr. JONES. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. William Buckley said:

"A point is reached when tenacity conveys steadfastness of purpose but misapplication of pride."

President Karzai last year told ABC News he wanted us to stay there another 15 or 20 more years. That's because he wants our money. This war is more about money and power. Every gigantic bureaucracy always wants more money, but this war has gone too far and too long, and I support this resolution.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. 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 House Concurrent Resolution 28.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for your steadfast commitment to the men and women who gallantly serve our country on the battlefield.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. First, let me get one argument out of the way. I've heard before some of my colleagues who support an American retreat from Afghanistan describe this effort as a fiscal matter. I would respond to that argument by simply stating that it's not a

question of whether we can afford to fund a military presence in Afghanistan, it's a matter of whether we can afford not to, particularly at this point.

I think my colleagues know that I'm very uncomfortable spending taxpayer dollars without a solid justification, and I would match my fiscal conservative credentials with anybody in this body. But when it comes to national security and when it comes to the care and protection of our troops in harm's way, we must not be, to use a phrase that you often hear on this floor, penny wise and pound foolish.

Further, a premature withdrawal of American troops from the Afghan theater would send a terrible message to both our friends and also to our adversaries. To our allies in the war on terrorism whom we would leave essentially twisting in the wind, to those 47 other nations that have joined the coalition in Afghanistan, we would essentially be saying, "Good luck. You're on your own." Not exactly what they had in mind when they joined us in this fight.

And, of course, to al Qaeda and to the Taliban, whom we would embolden by adopting this ill-advised resolution, we would be providing, once again, the sanctuary which they enjoyed in Afghanistan before our Armed Forces reversed their momentum.

I don't often find myself in agreement with President Obama's policies, but I did agree with him when he said a little more than a year ago, "I am convinced that our security is at risk in Afghanistan and Pakistan. This is the epicenter of violent extremism practiced by al Qaeda. It is from here that we were attacked on 9/11, and it is here that new attacks are being plotted as I speak." That was President Obama.

I also agree with General Petraeus who said last week that "our core objective in Afghanistan, needless to say, is to ensure that the country does not become a sanctuary once again for al Qaeda, the way it was prior to 9/11."

I know memories fade with time, but it's been not quite 10 years since 3,000 lives were lost on American soil—in New York, in Pennsylvania, and just minutes from here down the street at the Pentagon. Let's not forget what al Qaeda did then and let's keep working to prevent it from happening again. Let's not quit until the job is done.

Vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would like to insert into the RECORD a report from the United Nations that says that 2010 was the worst year for civilian casualties in Afghanistan with nearly 3,000 civilians killed.

AFGHANISTAN—ANNUAL REPORT ON PROTECTION OF CIVILIANS IN ARMED CONFLICT 2010

Kabul, Afghanistan, March 2011

#### Executive Summary

The human cost of the armed conflict in Afghanistan grew in 2010. The Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission and UNAMA Human Rights recorded 2,777 civil-

ian deaths in 2010, an increase of 15 per cent compared to 2009. Over the past four years, 8,832 civilians have been killed in the conflict, with civilian deaths increasing each year. The worsening human impact of the conflict reinforces the urgent need for parties to the conflict to do more to protect Afghan civilians, who, in 2010, were killed and injured in their homes and communities in even greater numbers. UNAMA Human Rights and the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission urge the Anti-Government Elements and Pro-Government Forces to strengthen civilian protection and fully comply legal obligations to minimize civilian casualties.

#### CIVILIAN DEATHS

Of the total number of 2,777 civilians killed in 2010, 2,080 deaths (75 per cent of total civilian deaths) were attributed to Anti-Government Elements, up 28 per cent from 2009. Suicide attacks and improvised explosive devices (IEDs) caused the most civilian deaths, totaling 1,141 deaths (55 per cent of civilian deaths attributed to Anti-Government Elements). The most alarming trend in 2010 was the huge number of civilians assassinated by Anti-Government Elements. Four hundred and sixty two civilians were assassinated representing an increase of more than 105 per cent compared to 2009. Half of all civilian assassinations occurred in southern Afghanistan. Helmand province saw a 588 per cent increase in the number of civilians assassinated by Anti-Government Elements and Kandahar province experienced a 248 per cent increase compared to 2009.

Afghan national security and international military forces (Pro-Government Forces) were linked to 440 deaths or 16 per cent of total civilian deaths, a reduction of 26 per cent from 2009. Aerial attacks claimed the largest percentage of civilian deaths caused by Pro-Government Forces in 2010, causing 171 deaths (39 per cent of the total number of civilian deaths attributed to Pro-Government Forces). Notably, there was a 52 per cent decline in civilian deaths from air attacks compared to 2009. Nine per cent of civilian deaths in 2010 could not be attributed to any party to the conflict.

I would like to put into the RECORD a report from the Afghanistan Rights Monitor relating to the number of civilians killed and wounded and displaced.

#### ARM ANNUAL REPORT CIVILIAN CASUALTIES OF WAR JANUARY—DECEMBER 2010

Kabul, Afghanistan, February 2011

#### Executive Summary

Over nine years after the internationally-celebrated demise of the repressive Taliban regime in Afghanistan, civilian Afghans increasingly suffer from the armed violence and rights violations committed by various internal and external armed actors. More ordinary Afghans were killed and injured in 2010 than a year before. And while US officials dubbed Afghanistan as their longest foreign war, Afghans suffered it for 32 years relentlessly.

Almost everything related to the war surged in 2010: the combined numbers of Afghan and foreign forces surpassed 350,000; security incidents mounted to over 100 per week; more fighters from all warring side were killed; and the number of civilian people killed, wounded and displaced hit record levels.

Collecting information about every security incident and verifying the often conflicting reports about their impacts on civilian people were extremely difficult and risky. The war was as heatedly fought

through propaganda and misinformation as it was in the battlefields thus making independent and impartial war reporting tricky and complex.

Despite all the challenges, we spared no efforts in gathering genuine information, facts and figures about the impacts of war on civilian communities. Our resources were limited and we lacked the luxury of strategic/political support from one or another side of the conflict because we stood by our professional integrity. We, however, managed to use our indigenous knowledge and delved into a wealth of local information available in the conflict-affected villages in order to seek more reliable facts about the war.

From 1 January to 31 December 2010, at least 2,421 civilian Afghans were killed and over 3,270 were injured in conflict-related security incidents across Afghanistan. This means everyday 6-7 noncombatants were killed and 8-9 were wounded in the war.

ARM does not claim that these numbers—although collected and verified to the best of our efforts—are comprehensive and perfect. Actual numbers of the civilian victims of war in 2010 could be higher than what we gathered and present in this report.

Unsurprisingly, about 63 percent of the reported civilian deaths and 70 percent of the injuries were attributed to the Armed Opposition Groups (AOGs) (Taliban, Hezb-e-Islami and the Haqqani Group); 21 percent of deaths (512 individuals) and 22 percent of injuries (655) were attributed to US/NATO forces; and 12 percent of deaths (278 individuals) and 7 percent (239) injuries were caused by pro-government Afghan troops and their allied local militia forces.

In addition to civilian casualties, hundreds of thousands of people were affected in various ways by the intensified armed violence in Afghanistan in 2010. Tens of thousands of people were forced out of their homes or deprived of healthcare and education services and livelihood opportunities due to the continuation of war in their home areas.

In November 2010, ARM was the first organization to voice concerns about the destruction of hundreds of houses, pomegranate trees and orchards in several districts in Kandahar Province by US-led forces as part of their counterinsurgency operations. In January 2011, an Afghan Government delegation reported the damage costs at over US\$100 million. In compensation, US/NATO forces have doled out less than \$2 million.

Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) are widely considered as the most lethal tools which killed over 690 civilians in 2010. However, as you will read in this report, there is virtually no information about the use of cluster munitions by US/NATO forces. Despite Afghanistan's accession to the international Anti-Cluster Bomb Treaty in 2008, the US military has allegedly maintained stockpiles of cluster munitions in Afghanistan.

A second key issue highlighted in this report is the emergence of the irregular armed groups in parts of Afghanistan which are backed by the Afghan Government and its foreign allies. These groups have been deployed as criminal and predatory by many Afghans and have already been accused of severe human rights violations such as child recruitment and sexual abuse.

I would like to put into the RECORD a report from the Congressional Research Service that the war in Afghanistan has cost over \$454 billion to date.

#### INTRODUCTION: WAR FUNDING TO DATE

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States has initiated three military operations: Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) covering primarily Afghani-

stan and other small Global War on Terror (GWOT) operations ranging from the Philippines to Djibouti that began immediately after the 9/11 attacks and continues; Operation Noble Eagle (ONE) providing enhanced security for U.S. military bases and other homeland security that was launched in response to the attacks and continues at a modest level; and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) that began in the fall of 2002 with the buildup of troops for the March 2003 invasion of Iraq, continued with counter-insurgency and stability operations, and is slated to be renamed Operation New Dawn as U.S. troops focus on an advisory and assistance role.

In the ninth year of operations since the 9/11 attacks while troops are being withdrawn in Iraq and increased in Afghanistan, the cost of war continues to be a major issue including the total amount appropriated, the amount for each operation, average monthly spending rates, and the scope and duration of future costs. Information on costs is useful to Congress to assess the FY2010 Supplemental for war costs for the Department of Defense (DOD) and State/USAID, FY2011 war requests, conduct oversight of past war costs, and consider the longer-term costs implications of the buildup of troops in Afghanistan and potential problems in the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. This report analyzes war funding for the Defense Department and tracks funding for USAID and VA Medical funding.

#### TOTAL WAR FUNDING BY OPERATION

Based on DOD estimates and budget submissions, the cumulative total for funds appropriated from the 9/11 attacks through the FY2010 Supplemental Appropriations Acts for DOD, State/USAID and VA for medical costs for the wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and enhanced security is \$1,121 billion including: \$751 billion for Iraq; \$336 billion for Afghanistan; \$29 billion for enhanced security; and \$6 billion unallocated.

Of this total, 67% is for Iraq, 30% for Afghanistan, 3% for enhanced security and 1/2% unallocated. Almost all of the funding for Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) is for Afghanistan.

This total includes funding provided in H.R. 4899/P.L. 111-212, the FY2010 Supplemental Appropriations Act enacted July 29, 2010.

Some 94% of this funding goes to the Department of Defense (DOD) to cover primarily incremental war-related costs, that is, costs that are in addition to DOD's normal peacetime activities. These costs include: military personnel funds to provide special pay for deployed personnel such as hostile fire or separation pay and to cover the additional cost of activating reservists, as well pay for expanding the Army and Marine Corps to reduce stress on troops; Operation and Maintenance (O&M) funds to transport troops and their equipment to Iraq and Afghanistan, conduct military operations, provide in-country support at bases, and repairing war-worn equipment; Procurement funding to cover buying new weapons systems to replace war losses, and upgrade equipment, pay modernization costs associated with expanding and changing the structure of the size of the Army and Marine Corps; Research, Development, Test & Evaluation costs to develop more effective ways to combat war threats such as roadside bombs; Working Capital Funds to cover expanding the size of inventories of spare parts and fuel to provide wartime support; and Military construction primarily to construct facilities in bases in Iraq or Afghanistan or neighboring countries.

In addition, the Administration initiated several programs specifically targeted at problems that developed in the Afghan and

Iraq wars: Coalition support to cover the logistical costs of allies, primarily Pakistan, conducting counter-terror operations in support of U.S. efforts; Commanders Emergency Response Program (CERP) providing funds to individual commanders for small reconstruction projects and to pay local militias in Iraq and Afghanistan to counter insurgent or Taliban groups; Afghan Security Forces Fund and the Iraq Security Forces Fund to pay the cost of training, equipping and expanding the size of the Afghan and Iraqi armies and police forces; and Joint Improvised Explosive Device (IEDs) Defeat Fund to develop, buy, and deploy new devices to improve force protection for soldiers against roadside bombs or IEDs.

I would like to put into the RECORD an article by Nobel prize-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz and Linda Bilmes in the Washington Post that says there is no question the Iraq war added substantially to the Federal debt.

[From the Times, Feb. 23, 2008]

THE THREE TRILLION DOLLAR WAR—THE COST OF THE IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN CONFLICTS HAVE GROWN TO STAGGERING PROPORTIONS

(By Joseph Stiglitz and Linda Bilmes)

The Bush Administration was wrong about the benefits of the war and it was wrong about the costs of the war. The president and his advisers expected a quick, inexpensive conflict. Instead, we have a war that is costing more than anyone could have imagined.

The cost of direct US military operations—not even including long-term costs such as taking care of wounded veterans—already exceeds the cost of the 12-year war in Vietnam and is more than double the cost of the Korean War.

And, even in the best case scenario, these costs are projected to be almost ten times the cost of the first Gulf War, almost a third more than the cost of the Vietnam War, and twice that of the First World War. The only war in our history which cost more was the Second World War, when 16.3 million U.S. troops fought in a campaign lasting four years, at a total cost (in 2007 dollars, after adjusting for inflation) of about \$5 trillion (that's \$5 million million, or \$2.5 million billion). With virtually the entire armed forces committed to fighting the Germans and Japanese, the cost per troop (in today's dollars) was less than \$100,000 in 2007 dollars. By contrast, the Iraq war is costing upward of \$400,000 per troop.

Most Americans have yet to feel these costs. The price in blood has been paid by our voluntary military and by hired contractors. The price in treasure has, in a sense, been financed entirely by borrowing. Taxes have not been raised to pay for it—in fact, taxes on the rich have actually fallen. Deficit spending gives the illusion that the laws of economics can be repealed, that we can have both guns and butter. But of course the laws are not repealed. The costs of the war are real even if they have been deferred, possibly to another generation.

#### Background

American voters must choose: more benefits or more defence; \$3 trillion budget leaves little for Bush to bank on; MoD forced to cut budget by £1.5bn; they're running our tanks on empty.

On the eve of war, there were discussions of the likely costs. Larry Lindsey, President Bush's economic adviser and head of the National Economic Council, suggested that they might reach \$200 billion. But this estimate was dismissed as "baloney" by the Defence Secretary, Donald Rumsfeld. His deputy, Paul Wolfowitz, suggested that post-war reconstruction could pay for itself

through increased oil revenues. Mitch Daniels, the Office of Management and Budget director, and Secretary Rumsfeld estimated the costs in the range of \$50 to \$60 billion, a portion of which they believed would be financed by other countries. (Adjusting for inflation, in 2007 dollars, they were projecting costs of between \$57 and \$69 billion.) The tone of the entire administration was cavalier, as if the sums involved were minimal.

Even Lindsey, after noting that the war could cost \$200 billion, went on to say: "The successful prosecution of the war would be good for the economy." In retrospect, Lindsey grossly underestimated both the costs of the war itself and the costs to the economy. Assuming that Congress approves the rest of the \$200 billion war supplemental requested for fiscal year 2008, as this book goes to press Congress will have appropriated a total of over \$845 billion for military operations, reconstruction, embassy costs, enhanced security at US bases, and foreign aid programmes in Iraq and Afghanistan.

As the fifth year of the war draws to a close, operating costs (spending on the war itself, what you might call "running expenses") for 2008 are projected to exceed \$12.5 billion a month for Iraq alone, up from \$4.4 billion in 2003, and with Afghanistan the total is \$16 billion a month. Sixteen billion dollars is equal to the annual budget of the United Nations, or of all but 13 of the US states. Even so, it does not include the \$500 billion we already spend per year on the regular expenses of the Defence Department. Nor does it include other hidden expenditures, such as intelligence gathering, or funds mixed in with the budgets of other departments.

Because there are so many costs that the Administration does not count, the total cost of the war is higher than the official number. For example, government officials frequently talk about the lives of our soldiers as priceless. But from a cost perspective, these "priceless" lives show up on the Pentagon ledger simply as \$500,000—the amount paid out to survivors in death benefits and life insurance. After the war began, these were increased from \$12,240 to \$100,000 (death benefit) and from \$250,000 to \$400,000 (life insurance). Even these increased amounts are a fraction of what the survivors might have received had these individuals lost their lives in a senseless automobile accident. In areas such as health and safety regulation, the US Government values a life of a young man at the peak of his future earnings capacity in excess of \$7 million—far greater than the amount that the military pays in death benefits. Using this figure, the cost of the nearly 4,000 American troops killed in Iraq adds up to some \$28 billion.

The costs to society are obviously far larger than the numbers that show up on the government's budget. Another example of hidden costs is the understating of U.S. military casualties. The Defense Department's casualty statistics focus on casualties that result from hostile (combat) action—as determined by the military. Yet if a soldier is injured or dies in a night-time vehicle accident, this is officially dubbed "noncombat related"—even though it may be too unsafe for soldiers to travel during daytime.

In fact, the Pentagon keeps two sets of books. The first is the official casualty list posted on the DOD Web site. The second, hard-to-find, set of data is available only on a different website and can be obtained under the Freedom of Information Act. This data shows that the total number of soldiers who have been wounded, injured, or suffered from disease is double the number wounded in combat. Some will argue that a percentage of these noncombat injuries might have happened even if the soldiers were not in Iraq.

Our new research shows that the majority of these injuries and illnesses can be tied directly to service in the war.

From the unhealthy brew of emergency funding, multiple sets of books, and chronic underestimates of the resources required to prosecute the war, we have attempted to identify how much we have been spending—and how much we will, in the end, likely have to spend. The figure we arrive at is more than \$3 trillion. Our calculations are based on conservative assumptions. They are conceptually simple, even if occasionally technically complicated. A \$3 trillion figure for the total cost strikes us as judicious, and probably errs on the low side. Needless to say, this number represents the cost only to the United States. It does not reflect the enormous cost to the rest of the world, or to Iraq.

From the beginning, the United Kingdom has played a pivotal role—strategic, military, and political—in the Iraq conflict. Militarily, the UK contributed 46,000 troops, 10 per cent of the total. Unsurprisingly, then, the British experience in Iraq has paralleled that of America: rising casualties, increasing operating costs, poor transparency over where the money is going, overstretched military resources, and scandals over the squalid conditions and inadequate medical care for some severely wounded veterans.

Before the war, Gordon Brown set aside £1 billion for war spending. As of late 2007, the UK had spent an estimated £7 billion in direct operating expenditures in Iraq and Afghanistan (76 per cent of it in Iraq). This includes money from a supplemental "special reserve", plus additional spending from the Ministry of Defense.

The special reserve comes on top of the UK's regular defense budget. The British system is particularly opaque: funds from the special reserve are "drawn down" by the Ministry of Defense when required, without specific approval by Parliament. As a result, British citizens have little clarity about how much is actually being spent.

In addition, the social costs in the UK are similar to those in the U.S.—families who leave jobs to care for wounded soldiers, and diminished quality of life for those thousands left with disabilities.

By the same token, there are macro-economic costs to the UK as there have been to America, though the long-term costs may be less, for two reasons. First, Britain did not have the same policy of fiscal profligacy; and second, until 2005, the United Kingdom was a net oil exporter.

We have assumed that British forces in Iraq are reduced to 2,500 this year and remain at that level until 2010. We expect that British forces in Afghanistan will increase slightly, from 7,000 to 8,000 in 2008, and remain stable for three years. The House of Commons Defense Committee has recently found that despite the cut in troop levels, Iraq war costs will increase by 2 per cent this year and personnel costs will decrease by only 5 per cent. Meanwhile, the cost of military operations in Afghanistan is due to rise by 39 per cent. The estimates in our model may be significantly too low if these patterns continue.

Based on assumptions set out in our book, the budgetary cost to the UK of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan through 2010 will total more than £18 billion. If we include the social costs, the total impact on the UK will exceed £20 billion.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BARNEY FRANK.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first, any suggestion that this is any way disrespectful of the sacrifice

of our troops is nonsense. Saying that we do not want brave Americans to continue in a very difficult situation in which they are at a great disadvantage and that in fact we would like to bring them home is no criticism of them at all, and nothing undermines their ability to be there. There is a policy decision as to whether they should be there.

Now my friend from Washington and my friend from California have said, well, this isn't the right forum parliamentarily, and my friend from Washington said, yes, we should have a change in strategy but not this way. But this is all we've got.

Right now, the Members have a choice, and that's the way this place is now being run: Either you vote for this resolution or you vote it down and you give an implicit and, in some cases, explicit approval to the administration to stay there indefinitely. General Petraeus said the other day he sees us jointly there with the Afghans well after 2014.

Now, yes, there is some gain we could get in deterring terrorism there, although the notion that if we stop terrorism in Afghanistan, that's going to be the end of it when there are unfortunately other places in the world—Somalia, Sudan, Yemen, elsewhere. We can't plug every hole in the world. And in fact this is an effort that, having been tried for 10 years, has not, unfortunately, looked to me like it's going to succeed.

We're told, well, but this was important because we deterred an attack on Europe. But where are the Europeans? The thing that most astounded me today was when my friend from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) said, well, what about our 47 coalition partners? What about them? They're sitting this one out. They're pulling out. This is a virtually unilateral American action with a couple of flags that we fly for a few other countries. Some of them did have people there and they've suffered casualties, but they're all withdrawing, leaving us alone.

And then let's talk about the cost of this war. The gentleman from Ohio said it's not a fiscal issue. Of course it is. This war costs us well over \$100 billion a year. You will see Americans die from a lack of police and fire and public safety here if you continue to fund this futile war.

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

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

I am grateful that we are having this debate from both sides, those that want to stay there for another 4 or 5 years versus those of us who would like to bring our troops home. I want to put a face on this debate if I may, Mr. Speaker.

This young man's name is Tyler Jordan from Cincinnati, Ohio. He is attending his father's funeral. He was a gunnery sergeant, Phillip Jordan, who was killed for this country. The 6-year-

old little boy, you can't see his eyes, but they hurt. They're pained.

How many more Tyler Jordans are going to be waiting for their daddy or mom to come home to be buried if we stay there 4, 5, 6, or 7 more years? And that is what has been indicated by the leadership of the military and this administration.

□ 1140

How many more moms and dads and wives and husbands are going to be at Dover Air Force Base to receive the remains of their loved ones? That is why this debate is so important, and why we need to have a date and a time to start bringing them home.

My last poster: this absolutely handsome couple. The marine went out with PTSD. His beautiful wife, Katie, and his little boy. Last year at Camp Lejeune, McHugh Boulevard, he pulls his car over in the middle of the day, and he shoots himself in the head and kills himself.

How many more Tom Bagosys will commit suicide? How many Tyler Jordans will not have their daddies coming home? How many moms and dads, wives and husbands will be at Dover to see those in a flag-draped coffin?

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be voting in favor of this resolution.

The United States military is the greatest fighting force on the face of the planet. I could not be more proud of our troops who have served our country with such valor and such vigor.

This is the longest war in the history of the United States of America. And let there be no mistake, the global war on terror is real. It is very real.

I reject the notion that polls should matter in any way, shape, or form in this debate. That is not how the United States operates. This is not how we decide whether or not we go to war or we bring our troops home.

I reject the notion that bringing our troops home at some point, which I consider to be victory, is somehow a pathway or paving a pathway to another 9/11. I think that is offensive, and I think it is inaccurate.

Now, in many ways we have had success over the course of the years. Let's understand that according to the National Intelligence Estimate, which has been printed in many newspapers, that the Taliban poses no clear and present danger to the current Afghan Government, nor do they pose a danger to the United States of America. Further, we have had our CIA Director state that there are less than 50 al-Qaeda in the entire boundaries of Afghanistan.

I believe it should be the policy of the United States of America that if we send our troops to war, we go with everything we have. We do not hold back. A politically correct war is a lost war, and at the present time we are playing politics. We aren't going with every-

thing we have. If we are serious about doing it, Mr. President, you go with everything. And until this President attends more funerals than he does rounds of golf, this person will be highly offended.

We have to define the mission. The President of the United States has failed to define success in Afghanistan. We are participating in the business of nation building, and I reject that. We are propping up a government that is fundamentally corrupt, and we all know it. It will not get us to where we want to go.

We must redefine the rules of engagement. Even when I was in Afghanistan visiting with General Petraeus, he admitted that we are using smaller caliber rounds. Again, we are trying to be more politically correct instead of actually protecting American lives.

Let me also say again that terrorism is a global threat. We must use our forces around the world when there is a direct threat on the United States of America. That is not confined to just the boundaries of Afghanistan. It is happening globally, and it is real. We have to deal with the threats in Iran and not take our eye off the ball.

Finally, I would say that our national debt is a clear and present danger to the United States of America, and we must pay attention to that.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and rules of the House. The Sergeant-at-Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The gentleman may continue.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, before I continue, may I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. May I ask the gentleman to yield me an additional 15 seconds?

Mr. JONES. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Aaron Nemelka, Carlos Aragon, Nigel Olsen, Matthew Wagstaff: Since I have been in office, these are the gentleman who have lost their lives in Afghanistan. I honor them. I thank them. And as I have talked to each of their parents, they want those rules of engagement changed, and they want to end this war in Afghanistan, with victory. With victory.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this week General Petraeus testified before Congress, and the essence of his testimony was that we are just now getting the necessary assets in place to make a difference in

Afghanistan; that our troops and coalition partners are making a significant difference; that the progress is fragile and reversible; but that it is essential that we keep it up because vital national interests are at stake.

I fear that as time has passed over the last 10 years and so many other events come and go in our Nation's life, that it is all too easy to forget that this country was attacked on 9/11 and that 3,000 Americans lost their lives. And we could come to the floor and hold up their pictures and the pictures of their children, of those who were killed on that day by terrorists, the attacks that were launched from Afghanistan, that were planned in Afghanistan and directed from Afghanistan.

This Congress at the time voted virtually unanimously that we would take military action to go make sure that Afghanistan would no longer be used as a launching pad for attacks against us and that from Afghanistan, people would no longer come here to kill Americans. That is the reason we are still there today, and that is the purpose of our military actions there today.

It is true that we may have a hard time plugging all the holes that could develop somewhere in the world where terrorist groups could squirt out to, but it is also true, in my view, that if we don't plug this hole, if we don't fulfill the mission that we have set out to fulfill in Afghanistan, we are going to have more holes all over the world developing, because people will know that we are not serious about doing what we say, and our security will be severely affected if that happens.

There have clearly been ups and downs in our military efforts there, just as there were in Iraq. But I believe that from General Petraeus on down, we have our best. They deserve our support to fulfill the mission the country has given them.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a report from the Afghanistan Study Group that says that the current U.S. military effort is helping to fuel the very insurgency we are attempting to defeat.

#### SUMMARY

At nine years and counting, the U.S. war in Afghanistan is the longest in our history, surpassing even the Vietnam War, and it will shortly surpass the Soviet Union's own extended military campaign there. With the surge, it will cost the U.S. taxpayers nearly \$100 billion per year, a sum roughly seven times larger than Afghanistan's annual gross national product (GNP) of \$14 billion and greater than the total annual cost of the new U.S. health insurance program. Thousands of American and allied personnel have been killed or gravely wounded.

The U.S. interests at stake in Afghanistan do not warrant this level of sacrifice. President Obama justified expanding our commitment by saying the goal was eradicating Al Qaeda. Yet Al Qaeda is no longer a significant presence in Afghanistan, and there are only some 400 hard-core Al Qaeda members remaining in the entire Af/Pak theater, most of them hiding in Pakistan's northwest provinces.

America's armed forces have fought bravely and well, and their dedication is unquestioned. But we should not ask them to make sacrifices unnecessary to our core national interests, particularly when doing so threatens long-term needs and priorities both at home and abroad.

Instead of toppling terrorists, America's Afghan war has become an ambitious and fruitless effort at "nation-building." We are mired in a civil war in Afghanistan and are struggling to establish an effective central government in a country that has long been fragmented and decentralized.

No matter how desirable this objective might be in the abstract, it is not essential to U.S. security and it is not a goal for which the U.S. military is well suited. There is no clear definition of what would comprise "success" in this endeavor. Creating a unified Afghan state would require committing many more American lives and hundreds of billions of additional U.S. dollars for many years to come.

As the WikiLeaks war diary comprised of more than 91,000 secret reports on the Afghanistan War makes clear, any sense of American and allied progress in the conflict has been undermined by revelations that many more civilian deaths have occurred than have been officially acknowledged as the result of U.S. and allied strike accidents. The Pakistan Inter-Services Intelligence continued to provide logistics and financial support to the Afghan Taliban even as U.S. soldiers were fighting these units. It is clear that Karzai government affiliates and appointees in rural Afghanistan have often proven to be more corrupt and ruthless than the Taliban.

Prospects for success are dim. As former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger recently warned, "Afghanistan has never been pacified by foreign forces." The 2010 spring offensive in Marjah was inconclusive, and a supposedly "decisive" summer offensive in Kandahar has been delayed and the expectations downgraded. U.S. and allied casualties reached an all-time high in July, and several NATO allies have announced plans to withdraw their own forces.

The conflict in Afghanistan is commonly perceived as a struggle between the Karzai government and an insurgent Taliban movement, allied with international terrorists, that is seeking to overthrow that government. In fact, the conflict is a civil war about power-sharing with lines of contention that are 1) partly ethnic, chiefly, but not exclusively, between Pashtuns who dominate the south and other ethnicities such as Tajiks and Uzbeks who are more prevalent in the north, 2) partly rural vs. urban, particularly within the Pashtun community, and 3) partly sectarian.

The Afghanistan conflict also includes the influence of surrounding nations with a desire to advance their own interests—including India, Pakistan, Iran, Saudi Arabia and others. And with the U.S. intervention in force, the conflict includes resistance to what is seen as foreign military occupation.

Resolving the conflict in Afghanistan has primarily to do with resolving the distribution of power among these factions and between the central government and the provinces, and with appropriately decentralizing authority.

Negotiated resolution of these conflicts will reduce the influence of extremists more readily than military action will. The Taliban itself is not a unified movement but instead a label that is applied to many armed groups and individuals that are only loosely aligned and do not necessarily have a fondness for the fundamentalist ideology of the most prominent Taliban leaders.

The Study Group believes the war in Afghanistan has reached a critical crossroads.

Our current path promises to have limited impact on the civil war while taking more American lives and contributing to skyrocketing taxpayer debt. We conclude that a fundamentally new direction is needed, one that recognizes the United States' legitimate interests in Central Asia and is fashioned to advance them. Far from admitting "defeat," the new way forward acknowledges the manifold limitations of a military solution in a region where our interests lie in political stability. Our recommended policy shifts our resources to focus on U.S. foreign policy strengths in concert with the international community to promote reconciliation among the warring parties, advance economic development, and encourage region-wide diplomatic engagement.

We base these conclusions on the following key points raised in the Study Group's research and discussions:

The United States has only two vital interests in the Af/Pak region: 1) preventing Afghanistan from being a "safe haven" from which Al Qaeda or other extremists can organize more effective attacks on the U.S. homeland; and 2) ensuring that Pakistan's nuclear arsenal does not fall into hostile hands.

Protecting our interests does not require a U.S. military victory over the Taliban. A Taliban takeover is unlikely even if the United States reduces its military commitment. The Taliban is a rural insurgency rooted primarily in Afghanistan's Pashtun population, and succeeded due in some part to the disenfranchisement of rural Pashtuns. The Taliban's seizure of power in the 1990s was due to an unusual set of circumstances that no longer exist and are unlikely to be repeated.

There is no significant Al Qaeda presence in Afghanistan today, and the risk of a new "safe haven" there under more "friendly" Taliban rule is overstated. Should an Al Qaeda cell regroup in Afghanistan, the U.S. would have residual military capability in the region sufficient to track and destroy it.

Al Qaeda sympathizers are now present in many locations globally, and defeating the Taliban will have little effect on Al Qaeda's global reach. The ongoing threat from Al Qaeda is better met via specific counter-terrorism measures, a reduced U.S. military "footprint" in the Islamic world, and diplomatic efforts to improve America's overall image and undermine international support for militant extremism.

Given our present economic circumstances, reducing the staggering costs of the Afghan war is an urgent priority. Maintaining the long-term health of the U.S. economy is just as important to American strength and security as protecting U.S. soil from enemy (including terrorist) attacks.

The continuation of an ambitious U.S. military campaign in Afghanistan will likely work against U.S. interests. A large U.S. presence fosters local (especially Pashtun) resentment and aids Taliban recruiting. It also fosters dependence on the part of our Afghan partners and encourages closer cooperation among a disparate array of extremist groups in Afghanistan and Pakistan alike.

Past efforts to centralize power in Afghanistan have provoked the same sort of local resistance that is convulsing Afghanistan today. There is ample evidence that this effort will join others in a long line of failed incursions.

Although the United States should support democratic rule, human rights and economic development, its capacity to mold other societies is inherently limited. The costs of trying should be weighed against our need to counter global terrorist threats directly, reduce America's \$1.4 trillion budget deficit,

repair eroding U.S. infrastructure, and other critical national purposes. Our support of these issues will be better achieved as part of a coordinated international group with which expenses and burdens can be shared.

The bottom line is clear: Our vital interests in Afghanistan are limited and military victory is not the key to achieving them.

On the contrary, waging a lengthy counterinsurgency war in Afghanistan may well do more to aid Taliban recruiting than to dismantle the group, help spread conflict further into Pakistan, unify radical groups that might otherwise be quarreling amongst themselves, threaten the long-term health of the U.S. economy, and prevent the U.S. government from turning its full attention to other pressing problems.

The more promising path for the U.S. in the Af/Pak region would reverse the recent escalation and move away from a counterinsurgency effort that is neither necessary nor likely to succeed. Instead, the U.S. should:

1. Emphasize power-sharing and political inclusion. The U.S. should fast-track a peace process designed to decentralize power within Afghanistan and encourage a power-sharing balance among the principal parties.

2. Downsize and eventually end military operations in southern Afghanistan, and reduce the U.S. military footprint. The U.S. should draw down its military presence, which radicalizes many Pashtuns and is an important aid to Taliban recruitment.

3. Focus security efforts on Al Qaeda and Domestic Security. Special forces, intelligence assets, and other U.S. capabilities should continue to seek out and target known Al Qaeda cells in the region. They can be ready to go after Al Qaeda should they attempt to relocate elsewhere or build new training facilities. In addition, part of the savings from our drawdown should be reallocated to bolster U.S. domestic security efforts and to track nuclear weapons globally.

4. Encourage economic development. Because destitute states can become incubators for terrorism, drug and human trafficking, and other illicit activities, efforts at reconciliation should be paired with an internationally-led effort to develop Afghanistan's economy.

5. Engage regional and global stakeholders in a diplomatic effort designed to guarantee Afghan neutrality and foster regional stability. Despite their considerable differences, neighboring states such as India, Pakistan, China, Iran and Saudi Arabia share a common interest in preventing Afghanistan from being dominated by any single power or being a permanently failed state that exports instability to others.

We believe this strategy will best serve the interests of women in Afghanistan as well. The worst thing for women is for Afghanistan to remain paralyzed in a civil war in which there evolves no organically rooted support for their social advancement.

The remainder of this report elaborates the logic behind these recommendations. It begins by summarizing U.S. vital interests, including our limited interests in Afghanistan itself and in the region more broadly. It then considers why the current strategy is failing and why the situation is unlikely to improve even under a new commander. The final section outlines "A New Way Forward" and explains how a radically different approach can achieve core U.S. goals at an acceptable cost.

#### AMERICA'S INTERESTS

The central goal of U.S. foreign and defense policy is to ensure the safety and prosperity of the American people. In practical terms, this means deterring or thwarting direct attacks on the U.S. homeland, while at the same time maintaining the long-term

health of the U.S. economy. A sound economy is the foundation of all national power, and it is critical to our ability to shape the global order and preserve our core values and independence over the long-term. The United States must therefore avoid an open-ended commitment in Afghanistan, especially when the costs of military engagement exceed the likely benefits.

#### What Is at Stake in Afghanistan?

The United States has only two vital strategic interests in Afghanistan. Its first strategic interest is to reduce the threat of successful terrorist attacks against the United States. In operational terms, the goal is to prevent Afghanistan from again becoming a "safe haven" that could significantly enhance Al Qaeda's ability to organize and conduct attacks on the United States.

The United States drove Al Qaeda out of Afghanistan in 2002, and Al Qaeda's presence in Afghanistan is now negligible. Al Qaeda's remaining founders are believed to be in hiding in northwest Pakistan, though affiliated cells are now active in Somalia, Yemen, and several other countries. These developments suggest that even a successful counterinsurgency campaign in Afghanistan would have only a limited effect on Al Qaeda's ability to conduct terrorist attacks against the United States and its allies. To the extent that our presence facilitates jihadi recruitment and draws resources away from focused counterterror efforts, it may even be counterproductive.

The second vital U.S. interest is to keep the conflict in Afghanistan from sowing instability elsewhere in Central Asia. Such discord might one day threaten the stability of the Pakistani state and the security of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal. If the Pakistani government were to fall to radical extremists, or if terrorists were able to steal or seize either a weapon or sufficient nuclear material, then the danger of a nuclear terrorist incident would increase significantly. It is therefore important that our strategy in Afghanistan avoids making the situation in Pakistani worse.

Fortunately, the danger of a radical takeover of the Pakistani government is small. Islamist extremism in Pakistan is concentrated within the tribal areas in its northwest frontier, and largely confined to its Pashtun minority (which comprises about 15 percent of the population). The Pakistani army is primarily Punjabi (roughly 44 percent of the population) and remains loyal. At present, therefore, this second strategic interest is not seriously threatened.

Beyond these vital strategic interests, the United States also favors democratic rule, human rights, and economic development. These goals are consistent with traditional U.S. values and reflect a longstanding belief that democracy and the rule of law are preferable to authoritarianism. The U.S. believes that stable and prosperous democracies are less likely to threaten their neighbors or to challenge core U.S. interests. Helping the Afghan people rebuild after decades of war is also appealing on purely moral grounds.

Yet these latter goals, however worthy in themselves, do not justify a costly and open-ended commitment to war in Afghanistan. Afghanistan remains one of the poorest countries in the world and is of little intrinsic strategic value to the United States. (Recent reports of sizeable mineral resources do not alter this basic reality.) Afghan society is divided into several distinct ethnic groups with a long history of conflict, it lacks strong democratic traditions, and there is a deeply rooted suspicion of foreign interference.

It follows that a strategy for Afghanistan must rest on a clear-eyed assessment of U.S. interests and a realistic appraisal of what

outside help can and cannot accomplish. It must also take care to ensure that specific policy actions do not undermine the vital interests identified above. The current U.S. strategy has lost sight of these considerations, which is why our war effort there is faltering.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article by Amanda Terkel of the Huffington Post that says that military commanders expect the United States to have a significant presence in Afghanistan for another 8 to 10 years, this according to a Member of Congress who was there.

[From huffingtonpost.com, Mar. 10, 2011]

COMMANDERS EXPECT A 'SIGNIFICANT' U.S. PRESENCE IN AFGHANISTAN FOR 8 TO 10 MORE YEARS; DEM REP

(By Amanda Terkel)

WASHINGTON.—Military commanders expect the United States to have a "significant presence" in Afghanistan for another eight to 10 years, according to a member of Congress who just returned from a trip to the region and has introduced legislation calling for a full accounting of the costs of the war.

Rep. Bruce Braley (D-Iowa) spent his congressional four-day weekend on a fact-finding trip to Afghanistan, meeting with Gen. David Petraeus, Amb. Karl Eikenberry and members of the Iowa National Guard. In an interview with The Huffington Post on Wednesday, Braley said that while there has clearly been some significant progress, challenges will remain even after 2014, when combat operations are supposed to end.

"It was very clear that under the best-case scenario, there will be some significant U.S. presence, according to them, for the next eight to 10 years," Braley said, adding that he expected that presence to include both military and civilian personnel. "That includes a very clear commitment that the drawdown will begin on schedule in July, and that the targeted date of being out with most combat forces by 2014 will be met. They continue to maintain that they are on pace to maintain those objectives."

The key transition benchmark, Braley said, will be the readiness of local law enforcement to assume principal responsibility of what are now largely U.S. security operations. "I think that the whole point is to transition the burden of maintaining security to the Afghan army and Afghan police, but there would be an obviously advisory role, they anticipate, for the U.S. military for the foreseeable future," he said. "The big question right now is when they start drawing down in July, where they're going to do that and the size of the redeployment."

Pentagon spokespersons told The Huffington Post that the Defense Department is not ready to discuss specific timelines at this point, and so far, no U.S. military or NATO official has publicly cited the time frame mentioned by Braley.

On Monday, Defense Secretary Robert Gates, who was also in Afghanistan to meet with Afghan President Hamid Karzai, said that both countries agree U.S. involvement should continue beyond 2014, although he didn't specify at what levels or for how long.

"I would say that if the Afghan people and the Afghan government are interested in an ongoing security relationship and some sort of an ongoing security presence—with the permission of the Afghan government—the United States, I think, is open to the possibility of having some presence here in terms of training and assistance, perhaps making use of facilities made available to us by the Afghan government for those purposes," said Gates. "We have no interest in permanent

bases, but if the Afghans want us here, we are certainly prepared to contemplate that."

While in Afghanistan, Gates also said that there were unlikely to be U.S. withdrawals in July from the hard-fought areas of the south—Helmand and Kandahar provinces. But he added, "While no decisions on numbers have been made, in my view, we will be well-positioned to begin drawing down some U.S. and coalition forces this July, even as we redeploy others to different areas of the country."

Braley said that one of the most profound comments made by Petraeus during their meeting was that there wasn't the "right combination at play" in Afghanistan until the fall of last year, which accounts for the slow pace of progress. Incidentally, Petraeus took command in Afghanistan from ousted Gen. Stanley McChrystal in June.

"One of the significant challenges that you face is dealing with a sovereign state that was sovereign in name only, which was a comment that Ambassador Eikenberry made," said Braley. "You've got a country with a high illiteracy rate, so that when Afghan army and police are trained, they are also being taught to read and basic math skills. It's a very long-term project to get Afghanistan to the point where it can sustain itself economically. That doesn't even take into account the activities that are going on in Pakistan, which have enormous implications in Afghanistan."

On Wednesday, Braley, a member of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, introduced the True Cost of War Act, which would require the president and pertinent cabinet members to submit a written report to Congress on the long-term human and financial costs of the war in Iraq and Afghanistan through 2020.

Braley said this legislation has been a priority of his since he came to Congress in 2006, in large part because of the toll the Iraq war was taking on the country.

"The whole point of my legislation is that the American people—especially at a time when Republicans have been pushing all these budget cuts—are entitled to know what the true costs are, because the young men and women coming back with these injuries certainly have a clear understanding of what they are," he said.

Braley added that on his trip, he brought up this issue at nearly every single briefing he attended, recounting the experiences he had just before his trip visiting wounded soldiers and their families who had been treated at the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Md. and the Walter Reed Army Medical Center in D.C.

"I wanted them to realize that in a single congressional district in Iowa, the implications of this war were enormous," said Braley. "I have to tell you that I was very impressed by how moved the people I shared those experiences with were. They tend to get caught up in talking policies, numbers and long-term objectives, and I think they appreciated the fact that I brought it down to a very real, human level."

On Monday, Rasmussen released a poll finding that for the first time, a majority of Americans want U.S. troops withdrawn from Afghanistan within one year.

I include for the RECORD a statement relating to a challenging of the claims of progress in Afghanistan that I issued 2 days ago.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Today, many of us are hearing from General Petraeus that "significant" progress is being made in Afghanistan. We have heard it before. Military and civilian leaders have, for years, told lawmakers and the public that they were making "progress" in Afghanistan. For instance:

In a speech to a joint session of Congress in 2004, President Karzai said, “You [Americans] came to Afghanistan to defeat terrorism, and we Afghans welcomed and embraced you for the liberation of our country. . . . This road, this journey is one of success and victory.”

In a joint press conference with President Karzai after that speech, President Bush said, “Today we witness the rebirth of a vibrant Afghan culture. Music fills the marketplaces and people are free to come together to celebrate in open. . . . Years of war and tyranny have eroded Afghanistan’s economy and infrastructure, yet a revival is under way.”

At another joint press conference with President Karzai in March of 2006, President Bush said, “We are impressed by the progress that your country is making, Mr. President [Karzai], a lot of it has to do with your leadership.”

In February of 2007, Lt. Gen. Karl Eikenberry told National Public Radio that Afghanistan was “on the steady path, right now. . . . to, I believe, success.”

In April 2008, President Bush told news reporters, “I think we’re making good progress in Afghanistan.”

October 2008, General McKiernan, Commander of NATO forces in Afghanistan, told the press “We are not losing in Afghanistan.” In May 2009, he was replaced by General McChrystal.

October 2008, President Bush said Afghanistan is “a situation where there’s been progress and there are difficulties.”

November 2009, President Obama, visiting troops in Afghanistan, reportedly said, “Because of the progress we’re making, we look forward to a new phase next year, the beginning of the transition to Afghan responsibility.”

December 2009, General Stanley McChrystal, the top commander, predicted that the U.S. troop buildup in Afghanistan will make “significant progress” in turning back the Taliban and securing the country by the coming summer. “By next summer I expect there to be significant progress that is evident to us,” McChrystal said in congressional testimony.

In January 2010, General McChrystal was asked by Diane Sawyer, “Have you turned the tide?” McChrystal answered, “I believe we are doing that now.”

In May 2010, General McChrystal told Congress that he saw “progress” in Afghanistan.

In May 2010, President Obama told the press that “we’ve begun to reverse the momentum” in Afghanistan.

In June 2010, Secretary Gates told a Congressional committee that we are “making headway” in Afghanistan. In June 2010, General McChrystal was replaced by General Petraeus.

In August 2010, General Petraeus said, “there’s progress being made” in Afghanistan.

In February 2011, General Petraeus said, “We have achieved what we set out to achieve in 2010” which was to reverse the insurgency momentum, solidify our accomplishments, and build on successes. “We took away safe havens and the infrastructure that goes with it.”

The President has requested another \$113.4 billion to continue the war in Afghanistan in FY12. That sum will be on top of \$454.7 billion already spent (and borrowed) on the war to date. On Thursday, March 17, 2011, Congress will have the opportunity to consider whether all of this “progress” has been worth the money. It is time for Congress to exercise fiscal responsibility and to assume its Constitutional responsibilities and end the war in Afghanistan. Vote YES on H. Con.

Res. 28 and direct the President to end this war by the end of the year.

Sincerely,

DENNIS J. KUCINICH,  
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have a senior member of the Judiciary Committee on the floor with me, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN). I don’t see any other members here. But this is an important matter for the Judiciary Committee in that article I, section 8, says only Congress has the right to declare war.

Obviously, we haven’t declared war in a very, very long time, so I think that we have to find out what is the constitutional basis that we are operating under in—well, I will skip Iraq. We all know that was based on false information promulgated from the President of the United States.

□ 1150

But, now, getting to Afghanistan, we find that we have a resolution dating back to September 14, 2011, a use of force resolution. But that has expired, by any rational investigation of it. It was designed to respond to the 9/11 terrorist attack and to fight al Qaeda. But today we’re in Afghanistan on a long-term effort at rebuilding the nation. Nation building is unrelated to that original resolution. And now we’re in Afghanistan and an unlawful incursion into Pakistan.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CONYERS. So now we’re in Pakistan and the CIA is operating covert combat activities there, and those are unlawful. We’re violating the UN Charter, which we are supposed to be a leader in. And so the Obama administration is carrying on the same military operations of its predecessor.

Mr. BERMAN. May I inquire how much time is remaining on the time allotted to me?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that 8 of those 22 minutes be yielded to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), who is now controlling the time for the majority on the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) will control 8 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to take a couple of minutes to talk about one point. That part of the majority party that is urging the same position I am on this resolution, which is a “no” vote, has made

the argument a number of times that when you’re dealing with fundamental issues of national security, you spend money, even under difficult times, a point that I have no disagreement with. And they argue the issue of what the alternatives will be and the potential for providing new safe havens for terrorists or more safe havens for terrorists or a return of Afghanistan as a safe haven for terrorists if we pass this resolution, and I don’t disagree with that point.

What I find upsetting about the majority’s position is their denial of the fundamental point. They quote General Petraeus for every position that they find philosophically and factually satisfying and ignore General Petraeus and Secretary Gates on the fundamental concept of how we hope to change the course of what is happening in Afghanistan. Because if we don’t change it, then we have to come and address the fundamental question of what we’re doing there through a counterinsurgency strategy.

So we talk about clear and hold and build. And it is the military’s job to clear and, for a time, to hold, but build is fundamentally a civilian program. General Petraeus over and over again has said this conflict in Afghanistan cannot be won unless we strengthen the governance of a very flawed government in Afghanistan, unless we provide economic opportunities for that society to progress and win the hearts and minds of the people of Afghanistan to the cause for which we are fighting.

It’s also a view of Afghanistan as if it’s isolated from the rest of the world. I can go through countries around the world—failed states, nearly failing states, terrible problems—which are certainly becoming safe harbors for terrorism.

So when the same party that makes a strong case for our national security interests here at the same time passes legislation which slashes every aspect of efforts to strengthen governance and development assistance and to provide the kinds of opportunities that serve our national security interests, I find it a strange kind of logic and a flaw in their approach to this.

I understand the economic hardships we have. If one wanted to look at the foreign assistance budget and take specific things that aren’t working and get rid of them, I understand that, and if one wanted to make proportional cuts in the foreign assistance budget. But to come with the argument of, “We’re broke; we’ve got to cut spending,” and then disproportionately focus on that aspect of our national security strategy which will do a tremendous amount and will be fundamental to any effort to stop them from being safe harbors for terrorism, and that is to massively slash disproportionately foreign assistance, it’s a terrible mistake. It terribly undermines the national security strategy that we’re trying to achieve through our operations and our presence and the money we’re spending

in Afghanistan. It's not thinking, I think, as clearly as needs to be thought. And I urge those in the majority to think again about how much the cuts that we need to make should be coming from that part of the budget that constitutes 1 percent of the Federal budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, I have great respect for him in many, many ways. We talk about we've got to enhance the governance of Afghanistan. Well, this is President Karzai's quote from March 12, 2001. I have read it before, but I want to submit it for the RECORD:

"I request that NATO and America should stop these operations on our soil," Karzai said. "This war is not on our soil. If this war is against terror, then this war is not here. Terror is not here."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN), the vice chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia, and an Iraq war veteran who continues to serve as a major in the U.S. Army Reserves.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 28 because it would undermine our national security and our ability to keep us safe right here at home. I understand that many Americans are frustrated with the length of this war. I also understand the American people have demanded the U.S. Government get its fiscal house in order. I know we cannot afford to fund this war indefinitely. But some think that cutting and running immediately from Afghanistan is the solution. That's simply not an option.

This is a reckless resolution. We've made progress in Afghanistan, and we cannot afford to abandon that progress by immediately withdrawing our troops. What we must do, however, is demand that our military and civilian leaders set clear and definable goals for our military efforts in Afghanistan. We also must listen to our military commanders who are there on the ground day in and day out.

General Petraeus has testified to our military's substantial progress in impeding the Taliban's influence and increasing the number of Afghan security forces. He cautioned, however, that this recent success is fragile and reversible.

We must allow our troops to remain in Afghanistan to defeat the Taliban and al Qaeda so that we can keep Americans safe here. We must continue to train and support local security forces because this will bring about the safe and successful full transition of the country's security to the Afghan people.

□ 1200

To withdraw now, to withdraw immediately, would be to forfeit that

progress and allow the Taliban and other extremists to regain their footing in Afghanistan.

We must honor the men and women of our Armed Forces, who have fought so hard. We must honor the men and women of the international armed forces, who have fought so hard. We must honor the men and women of the Afghan forces, who have fought hard to defend their own country. They have sacrificed so much, and we cannot abandon them now. Most importantly, it is not in our national interest to do so.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. BERMAN for giving us 8 minutes of his time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, how much time each group has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida controls 22 minutes; the gentleman from Ohio controls 22 minutes; the gentleman from California controls 9½ minutes; and the gentleman from North Carolina controls 16 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this House are talking about cutting \$100 billion from the budget. Well, we can trim the Federal budget of more than \$100 billion in out-of-control spending.

Members have been very concerned about out-of-control spending. They are calling for a reduction in the Federal budget. Cutting spending on the war in Afghanistan would solve their concerns. Spending on the war is greater than the minimum amount of Federal spending certain Members believe must be cut from the budget for fiscal responsibility.

In the fiscal year 2012 budget request, the President has requested \$113.4 billion to continue the war. In fact, congressional appropriations of over \$100 billion for the Afghanistan war has been the rule in recent years; and as we've seen, there is talk of extending this war for another 10 years. \$1 trillion, perhaps?

Spending on the Afghanistan war has increased much faster than overall government spending in recent years. Consider a comparison of the average annual rates of growth of government spending versus the Afghanistan war spending from 2008 through 2011.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 10 more seconds.

Overall government spending has increased 9 percent from 2008 through 2011, but Afghanistan war spending has increased 25 percent. If you want to save \$100 billion, then vote for this resolution.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. KUCINICH, I thank you for your courage in bringing this

debate to the floor. It's like the 600-pound elephant in the Nation. This war has gone on and on—and we never discuss it.

I want to applaud the courage of Mr. JONES from North Carolina. He has taken more than a lot of grief from his own party, and he has stood up to that with courage that is admirable.

I want to look at this debate, my colleagues, from the point of view of former chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, a position in which I was honored to serve.

Mr. KUCINICH, I think you underestimate the cost of this war. I've never seen you so conservative.

I had a hearing last year before the Veterans' Affairs Committee in which Nobel Prize-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz testified. He said these wars in Iraq and Afghanistan will be \$5 trillion to \$7 trillion wars over their whole course. Let us not forget—and that's not calculated in your costs. Mr. KUCINICH—the veterans, those who have served in this war with great courage, with great professionalism. Treating these veterans costs hundreds of billions of dollars more, and we're not considering that when we talk about ending this war.

We've been told that there have been about 45,000 casualties in these two wars in the last 10 years. Then why have almost 1 million people shown up at the Veterans Administration hospitals for war-related injuries? One million. This is not a rounding error. This is a deliberate attempt to misguide us on the cost of this war. This war is costing, in addition to what the budget says, hundreds of billions more for treating our veterans. We must calculate that into the cost of this war.

When you guys say, "deficit and debt," we are going to say, "Afghanistan."

In recent weeks, we have heard much from our Republican colleagues about out-of-control Federal spending. They want to cut \$100 billion from our budget.

If my friends are serious about cutting the budget, they should vote for H. Con. Res. 28.

Since 2001, our Nation has wasted \$1.121 trillion on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. We are spending \$5.4 billion a month in Iraq and \$5.7 billion a month in Afghanistan. This is a waste of our national resources and taxpayer funding!

For FY2012, the President has requested \$113.4 billion to continue the war in Afghanistan.

Between 2008 through 2011, overall government spending went up 9 percent annually. But this is nothing compared to the 25 percent annual increase in spending in Afghanistan.

Furthermore, spending on the Afghanistan war is rising at an accelerating rate. Over just three years (2010, 2011, and 2012), we will spend 45 percent more on the war in Afghanistan than we did in the preceding 8 years!

There is no better example of out-of-control Federal spending.

If Congress is really serious about being fiscally responsible and about cutting the Federal budget by three figures, then cutting spending on the out-of-control, hundred billion dollar a



year war in Afghanistan must be a serious consideration.

Today, we have an opportunity to do just that! A Yes vote will cut the 2012 budget by at least \$113.4 billion.

If you are serious about reducing the deficit, then vote "yes" on H. Con. Res. 28!

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. You're someone who says "billions of dollars" and "Afghanistan" both.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution and in support of our military personnel who are putting their lives in jeopardy in Afghanistan. They are doing their duty for us, for which every American should be eternally grateful. Now we must do our duty to them. If our military is engaged in a dangerous mission that we believe cannot be successful and but for face-saving we are keeping them there, we are doing a disservice to our defenders and to our Nation.

The people of Afghanistan are as courageous and independent as any on Earth. They are indomitable and unconquerable—a lesson invaders have learned the hard way for centuries. The liberation of Afghanistan from the Taliban was accomplished, not by a massive influx of American troops, but instead by fighters of the Northern Alliance militia and the air support that we provided them. It was a tremendous success.

When they were doing the fighting, it was a success. When we try to do the fighting all over the world, we lose. We cannot be a Nation that occupies the rest of the world. We cannot be a country that sends its troops all over the world to handle every problem.

After the great success of eliminating the Taliban from Afghanistan, our foreign policy bureaucracy, not our troops, set in place a government structure totally inconsistent with the village and tribal culture of the Afghan people. That information is no surprise to anybody. Most of us understand that.

They have a tribal culture there in Afghanistan and a village system. That is what works for them. Our State Department has tried to foist upon them a centralized system in which they don't even elect their provincial governors. After being liberated from the Taliban by Afghans, our troops are now there to force the Afghan people to accept an overly centralized and corrupt system which was put in place by our State Department bureaucracy.

I'm sorry, it won't work. It will not work. Any attempt to subjugate these people and to force them to acquiesce to our vision of Afghanistan will fail. We all understand that. If we are honest with ourselves, we know that that tactic won't succeed. To keep our troops over there any longer is sinful. It is a disservice to our country, and it is also sinful to those young men who

are willing to give their legs and their lives for us.

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

Mr. JONES. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. It is now up to us in Congress to stand up for those Americans in uniform who will be needlessly giving their lives to accomplish a mission that cannot be accomplished. If it can't be done, we should not be sending them over there.

The most responsible course of action is to, as quickly as possible, get our people out of this predicament, not to dig us in deeper and not to wait until this bloody quagmire kills even more Americans and we have to leave without success. If we can't win, we should pull out now.

Mr. JONES. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to a gentleman who knows a lot about the threats that are facing our Nation, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

□ 1210

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of power and emotion in this debate today, and I'm glad for that. There should be.

I recall the first time I had the chance to get to Afghanistan in late 2003. I met a woman there who had been trained as a doctor in the United States. She went to practice medicine in her home country of Afghanistan. When the Taliban took over, they stripped her of her medical duties. They sent her home. She was imprisoned in her own home for 6 years. I met her at a children's hospital, and in the days of the first conflict, she stripped off her burka, she walked 10 miles to the town to show up to provide medical care for the first time to these children as a woman in Afghanistan. With tears in her eyes she said, Thank you. These children have no chance. Afghanistan has no future.

And we saw the soccer field where they took people down and summarily executed them for violations that they deemed to be executable offenses under no law of their own, the burned buses where the modern conveniences were burned to get them out of the system when the Taliban took over to apply sharia law. And none of that would matter from the pain and the loss if you've attended one of these fine soldier's funerals; it is an emotional thing, and there is pain, and hurt, and sorrow, and something lost in all of us.

So none of those other things would be alone a reason to send our soldiers to risk their lives in defense of this country, but because of the things I talked about, because they have imprisoned women in Afghanistan, because of the things that they've done to the people there, it created hate and

ignorance and brutality, and al Qaeda saw an advantage, and they took it. They established there a safe haven where they recruited, where they financed, where they planned, where they armed themselves, where they recruited people around the world from other countries to come to train, and they sent some of them to the United States of America to slaughter 3,000 people.

And if you want to talk about money, the trillion-plus dollars that 9/11 has cost us just in economic loss, that's why we're there. We should not forget the mission today and why they risk their lives. If you want to talk about the State Department policies, I'm all in. I'd love to have that debate. If you want to talk about rules of engagement, I'm in, that's a place, let's do it, let's have that debate.

But if you want to tell the enemy today—and by the way, for the first time, we've got information that their commanders are saying we don't want to go fight. The spring offensive is being planned now, right now. Our soldiers are preparing for battle right now. This may be that last great battle in Afghanistan on behalf of our soldiers to eliminate the major components of the Taliban taking over their country.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. So if that woman doctor who trained here, taking care of kids, who cried for help and support doesn't move you, and maybe it shouldn't; for the pain of that funeral, that loss, that soldier who gave it all for this country doesn't move; then what ought to move you is the fact that these folks are gearing up and hoping and praying that we give up and we pull these troops out before the mission is done.

We all want them home. We want them home with no safe haven and a way that we can continue to put pressure on al Qaeda and its supporting affiliates.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would like to include in the RECORD an article on AlterNet by Tom Engelhardt which discusses the open-ended nature of the Afghanistan war.

#### HOW TO SCHEDULE A WAR: THE INCREDIBLE SHRINKING WITHDRAWAL DATE

(By Tom Engelhardt)

Going, going, gone! You can almost hear the announcer's voice throbbing with excitement, only we're not talking about home runs here, but about the disappearing date on which, for the United States and its military, the Afghan War will officially end.

Practically speaking, the answer to when it will be over is: just this side of never. If you take the word of our Afghan War commander, the secretary of defense, and top officials of the Obama administration and NATO, we're not leaving any time soon. As with any clever time traveler, every date that's set always contains a verbal escape hatch into the future.

In my 1950s childhood, there was a cheesy (if thrilling) sci-fi flick, *The Incredible Shrinking Man*, about a fellow who passed

through a radioactive cloud in the Pacific Ocean and soon noticed that his suits were too big for him. Next thing you knew, he was living in a doll house, holding off his pet cat, and fighting an ordinary spider transformed into a monster. Finally, he disappeared entirely leaving behind only a sonorous voice to tell us that he had entered a universe where “the unbelievably small and the unbelievably vast eventually meet, like the closing of a gigantic circle.”

In recent weeks, without a radioactive cloud in sight, the date for serious drawdowns of American troops in Afghanistan has followed a similar path toward the vanishing point and is now threatening to disappear “over the horizon” (a place where, we are regularly told, American troops will lurk once they have finally handed their duties over to the Afghan forces they are training).

If you remember, back in December 2009 President Obama spoke of July 2011 as a firm date to “begin the transfer of our forces out of Afghanistan,” the moment assumedly when the beginning of the end of the war would come into sight. In July of this year, Afghan President Hamid Karzai spoke of 2014 as the date when Afghan security forces “will be responsible for all military and law enforcement operations throughout our country.”

Administration officials, anxious about the effect that 2011 date was having on an American public grown weary of an unpopular war and on an enemy waiting for us to depart, grabbed Karzai’s date and ran with it (leaving many of his caveats about the war the Americans were fighting, particularly his desire to reduce the American presence, in the dust). Now, 2014 is hyped as the new 2011.

It has, in fact, been widely reported that Obama officials have been working in concert to “play down” the president’s 2011 date, while refocusing attention on 2014. In recent weeks, top administration officials have been little short of voluble on the subject. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates (“We’re not getting out. We’re talking about probably a years-long process.”), Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Admiral Mike Mullen, attending a security conference in Australia, all “cited 2014 . . . as the key date for handing over the defense of Afghanistan to the Afghans themselves.” The New York Times headlined its report on the suddenly prominent change in timing this way: “U.S. Tweaks Message on Troops in Afghanistan.”

Quite a tweak. Added Times reporter Elisabeth Bumiller: “The message shift is effectively a victory for the military, which has long said the July 2011 deadline undermined its mission by making Afghans reluctant to work with troops perceived to be leaving shortly.”

#### INFLECTION POINTS AND ASPIRATIONAL GOALS

Barely had 2014 risen into the headlines, however, before that date, too, began to be chipped away. As a start, it turned out that American planners weren’t talking about just any old day in 2014, but its last one. As Lieutenant General William Caldwell, head of the NATO training program for Afghan security forces, put it while holding a Q&A with a group of bloggers, “They’re talking about December 31st, 2014. It’s the end of December in 2014 . . . that [Afghan] President Karzai has said they want Afghan security forces in the lead.”

Nor, officials rushed to say, was anyone talking about 2014 as a date for all American troops to head for the exits, just “combat troops”—and maybe not even all of them. Possibly tens of thousands of trainers and other so-called non-combat forces would stay on to help with the “transition process.”

This follows the Iraq pattern where 50,000 American troops remain after the departure of U.S. “combat” forces to great media fanfare. Richard Holbrooke, Obama’s Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, was typical in calling for “the substantial combat forces [to] be phased out at the end of 2014, four years from now.” (Note the usual verbal escape hatch, in this case “substantial,” lurking in his statement.)

Last Saturday, behind “closed doors” at a NATO summit in Lisbon, Portugal, Afghan War commander General David Petraeus presented European leaders with a “phased four-year plan” to “wind down American and allied fighting in Afghanistan.” Not surprisingly, it had the end of 2014 in its sights and the president quickly confirmed that “transition” date, even while opening plenty of post-2014 wiggle room. By then, as he described it, “our footprint” would only be “significantly reduced.” (He also claimed that, post-2014, the U.S. would be maintaining a “counterterrorism capability” in Afghanistan—and Iraq—for which “platforms to . . . execute . . . counterterrorism operations,” assumedly bases, would be needed.)

Meanwhile, unnamed “senior U.S. officials” in Lisbon were clearly buttonholing reporters to “cast doubt on whether the United States, the dominant power in the 28-nation alliance, would end its own combat mission before 2015.” As always, the usual qualifying phrases were profusely in evidence.

Throughout these weeks, the “tweaking”—that is, the further chipping away at 2014 as a hard and fast date for anything—only continued. Mark Sedwill, NATO’s civilian counterpart to U.S. commander General David Petraeus, insisted that 2014 was nothing more than “an inflection point” in an ever more drawn-out drawdown process. That process, he insisted, would likely extend to “2015 and beyond,” which, of course, put 2016 officially into play. And keep in mind that this is only for combat troops, not those assigned to “train and support” or keep “a strategic over watch” on Afghan forces.

On the eve of NATO’s Lisbon meeting, Pentagon spokesman Geoff Morrell, waxing near poetic, declared 2014 nothing more than an “aspirational goal,” rather than an actual deadline. As the conference began, NATO’s Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen insisted that the alliance would be committed in Afghanistan “as long as it takes.” And new British Chief of the Defense Staff General Sir David Richards suggested that, given the difficulty of ever defeating the Taliban (or al-Qaeda) militarily, NATO should be preparing plans to maintain a role for its troops for the next 30 to 40 years.

#### WAR EXTENDER

Here, then, is a brief history of American time in Afghanistan. After all, this isn’t our first Afghan War, but our second. The first, the CIA’s anti-Soviet jihad (in which the Agency funded a number of the fundamentalist extremists we’re now fighting in the second), lasted a decade, from 1980 until 1989 when the Soviets withdrew in defeat.

In October 2001, in the wake of the 9/11 attacks, the Bush administration launched America’s second Afghan War, taking Kabul that November as the Taliban dissolved. The power of the American military to achieve quick and total victory seemed undeniable, even after Osama bin Laden slipped out of Tora Bora that December and escaped into Pakistan’s tribal borderlands.

However, it evidently never crossed the minds of President Bush’s top officials to simply declare victory and get out. Instead, as the U.S. would do in Iraq after the invasion of 2003, the Pentagon started building a new infrastructure of military bases (in this

case, on the ruins of the old Soviet base infrastructure). At the same time, the former Cold Warriors in Washington let their dreams about pushing the former commies of the former Soviet Union out of the former soviet socialist republics of Central Asia, places where, everyone knew, you could just about swim in black gold and run geopolitically wild.

Then, when the invasion of Iraq was launched in March 2003, Afghanistan, still a “war” (if barely) was forgotten, while the Taliban returned to the field, built up their strength, and launched an insurgency that has only gained momentum to this moment. In 2008, before leaving office, George W. Bush bumped his favorite general, Iraq surge commander Petraeus, upstairs to become the head of the Central Command which oversees America’s war zones in the Greater Middle East, including Afghanistan.

Already the guru of counterinsurgency (known familiarly as COIN), Petraeus had, in 2006, overseen the production of the military’s new war-fighting bible, a how-to manual dusted off from the Vietnam era’s failed version of COIN and made new and magical again. In June 2010, eight and a half years into our Second Afghan War, at President Obama’s request, Petraeus took over as Afghan War commander. It was clear then that time was short—with an administration review of Afghan war strategy coming up at year’s end and results needed quickly. The American war was also in terrible shape.

In the new COIN-ish U.S. Army, however, it is a dogma of almost biblical faith that counterinsurgencies don’t produce quick results; that, to be successful, they must be pursued for years on end. As Petraeus put it back in 2007 when talking about Iraq, “[T]ypically, I think historically, counterinsurgency operations have gone at least nine or 10 years.” Recently, in an interview with Martha Raddatz of ABC News, he made a nod toward exactly the same timeframe for Afghanistan, one accepted as bedrock knowledge in the world of the COINistas.

What this meant was that, whether as CENTCOM commander or Afghan War commander, Petraeus was looking for two potentially contradictory results at the same time. Somehow, he needed to wrest those nine to 10 years of war-fighting from a president looking for a tighter schedule and, in a war going terribly sour, he needed almost instant evidence of “progress” that would fit the president’s coming December “review” of the war and might pacify unhappy publics in the U.S. and Europe.

Now let’s do the math. At the moment, depending on how you care to count, we are in the 10th year of our second Afghan War or the 20th year of war interruptus. Since June 2009, Petraeus and various helpers have stretched the schedule to 2014 for (most) American combat troops and at least 2015 or 2016 for the rest. If you were to start counting from the president’s December surge address, that’s potentially seven more years. In other words, we’re now talking about either a 15-year war or an on-and-off again quarter-century one. All evidence shows that the Pentagon’s war planners would like to extend those already vague dates even further into the future.

#### ON TICKING CLOCKS IN WASHINGTON AND KABUL

Up to now, only one of General Petraeus’s two campaigns has been under discussion here: the other one, fought out these last years not in Afghanistan, but in Washington and NATO capitals, over how to schedule a war. Think of it as the war for a free hand in determining how long the Afghan War is to be fought.

It has been run from General Petraeus’s headquarters in Kabul, the giant five-sided

military headquarters on the Potomac presided over by Secretary of Defense Gates, and various think-tanks filled with America's militarized intelligentsia scattered around Washington—and it has proven a classically successful “clear, hold, build” counterinsurgency operation. Pacification in Washington and a number of European capitals has occurred with remarkably few casualties. (Former Afghan war commander General Stanley McChrystal, axed by the president for insubordination, has been the exception, not the rule.)

Slowly but decisively, Petraeus and company constricted President Obama's war-planning choices to two options: more and yet more. In late 2009, the president agreed to that second surge of troops (the first had been announced that March), not to speak of CIA agents, drones, private contractors, and State Department and other civilian government employees. In his December “surge” address at West Point (for the nation but visibly to the military), Obama had the temerity as commander-in-chief to name a specific, soon-to-arrive date—July 2011—for beginning a serious troop drawdown. It was then that the COIN campaign in Washington ramped up into high gear with the goal of driving the prospective end of the war back by years.

It took bare hours after the president's address for administration officials to begin leaking to media sources that his drawdown would be “conditions based”—a phrase guaranteed to suck the meaning out of any deadline. (The president had indeed acknowledged in his address that his administration would take into account “conditions on the ground.”) Soon, the Secretary of Defense and others took to the airwaves in a months-long campaign emphasizing that drawdown in Afghanistan didn't really mean drawdown, that leaving by no means meant leaving, and that the future was endlessly open to interpretation.

With the ratification in Lisbon of that 2014 date “and beyond,” the political clocks—an image General Petraeus loves—in Washington, European capitals, and American Kabul are now ticking more or less in unison.

Two other “clocks” are, however, ticking more like bombs. If counterinsurgency is a hearts and minds campaign, then the other target of General Petraeus's first COIN campaign has been the restive hearts and minds of the American and European publics. Last year a Dutch government fell over popular opposition to Afghanistan and, even as NATO met last weekend, thousands of antiwar protestors marched in London and Lisbon. Europeans generally want out and their governments know it, but (as has been true since 1945) the continent's leaders have no idea how to say “no” to Washington. In the U.S., too, the Afghan war grows ever more unpopular, and while it was forgotten during the election season, no politician should count on that phenomenon lasting forever.

And then, of course, there's the literal ticking bomb, the actual war in Afghanistan. In that campaign, despite a drumbeat of American/NATO publicity about “progress,” the news has been grim indeed. American and NATO casualties have been higher this year than at any other moment in the war; the Taliban seems if anything more entrenched in more parts of the country; the Afghan public, ever more puzzled and less happy with foreign troops and contractors traipsing across the land; and Hamid Karzai, the president of the country, sensing a situation gone truly sour, has been regularly challenging the way General Petraeus is fighting the war in his country. (The nerve!)

No less unsettling, General Petraeus himself has seemed unnerved. He was declared

“irked” by Karzai's comments and was said to have warned Afghan officials that their president's criticism might be making his “own position ‘untenable,’” which was taken as a resignation threat. Meanwhile, the COIN-meister was in the process of imposing a new battle plan on Afghanistan that leaves counterinsurgency (at least as usually described) in a roadside ditch. No more is the byword “protect the people,” or “clear, hold, build”; now, it's smash, kill, destroy. The war commander has loosed American firepower in a major way in the Taliban strongholds of southern Afghanistan.

Early this year, then-commander McChrystal had significantly cut back on U.S. air strikes as a COIN-ish measure meant to lessen civilian casualties. No longer. In a striking reversal, air power has been called in—and in a big way. In October, U.S. planes launched missiles or bombs on 1,000 separate Afghan missions, numbers seldom seen since the 2001 invasion. The Army has similarly loosed its massively powerful High Mobility Artillery Rocket System in the area around the southern city of Kandahar. Civilian deaths are rising rapidly.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We keep coming back to 9/11. We're near the eighth anniversary of the invasion of Iraq, which had nothing to do with 9/11, and which was predicated on a lie, no weapons of mass destruction. The war in Afghanistan is based on a misreading of history. The Soviet Union understood that at hard cost. The occupation is fueling an insurgency.

Now, Jeremy Scahill in the Nation points out that Taliban leaders have said they've seen a swelling in Taliban ranks since 9/11 in part attributed to the widely held perception that the Karzai government is corrupt and illegitimate, and that Afghans, primarily ethnic Pashtuns, want foreign occupation forces out. They're only fighting to make foreigners leave Afghanistan. Occupation fuels insurgency. That is an ironclad fact.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution, of which I'm proud to be an original cosponsor, and I'd like to thank Representative KUCINICH for his work on this resolution and also mainly for his continued and passionate defense of congressional war powers authority. Also, I, too, want to commend Congressman JONES for his leadership on this issue and so many other issues.

This resolution is simple and straightforward. It directs the President to end the near decade-long war in Afghanistan and to redeploy United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan by the end of this year. Al Qaeda is not in Afghanistan, and Osama bin Laden still has not been found. This resolution comes at a time when a growing number of Members of Congress, military and foreign policy experts, and, in particular, the American people, are calling for an immediate end to this war. Enough is enough.

Let me just say something. First of all, we've heard that polls are showing

that nearly three-quarters of the American public favors action to speed up U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan. Yes, the Congress authorized the use of force in 2001, which I voted against because it gave the President, any President, a blank check to use force, anytime, anyplace, anywhere in the world for any period of time. It was not a declaration of war, yet this has been the longest war in American history, the longest war in American history.

As the daughter of a 25-year Army officer who served in two wars, let me salute our troops, let me honor our troops and just say our servicemen and -women have performed with incredible courage and commitment in Afghanistan. But they have been put in an impossible situation. It's time to bring them home. There is no military solution in Afghanistan.

As we fight here in Congress to protect investments in education, health care, public health and safety, the war in Afghanistan will cost more than \$100 billion in 2011 alone.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. No one can deny that the increasing costs of the war in Afghanistan are constraining our efforts to invest in job creation and jump-start the economy.

Yesterday, I joined a bipartisan group of 80 Members of Congress in sending a letter to President Obama calling for a significant and sizeable reduction in United States troop levels in Afghanistan no later than July of this year.

This debate that we're having today here should have occurred in 2001 when Congress authorized this blank check. It was barely debated. It was barely debated, and the rush to war has created not less anger towards the United States but more hostilities, and it's not in our national security nor economic interests to continue.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to point out that for those Members who are concerned about the finances of this government, U.S. debt soared from \$6.4 trillion in March 2003 to \$10 trillion.

Joseph Stiglitz, Nobel Prize winner economist, and his associate, Linda Bilmes, pointed out that at least a quarter of that increase is directly attributable to the war in Iraq. As a result of two costly wars, funded by debt, our fiscal house was in abysmal shape even before the financial crisis, and those fiscal woes compounded the downturn. The global financial crisis was due at least in part—this is a quote—to the war.

□ 1220

Now they continue. The Iraq war didn't just contribute to the severity of the fiscal crisis, though it kept us from responding to it effectively. So, my friends, finance is a national security issue. If we are broke, we can't defend ourselves.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side, America does have a national security interest in protecting American citizens from terrorist attack. But the question before us is this: Is that national security interest being served by 10 years of nation building in the third most corrupt country in the entire world? Is our national security interest being served by sending 100,000 troops and \$454 billion in taxpayer money to a country where there are 50 members of al Qaeda? Is it a winning and likely successful strategy when al Qaeda simply moves where we aren't? They move out of Afghanistan into Pakistan, to Sudan, to wherever they can find a safe haven.

Does it make sense to ask our soldiers and our taxpayers to sacrifice when our Afghan partner is so profoundly corrupt? And I mean world-class corrupt: \$3 billion in pallets of cash moved out of the Kabul airport to safe havens for warlords; an Afghan Vice President who flies to Dubai with \$52 million in walking-around money; when the U.S.-backed Afghan major crimes unit tries to get Karzai to act on corruption and Karzai gets his buddy out of jail. Yes, we have a national security interest in protecting America from attack, but this is a losing strategy.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

After 10 long years, \$336 billion spent, 1,500 American lives lost, and thousands maimed, it is time to bring our troops home. Our servicemen and -women and their coalition allies have performed valiantly. The United States has done everything possible to provide opportunity for the Afghanistan people and the chance for a democratic government there to mature and take hold. Afghanistan must now take responsibility for its own destiny.

The fact of the matter is this: If now is not the time to leave, then when? Afghanistan has become the longest war in U.S. history, with a price tag of \$100 billion a year. At a time when we are contemplating cutting services for seniors, educational programs for children, and tuition assistance for working college students, that money could be spent more wisely elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, too much of our country's treasure has gone toward this war. But more importantly, the cost in human life, American and Afghan, has been enormous. As the world's greatest democracy, what kind of message does this war send to other nations? Do as we say, not as we do?

It is time to make our actions reflect our words. Get out of Afghanistan now.

Mr. KUCINICH. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman.

The question we are facing today is, should we leave Afghanistan? I think the answer is very clear, and it's not complicated. Of course we should, as soon as we can. This suggests that we can leave by the end of the year. If we don't, we'll be there for another decade, would be my prediction.

The American people are now with us. A group of us here in the Congress, a bipartisan group, for nearly a decade have been talking about this, arguing not to expand the war, not to be over there, not to be in nation building. And the American people didn't pay much attention. Now they are. The large majority of the American people now say it's time to get out of Afghanistan. It's a fruitless venture. Too much has been lost. The chance of winning, since we don't even know what we are going to win, doesn't exist. So they are tired of it. Financially, there's a good reason to come home as well.

Some argue we have to be there because if we leave under these circumstances we'll lose face; it will look embarrassing to leave. So how many more men and women have to die, how many more dollars have to be spent to save face? That is one of the worst arguments possible.

We are not there under legal conditions. This is a war. Who says it isn't a war? Everybody talks about the Afghan war. Was the war declared? Of course not. It wasn't declared. There was a resolution passed that said that the President at that time, under the emergency of 9/11, could go and deal with al Qaeda, those who brought upon the 9/11 bombings. But al Qaeda is not there anymore. So we are fighting the Taliban.

The Taliban used to be our allies at one time when the Soviets were there. The Taliban's main goal is to keep the foreign occupation out. They want foreigners out of their country. They are not al Qaeda. Yet most Americans—maybe less so now. But the argument here on the floor is we have got to go after al Qaeda. This is not a war against al Qaeda. If anything, it gives the incentive for al Qaeda to grow in numbers rather than dealing with them.

The money issue, we are talking about a lot of money. How much do we spend a year? Probably about \$130 billion, up to \$1 trillion now in this past decade.

Later on in the day, we are going to have two votes. We are going to have a vote on doing something sensible, making sense out of our foreign policy, bringing our troops home and saving hundreds of billions of dollars. Then we

also will have a vote against NPR, to cut the funding of NPR. There is a serious question about whether that will even cut one penny. But at least the fiscal conservatives are going to be overwhelmingly in support of slashing NPR, and then go home and brag about how they are such great fiscal conservatives. And the very most they might save is \$10 million, and that's their claim to fame for slashing the budget. At the same time, they won't consider for a minute cutting a real significant amount of money.

All empires end for fiscal reasons because they spread themselves too far around the world, and that's what we are facing. We are in the midst of a military conflict that is contributing to this inevitable crisis and it's financial. And you would think there would be a message there.

How did the Soviets come down? By doing the very same thing that we're doing: perpetual occupation of a country.

We don't need to be occupying Afghanistan or any other country. We don't even need to be considering going into Libya or anywhere else. Fortunately, I guess for those of us who would like to see less of this killing, we will have to quit because we won't be able to afford it.

The process that we are going through is following the War Powers Resolution. This is a proper procedure. It calls attention to how we slip into these wars.

I have always claimed that it's the way we get into the wars that is the problem. If we would be precise and only go to war with a declaration of war, with the people behind us, knowing who the enemy is, and fight, win, and get it over with, that would be more legitimate. They don't do it now because the American people wouldn't support it. Nobody is going to declare war against Afghanistan or Iraq or Libya.

We now have been so careless for the past 50 or 60 years that, as a Congress and especially as a House, we have reneged on our responsibilities. We have avoided our prerogatives of saying that we have the control. We have control of the purse. We have control of when we are supposed to go to war. Yet the wars continue. They never stop. And we are going to be completely brought down to our knees.

We can't change Afghanistan. The people who are bragging about these changes, even if you could, you are not supposed to. You don't have the moral authority. You don't have the constitutional authority.

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

Mr. JONES. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. PAUL. So I would say, the sooner, the better, we can come home. This process says come home. Under the law, it says you should start bringing troops home within 30 days. This allows up to the end of the year after

this would be passed. But this needs to be done. A message needs to be sent. And some day we have to wake up and say, if you are a fiscal conservative, you ought to look at the waste.

□ 1230

This is military Keynesianism to believe that we should do this forever. So I would say this is the day to be on record and vote for this resolution.

Mr. JONES. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a member of the Armed Services Committee and a distinguished combat veteran who has served our country honorably in Iraq and Afghanistan with the United States Marine Corps.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, first, I was in the Marine Corps. I did two tours in Iraq and one in Afghanistan. I didn't do anything exceptional; but if anybody else has served in Afghanistan, I will yield to you right now. If anybody in this Congress who has served in a military capacity in these wars in Afghanistan, I'll be happy to yield to you.

You might have taken a few trips over, and you can tell stories about the families that are impacted who you know. You can talk about people who you know that have been impacted. You can talk about those marines and soldiers and sailors and airmen that we see injured at Bethesda and Walter Reed; but if you want to quote somebody, you can quote me. I'm in 223 Cannon.

If you want to talk to a family that's been impacted by three deployments, two of my kids, all of them 10 or under—I have three—two of them have been through three deployments. One child, my youngest daughter, has been through one deployment, the Afghan deployment in 2007.

If you want to talk to somebody, feel free to talk to my family because they understand what it's like. What they also understand is the reason that we're there.

Less than 2 percent of America's population serves. The burden from Afghanistan is on their shoulders. It's on my family's shoulders. They know what's at stake. That's why they basically allowed me to do it. They allowed me to go to Iraq and Afghanistan because of the number one reason that we're there, the number one reason. And it's not to nation-build. It's to make sure that radicalized Muslims stop killing Americans. It's to stop them from destroying this country.

They want to murder us. Every single person in this room, every American, radicalized Muslims want to murder. That's why we have men and women over there right now fighting. That's it. There's no other reason for it.

Nation building is a thing we have to do there on the side to get the people, the Afghan people, on our side. But

what we're doing right now is we're taking out the enemy.

And we have to trust General Petraeus. We have to trust President Obama, in this case, that they know what's going on. He's the Commander in Chief, not us. We are not the commanders in chief. There's one of them, and it's the other side's President.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HUNTER. If you want to quote somebody who's been there, feel free to quote me. If you want to talk about it, feel free to come to my office. And if you want to hold up pictures of families, hold up pictures of mine because they've been impacted by it.

But I thank the gentleman from Ohio for bringing up this debate because what has happened is our side has cut defense by \$16 billion in H.R. 1. If we're not going to support our troops while we're fighting, this type of resolution might need a look at later. I don't think now is the right time.

I oppose the resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). All Members are reminded that remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair and through the Chair and not to each other.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would like to insert into the RECORD a recent report from The Washington Post that says that we've seen the steepest increase in lost limbs among soldiers and marines occurring in the last 4 months.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 9, 2011]

REPORT REVEALS STEEP INCREASE IN WAR AMPUTATIONS LAST FALL

(By David Brown)

The majority of American soldiers undergoing amputation for war wounds last fall lost more than one limb, according to data presented Tuesday to the Defense Health Board, a committee of experts that advises the Defense Department on medical matters.

Military officials had previously released data showing that amputations, and especially multiple-limb losses, increased last year. The information presented to the 20-member board is the first evidence that the steepest increase occurred over the last four months of the year.

In September 2010, about two-thirds of all war-theater amputation operations involved a single limb (usually a leg) and one-third two or more limbs. The split was roughly 50-50 in October and November. In December, only one-quarter of amputation surgery involved only one limb; three-quarters involved the loss of two or more limbs.

The Marines, who make up 20 percent of the forces in Iraq and Afghanistan, were especially hard hit. Of the 66 wounded severely enough to be evacuated overseas in October, one-third lost a limb.

In the first seven years of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, about 6 percent of seriously wounded soldiers underwent amputation.

Wounds to the genitals and lower urinary tract—known as genitourinary injuries—accounted for 11 percent of wounds over the last seven months of 2010, up from 4 percent in the previous 17 months, according to data presented by John B. Holcomb, a trauma surgeon and retired Army colonel.

The constellation of leg-and-genital wounds are in large part the consequence of

stepping on improvised explosive devices—homemade mines—and are known as “dis-mounted IED injuries.”

The data were assembled by Holcomb and two physicians at Landstuhl Regional Medical Center in Germany, where all seriously injured soldiers are taken on their way back to the United States.

The steep increase in both the rate and number of amputations clearly disturbed both Holcomb and members of the board, which met at a Hilton hotel near Dulles International Airport.

Holcomb, who spent two weeks at Landstuhl in December and is a former head of the U.S. Army Institute of Surgical Research, said he had heard of “unwritten pacts among young Marines that if they get their legs and genitals blown off they won't put tourniquets on but will let each other die on the battlefield.”

Richard H. Carmona, who was U.S. surgeon general from 2002 to 2006 and is now on the board, said the information was “very disturbing.”

He said it has made him ask: “What is the endgame here? Is the sacrifice we are asking of our young men and women worth the potential return? I have questions about that now.”

Carmona, 61, served as an Army medic in Vietnam before going to college and medical school. He has a son who is an Army sergeant and is serving in Iraq.

Jay A. Johannigman, an Air Force colonel who has served multiple deployments as a trauma surgeon, said his stint at the military hospital at Bagram Airfield in Afghanistan last fall “was different” both personally and medically.

“We see the enormous price our young men and women are paying. It should not be for naught,” he said. He didn't want to elaborate.

Why amputation-requiring injuries increased so much in recent months isn't entirely understood. It is partly a function of tactics that emphasize more foot patrols in rural areas. Some people have speculated the mines may be constructed specifically to cause the devastating wounds.

“Do the Marines know? Probably,” said Frank Butler, a doctor and retired Navy captain who has spearheaded improvements in battlefield first aid over the last decade. “But they're not releasing a thing. And they shouldn't.”

I would also like to insert into the RECORD a report from the “American Conservative” which says that late last year IED deaths among our own soldiers were up, not down.

[From The American Conservative, Mar. 10, 2011]

HOW'S THAT POPULATION-CENTRIC COIN GOING?

(Posted by Kelley Vlahos)

If the success or failure of the Afghan military “surge” rests on whether the U.S. can bring down the level of violence and protect the civilian population from the Taliban—a metric that the now fading COINdinitas had once insisted could be achieved with the right strategy—then two new statistics to emerge this week don't bode well for the prospects of the nearly 2-year-old counter-insurgency operation in Afghanistan.

First, more of our soldiers today are coming home this year with amputations than in the previous year, according reports coming out of the Defense Health Board this week. According to The Washington Post, which was apparently the only mainstream news outlet to cover the board's meeting in Northern Virginia on Tuesday, the steepest increase in lost limbs among soldiers and Marines occurred in the last four months.

The Marines, who make up 20 percent of the forces in Iraq and Afghanistan, were especially hard hit. Of the 66 wounded severely enough to be evacuated overseas in October, one-third lost a limb.

In the first seven years of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, about 6 percent of seriously wounded soldiers underwent amputation.

Wounds to the genitals and lower urinary tract—known as genitourinary injuries—accounted for 11 percent of wounds over the last seven months of 2010, up from 4 percent in the previous 17 months, according to data presented by John B. Holcomb, a trauma surgeon and retired Army colonel.

The constellation of leg-and-genital wounds are in large part the consequence of stepping on improvised explosive devices—homemade mines—and are known as “dismounted IED injuries.”

The data regarding the increased amputations were already reported in Friday’s WaPo, but apparently the fact they spiked in the last few months only came out in the meeting. Who knows if that point would’ve ever seen the light of day if a reporter hadn’t been there. A source close to the board told me that media rarely show up to cover the DHB, which is a pity, because its members, which include both civilian and retired military doctors and scientists, probably know more about the “big picture” regarding the health and welfare of our troops in the battlefield than anyone else and tend to talk candidly among themselves about conditions there.

The data was presented Tuesday by John B. Holcomb, a trauma surgeon and retired Army colonel. As a former head of the U.S. Army Institute of Surgical Research, he said he had heard of “unwritten pacts among young Marines that if they get their legs and genitals blown off they won’t put tourniquets on but will let each other die on the battlefield.”

New DHB member Richard Carmona, a former U.S. Surgeon General under Bush, apparently didn’t get the memo about keeping his emotional responses in check. The Vietnam veteran called the new statistics “very disturbing,” and then asked, “What is the endgame here? Is the sacrifice we are asking of our young men and women worth the potential return? I have questions about that now.”

He should definitely have questions, considering that Gen. David Petraeus, Lt. Gen. William “Svengali” Caldwell and others have been all over the press in recent weeks talking about how promising it looks in Afghanistan the Taliban’s “halted momentum,” and all that.

Meanwhile, the other big news today is that civilian deaths in Afghanistan are up, too.

According to a new U.N. report, civilian deaths as a result of war violence rose 15 percent from the year before in Afghanistan (some of the highest levels since the war began in 2001). More than two-thirds of those deaths—2,777—were caused by insurgents (up 28 percent) and 440 were caused by Afghan Army/NATO forces (down 25 percent\*). While the Taliban is responsible for most civilian deaths, the U.S. has made “protecting the population” a major strategic goal for winning over the Afghan people, legitimizing the Karzai government and draining the Taliban of its authority. Instead, it’s been publicly blamed and repudiated by Afghans for a number of civilian bombing deaths, the most recent being nine Afghan boys killed “by accident” in a U.S. air strike in Kunar province.

This week, President Karzai, rejected an apology from Petraeus for the killings, and later accepted another attempt at apology from Sec. Def. Bob Gates. It didn’t help that

Petraeus’ apology came a week after he suggested that the young victims of another NATO attack in Kunar had gotten their burn marks not from the strike, but from their parents, who might have hurt the kids themselves in disciplinary actions. It didn’t go over so well, especially since Afghan authorities say 65 people were killed, many of them women and children. NATO has now admitted that some civilians may have been hurt, but insists the operation had targeted insurgents.

Again, my mind goes back to the COINdinstas, many of whom remain delusional about the direction of the war, and others who might be furiously back-peddling or remodeling themselves as we speak. In June 2009, *Triage: The Next Twelve Months in Afghanistan and Pakistan*, was published by the pro-COIN Center for a New American Security (CNAS). In it, fellow Andrew Exum, CNAS CEO Nathaniel Fick, David Kilcullen and Ahmed Humayun wrote this (emphasis mine):

“To be sure, violence will rise in Afghanistan over the next year—no matter what the United States and its allies do. What matters, though, is who is dying. And here a particular lesson may be directly imported from the U.S. experience in Iraq. In 2007, during the Baghdad security operations commonly referred to as “the surge,” U.S. casualties actually increased sharply. What U.S. planners were looking for, however, was not a drop in U.S. casualties—or even a drop in Iraqi security force casualties but a drop in Iraqi civilian casualties. In the same way, U.S. and allied operations in Afghanistan must be focused on protecting the population even at the expense of allied casualties.”

*Afghan civilian casualties, whether at the hands of the coalition, the Taliban, or the Afghan government, will be the most telling measure of progress.*

Well, violence is up, and deaths among NATO and its allies are up. And so are civilian casualties.

Meanwhile, while the CNAS team said in June 2009 that NATO/Afghan soldier deaths were expected to rise, they also claimed that another metric of success would be an eventual flattening of IED (Improvised Explosive Devices) incidents.

Another indicator of cooperation (with local Afghans) is the number of roadside bombs (improvised explosive devices, or IEDs) that are found and cleared versus exploded. IED numbers have risen sharply in Afghanistan since 2006 (though numbers are still low, and IEDs still unsophisticated, compared to Iraq). The coalition should expect an increase in numbers again this year. However, a rise in the proportion of IEDs being found and defused (especially when discovered thanks to tips from the local population) indicates that locals have a good working relationship with local military units a sign of progress.

Despite all his spin to the contrary, Petraeus cannot hide the fact that late last year, IED deaths among our own soldiers were up, not down. A chart issued within its own November progress report to Congress last November shows that, and it shows that the found and cleared IEDs had not risen above the attacks in most areas of the country.

Plus, metric or no metric, the recent data indicating serious injuries of U.S. soldiers this late in the game—while every other assessment outside the military bubble says the Taliban are making more gains not less—should leave any thinking person at this point to question, “is it really worth it?”

Not sure what it will take before the COINdinstas admit events on the ground are falling short of their own metrics. Sounds

like a good follow-up to “Triage,” but will anyone there have the guts to write it?

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas, Representative JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I respect my President, our President.

I thank the previous speaker for his service. I thank all of the United States military, at home and abroad, for their brave and courageous service.

I beg to differ. The Constitution indicates that the Congress can declare war, which has not been so declared. I would make the argument that we have shed our blood in Afghanistan, and my hat is off to those families who have lost their loved ones, and certainly those who fight on the front lines today.

I believe it is important for Congress to be engaged in this effort because this is the people’s House. A few months ago, a year ago, I may not have supported this move. But here we are again, facing the same obstacles.

This amendment or resolution says within 30 days, but up to December 31, if necessary.

It is time now to push the Kabul government to be able to negotiate and engage. It is time to use smart power. It is time to let girls go to school, let leaders lead, and for our combat troops and others to come home.

It is time to recognize that our resources are needed around the world. Libya is in need.

But it is time for us to end with Afghanistan and to push them to be a sovereign nation, and to work with them on diplomacy and to be able to save lives.

I support this resolution. I wish that it would pass now.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the longest running war in our Nation’s history. I want to thank my friend and colleague from Ohio for introducing this resolution.

War is not the answer. It is not the way to peace. We must root out the causes of hate and violence.

Gandhi once said: “Power is of two kinds. One is obtained by the fear of punishment, and the other by acts of love. Power based on love is a thousand times more effective and permanent than the one derived from the fear of punishment.”

Our path to peace in Afghanistan is not through war; it is not through violence. Enough is enough. The time is long overdue.

We are spending billions of dollars a week. Not another nickel, not another dime, not another dollar, not another hour, not another day, not another week. We must end this war and end it now.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for bringing forth this important resolution and finally bringing to the floor of the House the discussion about the war in Afghanistan.

Wrong war, wrong time, wrong place. Intelligence estimates are that there are under 50 al Qaeda operatives in Afghanistan. With the current cost of the war effort, we're spending between \$1.5 billion and \$2 billion per al Qaeda operative.

There is a very real terrorist threat to our country that comes from the loosely knit al Qaeda terrorist network, but that threat does not emanate from Afghanistan. It does not emanate from any one particular nation-state. It is a stateless menace. They go wherever they're able to thrive on the lack of order.

To effectively combat this menace, we need targeted special operations, we need aggressive intelligence gathering, and we need to make sure that we combat this menace wherever they are with the appropriate resources.

Being bogged down, occupying one particular nation-state is a waste of resources and not the best way to keep the American people safe.

I strongly support this resolution.

□ 1240

Mr. KUCINICH. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I rise in support of the resolution, and again with great respect and concern for those great people who we are sending overseas to defend us. If we don't think they can succeed, it is incumbent upon us to bring them home as soon as possible.

I was not in the United States military in Afghanistan, but I did participate in a battle in Afghanistan when the Russians were there. I went in with the Mujahideen unit and fought in the Battle of Jalalabad in 1988. I got to know these people of Afghanistan. Foreign troops will never conquer the people of Afghanistan.

And, yes, radicalized Muslims did murder Americans on 9/11. By the way, most of them were Saudis. Most all of them who hijacked the planes were Saudis. And Saudi Arabia still has the radical Islamic tenets that we are talking about that supposedly brought us into this battle.

We will not succeed if we are planning to force the Afghan people to accept the centralized government that our State Department has foisted upon them. All we are going to do is lose more people. All we are going to do is have more wounded people and more of our military sent over there, because that is what they are telling us is the method of getting out. To get out, we have to have Karzai accepted.

We have foisted on them the most centralized system of government that

would never have even worked here, because we believe that local people should run the police and should elect their own local officials. If we don't believe that that system will work, and that is our plan, we should get our people out of there before more of them are killed and maimed.

Yes, we do respect DUNCAN HUNTER and all those people who have served. That is the reason, that is what motivates me.

Here we have WALTER JONES, who represents the Marine Corps down at Camp Lejeune. If they thought that they were defending our country and were going to save our lives, all of them would give their lives for us. But they are not on that mission. They are on that mission to get the Afghan people and coerce them into accepting a corrupt central government, and that won't work. It didn't work when I was there fighting the Russians. It won't work now.

Mr. JONES. I continue to reserve my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman from California, I would not compare a staff delegation trip to the valiant forces of our armed services who are fighting overseas.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), a member of the Armed Services Committee, a combat veteran of the first gulf war, who served again in Iraq 5 years ago with the United States Marine Corps.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this resolution forward, and I reluctantly rise in opposition to it.

I volunteered to serve in Iraq not because I believed that invading, pacifying, and administering the country was the right course of action, but I believed that once we had made the commitment that we had to follow it through and bring it to a reasonable and just conclusion.

In Afghanistan, I think that what this Nation first did was great: That we were attacked on 9/11. The Taliban controlled much of the country and gave safe harbor to al Qaeda, and we gave air, logistical, and advisory support to the anti-Taliban forces in the country and they pushed the Taliban out.

We made a wrong turn after that, by forcing the victors on the ground aside instead of using our leverage to have them reach out to the Pashtun elements of the country, and we superimposed a political process on them that doesn't fit the political culture of the country, a government that is mired in corruption and has little capacity to govern outside of Kabul. I believe it is wrong to use conventional forces against an irregular force that make our military vulnerable to asymmetric capability. But we have security interests in Afghanistan that we must accept.

We need to make sure that the Taliban doesn't take over the country

where it becomes a permissive environment, where they can use that to destabilize Afghanistan, to assist the Taliban on the other side of the Durand Line. We need some base of operations in Afghanistan to be able to strike al Qaeda targets in the federally administered tribal areas of Afghanistan. I believe that we can do it with a lighter footprint. I think we ought to be focused on supporting factions within this region that share our strategic interests.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida.

We have strategic interests in Afghanistan. It would be wrong, it would be irresponsible at this time to expeditiously withdraw all of our forces from Afghanistan, again, without recognizing our strategic interests there.

Although I differ on the strategy that we are using right now, I recognize the security interests of the United States that are vital for us to maintain not only peace and stability in the region but also at home.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), a member of the Armed Services, Intelligence, Agriculture, and Ethics Committees.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentlewoman.

We have to get this right. I rise in opposition to this motion. I use that phrase, it comes from David Petraeus' testimony in the last 2 days in front of the House Armed Services Committee.

He tells a poignant story about a black day in Iraq when he was commander of the 101st in which two helicopters collided midair and 17 troops were killed. Really, one of his darkest days. And in the emotions of all of that and the trauma and the fight to move forward, a young PFC came up to this two-star general, which is pretty odd, and he said: General, I know of 17 reasons why we have to get this right.

That analogy can be spread across all of the lives lost, all of the grievous injuries that we have suffered in this war over the last 10 years in Afghanistan. We have to get this right. And this emotion that they have brought forward is not remotely going to get it right. Whatever your position is, this is not the right thing to do. We should not do this.

These conversations have consequences. They are heard around the world. And while the other side, the folks who will vote for this, the folks who brought this forward have a right to do this and, in their mind, perhaps an obligation to do this, to have this conversation, these conversations affect the men and women in the fight. And for us to stand here over and over to tell them that they cannot win, that they cannot make this happen, is irresponsible on our part.

David Petraeus is the man who knows more about what is going on on

the ground in Afghanistan today than anybody walking the face of the Earth. And, Mr. Speaker, in all deference to the fellows who served 20 years ago there in whatever capacity, that was 20 years ago. Today, David Petraeus says the strategy is correct. We have got the inputs correct. We are moving forward, and we can make the circumstances to get the end results that we want in which the Afghan people are in charge of Afghanistan and responsible for Afghanistan security.

This resolution is incorrect. It will not get it right, and I strongly urge a “no” vote on this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, vice chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

War is expensive; and it should not be measured in the cost of money, which has been, really, the discussion today. I have the greatest respect for Mr. JONES and Mr. ROHRBACHER and you, too, Mr. KUCINICH, but this is an important issue before us.

Today, as we are here in the House of Representatives, Mark Wells is being buried. He was killed on March 5, representing us in Afghanistan. He had been to Iraq. And, yes, he is of Irish heritage, so his family decided, “We want to have his service on St. Patrick’s Day.”

I talked to his father, Burl, earlier this week. And Burl is proud of his son’s service, and he is proud of America’s service in Afghanistan. And Burl told me, he said: “Congressman POE, it is my fear that there are dark days ahead for America because we may not choose to persevere.”

And what I believe he meant by that was that his son and others who have died for this country, died for that concept of freedom, people that live after them, our soldiers that are over there, and we who make decisions, may not persevere and finish this war.

War is hard. It is expensive. And America never quits, and America should never quit in this war.

Our enemies in Iraq and Afghanistan have always had the policy and philosophy: America will get weary. Americans will quit. They don’t have the stomach for it.

□ 1250

We need to send a message to them and the rest of the world and to our troops that are on the front lines in Afghanistan today that we support them and we will not get weary, we will not quit, we will not give in or give up just because this war has been long and hard.

And that’s just the way it is.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would like to put into the RECORD an article from the National Interest which states that many U.S. and western troops cannot leave their bases without encountering IEDs or more coordinated attacks from insurgents.

[From The National Interest, Mar. 9, 2011]

PULLING A FAST ONE IN AFGHANISTAN

(By Christopher A. Preble)

I have just returned from a discussion of U.S. strategy in Afghanistan and Pakistan hosted by the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies. The meeting of 25 or so journalists, think tankers, and current and former government officials featured introductory remarks by Gilles Dorronsoro, visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment, and FDD’s Bill Roggio. FDD President, Cliff May, moderated the session. The meeting was officially on the record, but I’m relying solely on my hand-written notes, so I won’t quote the other attendees directly.

I would characterize the general mood as grim. A few attendees pointed to the killing of a number of Taliban figures in both Afghanistan and Pakistan, and reports of progress in Marja and the rest of Helmand province as evidence of progress. These gains, one speaker maintained, were sustainable and would not necessarily slip in the event that U.S. forces are directed where elsewhere.

Dorronsoro disputed these assertions. He judged that the situation today is worse than it was a year ago, before the surge of 30,000 additional troops. The killing of individual Taliban leaders, or foot-soldiers, was also accompanied by the inadvertent killing of innocent bystanders, including most recent nine children. So there is always the danger that even targeted strikes based on timely, credible intelligence, will over the long term replace one dead Talib with two or four or eight of his sons, brothers, cousins, and tribesman. How many people have said “We can’t kill our way to victory”?

For Dorronsoro, the crucial metric is security, no number of bad guys and suspected bad guys killed. And, given that he can’t drive to places that he freely visited two or three years ago, he judges that security in the country has gotten worse, not better. Many U.S. and Western troops cannot leave their bases without encountering IEDs or more coordinated attacks from insurgents. U.S. and NATO forces don’t control territory, and there is little reason to think that they can. Effective counterinsurgencies (COIN) are waged by a credible local partner, a government that commands the respect and authority of its citizens. That obviously doesn’t exist in Afghanistan. The Afghan militia, supposedly the key to long-term success, is completely ineffective.

Secretary Gates asserted on Monday that the draw down of U.S. troops would begin as scheduled this July, although, as the Washington Post’s Greg Jaffe writes, “he cautioned that any reductions in U.S. forces would likely be small and that a significant U.S. force will remain in combat for the rest of 2011.” NATO remains committed to 2014 as the date to hand over security to the Afghan government. Whether the United States retains a long-term presence in the country is the subject of much speculation.

For the people from FDD, it shouldn’t be. Roggio stressed that the problem with U.S. strategy is that Americans were looking for an exit, when we should be making a long-term commitment to Afghanistan. May concurred. When I asked them to clarify how long term, both demurred (Roggio said “a decade or more” but didn’t elaborate). I also inquired about the resources that would be required to constitute “commitment”. Given that we have over 100,000 troops on the ground, and that we will spend over \$100 billion in Afghanistan in this year alone, how much more of a commitment would they find acceptable? Again, no definitive answer.

Roggio did claim, however, that a long-term commitment would increase the pros-

pect of turning the Pakistanis. This is the crucial other piece in the puzzle. Nearly everyone in the meeting agreed that the unwillingness of the Pakistanis to cooperate with the United States had allowed a safe haven to be created in North Waziristan and elsewhere along the AfPak border. Most in the meeting admitted that Pakistan’s interests in Afghanistan did not always align with our own. None had an answer for decisively changing this calculus, but some agreed with Roggio that evidence of progress in Afghanistan—combined with a credible commitment on the part of the U.S. to remain for the long-haul—would convince the Pakistanis to side with the Americans.

If you’re reading carefully, you can see a circular logic here, brilliantly encapsulated by Dorronsoro. I paraphrase: We cannot win Afghanistan without turning Pakistan, but we cannot turn the Pakistanis without winning in Afghanistan. It is no wonder that one attendee declared herself growing increasingly depressed as the meeting wore on.

I would like to insert into the RECORD an article from Cato-at-Liberty’s Web site entitled America’s Aimless Absurdity in Afghanistan.

AMERICA’S ‘AIMLESS ABSURDITY’ IN AFGHANISTAN

(Posted By Malou Innocent On March 7, 2011)

Rasmussen reports that 52% of Americans want U.S. troops home from Afghanistan within a year, up from 43% last fall. Of course, polls are ephemeral snapshots of public opinion that can fluctuate with the prevailing political winds; nonetheless, it does appear that more Americans are slowly coming to realize the “aimless absurdity” of our nation-building project in Central Asia.

Earlier today, former Republican senator Judd Gregg of New Hampshire said on MSNBC’s “Morning Joe”: “I don’t think we can afford Afghanistan much longer.” He continued: “The simple fact is that it’s costing us. Good people are losing their lives there, and we’re losing huge amounts of resources there. . . . So I think we should have a timeframe for getting out of Afghanistan, and it should be shorter rather than longer.”

Gregg is absolutely right. It is well past time to bring this long war to a swift end. Yet Gregg’s comments also reflect a growing bipartisan realization that prolonging our land war in Asia is weakening our country militarily and economically.

To politicians of any stripe, the costs on paper of staying in Afghanistan are jarring. Pentagon officials told the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee that it costs an average of \$400 per gallon of fuel for the aircraft and combat vehicles operating in land-locked Afghanistan. The U.S. Agency for International Development has spent more than \$7.8 billion on Afghanistan reconstruction since 2001, including building and refurbishing 680 schools and training thousands of civil servants. Walter Pincus, of The Washington Post, reported that the Army Corps of Engineers spent \$4 billion last year on 720 miles of roads to transport troops in and around the war-ravaged country. It will spend another \$4 to \$6 billion this year, for 250 more miles.

War should no longer be a left-right issue. It’s a question of scarce resources and limiting the power of government. Opposition to the war in Afghanistan can no longer be swept under the carpet or dismissed as an issue owned by peaceniks and pacifists, especially when our men and women in uniform are being deployed to prop up a regime Washington doesn’t trust, for goals our president can’t define.

I would like to put into the RECORD an article from Truthdig posted on



AlterNet entitled *Afghanistan: Obscenely Well-Funded but Largely Unsuccessful War Rages on Out of Sight of the American Public*.

[From AlterNet, Nov. 18, 2010]

AFGHANISTAN: OBSCENELY WELL-FUNDED, BUT LARGELY UNSUCCESSFUL WAR RAGES ON OUT OF SIGHT OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

(By Juan Cole)

Not only is it unclear that the U.S. and NATO are winning their war in Afghanistan, the lack of support for their effort by the Afghan president himself has driven the American commander to the brink of resignation. In response to complaints from his constituents, Afghanistan's mercurial President Hamid Karzai called Sunday for American troops to scale back their military operations. The supposed ally of the U.S., who only last spring petulantly threatened to join the Taliban, astonished Washington with this new outburst, which prompted a warning from Gen. David Petraeus that the president was making Petraeus' position "untenable," which some speculated might be a threat to resign.

During the past two months, the U.S. military has fought a major campaign in the environs of the southern Pashtun city of Kandahar, launching night raids and attempting to push insurgents out of the orchards and farms to the east of the metropolis. Many local farmers were displaced, losing their crops in the midst of the violence, and forced to become day laborers in the slums of Kandahar. Presumably these Pashtun clans who found themselves in the crossfire between the Taliban and the U.S. put pressure on Karzai to call a halt to the operation.

That there has been heavy fighting in Afghanistan this fall would come as a surprise to most Americans, who have seen little news on their televisions about the war. Various websites noted that 10 NATO troops were killed this past Saturday and Sunday alone, five of them in a single battle, but it was hardly front page news, and got little or no television coverage.

The midterm campaign circus took the focus off of foreign affairs in favor of witches in Newark and eyes of Newt in Georgia. Distant Kandahar was reduced to an invisible battle in an unseen war, largely unreported in America's mass media, as though it were irrelevant to the big campaign issues—of deficits and spending, of taxes and public welfare. Since it was President Obama's offensive, Democrats could not run against it. Since it is billed as key to U.S. security, Republicans were not interested in running against it. Kandahar, city of pomegranates and car bombs, of poppies and government cartels, lacked a partisan implication, and so no one spoke of it.

In fact, the war is costing on the order of \$7 billion a month, a sum that is still being borrowed and adding nearly \$100 billion a year to the already-burgeoning national debt. Yet in all the talk in all the campaigns in the hustings about the dangers of the federal budget deficit, hardly any candidates fingered the war as economically unsustainable.

The American public cannot have a debate on the war if it is not even mentioned in public. The extreme invisibility of the Afghanistan war is apparent from a Lexis Nexis search I did for "Kandahar" (again, the site of a major military campaign) for the period from Oct. 15 to Nov. 15. I got only a few dozen hits, from all American news sources (National Public Radio was among the few media outlets that devoted substantial airtime to the campaign).

The campaign in the outskirts of Kandahar had been modeled on last winter's attack on the farming area of Marjah in Helmand Province. Marjah was a demonstration project, intended to show that the U.S., NATO and Afghanistan security forces could "take, clear, hold and build."

Petraeus' counterinsurgency doctrine depends on taking territory away from the insurgents, clearing it of guerrillas, holding it for the medium term to keep the Taliban from returning and to reassure local leaders that they need not fear reprisals for "collaborating," and then building up services and security for the long term to ensure that the insurgents can never again return and dominate the area. But all these months later, the insurgents still have not been cleared from Marjah, which is a site of frequent gun fights between over-stretched Marines and Taliban.

There is no early prospect of Afghan army troops holding the area, or of building effective institutions in the face of constant sniping and bombing. Marjah is only 18 square miles. Afghanistan is more than 251,000 square miles. If Marjah is the model for the campaign in the outskirts of Kandahar, then the latter will be a long, hard slog. Kandahar is even more complicated, since the labyrinthine alleyways of the city and its hundreds of thousands of inhabitants offer insurgents new sorts of cover when they are displaced there from the countryside.

Counterinsurgency requires an Afghan partner, but all along the spectrum of Afghan institutions, the U.S. and NATO are seeking in vain for the "government in a box" once promised by Gen. Stanley McChrystal. The people in the key provinces of Helmand and Kandahar are largely hostile to U.S. and NATO troops, seeing them as disrespecting their traditions and as offering no protection from violence. They see cooperating with the U.S. as collaboration and want Mullah Omar of the Taliban to join the government.

Although the U.S. and NATO have spent \$27 billion on training Afghan troops, only 12 percent of them can operate independently. Karzai and his circle are extremely corrupt, taking millions in cash payments from Iran and looting a major bank for unsecured loans, allowing the purchase of opulent villas in fashionable Dubai. It is no wonder that Petraeus is at the end of his rope. The only question is why the Obama administration is not, and how long it will hold to the myth of counterinsurgency.

I would like to put into the RECORD an article published on AlterNet titled *Totally Occupied: 700 Military Bases Spread Across Afghanistan*, by Nick Turse at TomDispatch.com.

[From AlterNet, Posted on February 10, 2010, Printed on March 17, 2011]

TOTALLY OCCUPIED: 700 MILITARY BASES SPREAD ACROSS AFGHANISTAN

(By Nick Turse, Tomdispatch.com)

In the nineteenth century, it was a fort used by British forces. In the twentieth century, Soviet troops moved into the crumbling facilities. In December 2009, at this site in the Shinwar district of Afghanistan's Nangarhar Province, U.S. troops joined members of the Afghan National Army in preparing the way for the next round of foreign occupation. On its grounds, a new military base is expected to rise, one of hundreds of camps and outposts scattered across the country.

Nearly a decade after the Bush administration launched its invasion of Afghanistan,

TomDispatch offers the first actual count of American, NATO, and other coalition bases there, as well as facilities used by the Afghan security forces. Such bases range from relatively small sites like Shinwar to megabases that resemble small American towns. Today, according to official sources, approximately 700 bases of every size dot the Afghan countryside, and more, like the one in Shinwar, are under construction or soon will be as part of a base-building boom that began last year.

Existing in the shadows, rarely reported on and little talked about, this base-building program is nonetheless staggering in size and scope, and heavily dependent on supplies imported from abroad, which means that it is also extraordinarily expensive. It has added significantly to the already long secret list of Pentagon property overseas and raises questions about just how long, after the planned beginning of a drawdown of American forces in 2011, the U.S. will still be garrisoning Afghanistan.

#### 400 FOREIGN BASES IN AFGHANISTAN

Colonel Wayne Shanks, a spokesman for the U.S.-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), tells TomDispatch that there are, at present, nearly 400 U.S. and coalition bases in Afghanistan, including camps, forward operating bases, and combat outposts. In addition, there are at least 300 Afghan National Army (ANA) and Afghan National Police (ANP) bases, most of them built, maintained, or supported by the U.S. A small number of the coalition sites are megabases like Kandahar Airfield, which boasts one of the busiest runways in the world, and Bagram Air Base, a former Soviet facility that received a makeover, complete with Burger King and Popeyes outlets, and now serves more than 20,000 U.S. troops, in addition to thousands of coalition forces and civilian contractors.

In fact, Kandahar, which housed 9,000 coalition troops as recently as 2007, is expected to have a population of as many as 35,000 troops by the time President Obama's surge is complete, according to Colonel Kevin Wilson who oversees building efforts in the southern half of Afghanistan for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. On the other hand, the Shinwar site, according to Sgt. Tracy J. Smith of the U.S. 48th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, will be a small forward operating base (FOB) that will host both Afghan troops and foreign forces.

Last fall, it was reported that more than \$200 million in construction projects—from barracks to cargo storage facilities—were planned for or in-progress at Bagram. Substantial construction funds have also been set aside by the U.S. Air Force to upgrade its air power capacity at Kandahar. For example, \$65 million has been allocated to build additional apron space (where aircraft can be parked, serviced, and loaded or unloaded) to accommodate more close-air support for soldiers in the field and a greater intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capability. Another \$61 million has also been earmarked for the construction of a cargo helicopter apron and a tactical airlift apron there.

Kandahar is just one of many sites currently being upgraded. Exact figures on the number of facilities being enlarged, improved, or hardened are unavailable but, according to a spokesman for ISAF, the military plans to expand several more bases to accommodate the increase of troops as part of Afghan War commander Stanley McChrystal's surge strategy. In addition, at least 12 more bases are slated to be built to help handle

the 30,000 extra American troops and thousands of NATO forces beginning to arrive in the country.

“Currently we have over \$3 billion worth of work going on in Afghanistan,” says Colonel Wilson, “and probably by the summer, when the dust settles from all the uplift, we’ll have about \$1.3 billion to \$1.4 billion worth of that [in the South].” By comparison, between 2002 and 2008, the Army Corps of Engineers spent more than \$4.5 billion on construction projects, most of it base-building, in Afghanistan.

At the site of the future FOB in Shinwar, more than 135 private construction contractors attended what was termed an “Afghan-Coalition contractors rodeo.” According to Lieutenant Fernando Roach, a contracting officer with the U.S. Army’s Task Force Mountain Warrior, the event was designed “to give potential contractors a walkthrough of the area so they’ll have a solid overview of the scope of work.” The construction firms then bid on three separate projects: the renovation of the more than 30-year old Soviet facilities, the building of new living quarters for Afghan and coalition forces, and the construction of a two-kilometer wall for the base.

In the weeks since the “rodeo,” the U.S. Army has announced additional plans to upgrade facilities at other forward operating bases. At FOB Airborne, located near Kane-Ezzat in Wardak Province, for instance, the Army intends to put in reinforced concrete bunkers and blast protection barriers as well as lay concrete foundations for Re-Locatable Buildings (prefabricated, trailer-like structures used for living and working quarters). Similar work is also scheduled for FOB Altimur, an Army camp in Logar Province.

#### THE AFGHAN BASE BOOM

Recently, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Afghanistan District-Kabul, announced that it would be seeking bids on “site assessments” for Afghan National Security Forces District Headquarters Facilities nationwide. The precise number of Afghan bases scattered throughout the country is unclear.

When asked by TomDispatch, Colonel Radmanish of the Afghan Ministry of Defense would state only that major bases were located in Kabul, Pakteya, Kandahar, Herat, and Mazar-e-Sharif, and that ANA units operate all across Afghanistan. Recent U.S. Army contracts for maintenance services provided to Afghan army and police bases, however, suggest that there are no fewer than 300 such facilities that are, according to an ISAF spokesman, not counted among the coalition base inventory.

As opposed to America’s fast-food-franchise-filled bases, Afghan ones are often decidedly more rustic affairs. The police headquarters in Khost Farang District, Baghlan Province, is a good example. According to a detailed site assessment conducted by a local contractor for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Afghan government, the district headquarters consists of mud and stone buildings surrounded by a mud wall. The site even lacks a deep well for water. A trench fed by a nearby spring is the only convenient water source.

The U.S. bases that most resemble austere Afghan facilities are combat outposts, also known as COPs. Environmental Specialist Michael Bell of the Army Corps of Engineers, Afghanistan Engineer District-South’s Real Estate Division, recently described the facilities and life on such a base as he and his co-worker, Realty Specialist Damian Salazar, saw it in late 2009:

“COP Sangar . . . is a compound surrounded by mud and straw walls. Tents with cots supplied the sleeping quarters . . . A

medical, pharmacy and command post tent occupied the center of the COP, complete with a few computers with internet access and three primitive operating tables. Showers had just been installed with hot [water] . . . only available from 8 a.m. to 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. . . .

“An MWR [Morale, Welfare and Recreation] tent was erected on Thanksgiving Day with an operating television; however, the tent was rarely used due to the cold. Most of the troops used a tent with gym equipment for recreation . . . A cook trailer provided a hot simple breakfast and supper. Lunch was MREs [meals ready to eat]. Nights were pitch black with no outside lighting from the base or the city.”

#### WHAT MAKES A BASE?

According to an official site assessment, future construction at the Khost Farang District police headquarters will make use of sand, gravel, and stone, all available on the spot. Additionally, cement, steel, bricks, lime, and gypsum have been located for purchase in Pol-e Khomri City, about 85 miles away.

Constructing a base for American troops, however, is another matter. For the far less modest American needs of American troops, builders rely heavily on goods imported over extremely long, difficult to traverse, and sometimes embattled supply lines, all of which adds up to an extraordinarily costly affair. “Our business runs on materials,” Lieutenant General Robert Van Antwerp, commander of the Army Corps of Engineers, told an audience at a town hall meeting in Afghanistan in December 2009. “You have to bring in the lumber, you have to bring in the steel, you have to bring in the containers and all that. Transport isn’t easy in this country—number one, the roads themselves, number two, coming through other countries to get here—there are just huge challenges in getting the materials here.”

To facilitate U.S. base construction projects, a new “virtual storefront”—an online shopping portal—has been launched by the Pentagon’s Defense Logistics Agency (DLA). The Maintenance, Repair and Operations Uzbekistan Virtual Storefront website and a defense contractor-owned and operated brick-and-mortar warehouse facility that supports it aim to provide regionally-produced construction materials to speed surge-accelerated building efforts.

From a facility located in Termez, Uzbekistan, cement, concrete, fencing, roofing, rope, sand, steel, gutters, pipe, and other construction material manufactured in countries like Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan can be rushed to nearby Afghanistan to accelerate base-building efforts. “Having the products closer to the fight will make it easier for warfighters by reducing logistics response and delivery time,” says Chet Evanitsky, the DLA’s construction and equipment supply chain division chief.

#### AMERICA’S SHADOWY BASE WORLD

The Pentagon’s most recent inventory of bases lists a total of 716 overseas sites. These include facilities owned and leased all across the Middle East as well as a significant presence in Europe and Asia, especially Japan and South Korea. Perhaps even more notable than the Pentagon’s impressive public foreign property portfolio are the many sites left off the official inventory. While bases in the Persian Gulf countries of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, and the United Arab Emirates are all listed, one conspicuously absent site is Al-Udeid Air Base, a billion-dollar facility in nearby Qatar, where the U.S. Air Force secretly oversees its on-going unmanned drone wars.

The count also does not include any sites in Iraq where, as of August 2009, there were

still nearly 300 American bases and outposts. Similarly, U.S. bases in Afghanistan—a significant percentage of the 400 foreign sites scattered across the country—are noticeably absent from the Pentagon inventory.

Counting the remaining bases in Iraq—as many as 50 are slated to be operating after President Barack Obama’s August 31, 2010, deadline to remove all U.S. “combat troops” from the country—and those in Afghanistan, as well as black sites like Al-Udeid, the total number of U.S. bases overseas now must significantly exceed 1,000. Just exactly how many U.S. military bases (and allied facilities used by U.S. forces) are scattered across the globe may never be publicly known. What we do know—from the experience of bases in Germany, Italy, Japan, and South Korea—is that, once built, they have a tendency toward permanency that a cessation of hostilities, or even outright peace, has a way of not altering.

After nearly a decade of war, close to 700 U.S., allied, and Afghan military bases dot Afghanistan. Until now, however, they have existed as black sites known to few Americans outside the Pentagon. It remains to be seen, a decade into the future, how many of these sites will still be occupied by U.S. and allied troops and whose flag will be planted on the ever-shifting British-Soviet-U.S./Afghan site at Shinwar.

General Petraeus and others in the administration continue their PR campaign. Overwhelming evidence is proving their upbeat assessments of our strategy is false. A recent article by the Los Angeles Times cited a report released by the Foreign Affairs Committee and the British Parliament that concluded that “despite the optimistic appraisals we heard from some military and official sources, the security situation across Afghanistan as a whole is deteriorating. Counterinsurgency efforts in the south and east have allowed the Taliban to expand its presence and control in other previously relatively stable areas in Afghanistan.”

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York, Mr. CHARLES RANGEL.

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

Mr. RANGEL. This afternoon sometime, I will reintroduce my bill calling for a mandatory draft, making certain that every young person has an opportunity one way or the other to serve this great nation of ours, whether we’re talking about in our schools, our hospitals, or just to provide some public service.

But the main part of this bill is that the President, when he asked us to declare war, or however we get involved in these things with loss of lives, we’re going to have these people that come to the well and explain how we have to get involved, we have to fight, we can’t give up, to see whether or not if their kids and grandchildren were mandated that they would have to go into these areas and put themselves in harm’s way, how soon it will be before we take another look at this.

Let me congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for allowing our priests, our rabbis, our ministers to recognize that

we're talking about human lives being lost because of our concern about oil in this part of the world. It hasn't got a darn thing to do with our national security. I just hope and pray that one day we would be able to say we know we made a mistake and withdraw from this type of thing now and for the future of this great country.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. BERMAN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), the chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you very much for yielding.

If our only reason for being in Afghanistan was to deny sanctuary to al Qaeda, I probably would have asked time from the gentleman from Ohio and be speaking from the other side, because when we are successful in Afghanistan, that will not have denied sanctuary to al Qaeda because they will simply go over into Pakistan. If not there, they'll go to Yemen and Somalia. If we leave Afghanistan now or if we leave Afghanistan before victory in Afghanistan, we will have sent a message to the world that their suspicions are really true, that all you have to do to the United States is make it tough for them and they will pull out. We did it in Beirut. We did it in Somalia. It is absolutely essential that we win here, or our credibility is gone forever as a major player in geopolitical things in the world.

A second good reason for staying in Afghanistan is that if we can have a fledgling democracy there, that will send a very powerful message to the Middle East from which most of the world's oil comes. There is a lot of upheaval there, and a stable democracy in Afghanistan would be enormously important.

Beyond denying sanctuary to al Qaeda, there are very good reasons for staying in Afghanistan until we have victory. Our young people there are doing an incredible job. I just came from there a bit over a week ago. We can succeed there, and I think we must succeed for the two reasons I mentioned.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON), a member of the Armed Services Committee and a decorated combat veteran who ended his 24-year military career as a colonel in the United States Army.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the lady.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the resolution. I served in Iraq when it was hard and unpopular, and I thank God that I live in a country that

had the intestinal fortitude to see it through.

This year, we're going to complete our objectives in Iraq, and the remaining 48,000 troops that are there are going to come home. There's going to be a small contingent, about 150 or so, that are going to move underneath the Embassy, but we will have completed our objectives and Iraq will be stable and friendly.

Now, Afghanistan is different from Iraq, but our approach should be similar. The surge has accomplished its primary aim, to seize the initiative from the Taliban. But now we need to finish the job of building out the institution, the security and the civil institutions.

I'm recently back from Afghanistan, and I had an opportunity to meet the leadership there. I feel confident we've got the right plan going forward. And I support the President's plan, the President's plan to begin withdrawal this year and to complete combat operations by 2014, because I believe this plan will stabilize Afghanistan and help protect our cherished way of life, preventing al Qaeda from regaining sanctuary.

Now going forward, I think we need to learn from these experiences. Some comments were made here earlier about us, whether or not we're a Republic or an empire. I share those concerns and those sentiments. We're a Republic, and we need to learn from these experiences. But we need to see this through. We need to stand with our Commander in Chief. We need to stand with our troops. Complete this task.

And then finally let me say that I join all today on both sides of the aisle who honor our service men and women who have fell in the line of battle. We pray for their souls. We pray for their families. We remember those wounded in battle, those who bear physical scars. Those who bear no physical scars who are emotionally scarred, we pray for them. We honor them.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GIBSON. And let me say this: That going forward, that this body, whether it be this issue or any issue, that this body and that this country shall be worthy of the sacrifices of our service men and women.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO), a member of the Armed Services Committee and a Marine veteran of the first gulf war who continues to serve with the Army National Guard.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, the resolution proposed by my colleague from Ohio does a disservice to the men and women who have courageously defended our country from our enemies in Afghanistan. This past weekend I had the distinct pleasure and honor of welcoming home the 287th Engineering

Company, commonly referred to as Sappers, based in Lucedale, Mississippi. They have the most dangerous mission in Afghanistan. They were the ones that cleared routes so that our men and women in uniform could have safe passage. They're the ones that rooted out the IEDs and the roadside bombs. And I'm happy to say they came back 100 percent, with one wounded warrior, but they did their mission.

While they were obviously overjoyed to see their loved ones again, the soldiers I spoke with were good to go with that mission and what they had accomplished. They fully understand that there are those who want to indiscriminately kill and maim Americans and we would rather take the fight to them overseas and abroad instead of having them come to our backyard, to our schools and our playgrounds.

□ 1300

Just yesterday, I had the chance to speak personally with General Petraeus after his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee. Again, as a Marine veteran of the Persian Gulf war and currently serving in the Mississippi National Guard, I know firsthand what good military commands look like, and General Petraeus is a great leader, a professional soldier, and someone whose opinion I respect very much.

Based on this resolution, his quote was, "The Taliban and al Qaeda obviously would trumpet this as a victory, as a success. Needless to say, it would completely undermine everything that our troopers have fought and sacrificed so much for."

Mr. Speaker, Congress' constitutional responsibility is to ensure that the courageous men and women in our armed services have the tools and equipment and training to do their job and come home safely to their family. Our warfighters don't need armchair generals in this Congress arbitrarily dictating terms that will cause irreparable harm to them and to the national security of this country.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining for each individual.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has 5¾ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) has 3½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) has 9½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, spending on the Afghanistan war is rising at an accelerating rate. Over just 3 years, in a period of 3 years—2010, 2011, and 2012—we will spend 45 percent more on the war in Afghanistan than we did in the preceding

8 years, \$336.9 billion versus \$231.2 billion. This is an example of out-of-control Federal spending.

If Congress is serious about being fiscally responsible and about cutting the Federal budget by three figures, then cutting spending on the out-of-control \$100 billion-a-year war in Afghanistan must be a serious consideration. This legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 28, gives those who are concerned about the costs of this war an opportunity finally to have a choice.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who seeks recognition?

The Chair will recognize Members for closing speeches in the reverse order of opening. That is, the gentleman from North Carolina, the gentleman from California, the gentleman from Ohio, and finally the gentlewoman from Florida.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KUCINICH. Is it the province of the Chair to determine that closing statements are in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Recognition is in the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. KUCINICH. Further parliamentary inquiry. Does the Chair have the right to determine that closing statements are the order of business here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the custom of the House for the Chair to recognize Members in the reverse order of their opening statements to make their closing statements.

Mr. KUCINICH. Further parliamentary inquiry. Does the Chair have the ability to direct individual Members that they are to give their closing statements?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A Member may yield his last amount of time to another Member at his discretion.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say to every Member that has been on the floor that served in our military, thank you and God bless you, as I say all the time to those who are overseas for this country.

Because I did not serve, I sought out a Marine general that every Marine that spoke on the floor today, if I said his name—but I don't have permission—they would salute him. They know him.

Let me share with you what this Marine general said to me back in November when I told him I read an article in The New York Times that an Army colonel was saying, Oh, the training of Afghans is going so well. So I emailed him. This is a six-point response, and I am going to read three very quickly:

“Continued belief that we can train the Afghan army to be effective in the time we have is nonsense. The vast majority cannot even read. They are people from the villages hooked on drugs,

illiterate, and undisciplined. The South Vietnamese soldiers were much better trained, and they could not stem the tide.”

He further states, “What is the end state we are looking to achieve? What are the measures of effectiveness? What is our exit strategy? Same old questions, no answers.”

He closed by saying this: “What do we say to the mother and father, the wife, of the last Marine killed to support a corrupt government and a corrupt leader in a war that cannot be won?”

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, if I could ask my good friend the gentleman from California if he would yield 2 minutes of his time to me.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to yield 2 minutes of my remaining time to my chairman, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida may control that time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, how much would I have, then, to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who seeks recognition?

Seeing none, we will proceed with the closing statements in the reverse order of the opening statements.

First, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JONES. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. The 2001 authorization of military force and the justification for our continued military presence in Afghanistan is that the Taliban in the past provided a safe haven for al Qaeda or could do so again in the future. General Petraeus has already admitted that al Qaeda has little or no presence in Afghanistan. Al Qaeda is an international organization, and, yes, they are a threat to America. The Taliban is only a threat to us as long as we continue our military occupation in Afghanistan.

After more than 9 years of military occupation of Afghanistan, can we really continue to claim to be acting in self-defense? The premise that the presence of our troops on the ground keeps us safer at home has been repudiated by recent terrorist attacks on the United States, all done by people other than Afghans outraged at continuing U.S. military occupation of predomi-

nantly Muslim countries. That is not to justify what they do, but it is to clarify the condition that we have in Afghanistan.

For how long are we going to continue to dedicate hundreds of billions of dollars and thousands of lives before we realize we can't win Afghanistan militarily?

At the end of the year, the administration and U.S. military leaders were touting peace talks to end the war with high-level Taliban leaders. These Taliban leaders turned out to be fake.

A November 2010 article in The New York Times detailed joint U.S. and Afghan negotiations with Mullah Akhtar Muhammad Mansour, a man the U.S. claimed was one of the most senior commanders in the Taliban. According to the New York Times, “the episode underscores the uncertain and even bizarre nature of the atmosphere in which Afghan and American leaders search for ways to bring the American-led war to an end. The leaders of the Taliban are believed to be hiding in Pakistan, possibly with assistance of the Pakistani government, which receives billions of dollars in U.S. aid.”

How can we claim that a cornerstone of our counterinsurgency strategy is to take out Taliban strongholds across the country while at the same time conducting negotiations with the Taliban in an effort to end the war?

This episode further underlies the significant weakness in our strategy. We think we can separate the Taliban from the rest of the Afghan population. Our counterinsurgency strategy fails to recognize a basic principle: Occupations fuel insurgencies. Occupations fuel insurgencies. Occupations fuel insurgencies.

The Taliban is a local resistance movement that is part and parcel of the indigenous population.

□ 1310

We lost the Vietnam war because we failed to win the hearts and minds of the local population. Without providing them with a competent government that provided them with basic security and a decent living, we're committing the same mistake in Afghanistan.

News reports indicate the Taliban is regaining momentum. The increase in civilian casualties due to higher levels of violence by insurgents further undermines the assurances of progress. As we send more troops into the country and kill innocent civilians with errant air strikes, the Taliban gains more support as resisters of foreign occupation. If we accept the premise that we can never leave Afghanistan until the Taliban is eradicated, we'll be there forever.

I would like to insert into the RECORD an article from The Nation, “America's Failed War in Afghanistan—No Policy Change Is Going to Affect the Outcome.” That's by Jeremy Scahill.

[From The Nation, Mar. 17, 2011]

AMERICA'S FAILED WAR IN AFGHANISTAN—NO POLICY CHANGE IS GOING TO AFFECT THE OUTCOME

(By Jeremy Scahill)

At the end of the NATO summit in Lisbon, Portugal this weekend, the leadership of the Afghan Taliban issued a statement characterizing the alliance's adoption of a loose timeline for a 2014 end to combat operations as "good news" for Afghans and "a sign of failure for the American government." At the summit, President Barack Obama said that 2011 will begin "a transition to full Afghan lead" in security operations, while the Taliban declared: "In the past nine years, the invaders could not establish any system of governance in Kabul and they will never be able to do so in future."

While Obama claimed that the U.S. and its allies are "breaking the Taliban's momentum," the reality on the ground tells a different story. Despite increased Special Operations Forces raids and, under Gen. David Petraeus, a return to regular U.S.-led airstrikes, the insurgency in Afghanistan is spreading and growing stronger. "By killing Taliban leaders the war will not come to an end," said the Taliban's former foreign minister, Wakil Ahmad Muttawakil, in an interview at his home in Kabul. "On the contrary, things get worse which will give birth to more leaders."

Former and current Taliban leaders say that they have seen a swelling in the Taliban ranks since 9-11. In part, they say, this can be attributed to a widely held perception that the Karzai government is corrupt and illegitimate and that Afghans—primarily ethnic Pashtuns—want foreign occupation forces out. "We are only fighting to make foreigners leave Afghanistan," a new Taliban commander in Kunduz told me during my recent trip to the country. "We don't want to fight after the withdrawal of foreigners, but as long as there are foreigners, we won't talk to Karzai."

"The Americans have very sophisticated technology, but the problem here in Afghanistan is they are confronting ideology. I think ideology is stronger than technology," says Abdul Salam Zaeef, a former senior member of Mullah Mohammed Omar's government. "If I am a Taliban and I'm killed, I'm martyred, then I'm successful. There are no regrets for the Taliban. It's very difficult to defeat this kind of idea."

But it is not simply a matter of ideology versus technology. The Taliban is not one unified body. The Afghan insurgency is fueled by fighters with a wide variety of motivations. Some are the dedicated jihadists of which Zaeef speaks, but others are fighting to defend their land or are seeking revenge for the killing of family members by NATO or Afghan forces. While al Qaeda has been almost entirely expelled from Afghanistan, the insurgency still counts a small number of non-Afghans among its ranks. Bolstering the Taliban's recruitment efforts is the perception in Afghanistan that the Taliban pays better than NATO or the Afghan army or police.

The hard reality U.S. officials don't want to discuss is this: the cultural and religious values of much of the Pashtun population—which comprises 25-40 percent of the country—more closely align with those of the Taliban than they do with Afghan government or U.S./NATO forces. The Taliban operate a shadow government in large swaths of the Pashtun areas of the country, complete with governors and a court system. In rural areas, land and property disputes are resolved through the Taliban system rather than the Afghan government, which is widely distrusted. "The objectives and goal of the

American troops in Afghanistan are not clear to the people and therefore Afghans call the Americans 'invaders,'" says Muttawakil. "Democracy is a very new phenomenon in Afghanistan and most people don't know the meaning of democracy. And now corruption, thieves and fakes have defamed democracy. Democracy can't be imposed because people will never adopt any value by force."

The U.S. strategy of attempting to force the Taliban to surrender or engage in negotiations rests almost exclusively on attempts to decapitate the Taliban leadership. While Taliban leaders acknowledge that commanders are regularly killed, they say the targeted killings are producing more radical leaders who are far less likely to negotiate than the older school Taliban leaders who served in the government of Mullah Mohammed Omar. "If today Mullah Omar was captured or killed, the fighting will go on," says Zaeef, adding: "It will be worse for everyone if the [current] Taliban leadership disappears."

In October, there were a flurry of media reports that senior Taliban leaders were negotiating with the Karzai government and that U.S. forces were helping to insure safe passage for the Taliban leaders to come to Kabul. The Taliban passionately refuted those reports, saying they were propaganda aimed at dividing the insurgency. Last week the Taliban appeared vindicated on this point as Karzai spoke in markedly modest terms on the issue. He told The Washington Post that three months ago he had met with one or two "very high" level Taliban leaders. He characterized the meeting as "the exchange of desires for peace," saying the Taliban "feel the same as we do here—that too many people are suffering for no reason."

Update: [On Tuesday, The New York Times reported that NATO and the Afghan government have held a series of "secret" peace negotiations with a man who posed as a senior Taliban leader, Mullah Akhtar Muhammad Mansour. A Western diplomat involved in the discussions told the Times, "[W]e gave him a lot of money." It is unclear who, if anyone, the impostor was working for, though the Times speculated that he could have been deployed by Pakistan's ISI spy agency or by the Taliban itself. "The Taliban are cleverer than the Americans and our own intelligence service," said a senior Afghan official who is familiar with the case. "They are playing games." Last month, the White House asked the Times to withhold Mansour's name "from an article about the peace talks, expressing concern that the talks would be jeopardized—and Mr. Mansour's life put at risk—if his involvement were publicized. The Times agreed to withhold Mr. Mansour's name," according to the paper.

This incident is significant on a number of levels. If true, it underscores the ineffective and inaccurate nature of U.S., NATO and Afghan government intelligence. It also confirms what Taliban leaders have stated publicly and to The Nation, namely that it has not negotiated with the Afghan government or NATO and that it will not negotiate unless foreign troops leave Afghanistan. The fake Mullah Mansour, according to the Times, "did not demand, as the Taliban have in the past, a withdrawal of foreign forces or a Taliban share of the government."

In October, a U.S. official said that reports in U.S. media outlets of senior Taliban negotiating are propaganda aimed at sowing dissent among the Taliban leadership. "This is a psychological operation, plain and simple," the official with firsthand knowledge of the Afghan government's strategies told the McClatchy news service. "Exaggerating the significance of it is an effort to sow distrust within the insurgency."

Today on MSNBC, Pentagon spokesperson Geoff Morrell continued to insist that U.S. and NATO forces have facilitated safe passage for Taliban leaders for reconciliation meetings in Kabul. The Taliban maintain there have been no meetings.

The Taliban impostor incident also calls into question scores of deadly night raids that have resulted in the deaths of innocent Afghans. Several survivors of night raids recently told The Nation that they believed they were victims of bad intelligence provided by other Afghans for money or to settle personal grudges.

Contrary to the rhetoric emanating from NATO and Washington, the Taliban are not on the ropes and, from their perspective, would gain nothing from negotiating with the U.S. or NATO. As far as they are concerned, time is on their side. "The bottom line for [NATO and the U.S.] is to immediately implement what they would ultimately have to implement . . . after colossal casualties," stated the Taliban declaration after the recent NATO summit. "They should not postpone withdrawal of their forces."

Depending on who you ask, the fact that Gen. Petraeus has brought back the use of heavy U.S. airstrikes and is increasing night raids and other direct actions by Special Operations Forces could be seen as a sign of either fierce determination to wipe out "the enemy" or of desperation to prove the U.S. and its allies are "winning." Over the past three months, NATO claims that Special Operations Forces' night raids have resulted in more than 360 "insurgent leaders" being killed or captured along with 960 "lower-level" leaders and the capture of more than 2400 "lower-level" fighters. In July, Special Operations Forces averaged 5 raids a night. Now, according to NATO, they are conducting an average of 17. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton called the raids "intelligence-driven precision operations against high value insurgents and their networks," adding, "There is no question that they are having a significant impact on the insurgent leadership."

The raids undoubtedly have produced scores of successful kill or capture operations, but serious questions abound over the NATO definitions of Taliban commanders, sub-commanders and foot soldiers. Most significantly, the raids consistently result in the killing of innocent civilians, a fact that is problematic for NATO and the Karzai government. "A lot of times, yeah, the right guys would get targeted and the right guys would get killed," says Matthew Hoh a former senior State Department official in Afghanistan who resigned in 2009 in protest of U.S. war strategy. "Plenty of other times, the wrong people would get killed."

Sometimes it would be innocent families." Hoh, who was the senior U.S. civilian in Zabul province, a Taliban stronghold, describes night raids as "a really risky, really violent operation," saying that when Special Operations Forces conduct them, "We might get that one guy we're looking for or we might kill a bunch of innocent people and now make ten more Taliban out of them."

Hoh describes the current use of U.S. Special Operations Forces in Afghanistan as a "tremendous waste of resources," saying, "They are the best strike forces the world's ever known. They're very well trained, very well equipped, have a tremendous amount of support, and we've got them in Afghanistan chasing after mid-level Taliban leaders who are not threatening the United States, who are only fighting us really because we're in their valley."

In an interview with The Washington Post in mid-November, President Karzai called for an end to the night raids. "I don't like it in

any manner and the Afghan people don't like these raids in any manner," Karzai said. "We don't like raids in our homes. This is a problem between us and I hope this ends as soon as possible. . . . Terrorism is not invading Afghan homes and fighting terrorism is not being intrusive in the daily Afghan life."

Karzai's comments angered the Obama administration. At the NATO summit, President Obama acknowledged that civilian deaths have sparked "real tensions" with the Karzai government, but reserved the right to continue US raids. "[Karzai's] got to understand that I've got a bunch of young men and women . . . who are in a foreign country being shot at and having to traverse terrain filled with IEDs, and they have to protect themselves," Obama said. "So if we're setting things up where they're just sitting ducks for the Taliban, that's not an acceptable answer either." Republican Senator Lindsey Graham blasted Karzai's statement calling for an end to night raids, saying, "it would be a disaster for the Petraeus strategy."

Along with Afghan government corruption, including a cabal of war lords, drug dealers and war criminals in key positions, the so-called Petraeus strategy of ratcheting up air strikes and expanding night raids is itself delivering substantial blows to the stated U.S. counterinsurgency strategy and the much-discussed battle for hearts and minds. The raids and airstrikes are premiere recruiting points for the Taliban and, unlike Sen. Graham and the Obama administration, Karzai seems to get that. In the bigger picture, the U.S. appears to be trying to kill its way to a passable definition of a success or even victory. This strategy puts a premium on the number of kills and captures of anyone who can loosely be defined as an insurgent and completely sidelines the blowback these operations cause. "We found ourselves in this Special Operations form of attrition warfare," says Hoh, "which is kind of like an oxymoron, because Special Operations are not supposed to be in attrition warfare. But we've found ourselves in that in Afghanistan"

I would like to put into the RECORD an article from Aljazeera.net, which points out that for all practical purposes, Washington has given up on its counterinsurgency strategy.

[From Aljazeera.net, Mar. 7, 2011]

**FAILING IN AFGHANISTAN SUCCESSFULLY—DESPITE HUNDREDS OF BILLIONS OF DOLLARS AND THOUSANDS OF TROOPS, THE U.S. IS UNABLE TO CONCLUDE ITS LONGEST WAR**

(By Marwan Bishara)

While we have been fixated on successive Arab breakthroughs and victories against tyranny and extremism, Washington is failing miserably but discreetly in Afghanistan.

The American media's one-obsession-at-a-time coverage of global affairs might have put the spotlight on President Obama's slow and poor reaction to the breathtaking developments starting in Tunisia and Egypt. But they spared him embarrassing questions about continued escalation and deaths in Afghanistan.

In spite of its international coalition, multiple strategies, hundreds of billions of dollars, and a surge of tens of thousands of troops, the U.S. is unable to conclude its longest war yet or at least reverse its trend.

Recent "reports" from the war front have been of two kinds. Some official or analytical in nature and heavily circulated in Washington portray a war going terribly well. On the other hand, hard news from the ground tell a story of U.S. fatigue, backtracking and tactical withdrawals or re-deployments which do not bode well for de-

feating the Taliban or forcing them to the negotiations' table.

For example, while the U.S. military's decision to withdraw from the Pech valley was justified on tactical need to redeploy troops for the task of "protecting the population", keen observers saw it as a humiliating retreat from what the Pentagon previously called a very strategic position and sacrificed some hundred soldiers defending it.

Likewise, strategic analysts close to the administration speak triumphantly of U.S. surge and hi-tech firepower inflicting terrible cost on the Taliban, killing many insurgents and driving many more from their sanctuaries.

But news from the war front show the Taliban unrelenting, mounting counter-attacks and escalating the war especially in areas where the U.S. has "surged" its troops. And while the majority of the 400 Afghan districts are "calmer", they remain mostly out of Kabul's control.

*What success?*

Those with relatively long memories recall the then defence secretary Donald Rumsfeld's claims that most of Afghanistan was secure in early 2003 and that American forces had changed their strategy from major combat operations to stabilisation and reconstruction project.

But the Taliban continued to carry daily attacks on government buildings, U.S. positions and international organisations. Two years later, the U.S. was to suffer the worst and deadliest year since the war began.

Today's war pundits are in the same state of denial. For all practical purpose, Washington has given up on its counterinsurgency (COIN) strategy devised under McChrystal and Petraeus.

Instead, it is pursuing a heavy handed and terribly destructive crackdown that includes special operations, assassinations, mass demolitions, air and night raids etc. that have led to anything but winning the country, let alone its hearts and minds.

The killing of nine Afghan children last week—all under the age of 12—by U.S. attack helicopters has once again put the spotlight on the U.S. military's new aggressive methods.

The results are so devastating for the conduct of the war and to Washington's clients, that President Karzai not only distanced himself from the U.S. methods, but also publicly rejected Washington's apology for the killings.

Nor is the recruitment and training of the Afghan forces going well. Indeed, many seem to give up on the idea that Afghan security forces could take matters into their hands if the U.S. withdraws in the foreseeable future.

Worse, U.S. strategic co-operation with Pakistan—the central pillar of Obama's PakAf strategy—has cooled after the arrest of a CIA contractor for the killing of two Pakistanis even though he presumably enjoys diplomatic immunity.

Reportedly, it has also led to a "breakdown" in co-ordination between the two countries intelligence agencies, the CIA and the ISI.

But the incident is merely a symptom of a bigger problem between the two countries. A reluctant partner, the Pakistani establishment and its military are unhappy with U.S. strategy which they reckon could destabilise their country and strengthen Afghanistan and India at their expense.

That has not deterred Washington from offering ideas and money to repair the damage. However, it has become clear that unlike in recent years, future improvement in their bilateral relations will most probably come as a result of the U.S. edging closer to Pakistan's position, not the opposite.

All of which makes one wonder why certain Washington circles are rushing to advance the "success story".

*Running out of options*

The Afghan government's incapability to take on the tasks of governing or securing the country beyond the capital, and the incapacity of the Obama administration to break the Taliban's momentum does not bode well for an early conclusion of the war.

To their credit some of Obama's war and surge supporters realise that there is no military solution for Afghanistan. Clearly, their claims of battlefield successes help justify the rush to talk to the Taliban.

But it is not yet clear whether the presumably ongoing exploratory secret negotiations with the Taliban are serious at all, or will lead to comprehensive negotiations and eventually a lasting deal. The last "Taliban commander" Washington dialogued with in the fall turned out to be an impostor—a shopkeeper from Quetta!

If the Taliban does eventually accept to sit down with Obama or Karzai envoys, the U.S. needs to explain why it fought for 10 years only to help the group back to power.

Secretary of state Hillary Clinton has begun the humiliating backtracking last month: "Now, I know that reconciling with an adversary that can be as brutal as the Taliban sounds distasteful, even unimaginable. And diplomacy would be easy if we only had to talk to our friends. But that is not how one makes peace."

*Facing up to the reality*

The mere fact that the world's mightiest superpower cannot win over the poorly armed Taliban after a long decade of fighting, means it has already failed strategically, regardless of the final outcome.

The escalation of violence and wasting billions more cannot change that. It is history. The quicker the Obama administration recognises its misfortunes, minimises its losses and convenes a regional conference over the future of Afghanistan under UN auspices, the easier it will be to evacuate without humiliation.

Whether the U.S. eventually loses the war and declares victory; negotiates a settlement and withdraw its troops, remains to be seen. What is incontestable is that when you fight the week for too long, you also become weak.

All of which explains the rather blunt comments made in a speech at the end of February, by U.S. Defence Secretary Robert Gates when he said ". . . any future defense secretary who advises the president to again send a big American land army into Asia or into the Middle East or Africa should 'have his head examined,' as General MacArthur so delicately put it."

Amen.

I would like to insert into the RECORD, from AlterNet, an article by Derrick Crowe and Robert Greenwald posted on February 6, 2011, titled *Damning New Report Shows U.S. Strategy is Blocking Chance for Peace in Afghanistan*.

[From AlterNet, Feb. 6, 2011]

**DAMNING NEW REPORT SHOWS U.S. STRATEGY IS BLOCKING CHANCE FOR PEACE IN AFGHANISTAN**

(By Derrick Crowe and Robert Greenwald)

See: <http://www.alternet.org/story/149815/>

The new report from NYU's Center for International Cooperation is a damning description of the U.S. policies in Afghanistan since 2001, and a warning that the escalated military strategy blocks the road to peace while making the Taliban more dangerous.

Separating the Taliban from al-Qaeda: The Core of Success in Afghanistan is the latest

in a continuous string of statements from Afghanistan experts that the U.S. war policies that were launched a year ago aren't making us safer and aren't worth the substantial costs: \$1 million per U.S. troop in Afghanistan per year, for a total of more than \$375.5 billion wasted so far. The report is written by Alex Strick van Linschoten and Felix Kuehn, Kandahar-based researchers who've spent more than four years researching the Taliban and the recent history of southern Afghanistan.

I would like to place into the RECORD an article from ABC News titled *Afghan Security the Worst in a Decade*, according to the U.N.

ABC NEWS—AFGHAN SECURITY THE WORST IN A DECADE: UN

The security situation in Afghanistan has worsened to its lowest point since the toppling of the Taliban a decade ago and attacks on aid workers are at unprecedented levels, a United Nations envoy said.

Robert Watkins, the outgoing UN deputy special representative of the Secretary General for Afghanistan, says from a humanitarian perspective, security "is on everyone's minds".

"It is fair to say that security in the country is at its lowest point since the departure of the Taliban," he said.

Mr Watkins says before last year's surge in NATO military forces, the insurgency was centred in the south and south-east of the country.

"Since the surge of NATO forces last year, we have seen the insurgency move to parts of the country where we've never seen before," he said.

"We've now confronted with security problems that we'd never dream that we'd have. "While NATO is claiming that it has turned the corner . . . we still see these very difficult security problems."

UN relief agencies now have regular access to just 30 per cent of the country. Access is mixed for another 30 per cent while there is hardly any access to the remaining 40 per cent.

Mr Watkins says a key issue is the "conflation of political, military, developmental and humanitarian aid".

"Because of the way aid is dispersed in Afghanistan . . . it has contributed to perception in parts of the Afghan population that somehow humanitarian work is lumped into this political and military effort," he said.

"We have to emphasise that we recognise that there has to be separation and we have to be very careful to try to address this perception."

But he pointed out that a positive development was that the international and Afghan military have publicly acknowledged that some kind of negotiated settlement was necessary to end the instability.

"[This year] can be a crucial year if there is a breakthrough in finding some kind of reconciliation efforts," he said.

The Taliban, a hardline Islamist movement, was forced from power in late 2001 after a US invasion launched in the wake of the September 11 attacks on New York and Washington.

I would like to place into the RECORD an article from The New York Times discussing the counterintelligence strategy titled *U.S. Pulling Back in Afghan Valley it Called Vital to War*.

[From The New York Times, Feb. 24, 2011]

U.S. PULLING BACK IN AFGHAN VALLEY IT CALLED VITAL TO WAR

(By C. J. Chivers, Alissa J. Rubin and Wesley Morgan)

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN.—After years of fighting for control of a prominent valley in

the rugged mountains of eastern Afghanistan, the United States military has begun to pull back most of its forces from ground it once insisted was central to the campaign against the Taliban and Al Qaeda.

The withdrawal from the Pech Valley, a remote region in Kunar Province, formally began on Feb. 15. The military projects that it will last about two months, part of a shift of Western forces to the province's more populated areas. Afghan units will remain in the valley, a test of their military readiness.

While American officials say the withdrawal matches the latest counterinsurgency doctrine's emphasis on protecting Afghan civilians, Afghan officials worry that the shift of troops amounts to an abandonment of territory where multiple insurgent groups are well established, an area that Afghans fear they may not be ready to defend on their own.

And it is an emotional issue for American troops, who fear that their service and sacrifices could be squandered. At least 103 American soldiers have died in or near the valley's maze of steep gullies and soaring peaks, according to a count by The New York Times, and many times more have been wounded, often severely.

Military officials say they are sensitive to those perceptions. "People say, 'You are coming out of the Pech'; I prefer to look at it as realigning to provide better security for the Afghan people," said Maj. Gen. John F. Campbell, the commander for eastern Afghanistan. "I don't want the impression we're abandoning the Pech."

The reorganization, which follows the complete Afghan and American withdrawals from isolated outposts in nearby Nuristan Province and the Korangal Valley, runs the risk of providing the Taliban with an opportunity to claim success and raises questions about the latest strategy guiding the war.

American officials say their logic is simple and compelling: the valley consumed resources disproportionate with its importance; those forces could be deployed in other areas; and there are not enough troops to win decisively in the Pech Valley in any case.

"If you continue to stay with the status quo, where will you be a year from now?" General Campbell said. "I would tell you that there are places where we'll continue to build up security and it leads to development and better governance, but there are some areas that are not ready for that, and I've got to use the forces where they can do the most good."

President Obama's Afghan troop buildup is now fully in place, and the United States military has its largest-ever contingent in Afghanistan. Mr. Obama's reinforced campaign has switched focus to operations in Afghanistan's south, and to building up Afghan security forces.

The previous strategy emphasized denying sanctuaries to insurgents, blocking infiltration routes from Pakistan and trying to fight away from populated areas, where NATO's superior firepower could be massed, in theory, with less risk to civilians. The Pech Valley effort was once a cornerstone of this thinking.

The new plan stands as a clear, if unstated, repudiation of earlier decisions. When Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal, the former NATO commander, overhauled the Afghan strategy two years ago, his staff designated 80 "key terrain districts" to concentrate on. The Pech Valley was not one of them.

Ultimately, the decision to withdraw reflected a stark—and controversial—internal assessment by the military that it would have been better served by not having entered the high valley in the first place.

"What we figured out is that people in the Pech really aren't anti-U.S. or anti-any-

thing; they just want to be left alone," said one American military official familiar with the decision. "Our presence is what's destabilizing this area."

Gen. Mohammed Zaman Mamozaï, a former commander of the region's Afghan Border Police, agreed with some of this assessment. He said that residents of the Pech Valley bristled at the American presence but might tolerate Afghan units. "Many times they promised us that if we could tell the Americans to pull out of the area, they wouldn't fight the Afghan forces," he said.

It is impossible to know whether such pledges will hold. Some veterans worry that the withdrawal will create an ideal sanctuary for insurgent activity—an area under titular government influence where fighters or terrorists will shelter or prepare attacks elsewhere.

While it is possible that the insurgents will concentrate in the mountain valleys, General Campbell said his goal was to arrange forces to keep insurgents from Kabul, the country's capital.

"There are thousands of isolated mountainous valleys throughout Afghanistan, and we cannot be in all of them," he said.

The American military plans to withdraw from most of the four principal American positions in the valley. For security reasons, General Campbell declined to discuss which might retain an American presence, and exactly how the Americans would operate with Afghans in the area in the future.

As the pullback begins, the switch in thinking has fueled worries among those who say the United States is ceding some of Afghanistan's most difficult terrain to the insurgency and putting residents who have supported the government at risk of retaliation.

"There is no house in the area that does not have a government employee in it," said Col. Gul Rahman, the Afghan police chief in the Manogai District, where the Americans' largest base in the valley, Forward Operating Base Blessing, is located. "Some work with the Afghan National Army, some work with the Afghan National Police, or they are a teacher or governmental employee. I think it is not wise to ignore and leave behind all these people, with the danger posed to their lives."

Some Afghan military officials have also expressed pointed misgivings about the prospects for Afghan units left behind.

"According to my experience in the military and knowledge of the area, it's absolutely impractical for the Afghan National Army to protect the area without the Americans," said Major Turab, the former second-in-command of an Afghan battalion in the valley, who like many Afghans uses only one name. "It will be a suicidal mission."

The pullback has international implications as well. Senior Pakistani commanders have complained since last summer that as American troops withdraw from Kunar Province, fighters and some commanders from the Haqqani network and other militant groups have crossed into Afghanistan from Pakistan to create a "reverse safe haven" from which to carry out attacks against Pakistani troops in the tribal areas.

The Taliban and other Afghan insurgent groups are all but certain to label the withdrawal a victory in the Pech Valley, where they could point to the Soviet Army's withdrawal from the same area in 1988. Many Afghans remember that withdrawal as a symbolic moment when the Kremlin's military campaign began to visibly fall apart.

Within six months, the Soviet-backed Afghan Army of the time ceded the territory to mujahedeen groups, according to Afghan military officials.

The unease, both with the historical precedent and with the price paid in American

blood in the valley, has ignited a sometimes painful debate among Americans veterans and active-duty troops. The Pech Valley had long been a hub of American military operations in Kunar and Nuristan Provinces.

American forces first came to the valley in force in 2003, following the trail of Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, the leader of the Hezb-i-Islami group, who, like other prominent insurgent leaders, has been said at different times to hide in Kunar. They did not find him, though Hezb-i-Islami is active in the valley.

Since then, one American infantry battalion after another has fought there, trying to establish security in villages while weathering roadside bombs and often vicious fights.

Along with other slotlike canyons that the United States has already largely abandoned—including the Korangal Valley, the Waygal Valley (where the battle of Wanat was fought in 2008), the Shuryak Valley and the Nuristan River corridor (where Combat Outpost Keating was nearly overrun in 2009)—the Pech Valley was a region rivaled only by Helmand Province as the deadliest Afghan acreage for American troops.

On one operation alone in 2005, 19 service members, including 11 members of the Navy Seals, died.

As the years passed and the toll rose, the area assumed for many soldiers a status as hallowed ground. "I can think of very few places over the past 10 years with as high and as sustained a level of violence," said Col. James W. Bierman, who commanded a Marine battalion in the area in 2006 and helped establish the American presence in the Korangal Valley.

In the months after American units left the Korangal last year, insurgent attacks from that valley into the Pech Valley increased sharply, prompting the current American battalion in the area, First Battalion, 327th Infantry, and Special Operations units to carry out raids into places that American troops once patrolled regularly.

Last August, an infantry company raided the village of Omar, which the American military said had become a base for attacks into the Pech Valley, but which earlier units had viewed as mostly calm. Another American operation last November, in the nearby Watapor Valley, led to fighting that left seven American soldiers dead.

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction:

Correction: February 24, 2011

An earlier version of this article referred incorrectly to a pullback of American forces in eastern Afghanistan. It is a pullback from remote territory within Kunar Province, not from the province as a whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. I simply would very quickly make the case that the resolution should be voted against for several reasons. Initially, because it improperly invokes a provision of the War Powers Act that's inapplicable. This war was authorized by the U.S. Congress. Secondly, the manner in which it would force withdrawal is irresponsible and I don't think is the right way to do it. And, thirdly, that I am not prepared, from this point of view, to say that failure is in any way inevitable, and that we should not at this time make the judgment to pull the plug out from what we are doing in Afghanistan.

I would urge a "no" vote on the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCINICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We've stated over and over in this debate the cost of this war in this budget alone will be over \$113 billion—\$113 billion. There are Members who have come to this floor trying to whack a billion dollars in spending here and there. This is \$113 billion. You want to cut out waste, let's get out of Afghanistan.

Keep in mind that when you go to the Pentagon, and some of our Members have, and have gone to Afghanistan, there's an open-ended war going on here. There's no end in sight. I've submitted for the RECORD articles with respect to that. Hear this: We're going to be there through at least 2020. And that's going to cost us an extra, at least an extra trillion dollars.

Where are we going to get that money? Are we going to cut Social Security for that? Are we going to cut health care and cut funds for education? Are we going to cut more funds for home heating aid?

Where are we going to get this money? Are we ready to give up our entire domestic agenda so that we can continue on the path of a war to prop up a corrupt regime whose friends are building villas in Dubai, presumably with money that comes through the United States that's shipped out in planes out of the Kabul airport?

We have to start standing up for America here.

I appreciate and respect every Member of this Congress who served in the military. We honor them, just as I honor the members of my own family; my father, Frank, who was a World War II veteran; my brother Frank, who was a Vietnam veteran; my brother Gary, a Vietnam-era veteran; my sister Beth Ann, an Army veteran. I come from a family that appreciates service to our country.

But how are we serving our troops by letting them in a situation that is absolutely impossible, whether it's greater numbers of them returning home with injuries from IEDs. How are we serving our troops by telling them we're going to keep extending the period of the war? Who's speaking up truly for our troops here? Is it General Petraeus, who says, Well, we'll just keep the war going and maybe—maybe—we'll send 2,000 troops out of Afghanistan or redirect them by 2014. He doesn't get to make the choice. That choice must be made by the Congress of the United States.

It's time that we started to stand up for the Constitution of the United States, which, last I checked, in Article I, section 8 provides that Congress has to make the decision whether or not to send our troops into war. We have not the right to give that over to a President, over to a general, or anybody else. It's our prerogative inside this Congress.

In 2001, Mr. Speaker, I joined with Members of this House in voting for the authorization of military force following the terrorist attacks on 9/11. I don't take a backseat to anyone in standing up to defend this country. But as the United States continues in what is now the longest war in our history, it has become clear that the authorization for military force is being used as a *carte blanche* for circumventing Congress' role as a coequal branch of government.

I want you to hear this. We're a coequal branch of government. We're not lap dogs for the President. We're not servants of generals. We are a coequal branch of government expressing the sovereign will of the American people.

It has become clear this administration, just as the last administration, is willing to commit us to an endless war and an endless stream of money, just a year after a commitment of an additional 30,000 troops to Afghanistan and continued assurances of "progress." They have been walking that dog down the road for the last 7 years. Progress.

My legislation invokes the War Powers Resolution of 1973, and if enacted, would require this President to withdraw U.S. Armed Forces out of Afghanistan by December 31, 2011.

Regardless of your support or opposition to the war in Afghanistan, this debate has been a critical opportunity to evaluate the human and the economic cost as this Congress works to address our country's dire financial straits. Those of us that supported the withdrawal may not agree on a timeline, but an increasing number of us agree it's time to think and rethink our current national security strategy. And we have to know the costs are great. We can't get away from the costs of this war.

Nobel Prize-winning economist Joe Stiglitz and Linda Bilmes, his associate, wrote a book about the Iraq war. They projected then a minimum of \$3 trillion in costs.

I would like to include in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a statement that I made over 8 years ago at the beginning of the Iraq war, where I pointed out there was nothing—no reason why we should be going to war in Iraq because there was no proof that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction.

I mention that in terms of this debate because we're at the confluence of the events—the anniversary of the Iraq war; the confluence of the funding of the war in Afghanistan. We've got to get out of Afghanistan. We've got to get out of Iraq. We've got to start taking care of things here at home.

ANALYSIS OF JOINT RESOLUTION ON IRAQ BY  
DENNIS J. KUCINICH

WASHINGTON, Oct 2, 2002.—Whereas in 1990 in response to Iraq's war of aggression against and illegal occupation of Kuwait, the United States forged a coalition of nations to liberate Kuwait and its people in order to defend the national security of the United States and enforce United Nations Security Council resolutions relating to Iraq;



**KEY ISSUE:** In the Persian Gulf war there was an international coalition. World support was for protecting Kuwait. There is no world support for invading Iraq.

Whereas after the liberation of Kuwait in 1991, Iraq entered into a United Nations sponsored cease-fire agreement pursuant to which Iraq unequivocally agreed, among other things, to eliminate its nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons programs and the means to deliver and develop them, and to end its support for international terrorism;

Whereas the efforts of international weapons inspectors, United States intelligence agencies, and Iraqi defectors led to the discovery that Iraq had large stockpiles of chemical weapons and a large scale biological weapons program, and that Iraq had an advanced nuclear weapons development program that was much closer to producing a nuclear weapon than intelligence reporting had previously indicated;

**KEY ISSUE:** UN inspection teams identified and destroyed nearly all such weapons. A lead inspector, Scott Ritter, said that he believes that nearly all other weapons not found were destroyed in the Gulf War. Furthermore, according to a published report in the Washington Post, the Central Intelligence Agency has no up to date accurate report on Iraq's WMD capabilities.

Whereas Iraq, in direct and flagrant violation of the cease-fire, attempted to thwart the efforts of weapons inspectors to identify and destroy Iraq's weapons of mass destruction stockpiles and development capabilities, which finally resulted in the withdrawal of inspectors from Iraq on October 31, 1998;

**KEY ISSUES:** Iraqi deceptions always failed. The inspectors always figured out what Iraq was doing. It was the United States that withdrew from the inspections in 1998. And the United States then launched a cruise missile attack against Iraq 48 hours after the inspectors left. In advanced of a military strike, the US continues to thward (the Administration's word) weapons inspections.

Whereas in 1998 Congress concluded that Iraq's continuing weapons of mass destruction programs threatened vital United States interests and international peace and security, declared Iraq to be in "material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations" and urged the President "to take appropriate action, in accordance with the Constitution and relevant laws of the United States, to bring Iraq into compliance with its international obligations" (Public Law 105-235);

Whereas Iraq both poses a continuing threat to the national security of the United States and international peace and security in the Persian Gulf region and remains in material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations by, among other things, continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability, and supporting and harboring terrorist organizations;

**KEY ISSUES:** There is no proof that Iraq represents an imminent or immediate threat to the United States. A "continuing" threat does not constitute a sufficient cause for war. The Administration has refused to provide the Congress with credible intelligence that proves that Iraq is a serious threat to the United States and is continuing to possess and develop chemical and biological and nuclear weapons. Furthermore there is no credible intelligence connecting Iraq to Al Qaida and 9/11.

Whereas Iraq persists in violating resolutions of the United Nations Security Council by continuing to engage in brutal repression of its civilian population thereby threat-

ening international peace and security in the region, by refusing to release, repatriate, or account for non-Iraqi citizens wrongfully detained by Iraq, including an American serviceman, and by failing to return property wrongfully seized by Iraq from Kuwait;

**KEY ISSUE:** This language is so broad that it would allow the President to order an attack against Iraq even when there is no material threat to the United States. Since this resolution authorizes the use of force for all Iraq related violations of the UN Security Council directives, and since the resolution cites Iraq's imprisonment of non-Iraqi prisoners, this resolution would authorize the President to attack Iraq in order to liberate Kuwaiti citizens who may or may not be in Iraqi prisons, even if Iraq met compliance with all requests to destroy any weapons of mass destruction. Though in 2002 at the Arab Summit, Iraq and Kuwait agreed to bilateral negotiations to work out all claims relating to stolen property and prisoners of war. This use-of-force resolution enables the President to commit U.S.046 troops to recover Kuwaiti property.

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has demonstrated its capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people;

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has demonstrated its continuing hostility toward, and willingness to attack, the United States, including by attempting in 1993 to assassinate former President Bush and by firing on many thousands of occasions on United States and Coalition Armed Forces engaged in enforcing the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council;

**KEY ISSUE:** The Iraqi regime has never attacked nor does it have the capability to attack the United States. The "no fly" zone was not the result of a UN Security Council directive. It was illegally imposed by the United States, Great Britain and France and is not specifically sanctioned by any Security Council resolution.

Whereas members of al Qaida, an organization bearing responsibility for attacks on the United States, its citizens, and interests, including the attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, are known to be in Iraq;

**KEY ISSUE:** There is no credible intelligence that connects Iraq to the events of 9/11 or to participation in those events by assisting Al Qaida.

Whereas Iraq continues to aid and harbor other international terrorist organizations, including organizations that threaten the lives and safety of American citizens;

**KEY ISSUE:** Any connection between Iraq support of terrorist groups in Middle East, is an argument for focusing great resources on resolving the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. It is not sufficient reason for the U.S. to launch a unilateral preemptive strike against Iraq.

Whereas the attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001 underscored the gravity of the threat posed by the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by international terrorist organizations;

**KEY ISSUE:** There is no connection between Iraq and the events of 9/11.

Whereas Iraq's demonstrated capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction, the risk that the current Iraqi regime will either employ those weapons to launch a surprise attack against the United States or its Armed Forces or provide them to international terrorists who would do so, and the extreme magnitude of harm that would result to the United States and its citizens from such an attack, combine to justify action by the United States to defend itself;

**KEY ISSUE:** There is no credible evidence that Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruc-

tion. If Iraq has successfully concealed the production of such weapons since 1998, there is no credible evidence that Iraq has the capability to reach the United States with such weapons. In the 1991 Gulf War, Iraq had a demonstrated capability of biological and chemical weapons, but did not have the willingness to use them against the United States Armed Forces. Congress has not been provided with any credible information, which proves that Iraq has provided international terrorists with weapons of mass destruction.

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 authorizes the use of all necessary means to enforce United Nations Security Council Resolution 660 and subsequent relevant resolutions and to compel Iraq to cease certain activities that threaten international peace and security, including the development of weapons of mass destruction and refusal or obstruction of United Nations weapons inspections in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687, repression of its civilian population in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 688, and threatening its neighbors or United Nations operations in Iraq in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 949;

**KEY ISSUE:** The UN Charter forbids all member nations, including the United States, from unilaterally enforcing UN resolutions.

Whereas Congress in the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1) has authorized the President "to use United States Armed Forces pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 (1990) in order to achieve implementation of Security Council Resolutions 660, 661, 662, 664, 665, 666, 667, 669, 670, 674, and 677";

**KEY ISSUE:** The UN Charter forbids all member nations, including the United States, from unilaterally enforcing UN resolutions with military force.

Whereas in December 1991, Congress expressed its sense that it "supports the use of all necessary means to achieve the goals of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 as being consistent with the Authorization of Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1)," that Iraq's repression of its civilian population violates United Nations Security Council Resolution 688 and "constitutes a continuing threat to the peace, security, and stability of the Persian Gulf region," and that Congress, "supports the use of all necessary means to achieve the goals of United Nations Security Council Resolution 688";

**KEY ISSUE:** This clause demonstrates the proper chronology of the international process, and contrasts the current march to war. In 1991, the UN Security Council passed a resolution asking for enforcement of its resolution. Member countries authorized their troops to participate in a UN-led coalition to enforce the UN resolutions. Now the President is asking Congress to authorize a unilateral first strike before the UN Security Council has asked its member states to enforce UN resolutions.

Whereas the Iraq Liberation Act (Public Law 105-338) expressed the sense of Congress that it should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove from power the current Iraqi regime and promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime;

**KEY ISSUE:** This "Sense of Congress" resolution was not binding. Furthermore, while Congress supported democratic means of removing Saddam Hussein it clearly did not endorse the use of force contemplated in this resolution, nor did it endorse assassination as a policy.

Whereas on September 12, 2002, President Bush committed the United States to “work with the United Nations Security Council to meet our common challenge” posed by Iraq and to “work for the necessary resolutions,” while also making clear that “the Security Council resolutions will be enforced, and the just demands of peace and security will be met, or action will be unavoidable”;

Whereas the United States is determined to prosecute the war on terrorism and Iraq’s ongoing support for international terrorist groups combined with its development of weapons of mass destruction in direct violation of its obligations under the 1991 ceasefire and other United Nations Security Council resolutions make clear that it is in the national security interests of the United States and in furtherance of the war on terrorism that all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions be enforced, including through the use of force if necessary;

**KEY ISSUE:** Unilateral action against Iraq will cost the United States the support of the world community, adversely affecting the war on terrorism. No credible intelligence exists which connects Iraq to the events of 9/11 or to those terrorists who perpetrated 9/11. Under international law, the United States does not have the authority to unilaterally order military action to enforce UN Security Council resolutions.

Whereas Congress has taken steps to pursue vigorously the war on terrorism through the provision of authorities and funding requested by the President to take the necessary actions against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations or persons who planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001 or harbored such persons or organizations;

**KEY ISSUE:** The Administration has not provided Congress with any proof that Iraq is in any way connected to the events of 9/11.

Whereas the President and Congress are determined to continue to take all appropriate actions against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations or persons who planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such persons or organizations;

**KEY ISSUE:** The Administration has not provided Congress with any proof that Iraq is in any way connected to the events of 9/11. Furthermore, there is no credible evidence that Iraq has harbored those who were responsible for planning, authorizing or committing the attacks of 9/11.

Whereas the President has authority under the Constitution to take action in order to deter and prevent acts of international terrorism against the United States, as Congress recognized in the joint resolution on Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40); and

**KEY ISSUE:** This resolution was specific to 9/11. It was limited to a response to 9/11.

Whereas it is in the national security of the United States to restore international peace and security to the Persian Gulf region;

**KEY ISSUE:** If by the “national security interests” of the United States, the Administration means oil, it ought to communicate such to the Congress. A unilateral attack on Iraq by the United States will cause instability and chaos in the region and sow the seeds of future conflicts all over the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased and honored to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER), a member of the Financial Services Committee, a former member of our Foreign Affairs Committee. I would like to remind my good friend that we still have a GOP vacancy in our committee and we need freedom and democracy believers like the gentleman from Michigan; seniority retained.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman. I thank her for her kind words and her attempt to draft me.

In this age of hope and peril, today we all assemble with earnestness and sincerity to discuss matters of liberty and tyranny, matters of life and death.

□ 1320

What we see in Afghanistan is a counterinsurgency operation being led by the United States. It is the most difficult and painful type of military operation to witness because it does involve working with the population, winning hearts and minds, and helping to build the institutions of democracy and liberty at the community and national levels, which have been nonexistent for decades.

Yet because the cause is difficult, it does not mean we can turn away from it, because the Afghan people cannot turn away from it.

In 2006, I was fortunate to be on a CODEL with many of my colleagues, and we had the opportunity to meet women who were serving in the Afghan National Assembly. Despite the difficulties in translation, it was very clear that they wanted to accomplish two things: they wanted to serve the Afghan people, who had entrusted them with their positions; and they wanted to honor the men and women of the United States military, who had risked and given so much for them to have that opportunity.

As I said, I deeply appreciate the sincerity and earnestness of this debate today because, in this instance, clearly, it is not one based upon partisan division, but one based upon the dictates of conscience. I think it is very important that we look into this situation and see that it is not simply the United States that is involved here and that it is not simply a question of leaving without consequence. If we leave now, if we back this resolution, there will be consequences to the female Afghan National Assembly parliamentarians, who are trying to build freedom within that country.

In my discussion with those brave women, they brought up how difficult it was for them: how hard it would be to build a sustainable democracy; to build an economy; to build, in many ways, what we here take for granted.

I said to them that it was very important to remember that the United States, itself, was not always a great national power and a beacon of hope and freedom and that in our darkest days after the Revolution there were many who thought this free Republic

would fail, and there were enemies who sought its destruction. Yet, at the founding time, the people of the United States and their leaders were able to take this Nation’s democracy and turn it into one that not only secured freedom for itself but one that expanded it to others.

I said that it was within the Halls of the United States Congress, within the Halls of our institution, that you could see the pictures of the Founders, like Jefferson and Madison, hanging from the walls, which remind us of what we have endured, what we enjoy, and what we must return.

I told the Afghan National Assembly women that one day their daughters and granddaughters would look up and see on the walls their portraits hanging in a free Afghanistan that was allied with the Free World against terrorism and that was a beacon, itself, to those who were oppressed—because they will be free, because we will honor our duty not to seek miserly to hold our own freedom for ourselves, and because we will follow what Lincoln said:

In seeking to extend freedom to the enslaved, we ensure freedom for ourselves.

We will continue to stand with the Afghan people. We will continue to honor the commitment to the solemn word of the United States as she gave to that country; and one day, we will look back, and we will be proud of the votes we cast today.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have now been in Afghanistan for 113 months, ten months longer than the war in Vietnam. The war in Afghanistan is now the longest conflict in United States history.

Here at home, Americans are out of work, teachers are facing budget cuts, police departments are overstretched, and yet the President and much of Congress continue to cling to the notion that if given more time and more precious taxpayer dollars borrowed from China we will finally—after a decade of war—gain the edge to “finish the job” in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t buy it. There is no comprehensive political outcome in sight. There is no decisive military outcome that will allow us to declare “victory.” There is no meaningful government outside of Kabul, the Afghani security forces are in disarray, and there is unbelievable corruption throughout the Karzai government, police, and security forces.

Despite these realities, the U.S. taxpayer is being asked to foot a \$100 billion bill per year—again, all borrowed money that future generations will have to pay back with interest—to continue a failed strategy in Afghanistan. I continue to be extremely concerned that the Afghanistan war has drawn the U.S. into a black hole not completely unlike Vietnam, where we propped up a corrupt government that had no relationship to the rest of the country. Recent events in North Africa and throughout the Middle East have shown us the consequences of similar policies.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support our troops. They have fought heroically and done everything we have asked of them. We should honor those who have served and sacrificed for their country. But we are not honoring those who have served and those who continue to serve by supporting a war without

clear objectives, a clear exit strategy, and without any substantial hope for a “military victory.”

Clearly an orderly withdrawal can not be accomplished in 9 months. But supporting H. Con. Res. 28 provides an opportunity to send a message to the President that the current strategy and cost of the war in Afghanistan are unsustainable. We need a clear exit strategy. We need a less expensive, less troop intensive policy that could bring about a much better result in Afghanistan. We need to prioritize the needs here at home instead of spending treasure and blood on a seemingly open-ended war in Afghanistan. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Con. Res. 28.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today the House has a chance to make a judgment about the wisdom of continuing our combat role in Afghanistan. In 2009, I came to the floor of the House and declared that I would give the President at least a year to show that his approach could work. For those who choose to actually look at the facts and the results to date, the conclusion is clear: it is time—past time—for us to leave Afghanistan.

Time and again, our military forces would take out one of their field commanders, and every time several more rise to take their place. This is the nature of insurgency, it is the nature of the problem that confronts us, and it is not a problem that will be resolved by the continuous, endless use of military force. The number of insurgent attacks is at an all-time high. The corruption and dysfunctionality of the Afghan government has become legendary. And the cost of this conflict—both in killed and wounded, including the long-term care costs for the hundreds of thousands of veterans of this war—continue to rise. I voted for this resolution today in order to show that I am no longer willing to allow our military and our nation to bear the endless, deadly burden of a war without end that is moving neither our country nor theirs closer to safety and security. I hope the President takes note and works with us to bring our troops home.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Gates recently stated that we could be in Afghanistan past the 2014 deadline for complete troop withdrawal. Meanwhile, more than 60 percent of Americans oppose this war, with more than 70 percent of people believing that we should withdraw a substantial number of U.S. troops from Afghanistan this summer.

This is the longest war in U.S. history and all we have to show for it is a higher deficit and more debt.

We already spend the most of any country in the world on defense. The next closest defense-spending country is China—and we spend seven times what they do.

Defense spending currently constitutes about 60 percent of our discretionary spending. And it has increased 86 percent since 1998, becoming more entrenched than any entitlement program. As we’re talking about cutting important programs that working families depend on, we should not continue to throw money down an endless hole in Afghanistan.

I recently conducted a survey in my district inquiring about constituents’ priorities and discovered that getting out of Afghanistan was second only to job creation. They also agree that one of the best ways to reduce the deficit is through extensive defense spending cuts.

Republicans keep expressing the absolute necessity in cutting \$100 billion from the budget over the next five years. Pulling out of Afghanistan would, all by itself, save us over \$100 billion in the upcoming budget.

It is time for Congress to reassert its Constitutional war powers authority and set a time line for complete withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan.

I am proud to support this resolution by Representatives KUCINICH and JONES that gives Congress, and therefore the American people, the power to decide whether America enters into or continues a war.

I urge my colleagues to follow the will of the American people and support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 28, a resolution that directs the President, pursuant to the War Powers Resolution, to remove our troops from Afghanistan no later than December 31st, 2011.

Secretary Gates recently stated that we could be in Afghanistan past the 2014 deadline for complete troop withdrawal. Meanwhile, more than 60 percent of Americans oppose the war, with more than 70 percent of people believing that we should withdraw most troops from Afghanistan this summer. I recently conducted a survey in my district inquiring about constituents’ priorities and discovered that getting out of Afghanistan was second only to job creation. They also agree that one of the best ways to reduce the deficit is through extensive defense spending cuts.

This is the longest war in U.S. history and all we have to show for it is a higher deficit and more debt. Yet Republicans, who continue to tout the merits of a balanced budget, refuse to consider ending this expensive war, let alone consider modest defense-spending cuts.

Defense spending currently constitutes almost 60 percent of our discretionary spending. As we are forced to consider cutting important programs that working families depend on, we should not continue to throw money down an endless hole in Afghanistan. Republicans continue to express the absolute necessity in cutting \$100 billion from the budget over the next five years. Pulling out of Afghanistan would, all by itself, save us over \$100 billion in the upcoming budget.

The Majority is not listening to the American people. The American people want us out of Afghanistan and they want a solid plan to improve the economy and create jobs, neither of which the Republicans deem worthy enough to address.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this resolution proposed by Representatives KUCINICH and JONES that gives Congress, and therefore the American people, the Power to decide whether America enters into or continues a war. I urge my colleagues to follow the will of the people and support this resolution.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am writing to urge my support to bring our troops our home. The recent debate on removing the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan has been the topic of many discussions and now is the time to take action. This devastating war has continued on for nearly a decade and it has taken the lives of more than 1,400 Americans and cost taxpayers over \$366 billion.

The war in Afghanistan is not worth fighting. We need to end this national humiliation and

redirect war funding. The scope of our interest in Afghanistan has been exceeded and it is time to bring this war to a successful conclusion. While we have achieved hard-earned milestones, the situation in Afghanistan has deteriorated and the threat to our national security remains unaffected.

We can no longer fight this war. We have to leave it up to the Afghan people to determine their own fate and future. I ask my colleagues to join me in taking a stand to bring our troops home. Our economy is at stake, the precious lives of our troops and their families hang in the balance and the integrity of the United States has been severely jeopardized.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, we’re debating the wrong resolution here today.

We should be debating a resolution that honors the continuing sacrifice, service, the courage and the steadfastness of our men and women in uniform—all volunteers—as they work to carry out their missions in the global war on terror. And their families back at home.

These warriors serve today in Afghanistan, and yes, in Iraq.

Both are active war zones where there are no “front lines” and every deployed servicemember lays his or her life on the line every day.

And they have made significant progress. General Petraeus told our Defense Subcommittee this morning that “The momentum of the Taliban has been halted in much of the country and reversed in some important areas.”

The Afghan Security Forces are growing in number and capability.

And the day when we turn all operations over to the Afghans gets closer and closer.

None of this has been easy.

Progress has been made through hard fighting and considerable sacrifice of so many Americans and our allies.

There have been tough losses along the way. And there have been setbacks as well as successes.

But instead of debating a resolution that honors the sacrifice of our brave warfighters, we are considering a measure that seeks to “turn off the lights and slam the door as we withdraw.”

Well, we’ve been down this road before.

Two decades ago we celebrated alongside our Afghan allies as the invading Russian military rolled back into the USSR in defeat.

And when the celebration ended, we walked away—we did not follow-up with the necessary investments in diplomacy and development assistance, turning our back on Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Had we not done that in the early 1990s, we would have better secured our own country’s future, as well as peace and stability in the region.

Instead of intensifying our humanitarian efforts to help the Afghans meet their postwar challenges, we simply walked away—leaving a destroyed country that lacked roads, schools, and any plan or hope for rebuilding.

Into this void marched the Taliban and al-Qaeda. My Colleagues, as they say, “the rest is history” for the Afghans and for all Americans:

Horrors perpetrated on Afghan men, women and children;

A curtain of oppression which denied half the population—women—any rights and dignity;

Closed schools. Destroyed cultural institutions and national treasures;

A modern-day Dark Ages;

Mr. Speaker, the resolution we debate today would have us repeat that sad and dangerous saga.

I urge defeat of the resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Kucinich resolution directing the President to remove United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan.

It is time to bring U.S. involvement in the war in Afghanistan to an end and to bring our troops home. The war effort in Afghanistan is no longer serving its purpose of enhancing the security of the United States, which should be our goal.

We were attacked on 9/11 by al Qaeda. Al Qaeda had bases in Afghanistan. It made sense to go in and destroy those bases. And we did. We have every right, we have every duty to destroy bases which are being used to plot against the United States. But the CIA tells us that there are now fewer than 100 al Qaeda personnel in all of the country of Afghanistan.

It is past time to admit that our legitimate purpose in Afghanistan—to destroy al Qaeda bases—has long since been accomplished. But it is a fool's errand to try to remake a country that nobody since Genghis Khan has managed to conquer. What makes us think, what arrogance gives us the right to assume that we can succeed where the Mongols, the British, the Soviets failed? No government in Afghanistan, no government in Kabul, has ever been able to make its writ run in the entire country.

Why have we undertaken to invent a government that is not supported by the majority of the people, a government that is corrupt, and try to impose it on this country? Afghanistan is in the middle of what is at this point a 35-year civil war. We have no business intervening in that civil war, we have no ability to win it for one side or the other, and we have no necessity to win it for one side or the other. This whole idea of counterinsurgency, that we are going to persuade the people who are left alive after our firepower is applied to love the government that we like is absurd.

It will take tens of years, hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars, tens of thousands of American lives, if it can be done at all, and we don't need to do it. It's their country. If they want to have a civil war, we can't stop them. We can't choose the rulers that they have, we don't have to like the rulers that they have, and we don't have to like their choices. It's not up to us.

At this point we must recognize that rebuilding Afghanistan is both beyond our ability and beyond our mandate to prevent terrorists from attacking the United States. And if it be said that there are terrorists operating in Afghanistan, that may be, but it is also true of Yemen, Somalia and many other countries. We do not need to invade and conquer and occupy all those countries, and Afghanistan provides no greater necessity or justification for military operations.

We are throwing \$100 billion a year—plus countless lives—down a drainpipe, for no useful purpose at all—and with very little discussion of our purposes and of whether our policy matches our purposes.

To continue so bad a policy at so high a cost is simply unconscionable. It is unjustifi-

able to sacrifice more money and more lives this way. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to bring the U.S. involvement in the war in Afghanistan to a close.

Now, I want to say a word about supporting the troops. I believe it is more supportive of the troops to bring them home from a war that they should not be fighting than it is to give them weapons to fight an unnecessary war in which some of them, unfortunately, will lose their lives.

So I say support our troops. Bring them home. Support the country. Stop fighting where it no longer makes sense.

Vote for this resolution. Let's bring our troops home.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Con. Res. 28, a resolution requiring the removal of all United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan. I believe it is time to bring the United States Military's involvement in Afghanistan to a close.

Since the beginning of the Afghanistan War, the United States and Coalition Forces have lost 2,347 service men and women. Tens of thousands have suffered from other disabilities or psychological harm. With thousands of Texas Guardsmen currently serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, I will never forget their bravery in fighting for the freedoms, liberties, aid human dignity of the Afghanistans people.

Our nation's economic and national security interests are not served by a policy of an open-ended war in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers have fought for us, now it's time for us to fight for them. I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution and help bring our soldiers home.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, while I support the intent of this bill, I rise in reluctant opposition to H. Con. Res. 28, legislation introduced by Congressman KUCINICH directing the President to remove U.S. Armed Forces from Afghanistan within 30 days.

I agree with Congressman KUCINICH that we must have an exit strategy and a concrete plan to withdraw troops from Afghanistan. However, I voted against this resolution when it came up for a vote last year because I believed that withdrawing all troops 30 days after enactment of the bill was unrealistic.

Yesterday, along with a large number of my like-minded colleagues in the House, I sent a letter to President Obama urging him to prepare for a significant and sizeable drawdown of troops from Afghanistan that begins this July. I ask for permission to include this letter for the record.

Last December, the Obama Administration concluded in its review of the war in Afghanistan that we will be ready to begin a responsible drawdown in July 2011. This week, General Petraeus testified before Congress that he would keep our military and counterinsurgency gains in mind as he begins to provide recommendations to the President on commencing our military drawdown in July.

We have now entered the tenth year that American troops have been in Afghanistan, the longest war in U.S. history. An overwhelming majority of the American people—including an increasing number of Members of Congress—supports a safe and significant redeployment of U.S. troops from Afghanistan soon.

There is no question that we need to end our mission in Afghanistan. I will carefully re-

view the Obama Administration's assessment of the war effort, including plans for a drawdown, in the coming months. Insufficient progress in withdrawing U.S. troops by July 2011 will compel me to support a resolution like this in the future.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, March 16, 2011.

Hon. BARACK OBAMA,  
President of the United States,  
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT, We write to you to: express our utmost support for your planned drawdown of the U.S. military presence in Afghanistan beginning no later than July of this year. We, the undersigned members of Congress, believe the forthcoming reduction in U.S. troop levels in Afghanistan must be significant and sizeable, and executed in an orderly fashion.

Our nation's economic and national security interests are not served by a policy of open-ended war in Afghanistan. At a time of severe economic distress, the war in Afghanistan is costing the United States more than \$100 billion per year, excluding the long-term costs of care for returning military servicemembers. At the same time, military and intelligence officials agree that Al Qaeda's presence in Afghanistan is diminished and that there will not be a military solution to resolve the current situation. It is simply unsustainable for our nation to maintain a costly, military-first strategy in Afghanistan.

A significant redeployment of U.S. troops from Afghanistan beginning in July 2011 will send a clear signal that the United States does not seek a permanent presence in Afghanistan. This transition will provide incentive for internal stakeholders to improve upon the political status quo, reduce corruption, and take meaningful steps toward the establishment of an effective, trustworthy, and inclusive governance structure. A meaningful start to withdrawal will also empower U.S. diplomatic engagement with regional and global stakeholders who share a common interest in the long-term stability of Afghanistan.

The majority of the American people overwhelmingly support a rapid shift toward withdrawal in Afghanistan. In fact, a Gallup Poll released on February 2, 2011 indicated that 72% of Americans favor action this year to "speed up the withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan." Let us be clear. The redeployment of a minimal number of U.S. troops from Afghanistan in July will not meet the expectations of Congress or the American people.

Mr. President, as you work to finally bring an end to the war in Iraq by the end of this year, we must commit ourselves to ensuring that our nation's military engagement in Afghanistan does not become the status quo. It is time to focus on securing a future of economic opportunity and prosperity for the American people and move swiftly to end America's longest war in Afghanistan.

Mr. President, we look forward to working with you to make that goal a reality.

Sincerely,

Joe Baca; Tammy Baldwin; Karen Bass; Lois Capps; Michael E. Capuano; André Carson; Yvette D. Clarke; Steve Cohen; John Conyers, Jr.; Jerry F. Costello; Elijah E. Cummings; Danny K. Davis (IL); Peter A. DeFazio; Rosa L. DeLauro; Theodore E. Deutch; John J. Duncan, Jr. (TN); Donna F. Edwards; Keith Ellison; Sam Farr; Bob Filner; Barney Frank; Marcia L. Fudge; John Garamendi; Raúl M. Grijalva; Luis V. Guterrez; Alcee L. Hastings; Maurice D. Hinchey; Mazie K. Hirono; Rush D. Holt; Michael M. Honda; Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.; Sheila Jackson Lee; Eddie

Bernice Johnson; Hank Johnson, Jr.; Timothy V. Johnson; Walter B. Jones; Barbara Lee; John B. Larson; John Lewis; Zoe Lofgren; Ben Ray Lujan; Carolyn B. Maloney; Edward J. Markey; Doris O. Matsui; Jim McDermott; James P. McGovern; Michael H. Michaud; George Miller; Gwen Moore; James P. Moran; Christopher S. Murphy; Grace Napolitano; Eleanor Holmes Norton; John W. Olver; Bill Pascrell, Jr.; Ron Paul; Donald M. Payne; Chellie Pingree; Jared Polis; David E. Price; Mike Quigley; Rep. Charles B. Rangel; Laura Richardson; Lucille Roybal-Allard; Linda T. Sánchez; Loretta Sanchez; Janice D. Schakowsky; Bobby Scott; José E. Serrano; Albio Sires; Louise McIntosh Slaughter; Jackie Speier; Pete Stark; Mike Thompson (CA); John F. Tierney; Edolphus Towns; Niki Tsongas; Maxine Waters; Anthony D. Weiner; Peter Welch; Lynn C. Woolsey, Members of Congress.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this resolution with great reluctance.

I have had many great conversations and discussions with the sponsor of this resolution since coming to Congress about the issues of war and peace and justice. He even came to my district last year to join me in a town hall on the war in Afghanistan. He's been a great leader on this issue and a great friend.

I agree with the gentleman about the need to bring our troops home from Afghanistan as soon as possible. Recently, I joined a number of my colleagues in writing to the President to make clear our belief that the troop withdrawals from Afghanistan should be "substantial, significant, and orderly." The gentleman from Ohio did not join that letter although as I said, I know he shares the same goals of all those who signed it.

A few weeks ago, I voted for an amendment to H.R. 1 that would limit funding for the war in Afghanistan to \$10 billion, with the hope that those funds would be used by the Defense Department to plan and implement a timetable for the safe and expeditious withdrawal of our troops.

I want an end to these wars. One of the criteria that I have used for supporting those efforts and similar efforts in the past by a number of my colleagues is that we have to allow our military planners to implement that withdrawal in a way that is safe, orderly and responsible.

I doubt that the 30 day-withdrawal deadline in this bill meets that criteria. The bill itself recognizes that by giving the President the option to delay that withdrawal through the end of the year.

Although I am eager to withdraw, I am beset with a nagging question: how practical is it to move 100,000 troops and the associated equipment out of a country half way around the world in 30 days in an orderly, safe, and responsible fashion?

I support getting our troops out of Afghanistan. But we have to do so wisely. We can't waive a magic wand today and they are gone tomorrow or dismiss concerns about their safety. That is why on the issue of how that withdrawal is conducted, I have always supported legislation that defers that question to our military planners.

Again, even the letter that was sent to the President recently by a number of my colleagues, such as BARBARA LEE and JIM MCGOVERN, who like myself opposed the es-

calation of this war and want all of our troops home soon, does not dictate size or set a timetable for those withdrawals after July 2011.

That letter however did make clear that "a significant redeployment from Afghanistan beginning in July 2011 will send a clear signal that the United States does not seek a permanent presence in Afghanistan."

Even though July does not begin for over 100 days from now, sending that letter in March allows the military to have plenty of time to plan for a sizeable withdrawal.

This was the same gist of several bills by Mr. MCGOVERN last year that asked the military to give us their withdrawal plan by a certain date, including any reasons for why a redeployment might be delayed, rather than having Congress mandate that date.

Again, I support this resolution reluctantly because it sends an important signal to the Afghanistan government and its people that the U.S. is not intent on an endless occupation and that after ten years in America's longest war in history, we cannot morally or financially continue to afford this war. To the extent this resolution does that, I am in full support. However, again, my concerns remain about its method.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, once again we are debating this issue. And once again I will vote in support of ending our involvement in Afghanistan.

Our ongoing commitment in Afghanistan has proved exceedingly difficult and costly—and at a time when we can ill-afford the \$100 billion a year to sustain it. After years of war, the economic and military costs are straining our servicemembers, their families, and the country—they are simply too high.

President Obama increased our commitment there while also defining a goal of withdrawal. But our increased efforts have not yielded enough progress.

I have joined with my colleagues in sending a letter, led by Rep. BARBARA LEE, to the President supporting his planned drawdown of the U.S. military presence in Afghanistan beginning no later than July of this year.

It is time to bring this war to a responsible end.

Our brave men and women in uniform have fought well and continue to deserve our full support and commitment to return them home safely to their families and loved ones. They have fought with honor, at great cost, in the face of great challenges. I am humbled by their sacrifice.

While I support the President and our military leadership, I believe we must send a message that the U.S. cannot sustain further commitments in Afghanistan.

I believe the resolution before us today sends that message, and that is why I support it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 16, 2011, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### PROHIBITING FEDERAL FUNDING OF NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 174, I call up the bill (H.R. 1076) to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1076

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

#### SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO AND RADIO CONTENT ACQUISITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No Federal funds may be made available—

(1) to an organization that is incorporated as of the date of the enactment of this Act for each of the purposes described in subsection (c), or to any successor organization;

(2) for payment of dues to an organization described in paragraph (1); or

(3) for the acquisition of radio programs (including programs to be distributed or disseminated over the Internet) by or for the use of a radio broadcast station that is a public broadcast station (as defined in section 397(6) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 397(6))).

(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) OTHER PURPOSES.—Paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) shall not be construed to prohibit the making available of Federal funds to any entity, including an entity that engages in the payment described in such paragraph (2) or the acquisition described in such paragraph (3), for purposes other than such payment or acquisition.

(2) RADIO CONTENT ACQUISITION BY BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS OR DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY.—Subsection (a)(3) shall not be construed to apply to the acquisition of radio programs by the Broadcasting Board of Governors or the Defense Media Activity.

(c) PURPOSES DESCRIBED.—The purposes described in this subsection are the following:

(1) To propose, plan and develop, to acquire, purchase and lease, to prepare, produce and record, and to distribute, license and otherwise make available radio programs to be broadcast over noncommercial educational radio broadcast stations, networks and systems.

(2) To engage in research study activities with respect to noncommercial educational radio programming and broadcasting.

(3) To lease, purchase, acquire and own, to order, have, use and contract for, and to otherwise obtain, arrange for and provide technical equipment and facilities for the production, recording and distribution of radio programs for broadcast over noncommercial educational radio stations, networks and systems.

(4) To establish and maintain one or more service or services for the production, duplication, promotion and circulation of radio programs on tape, cassettes, records or any other means or mechanism suitable for non-commercial educational transmission and broadcast thereof.

(5) To cooperate and participate with foreign broadcasting systems and networks in all aspects of international radio programming and broadcasting.

(6) To develop, prepare and publish information, data, reports and other materials in support of or relating to noncommercial educational radio programming and broadcasting.

(7) To otherwise forward and advance the development, production, distribution and use of noncommercial educational radio programs, materials and services, and to assist and support noncommercial educational radio broadcasting pursuant to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, as it may from time to time be amended.

(d) FEDERAL FUNDS DEFINED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term “Federal funds” means, with respect to receipt by a non-Federal entity from the Federal Government, the following:

- (A) Grants.
- (B) Loans.
- (C) Property.
- (D) Cooperative agreements.
- (E) Direct appropriations.

(2) GRANTS OR SUBGRANTS FROM NON-FEDERAL ENTITY.—Such term also includes grants or subgrants from Federal funds made available to a non-Federal entity.

(e) CHANGES TO FUNDING FORMULA.—Section 396(k)(3)(A) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396(k)(3)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking “fiscal year” and all that follows and inserting “fiscal year, such amounts shall be available for distribution among the licensees and permittees of public radio stations pursuant to paragraph (6)(B).”; and

(2) in clause (v)(II), by striking “clause (ii)(II) and (III)” and inserting “clause (iii).”

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 396 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)(2)—

(A) in the matter before clause (i) of subparagraph (B), by inserting “(except for the acquisition of radio programs)” after “public telecommunications services”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “(except for the acquisition of radio programs)” after “public telecommunications services”;

(2) in subsection (k)—

(A) in the 1st sentence of paragraph (3)(B)(i)—

(i) by striking “and subparagraph (A)(iii)(II).”; and

(ii) by striking “or radio”;

(B) in the 3rd sentence of paragraph (6)(B), by striking “paragraph (3)(A)(iii)(I)” and inserting “paragraph (3)(A)(iii).”; and

(C) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking “(iii)(I)” and inserting “(iii).”; and

(ii) by inserting “(except for the acquisition of radio programming)” before the period at the end; and

(3) in subsection (l)(4)—

(A) in the matter before clause (i) of subparagraph (B), by striking “(iii)(II)” and inserting “(iii).”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “subsection (k)(3)(A)(iii)(III)” and inserting “subsection (k)(3)(A)(iii).”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking “subsection (k)(3)(A) (ii)(III) or (iii)(II)” and inserting “subsection (k)(3)(A)(ii)(II) or subsection (k)(3)(A)(iii).”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1076, a bill to get the Federal Government—and Federal taxpayers—out of the business of buying radio programming they do not agree with. This is a bill that is long overdue. Regardless of what you think of NPR, its programming or statements by its management, the time has come to cut the umbilical cord from the taxpayer support that has become as predictable as an entitlement program.

Much has changed, Mr. Speaker, in the media landscape since the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was created in 1967, followed by its creation of National Public Radio in 1970. Today, we have multiple listening choices. There is analog radio, digital radio, satellite radio, streaming radio over the Internet, and podcasts—both commercial and the self-published variety. Choice and available content are not the problem. If you want to find some content, the only question is where you will find it.

In these challenging economic times, committing the taxpayer to fund and support particular content, including content he or she may never listen to, highlights this absurd anachronism of the past. It is time to move forward and to let National Public Radio spread its wings and support itself.

This legislation does several important things. It prohibits the direct Federal funding of National Public Radio; and more importantly, it ensures that American taxpayers will not be funding through their tax dollars radio programming from NPR or other outlets with which they may not agree.

It is also important to recognize that this bill does not do a few things. It does not defund public radio stations. I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is such an important point. It does not defund public radio stations. They still may use Federal funding to operate their stations or to produce their own programming. Public radio stations may also continue to purchase programming from NPR or other sources, just not with Federal taxpayer dollars. Also, this bill has no impact—I want to repeat that—no impact on public television.

The added benefit of this legislation is that it ensures that, if taxpayer dollars are necessary and given to local stations, the money will not be used to purchase generic national programming but, instead, can be used to produce local content that actually will meet the needs of the communities in which these are located.

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

□ 1330

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1076. This bill will cripple National Public Radio, public radio stations, and programming that is vital to over 27 million Americans. We are now voting to deny the public access to one of our Nation’s most credible sources of news coverage. CBO has scored this bill. It does not save a penny. This means that this legislation does not serve any fiscal purpose, but it does serve an ugly ideological one.

This legislation is not about reforming NPR. It is about punishing NPR. We’ve held no hearings on this bill. It didn’t get referred to the committee for consideration. It’s being handled as if it were an emergency. We don’t even know all the facts, but that’s apparently no impediment.

For decades, decisions on Federal support for public broadcasting have been made 2 years in advance to insulate public broadcasting from politically motivated interference. This bill removes that buffer. NPR is now exposed to the full force of the political winds that blow through the House of Representatives. That means the independence and objectivity that public broadcasting has tried so hard to uphold is now subject, clearly, to political interference.

For those who complain that they don’t want content to be one way or the other on the political spectrum, to be honest and fair, the right-wing Republicans are trying to impose their view of what NPR should be saying in the content of their programming. They will say that’s not the case; but, Mr. Speaker, that is the case.

There is no reason for this bill. It is vindictive, it is mean-spirited, it is going to hit the smallest stations in rural areas particularly hard. Public radio is indispensable for access to news that’s hard to get, especially where broadband service is limited.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from the State of California (Ms. ESHOO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, be allowed to control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the author of the legislation.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you, Madam BLACKBURN, for your great work that you do on the committee.

I introduced H.R. 1076 because the Federal Government can no longer afford to fund programs that are fully capable of standing on their own. This is

not about the ideology of NPR executives or the content that NPR produces; but whether, in this age of trillion-dollar annual deficits, taxpayers should subsidize a nonessential entity.

Plain and simple, this bill accomplishes three things. First, it prohibits public radio stations from using Federal funds to purchase programming. Current Federal law requires that about 26 percent of Federal grants to public radio stations be used for the production or acquisition of programming. Many stations use these restricted grants to purchase programming from NPR. These programming fees are the largest single source of NPR revenue at \$56 million in fiscal year '10.

Second, H.R. 1076 prohibits stations from using Federal funds to pay NPR dues: in fiscal year '10, over 400 member stations paid a total of \$2.8 million in dues to NPR.

Third, my bill prohibits direct Federal fundings of National Public Radio. For fiscal year '10, NPR received over \$5 million in direct funding from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Departments of Education and Commerce, and the National Endowment for the Arts. These three sources of revenues I just described totaled about \$64 million in fiscal year '10.

Local public radio stations would not be able to use Federal tax dollars under this bill to purchase content, whether it's from NPR or any other vendor. However, under this bill, a station could use other dollars for the payment of NPR dues or the acquisition of programming. Should this bill become law, the prohibition of funds would take effect immediately.

But the real issue today is the proper role of the Federal Government with National Public Radio and whether government programs and services that can be funded privately should receive taxpayer dollars. We live in an age of digital radio, computerized digital streaming, commercial all-news radio, and radio talk shows, many of which are also streamed on the Internet or over satellite radio; and these provide sources of news and opinion without Federal taxpayer dollars. NPR should do the same.

With the national debt over \$13 trillion, the government should simply not continue to fund nonessential services, and this bill is just one step.

Long before any firings, videos, and executive comments at NPR, I sponsored legislation in Congress to pull the plug on taxpayer funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, NPR's parent company, as well as NPR. Last year, many of you will remember this issue came up as a YouCut item, and we voted in support of de-funding.

Last month, this House passed H.R. 1. Within that bill, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's unobligated funds for fiscal year '11 would be rescinded. When you couple H.R. 1 with this bill, H.R. 1076, we end up with taxpayers having to subsidize National Public Radio.

I'm a strong believer in the free market. I'd like to see NPR rework its business model and begin to compete for all of its income. NPR already receives a huge amount of funding from private individuals and organizations through donations and sponsorships. NPR can and should be entirely supported with private sources.

In my own State of Colorado, Colorado Public Radio received in fiscal year '10 only 6 percent of its funding from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Now, according to this bill, Colorado Public Radio is still permitted to apply for and receive Federal grants through the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, but they cannot use Federal money for the NPR dues or purchasing of content. They could use the other 94 percent of their money to purchase program content. Will this potentially require them to review and reprioritize where money is spent? I'm sure it will. But will it kill its programming? No way.

According to NPR, Federal funding to supplement operations amounts to less than 2 percent of its annual budget. Some have said this Congress should not bother with such a small amount of money. Only in Washington would anyone say \$64 million is not worth saving. You have to start somewhere if you're truly serious about getting our fiscal house in order. If Congress cannot make difficult decisions in the small areas, how can we even begin to tackle entitlements or other major programs?

If we look at the sting video that has received so much attention, Ron Shuler admits that NPR would be better off without Federal funding. There is no need for further debate. NPR does not need taxpayer dollars. We can save a program, or we can save our country. Americans want Washington to get serious about ending our overspending. If we can do that, the economy will get better, and we will have less unemployment and more jobs.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LAMBORN. To wrap up, like many Americans, I enjoy much of NPR's programming; but let it live on its own. It can do that simply by changing its business model. Just take the taxpayer out of the equation.

Ms. ESHOO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in fierce opposition to this bill which is going to adversely affect more than 34 million National Public Radio listeners through 900 local stations across our entire country.

My Republican colleagues have declared an emergency to rush this bill to the floor without any hearings whatsoever to examine the proposal. I think that's a bad way to do business.

□ 1340

We have many emergencies to deal with in our country, but attacking and

crippling NPR is hardly an emergency. And it does it in a very sneaky backdoor way. What the bill does is it cuts off the use of all Federal funding to NPR by preventing any grants to it. It prevents any support to NPR by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and it prevents support to NPR programming from public radio stations across the country. In other words, it cripples it, it hobbles it, which is really what the majority is seeking to do.

This proposal is not going to do anything about reducing the deficit. The CBO has weighed in. It doesn't cut any Federal spending. In fact, the bill doesn't produce one penny in savings. What's very clear is what it does do, and it's really purposeful. And that is to hobble NPR, threatening 9,000 jobs at stations across the country. Why? I think the motivations behind this effort are quite clear: They are rooted in an ideological view about what NPR broadcasts, and it capitalizes on recent headlines involving Ron Schiller and Juan Williams. This attack on NPR strikes at the core of a wide array of NPR programming that Americans enjoy every single day, all week long across the country, from "The Diane Rehm Show" to "Morning Edition" and two of my favorites, "Car Talk" and "World of Opera." I acknowledge that our Nation faces threats, but "Car Talk" is hardly one of them, and neither is "Diane Rehm." Silencing what some disagree with—make no mistake about it—is a threat to our democracy. A great democracy does not silence voices. We want many voices to the many.

NPR programming reaches more than 900 independently owned and operated stations across the country, from San Francisco's KQED, the most listened to public radio station in the country with more than 740,000 listeners each week, to small rural stations like that of the chairman of the subcommittee, KCUW in Pendleton, Oregon. These stations provide an important public service to the local community, and people trust it, and they enjoy it. They want it. They like it. This is national programming with local listenership.

And NPR's listenership has increased, unlike other stations, by 72 percent over the last 10 years. A recent national survey found—and that's why I think this is an ill-begotten proposal by the majority. You say you listen to the American people. I think you have to take the plugs out of your ears. A recent national survey found that almost 70 percent of all voters across the entire political spectrum oppose terminating the funding for public broadcasting, including 56 percent of Republicans in the country.

So I think it's time to stand up for NPR. I think that this is a phony emergency measure, and I don't think NPR deserves to be treated this way. I urge my colleagues to vote to preserve really what I think is a national treasure. It provides in very tough times very

clear and important news and information to instruct our country and listeners in local communities around our Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, let's really be honest and talk about what this bill is about. This bill is about making sure that we are spending taxpayer dollars the way that the people that earned them would spend them. And we saw, as the gentlelady from California indicated, on video executives at NPR saying that they don't need taxpayer dollars. So that's number one. That's out there. That was demonstrated for all of America to see. We are also in the process of making sure that Washington begins to do what every American family and small businessperson is having to do right now. It's called tightening the belt. It's called trying to learn how to do more with less. And inherently, what that means is, we have got to start prioritizing the things that are important to the American people.

The problem is, we have seen NPR programming and its programming often veer far from what most Americans would like to see as far as the expenditure of their taxpayer dollars. That's the bottom line. Nobody is on a rampage. Nobody is trying to say that we don't like NPR for NPR's sake. We have seen how they spend their money. So that's why we are saying, it's time to prioritize. It's time to reflect the common sense of the American people. And that's why the bill takes the form that it does. It says that we have got to, number one, listen to the executives at NPR who say that they don't need taxpayer funding.

Well, listen, we are all about looking for ways to cut right now and save on both sides of the aisle. We ought to take that advice for what it is. But we also know that NPR takes its funding and benefits from taxpayer dollars through the payments of local stations across the country. So what we are saying by this bill, those stations are not going to be starved from Corporation for Public Broadcasting grants, unlike the lady indicated. What they are going to be told is, You are not going to be using those taxpayer dollars for programming because we have seen how NPR has used that funding and the kind of programming that has been involved.

We are trying to find commonality. Our country is made up of much diversity with people of a lot of differing opinions. Why should we allow taxpayer dollars to be used to advocate one ideology? Why should we? We shouldn't. We should insist that our taxpayer dollars are prioritized, and the people's interests of this country are honored. That's why I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to our dis-

tinguished colleague from our beautiful State of California, Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1076. I can't believe what I am hearing from the other side of the aisle. It's not a lefty-type organization. This bill would prohibit public radio stations from using Federal funds to buy popular programs like "Morning Edition," "All Things Considered," and "This American Life." Mr. Speaker, this would be a huge disruption to our Nation's public radio system, economy, and most importantly, the intellectual content and news that so many Americans rely upon.

According to a recent study, NPR's overall audience grew last year to over 27 million weekly listeners, up 60 percent overall since 2000. And this is when most other media outlets are struggling.

And as a former board chair of Sacramento's local PBS TV station, I can attest to the value that national public broadcasting programming offers to my constituents. Mr. Speaker, thousands of my constituents rely on local NPR stations to get their news, and this is a very diverse group. In fact, since this bill was introduced, I have received a significant number of calls from them voicing very strong support for NPR and very, very strong opposition to this legislation. One of my constituents told me that listening to NPR makes him a more informed, more engaged citizen.

Moreover, this bill will not produce any savings for the taxpayer and will not reduce the deficit. For my constituents, it's a simple equation of value for money.

□ 1350

And also, this is about jobs. We need to talk about jobs. Public radio stations employ over 9,000 workers across the country, including 40 in Sacramento. Mr. Speaker, these are jobs we cannot lose.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this harmful legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to yield 2 minutes to one of our new freshman Members, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), who is a broadcaster and brings that expertise to this Chamber.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1076.

As a broadcaster, I understand the importance of the free marketplace, the freedom to express yourself, but to do it on your own merit.

I brought an idea to the marketplace to develop a radio news network, started with four stations, and within 4 years was able to grow that to 50 stations serving five States. I did not ask for one thin dime from the Federal Government.

I think freedom to succeed in this country has to exist also with the free-

dom to fail. We have an open marketplace. We have an opportunity to sell advertising around the ideas that we express on the radio.

I'm a success story in using the open marketplace, the freedom to succeed. But it also comes with the freedom to fail. And earlier in the year, or last year, rather, I started a radio station, a small venture. I populated that staff with folks that were on unemployment; so I know what it means to create jobs.

And certainly this is not about further burdening our taxpayer with support of an industry that is perfectly capable of supporting itself.

Ms. ESHOO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Crisis averted, ladies and gentlemen. What a relief. What a relief. I'm glad we got the economy back going. I'm glad we've secured our nuclear power plants. I'm so glad that Americans are back to work.

We finally found out our problem. We discovered a target that we can all agree upon. It's these guys. This is the problem. It's Click and Clack, the Tappet brothers. We're finally getting rid of them. Thank God we solved this problem for the country.

Now, let's look at the record here. For one, they talk in that Boston accent. "Cah" talk. It's a "car." I need to call Congressman CAPUANO whenever they're on the air.

Secondly, they talk about master cylinders and slave cylinders. It's kinky. I am glad my Republican friends are finally getting to the bottom of this.

And then with all the giggling and snorting that they do every weekend on their show, it's got to be some kind of a code. They're clearly talking to the Russians or the Chinese or something with all that giggling and snorting.

It is fine. I'm so relieved that we had this emergency session, that we waived the rules of the House that require 72 hours so we finally get these guys off my radio. Click and Clack, the Tappet brothers on "Car Talk." I know it. Because these guys, clearly they're political. Well, I don't know if they're political. They make no sense about most of what they say.

But you know what? I'm glad we're finally not going to have to listen to them. I'm glad the Republican Party finally said enough of Click and Clack, the Tappet brothers. That clearly was what the American people said in campaign 2010. Clearly it's in their contract with America or something; right? Get rid of Click and Clack?

It's about time, I have to say, because the last thing we want is informative solutions to how we fix our cars and the Car Talk Puzzler. And think about all the people we're finally going to put out of work, you know, their Customer Care Rep, Heywood Yabuzzoff—I'll tell you how to spell this later, I say to the stenographer—and the Director of Ethics, Youlyin



Sack, all of these guys that finally are going to be taken off the public payroll.

The Republican Party, no one can say they're not in touch. They get it. They understand where the American people are. The American people are not concerned about jobs or the economy or what's going on around the world. They're staring at their radio saying, Get rid of Click and Clack. Finally my Republican friends are doing it.

Kudos to you.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 2 minutes to a highly respected member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Telecommunications and Internet Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MIKE DOYLE.

And Happy St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today the House Republicans want to eliminate funding for NPR, some because they think the government shouldn't operate a news service and some because they think the reporting is biased. I believe they're wrong on both counts.

Public radio plays an important role in our communities as a source of news and entertainment. My colleagues should consider the studies that show that NPR listeners are more aware of indisputable facts than viewers and listeners of most other news sources.

Opponents of NPR hold up a video hit piece to show that NPR is biased. Even Glenn Beck's Web site, The Blaze, explains that the video is neither fair nor balanced, how it's basically a lie.

And my colleagues should consider the fact that many NPR programs have nothing to do with news or politics. Where's the bias in "Car Talk"? There might be a bias against Pintos or Pacers, but not a political bias. Where's the political bias in music broadcasts? There might be a bias against Prokofiev, but not a political bias.

Even so, if this bill were simply to defund NPR's direct public contribution, then at least it would only impact the organization with the alleged political bias, which is, again, based on a lie. But this bill goes further. It hurts local public radio stations and tens of millions of listeners from across the country.

If this bill is enacted, communities across the country will be denied programming that their residents want. Whatever happened to the philosophy that more choice is better?

My colleagues, this is bad public policy. This is a terrible bill. This is a terrible waste of our time, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to clear up what I think are probably a couple of misunderstandings that my colleagues have across the aisle.

One of the things I think it's important for everyone in this Chamber to realize, and I know some want to make fun of the fact that we're here talking about \$100 million, \$92 million, \$67 million, different funding that goes in and through NPR. Mr. Speaker, every single penny that comes from the taxpayer is important. And every single penny that we appropriate comes from those taxpayers, and we are charged with being good stewards of that money. Changing the structure in which NPR does their business, as Mr. LAMBORN said, looking at that business model, this is a step that we can take to save those taxpayer dollars. This is a step that is going to change that business model and free NPR.

Now, contrary to what some across the aisle are saying, this doesn't take NPR off the air. What this does is to say, NPR, you've got to get out of the taxpayers' pocket, because the taxpayer is not going to allow those taxpayer dollars to be spent to pay those NPR dues and to buy that NPR programming.

Now, another misconception that seems to be out there is about jobs and saying that programming is going to be denied because these stations won't be able to use taxpayer money to acquire some of this government NPR programming. Let me tell you, what we're doing is empowering these local radio stations, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues understand this.

□ 1400

We are turning to these local affiliates and saying, look, there are still going to be grants out there. You can create your own programming.

This is a great jobs program for these local radio stations. This is telling them you don't have to buy programming you don't want and that your listeners really don't want to listen to.

We are saying, get creative. Get that American spirit to work just as Mr. CRAWFORD was talking about. Find a niche in your marketplace and create a program.

Do you want to talk about the jobs that are created? Every time that you create a new radio show, you have got a writer, an editor, a producer, a director, a sound engineer, a sound tech, a systems engineer. You have got post-production work to take place. You have got a host. You have got a call screener, you have got a board operator, you have got a research assistant working with that writer and working with that editor. You have got a sales and marketing team working. You have got advertisers that are looking; now, of course NPR calls them sponsors. You have affiliate relations teams that are working. And you also have attorneys that are working on the intellectual property to make certain that they protect that content.

So I would just encourage my colleagues across the aisle here to remember, this is about freeing up those local radio stations. It is about getting NPR out of the taxpayer pocket. It is making certain that we are good stewards of the taxpayer money.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. I would just like to add something here, and that is that one of the mantras of our friends on the other side of the aisle was "read the bill."

If the gentlewoman from Tennessee would read the bill, she would know that there is not one dime, not one cent that is saved in this bill. And what this bill does is you can talk all you want about NPR and how much you love it, but what you are doing is killing off the local stations from being able to have the money to buy NPR's programming. So you are hurting local broadcasting.

I now would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished woman from the Santa Barbara, California area, a valued member of the committee, Congresswoman LOIS CAPPs.

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this effort to defund public radio.

Right now, millions of Americans tune in to NPR stations across the country for one reason, the consistency of the high quality of its programming. In a world awash by often ill-informed and sensationalist cable news and ever louder voices, public broadcasting provides thoughtful, even-handed analysis of the issues of the day. And they do it every day. The bill before us seeks to end that. It is nothing more than an effort to cripple NPR by crippling our local public radio stations.

The bill would decimate local NPR stations by restricting their ability to choose programming best suited to their community.

In my district, NPR stations like KCLU, KCRW, and KCBX provide valuable international and domestic news. They bring "All Things Considered," "Morning Edition," and "Car Talk" into our cars and our living rooms. But these stations also cover local news, concerts, local and school events. They produce shows like "Ears on the Arts," "Community Calendar," and "From Ballet to Broadway." The bill throws all that out the window.

NPR reports and media coverage are consistently even-handed, driven by a high standard of journalistic ethics. They are not politically biased. NPR lets the stories do the talking, not the commentators. And apparently the public, the tax-paying public, likes that.

According to the Pew Project for Excellence in Journalism, in the last year the television networks' audience slipped 3.5 percent, newspapers were down 5 percent, radio fell 6 percent, magazines were down almost 9 percent. NPR, up 3 percent. Since 2000, NPR's audience is up 58 percent. In the last

year, it's Web site, npr.org, drew an average of 15.7 million unique monthly visitors, up more than 5 million visitors.

This is a reflection of the quality of its programs and its dedication to its mission. Public broadcasting helps educate our society, celebrates the arts, education, respectful debate, and civil discourse. NPR and the 900-plus local stations are valuable resources for our country.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for public broadcasting and oppose this legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, since the previous speaker talked a little bit about NPR and its listening audience, I would like to make certain that the record reflects a little bit about that listening audience.

We know that more men than women listen to NPR, except for the classical music, which is 48 percent female. Baby boomers are a big part of their audience.

We also know that NPR, according to their Web site, says that their audience is extraordinarily well educated. Nearly 65 percent of all listeners have a bachelor's degree, compared to only a quarter of the U.S. population.

We also know that they are wealthy listeners, Mr. Speaker. NPR households tend to be more affluent than other households as a result of their educational attainment. The median household income of an NPR news listener is about \$86,000, compared to the national average of about \$55,000.

We also know that when it comes to geography, more than 99 percent of the U.S. population has access to at least one NPR station. And then, when it comes to employment, the majority of NPR listeners, 63 percent, are employed full time.

Mr. Speaker, again, I repeat the point. The object of this today is to get NPR out of the taxpayers' pockets. It is time for us to do this. It is time for this structure to be changed. It is time for us to be good stewards and save the money of the American taxpayer. This is another step toward that goal.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to Congresswoman TAMMY BALDWIN from Wisconsin, a highly valued member of the committee.

Ms. BALDWIN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this bill which prohibits Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content.

I am incredibly disappointed in my Republican colleagues for this needless attempt to cripple NPR and threaten thousands of jobs in the public broadcasting community. Without so much as a single hearing on this subject, this bill dissolves a vital public radio system depended upon by millions of Americans across the country.

Twenty-seven million Americans listen to NPR each week, and back home

in Wisconsin nearly 450,000 people listen to Wisconsin Public Radio weekly over three statewide networks. In addition, 2.3 million visitors visited the Wisconsin Public Radio Web site in 2010.

Those who listen to Wisconsin Public Radio know how much there is to love. Wisconsin Public Radio provides over 9 hours each weekday of interactive radio programming, engaging Wisconsin residents and experts from around the world in public policy, culture, arts, and educational discussions. And because Wisconsin is largely a rural State, our citizens rely on over-the-air broadcasting more than almost any other State. This means that Wisconsin audiences significantly rely on public radio.

Not only would this horrible bill, rushed before us today, cripple local radio stations and programming that we enjoy in Wisconsin; it severely harms listeners' access to national shows, like "Morning Edition," "All Things Considered," "This American Life," "A Prairie Home Companion," and one of my personal favorites, "Whad'ya Know," among many others.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is clearly not interested in creating jobs or dealing seriously with this deficit. Despite all of the talk, we are here today considering legislation that attacks public radio. I strongly oppose this bill, and I strongly urge all of my colleagues to do so, too.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

□ 1410

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to rise in support of this bill. The Federal Government has a few constitutional duties, and we seem to have taken on a lot of Federal responsibilities. As time goes on, every time we see a need, we think we have to tap into the taxpayers and create another government function. But this is not one of those functions that is an enumerated power of the United States Congress. It is not something that we are compelled to do. It is something that is discretionary. We are into operations at a time of austerity, a time when we see what's happened as a prelude to the American economy, if we just look over to Europe, in places like, oh, Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Greece, Spain, for example. That's the direction we're heading with our economy. And as we see this discretionary spending grow along with our entitlements grow and our economy contract, we also need to take a look at these items that are at our discretion as to whether or not to fund.

I think that the image that we have seen on the videos tells us something about the internal culture of NPR. If you haven't seen the videos, or if you've just seen the little text in there, that doesn't give you the real sense of

what was going on in that conversation with Mr. Schiller at that table for 2 hours that day. If you look at the whole video, you'll see, the cast of the character and the content reflected, the culture of NPR; in the same way, in my view, that the videos of ACORN reflected accurately the actual internal culture of ACORN. We shut off the funding to ACORN for that reason. Of all the data that we've put out on ACORN, you couldn't be convinced to shut off the funding until you saw the reality of the video.

Then we looked into Planned Parenthood, and of all the data that was brought out here to the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker—and I compliment MIKE PENCE for doing so and all of those who stood with him and for life—still, the American people didn't understand the real culture of Planned Parenthood until they saw the video.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlewoman.

Of all the data that we've seen, we still had not absorbed the real culture of NPR, until we saw the video of that dinner, those 2 hours that day.

So I stand in support of this act and this resolution, and I believe it's time for us to draw a bright line in our budget and cut this funding. I will be voting to adopt the cutting of the funding, as will my colleagues.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have left on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 13 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 11 minutes remaining.

Ms. ESHOO. Thank you.

I now would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman ED MARKEY, whom I think possesses the broadest and the deepest knowledge about telecommunications in the Congress.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, in an era when Edwardian drama is the only way to characterize the way in which cable news deals with the public affairs of our country, there is an oasis of real news that begins with Morning Edition, goes right through the day to All Things Considered, which focuses on that most unusual of all subjects, hard news, that the American people can use to make judgments about the affairs of our country and the affairs of the world. It is an oasis of information that is supplemented, yes, by Lake Woe Begone, On Point, other programs that raise the cultural level but serve as a place where people, 170 million Americans, can go to get real information.

Now what is this debate all about? Well, it's really about an ancient animosity which the Republican Party has had to the very creation of NPR, through Newt Gingrich, through the

early years of the 21st century, right up to today where it's on a list of grievances which they have about this ability of NPR to provide this news and information. That's what the debate's about. You don't have to be Dick Tracy to figure out what this debate is all about. They have right from the very beginning of the creation of this network wanted to destroy it.

I think that they are going to run into a razor blade sharp edge reaction from the American public as they find that, in place of Morning Edition and Car Talk and All Things Considered, they want to move to radio silence, and when the American people find out about that, they are going to be outraged.

I would vote "no" and urge strongly a "no" vote for all Members of this body.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address one thing. This is not an ancient animosity. I don't think I'm quite that old. And I don't think you have to be Dick Tracy to figure out what this debate is about. This debate is about saving taxpayer money. We do not have a revenue problem in this town. We have a spending problem in this town. The Federal Government does not have the money to fund these programs. We are borrowing 42 cents of every single dollar that we spend. We have to get the spending under control. We have to get an environment where the American people can get back to work. And we're talking about funding for NPR.

I just gave the demographics. It is a wealthy, educated listening audience. If people want this programming, Mr. Speaker, they're going to be willing to pay for it. But the American taxpayer has said, get NPR out of our pocket.

I pulled the sponsors for NPR, and I think my colleagues would be interested in this. When you go to the NPR Web site and you start pulling the sponsors, they don't sell advertising, but they do have many sponsors. They have some sponsors that land in the \$1 million plus category. And then they list sponsors all the way down to \$5,999. This is how wealthy the sponsorship base and the subscribership base is for them. It is time for us to remove the Federal support system that they have relied on. They have told us they do not need the money. We need to cut the umbilical cord. We need to see what NPR can do on their own.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the dean of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California for her yielding me this time, and I commend her for her opposition to this outrageous piece of legislation.

I rise in strenuous opposition to H.R. 1076, visited upon us without any attention to regular order, hastened to the floor in defiance of the commitments of the Speaker, and without any hearings or consideration by the Committee on Energy and Commerce. No opportunity for the public to speak or to be heard on what we're doing.

The majority continues to force Members of this body to waste time and energy of the House, a critical asset of this Nation, on political witch-hunts with respect to health care and the environment. Now we find that we're adding public broadcasting to this list.

Public broadcasting is a national treasure. It provides us impartial, honest coverage of facts and news. It provides information not available elsewhere. And, yes, it sheds a little bit of culture on our people, something which probably my Republican colleagues find offensive. It has done so at very low cost to the public, with huge contributions from the people for the support of this.

This legislation is going to prohibit local stations like Michigan Radio in Ann Arbor, and in your own districts and in your States, from using money from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to acquire or produce any public radio programs. As regards process, we are completely evading the processes and the commitments that are to be found in the rules and the pronouncements of the leadership on the other side. And we are finding that the history of this, which goes back to the 1934 Communications Act in the Commerce Committee, has been grossly disregarded.

So much for regular order. And so much for transparency that the majority made such a big fuss about at the beginning of this year. What's next? Are we going to amend the Endangered Species Act on the floor to declare an open season on Big Bird? Or upon programs which educate our kids or which contribute to the advancement of our society?

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1076. It's a bad bill.

□ 1420

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who is the chairman of the House Caucus on Public Broadcasting.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentle lady.

I want to make five basic points.

Number one, there are no savings to the taxpayer in this bill. It simply passes on higher costs and fewer choices to local stations.

Second, it is not going to stop NPR, which will go on in New York and Los Angeles and even Portland, Oregon. What it will cripple is what happens in smaller local stations around the country who rely on NPR and other public broadcasting entities for their content.

My good friend from Tennessee just went through all the steps that are necessary to produce local content. That is complex and it is expensive. That is why they voluntarily buy "Morning Edition" or "Prairie Home Companion" or "Car Talk."

NPR never said it didn't need the money. They are relying on a discredited video that was exposed by Glenn Beck's Web site, of all places. Our friends should talk to the thousands of volunteers at home who rely upon public broadcasting resources to provide the content that Americans love.

Reject this travesty.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in response to this statement that there are no savings, may I point my colleagues to a CRS report on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Federal funding and issues, and I will be happy to submit this for the RECORD.

Reading from it: "NPR, Incorporated, which oversees the NPR system, states that annually NPR receives direct funding in the range of \$1.5 million to \$3 million from three Federal agencies and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Those are the National Endowment for the Arts, the CPB, the Department of Commerce's National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and the Department of Education."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is you can't do that anymore. This is one of the steps that we have to take in order to straighten out this budgeting process. Our country does not have the money to spend on this. NPR does not need the money. They will not be able to get these grants. We will save those dollars.

The American taxpayer has said, Get your fiscal house in order. This is a step in that process. I know they don't like it, but, you know what? This is something we can do. This is something we will do. This is something the American people want to make certain that we do so that we get this Nation back on a firm fiscal and sound fiscal policy.

The day has come that the out-of-control Federal spending has to stop. A good place to start is by taking NPR out of the taxpayer's pocket.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentle lady from California.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1076 to defund National Public Radio. Overwhelmingly, my Rhode Island constituents agree, this legislation is no more than an ideological attack on public broadcasting masquerading as a fiscal issue. That is because Federal funding accounts for less than three-thousandths of one percent of the annual Federal budget. In addition to that, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says this legislation will not reduce the deficit by a single penny.

Without as much as a hearing, this legislation undermines public broadcasting, a system that 34 million Americans turn to weekly and in which Americans across the political spectrum place high trust.

These funding restrictions will devastate the economy of public radio. It will harm local stations. It will inhibit their ability to attract audiences, develop stable local revenue bases, and, most importantly, their ability to continue to produce local programming. Public broadcasting gives voice to the smallest and most diverse communities in our country. I know firsthand the high quality broadcasting the NPR provides in Rhode Island and all across this country.

It would also endanger 9,000 jobs at local public radio stations and communities across the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this assault on the free exchange of ideas and instead support a democracy that continues to listen carefully to its people.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who is one of the great advocates of public broadcasting in the Congress.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition. 170 million Americans use public media for vital news. Sixty-one percent of voters who support deficit reduction also support funding for public broadcasting. Yet the assault on public broadcasting continues, when jobs and the economy should be our top priority.

This outrageous bill would prohibit public radio stations from using Federal funds to acquire any radio programming from any outside source. That means that your local stations may not be able to air quality programming.

We were not sent here to silence "Prairie Home Companion," "Car Talk" and "Morning Edition." Let's stop trying to put Diane Rehm out of work and focus on putting more Americans back to work.

Reject this bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), the chairman of the House Democratic Caucus.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady. I wish her a happy St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. Speaker, there is a pattern here. Americans are seeing through what amounts to an ideological purge.

In Wisconsin, under the guise of dealing with the deficit, they are taking away collective bargaining rights.

In Washington, under the guise of dealing with the deficit, they are cutting Planned Parenthood and taking away women's rights.

Under the guise of dealing with the deficit, they are planning to privatize Social Security and voucher Medicare, as if they had anything to do with causing the deficit and the problem we are in.

And under the guise of saving taxpayers' dollars, what they are doing is silencing NPR, not because it saves money, but because it is not on the same ideological frequency of the extreme right.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when is the majority going to try to solve a real problem? The reaction to unemployment is "so be it." The reaction to an immoral Afghanistan policy is a big shrug. But a modest investment in educational, commercial-free programming, now, that is a national crisis. I guess they figure if they can't catch bin Laden, they might as well go after "A Prairie Home Companion."

Public broadcasting, Mr. Speaker, performs a vital function in a democracy. It is also twice as popular as the Afghanistan war, and it supports 21,000 jobs. That is 21,000 jobs more than the Republican agenda would create.

Vote against H.R. 1076.

□ 1430

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. While Republicans insist today that NPR is a four-letter word, the real attack is on KUT and similar public radio across America. Two hundred fifty thousand Texans rely upon KUT's in-depth radio news scrutiny of the Texas legislature and local government. The only "bias" of those who begin with Morning Edition is a bias for truth. My constituents tune in to KUT because they want fact-based, not faux-based, not FOX-based coverage.

Like their continued assault on PBS, these Republicans just can't tell the difference between Big Government and Big Bird. While they pander to Wall Street, they continue to want to terminate support of Sesame Street. "All Things Considered," their attack really has nothing to do with balancing the budget. It is an ideological crusade against balanced news and educational programming. Cutting access to the power of knowledge decreases our ability to hold our government accountable. Don't weaken our democracy by weakening this vital source of reality-based journalism.

Don't cut KUT. Public radio serves the public interest.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to one of our freshman Members, the gentleman from the Florida Panhandle (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. We talk about Big Bird and that sounds wonderful. We had a couple of Big Birds in my family. We have four small children, and they love Big Bird.

But I will tell you this: When the CEO of Sesame Street is compensated \$956,000 in 2008 compensation, that's over double what the leader of the free world makes. Think about that: \$956,000, when, in the same year, Sesame Street received \$211 million in toy and consumer product sales.

So to stand here and say that we have the luxury at this incredibly critical crisis moment in our deficit struggles that we have the luxury of making sure that PBS can pay Mrs. Kerger \$632,000 in salary, and that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting can pay its President and CEO \$300,000 apiece, I mean, really. Are we serious? Are we serious?

We can do better. We must do better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 3 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 6 minutes remaining.

Ms. ESHOO. At this time I would yield 1 minute to the gentleman, the great Irishman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, National Public Radio has the strongest intellectual, artistic, and informational in-depth content of any radio network in this country because its content is not compromised by corporate ownership. I love it. But I won't lose it.

It's the rural stations that depend on NPR for half their budget. They can't afford to lose this national asset, nor can the 36 million people who rely on emergency alerts from NPR in times of crisis. The commercial market won't do that because there's no profit in it. Nor can the visually and hearing-impaired afford to lose the technology NPR developed.

This has nothing to do with the deficit. It's an infinitesimal fraction of our national debt. It jeopardizes 9,000 jobs, and it distracts us from solving the real problems that this Nation faces while trying to destroy one of the primary sources of an enlightened electorate.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think that this is one of those things that's kind of what's wrong around here. Everybody says, Don't do this, don't do this; that's not much money, that's not much money. Mr. Speaker, it all adds up. And the American people have had it with the Federal Government spending money they do not have.

With that I yield 1 minute to a wonderful new Member who has joined us, the gentlewoman from Dunn, North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation.

Let us be clear: This legislation would simply prohibit direct Federal

funds—taxpayer money—from being made available to National Public Radio, or as we know it, NPR, and would prohibit public radio stations from using Federal funds to pay for their NPR dues. The bill would prohibit public radio stations from using Federal funds for the production or acquisition of programming.

I want to be very clear: I am in support of the arts. However, I do not believe that NPR has the right to public funds from our hard-earned taxpayer dollars when they receive plenty of funding from private sources. These prohibitions would not affect a local radio station's ability to use Federal funding for their operations or for the reduction of their own programming. NPR already receives direct Federal funding through the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Department of Education, Department of Commerce, and the National Endowment for the Arts. They also get a considerable amount of money from local radio stations. Why do they need more?

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 2 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 4½ minutes remaining.

Ms. ESHOO. I yield 1 minute to the brilliant, brilliant gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, NPR provides news and cultural enrichment—yes, enrichment—that adds value to the lives of millions of Americans. It reaches into all parts of our country, even into that fact-free universe where the other side seems to be living, saying that factual information is somehow a liberal bias.

We talk about the need for a well-informed public. Just this morning, we had a reminder of the benefits that NPR brings to America. Today, there was a news report on the slow progress the U.S. Army is making towards seeing that wounded soldiers get the Purple Hearts they deserve. General Chiarelli, the Army's second in command, remarked in this story that it was previous reporting by NPR that was removing the confusion and the misunderstanding that had prevented the serving soldiers from getting the Purple Heart recognition. This is good reporting. The other side seems to think that this is, that this is, this is—wait, wait, don't tell me—biased reporting.

We need NPR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield my remaining 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, a study conducted by the Center for International and Security Studies found that those who said they received most of their news from NPR

were only about one-fourth as likely to hold a demonstrably false belief about important issues relating to the Iraq war as those who primarily consumed news from our colleagues' favorite news channel. A similar study conducted last year on mainly economic issues produced similar results. Those who primarily listened to NPR were considerably less likely to hold demonstrably false beliefs.

So now our colleagues across the aisle want to pull the plug on NPR, one of the most accurate sources of demonstrably true news and information. Our colleagues want to fire the messenger. This is not a move to create jobs or save money. This is a move to save face at the expense of truth. And I believe that such a move comes at a price that we simply cannot afford to pay.

This country needs NPR. Vote against the Republican bill.

□ 1440

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I do think our colleagues across the aisle are missing the point on this. We are responsible for making certain that this fiscal house gets in order. This is just another of those steps. This bill is not about taking NPR off the air. There is nothing here that says you will take NPR off the air.

What it simply says is, if you are an affiliate station and if you want to pay NPR dues, you can't use taxpayer dollars. If you want to buy NPR programming, you cannot use taxpayer dollars for that. The taxpayers want NPR out of their pockets. Now, there is plenty of popular programming out there, and if listeners want to hear that, we are not trying to disenfranchise those listeners. Indeed, if listeners like the NPR they have, they can keep it. What we're saying is that they need to raise the money for this.

We went through the demographics for NPR: college-educated; 63 percent have full-time jobs; the average household income is upwards of \$86,000 a year. They have a list of sponsors who give over \$1 million a year to NPR. NPR, itself, has said it does not need our taxpayer funding. So this is a place that we can save some money.

Now, to those who say it is a job-killing program, may I remind you, indeed, to develop local programming, I articulated 17 different positions that are attached to creating even one radio show. Unlike some of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I fully believe there are talented people—talented writers and editors and programmers—all across this great Nation who would love to have a platform for the great ideas and the content they would like to create.

I want to encourage all of my colleagues to take a step in the right direction in getting our fiscal house in order. The time has come for us to claw back this money. The time has come for us to send a message. We need to get NPR out of the taxpayers' pockets. I encourage a "yes" vote on H.R. 1076.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to not only support National Public Radio, but to speak against a bill that is a top example of thoughtless political pandering.

The consequences of this legislation are much broader than simply defunding NPR, which provides thoughtful news broadcasts and well-known programs that are listened to by my constituents and over 27 million people nationwide. This bill will cause all locally owned public broadcasting stations across our country to lose key funding. Yes, this is a job killing bill brought forth by my Republican colleagues.

The Republican leadership wants the public to think that they're working hard to cut spending and that this legislation will help taxpayers. Let's call them out on what they're really doing: putting jobs at risk so that they can appeal to right-wing voters. This is not just pettiness—it's pure hypocrisy and goes against everything that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle supposedly stand for. Does this bill save a great deal of money? No—it doesn't do a thing to reduce the deficit. Does this bill create jobs? Absolutely not—in fact, it does the opposite. And what happened to the Republican commitment to transparency? This bill has not been available for 72 hours, breaking the Republican leadership's pledge to allow three days for the public to read legislation, and several germane amendments have been rejected.

This bill sacrifices jobs and well-loved programs to score political points. It is a waste of this Congress's time and the legislators behind it should be ashamed of themselves. I am happy to work with my colleagues toward real deficit reduction and job creation strategies. Until that happens, I urge Members to vote no against this harmful and tactless legislation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1076, a Republican bill to prohibit federal funding for National Public Radio.

Congress has been in session this year for nearly three months, and what have the American people gotten?

The House voted to repeal new patients' rights and benefits and to strengthen the rights of insurance companies.

The House voted to cut funds for education and Pell Grants at a time when we need to build up, not tear down, our educational and economic competitiveness.

The House voted to eliminate funds for Planned Parenthood, a highly regarded source for medical and health information and services for women.

The House voted to take away the rights of workers to contest workplace abuses by their employers, weaken the reporting system for workplace safety violations, and lower the wages of construction workers on federal contracts.

And now, today, the House is voting to kill the small amount of federal funding for National Public Radio, an important and unbiased source of news for tens of millions of Americans across the country.

Not one bill so far to create jobs. Not one bill so far to invest in America. Not one bill that makes it clear America will be ready to compete in the global economy and win the race to produce the best college graduates in the world.

Instead, the American people are being fed a steady diet of right-wing ideological attacks

on our rights, on our values, and on middle class economic opportunities. American families are desperate for work, but they are getting nothing but a cold shoulder from the House of Representatives under this new leadership.

The attack on NPR, just like the attack on Planned Parenthood, or on Head Start, and on workers' rights and safety, has nothing to do with reducing the deficit and the debt. It is nothing more than a partisan political agenda that is out of step with, and very dangerous to, the American people.

The attack on NPR is outrageous and it should be rejected. The American people benefit greatly having this source of news that is free from the influence and demands of corporations and that consistently delivers top quality, in-depth, and breaking news on foreign affairs, science and technology, politics, the arts, and business.

If this leadership is so concerned with the deficit, why hasn't it called up legislation to reduce tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies to major oil companies, companies with record profits quarter after quarter and no need for subsidies to carry out their work?

Why hasn't this leadership called up legislation to reduce some of the billions of dollars in Pentagon waste documented year after year?

And why was this leadership's first major action in the House a bill that would increase the deficit over the next ten years by more than \$210 billion by repealing our historic health care law?

Why? Because their rhetoric about deficit reduction is just a cover for a divisive political agenda that they hope will help them in the next election.

I strongly support eliminating wasteful government spending, and I have a long and documented track record of deficit reduction. Whether it was my successful effort to increase student loan aid by reducing taxpayer support to private lenders, or passing the health care reform law, or through my early support for Pay-As-You-Go budgeting, I have always made this a priority.

I know how hard it is to make tough choices about saving taxpayer money and being fiscally responsible.

I know it is not hard for politicians to cut Head Start, but it's really hard on low-income mothers trying to educate their children. And I know it is not hard to cut the small amount of federal funding for NPR, but it is really hard on the millions of Americans who hunger for information from a wide variety of sources.

I'll tell you what's hard to cut. It is really hard to cut land subsidies to multi-national mining companies, or royalty subsidies to oil companies, or water and price subsidies to major agricultural corporations. I know, because I have fought to make those cuts. And corporations fight back, hard.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I rise in opposition to this bill that will not reduce our deficit but will reduce the level of information Americans have about really complex and important issues facing our country. And I rise in opposition to the past three months of partisan, ideological and political attacks on the basic rights, values and services that are so important to our country.

And I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1076, which would prohibit federal funding of National Public Radio, and

I urge my colleagues to vote against this misguided bill. National Public Radio (NPR) provides an essential public service to our nation at a minimal cost to taxpayers. In Rhode Island, WRNI utilizes federal funds to provide local coverage of news events with local reporters. Without these funds, which account for nearly 8 percent of their annual budget, WRNI would lose its ability to bring local information to local communities, from the breaking news of the day to upcoming arts and cultural events.

This bill will not reduce our deficit by one penny and it will not save or create any jobs. In fact, some have estimated that 9,000 jobs will be lost due to the elimination of federal funding for NPR. In a time of unprecedented global events, from natural disasters to citizen uprisings to dramatic economic upheaval, we must ensure that people have access to accurate information, not limit it even more. Once again, I urge my colleagues to put politics aside and oppose this bill to eliminate federal funding for NPR.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1076, a bill to Prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content.

NPR is a congressionally chartered non-profit organization that provides independent and non-partisan news and education to approximately 27 million Americans each week.

This is a politically motivated bill that would hurt over 900 local radio stations across America that rely on NPR for fact based news content and the millions of Americans who listen to NPR for their daily news.

NPR enjoys very strong support from the American public as nearly 70 percent voiced their opposition to eliminating funding for public broadcasting according to recent polling.

Constituents in my home of Dallas, Texas have contacted my office by the hundreds; making phone calls, sending emails and faxes to express how important NPR is to them.

This bill will do nothing to create jobs or improve our economy. In fact, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office has stated that this bill would produce zero savings to the taxpayer, and do nothing to reduce the deficit.

Families with low incomes, families living in rural areas, and minorities would be especially hurt by this legislation.

Smaller radio stations in rural America rely on NPR more than large cities for radio content so they would be more greatly impaired by the bill's prohibition against using federal funding to local radio stations to pay for any content from any source, depriving them of hours of programming every day.

At a time when our national news is driven more and more by commercial interests and obsession with viewing ratings, it's more important than ever for Americans to have an objective and unbiased source of news and national commentary that is based on facts and reporting.

I also object to the process that the Republican Leadership has brought this bill under consideration today. The Republican Leadership have reversed themselves on their own promise to for every bill to undergo 72 hours of review.

The American people have not heard a single hearing on this bill nor have they heard a single minute of testimony from any expert witness on the merits of this bill.

Not only was this bill rushed to floor of the House without sufficient review and scrutiny by the public, but the Republican Leadership has brought this bill to the floor that prohibits any opportunity for any other Representative in this House to offer a single amendment to improve it.

This is not the way to run the people's House. This legislation is pure political posturing and is distraction from what we should be doing today, which is working to create jobs and improve our economy.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand with me today in voting "no" on this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong disapproval of H.R. 1076, which would prohibit federal funds to National Public Radio. The proposal today is a draconian attempt to kill public radio to millions of listeners across our nation who depend and cherish this essential service.

The bill would significantly impede NPR's local station in Detroit, WDET 101.9 to continue its public service. Over 150,000 listeners in southeast Michigan, northwest Ohio and our neighbors in Canada would be deprived of such great shows such as The Diane Rehm Show, Jazz Profiles hosted by my friend Nancy Wilson and many other news and cultural programs. Furthermore, WDET and other NPR stations are one of the few radio providers of local news. The station carries many diverse perspectives that strengthen the social fabric for Detroiters.

Media consolidation, for a variety of reasons, has resulted in a less progressive, less diverse, and a narrower set of viewpoints. For years, public radio has successfully been able to provide Americans with cutting edge, sophisticated, and culturally relevant news that otherwise would not be able to enjoy this much needed public service.

Today's bill jeopardizes public radio's ability to operate at an optimal level, and could result in a dramatic decrease in Americans' access to this vital medium. It is a shame that our nation's children and young people may not have the ability to listen to classical music, opera, and other intellectually stimulating broadcast that are vitally important to the intellectual and cultural of our future Americans. In short, today's vote is a needless attack on one of America's cherished institutions—public radio. I urge my colleagues to look at other ways to balance our Nation's budget that do not include cuts to education and culture.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, here the Republicans go again. I guess no one in this country, as they envision, it should ever have a different point of view than theirs. Liberty cannot be just an empty word. It certainly is not to us Democrats. We opposed the elimination of National Public Radio last year and I oppose it today.

Thinking and discerning people like to get their information from different sources and different points of view and then make their own decisions. That is what NPR provides.

The American people are smart and do not want to be spoon fed propaganda and brainwashed by any one ideology or political party.

And they support Public Broadcasting—Republicans, Democrats and Independents alike. When asked, more than two-thirds oppose the elimination of federal funding for public broadcasting as this bill would do.

This bill has nothing to do with reducing the deficit. It is an ideological battle—all about

never supporting and always wanting to get rid of public radio and public TV. Republicans are showing again that they are out of touch with the American people.

This attempt to shut down free radio is misguided and based on deliberately distorted information.

Taking funding away from national Public Radio would hurt local stations, small stations—many even in Republican districts—which depend on NPR programming to survive so that they can carry local news, events and programming and even provide the opportunity for any of us to speak to the public.

Colleagues, let's vote for Democracy. Vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, had I been able to vote on H.R. 1076, legislation that would decimate public radio in America, I would have voted "no."

National Public Radio (NPR) is one of America's most vital and trusted news sources, utilized by 27 million Americans each week. Taking away federal assistance for public radio would hurt 900 public radio stations, especially smaller stations in rural America that lack a sizable donor base.

Access to popular and informative news programming, including All Things Considered, Morning Edition, Forum, On Point, and This American Life, would be jeopardized in smaller markets. Broadly available access to informative and objective news in America would be compromised.

My office has received many calls and letters from residents throughout the 10th Congressional District, urging Congress to preserve NPR's budget. My constituents understand that public broadcasting is a critical and cost-effective American investment, and I stand with them.

H.R. 1076 harms our economy and American competitiveness. The Congressional Budget Office has determined that this legislation will have zero impact on the budget and the deficit, but it will likely destroy 9,000 jobs. Our support of public broadcasting is a tremendous bargain for the American people. At a time of increasing competition in the global economy, America's future prosperity depends on a knowledgeable workforce, and our robust democracy depends on a well-informed citizenry.

H.R. 1076 takes away vital information from the American people, and that is why I am deeply opposed to this pointless and destructive bill.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1076, which prohibits federal funding for National Public Radio (NPR) and radio content acquisition.

According to a preliminary estimate from Congressional Budget Office, this bill will produce no savings for the taxpayers and will not reduce the deficit. This is an ideologically driven piece of legislation that does nothing to reduce our deficit.

Each week, 27.2 million Americans nationwide turn to NPR to find the kind of news, music programs, and interesting entertainment they can't get elsewhere. NPR offers quality in-depth reporting, insightful commentary, and an on-air forum that allows a wide range of voices to be heard. With political rhetoric and ideological name-calling filling cable news programs, NPR's news coverage has become an essential source for people looking for the facts. This is why 8 out of 10 voters oppose cutting federal funding for public broadcasting.

In my district, Hawaii Public Radio (HPR) engages its island listeners through countless events statewide. These include the Hawaii Book and Musical Festival as well as a series of pre-performance lectures at the Hawaii Opera Theatre. HPR also embraces Native Hawaiian culture with its daily Hawaiian language newscast and the "Hawaiian Word of the Day" feature.

With the program Aloha Shorts, HPR promotes local poets and actors. HPR has even given our children an opportunity to be heard by a national audience having young musicians featured in the sold out From the Top performances, which received national broadcast. With over 400 volunteers and audiences on all islands, HPR shares the diversity of Hawaii with communities across the country.

Hawaii Public Radio is not just a radio station—it's an essential part of our island community and deserves federal support.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the importance of NPR in people's daily lives and vote against this bill.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. The legislation on the floor today, a bill to defund National Public Radio, is another example of a Republican-Tea Party agenda which kills jobs and imposes an extremist right-wing ideological agenda on the American people. This bill and debate is about titillating right wing passions and silencing public broadcasting—nothing more. It is time for listeners of public radio, viewers of public television, and all citizens who value non-commercial broadcasting to make their voices heard or some valuable radio stations and important programming will disappear.

In my state, Minnesota Public Radio is a treasured source of information and an important employer. The effects of this legislation would hurt National Public Radio, hurt Minnesota Public Radio, and Minnesotans who value this critical public media resource. Currently, public broadcasting in Minnesota receives over \$4.2 million in federal grants, and that funding is at risk as a result of this bill.

This ill-conceived and mean-spirited attack on an important non-profit employer would mean hundreds of lost jobs in Minnesota and the silencing of important public broadcasting content currently heard by tens of millions of Americans every week. Again, this is not surprising coming from a Republican-Tea Party majority that has already passed legislation that would eliminate nearly a million American jobs.

While Democrats are fighting to strengthen the economy and create jobs, the Republican-Tea Party is pursuing an agenda that kills jobs, busts unions, and rewards big corporations with taxpayer handouts. This extreme agenda is an affront to the American people and seriously diminishes the ability for bipartisan solutions to our nation's most serious challenges.

The bill is on the floor today in large part because of the exploits of a Republican operative who doubles as a muckraking dirty trickster. This faux-journalist lied to a National Public Radio executive to secure a meeting and then pieced together a deceptively-edited video of a secretly taped meeting. One media expert called the media sabotage of NPR by James O'Keefe, ". . . unethical. It's pretty scummy."

Mr. James O'Keefe, the Republican operative who deceived NPR, is most famous for

being arrested and convicted of attempting to infiltrate the office of a Democratic U.S. Senator while impersonating a telephone repairman in an attempt to eavesdrop on calls between constituents and congressional staff. Now Mr. O'Keefe's criminal and unethical behavior is being used by the Republican-Tea Party majority in the U.S. House to pass a law to defund NPR.

I guess today's legislation could be called an example of yellow policy-making based upon yellow journalism—except for the fact that any reference to journalism even in its most pejorative form in association with Mr. O'Keefe is a discredit to journalism.

Mr. O'Keefe is in better company with Republicans such as former President Richard Nixon and former House Majority Leader Tom DeLay in their efforts to embrace criminal behavior in the pursuit of political advantage.

The millions and millions of Americans who seek unbiased news, information, educational, and cultural programming should not be surprised that the Republican-Tea Party Congress and their corporate sponsors want to eliminate funding for National Public Radio. This legislation is not about deficit reduction because this bill fails to reduce the federal budget deficit by even \$1 according to the Congressional Budget Office, but it is about advancing a right-wing political agenda at NPR's expense.

This week, the Republican-Tea Party held an emergency meeting about so-called urgently needed legislation.

What was the emergency? Were we finally going to consider a jobs bill? No.

The "emergency" declared was to prohibit federal funding to go to NPR.

This bill will prevent all public radio stations from using federal funds to purchase any programming from any source. The Republican-Tea Party majority wants to take control away from our local stations, like Minnesota Public Radio. It means that local stations, across the country, will not be able to use these funds to get programming from two of the largest public radio organizations in the country—American Public Media and Public Radio International—both located in Minnesota. That means stations could not use the funds to purchase programs like the beloved "A Prairie Home Companion" and "This American Life".

Why have the Republicans brought this bill to the floor without as much as a single minute of consideration in a hearing or in committee?

This NPR "emergency" is not to help struggling families and debate a badly-needed jobs bill right before we leave on a week-long recess.

It is to consider legislation that will weaken our community. That will cost jobs in Minnesota. And all the Republican-Tea Partiers will vote for it based on the antics of a Republican operative who makes a living from lying.

I would urge Members of the U.S. House and all Americans who value journalistic integrity and valuable public media outlets, like Minnesota Public Radio, to fight against a very bad bill and the harm it would cause to our communities.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose H.R. 1076, the bill to stop federal funding for National Public Radio (NPR). The bill bars making federal funds available for: NPR; payments of dues to NPR; and the acquisition of any radio programming by or for the use of a public radio station.

Earlier this week the Republican led House passed a three week CR that contained \$50 million in cuts for NPR's parent organization, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The new House majority is looking to cut all federal funding of public radio and television stations.

Mr. Speaker, without federal funding, many public radio and TV stations, especially in rural and small communities would go off air. Prohibiting local stations from using federal funds to acquire or produce local/national programming will interfere with the operating independence fundamental to the American's public radio system.

Barring public radio stations from using federal funds to acquire public radio programming would be a huge disruption to the economic model used by public radio stations to serve audiences and to develop local programming, including local/regional news.

If this measure were to pass, New York Public Radio's own station WNYC's national morning news program, *The Takeaway*, with an audience of younger and more diverse listeners, will be in serious jeopardy. New York Public Radio produces more than 150 original hours of programming each week, including a broad range of daily news, talk and cultural and classical music programming. New York Public Radio has two million weekly listeners in NYC metropolitan region and 3 million listeners across the country.

After 11 weeks with no jobs legislation, the Republican Majority is bringing up this bill that does not create jobs or reduce the deficit. I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, while the media may focus on NPR, the federal dollars being targeted by this awful bill now go directly to local public radio stations, not to NPR.

The federal dollars received make up a small percentage of the budget for larger stations, but these dollars represent a significant percentage of budgets for local public radio stations, like KAZU and KUSP in my district. It's important to note that stations are then able to leverage those federal grants into millions of dollars in donations from listeners, corporate supporters and foundations. That's the definition of a good federal investment.

Those federal grants enable our local public radio stations to do in-depth stories on local issues important to our region—our world famous tourism events like the AT&T Pebble Beach golf tournament, the Monterey Jazz and Pops festivals, our multi-billion dollar agriculture industry or the budget crisis in California.

Unlike commercial media, local public radio employees have only one concern—to serve their audience. Public broadcasting gives voices to the smallest and most diverse communities in our country that are overlooked by commercial broadcast radio. These are the voices that will be lost if H.R. 1076 is enacted.

H.R. 1076 is an ideological attack on public broadcasting masquerading as a fiscal issue.

Without so much as a single hearing on a subject that affects 34 million Americans weekly who depend on public broadcasting for their commercial-free news and more, this legislation dismantles fifty years of quality public broadcasting and thousands of jobs because of a political bias.

I hope my colleagues will consider the impact that any cuts or elimination of the ability to buy NPR programming would have on institutions in your district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote to against H.R. 1076 which would prohibit federal funding for NPR and the use of federal funds to acquire radio content.

Today's Republican attempts to defund NPR will affect stations all across the country. In my district alone, KTSU and KPFT will have to cope with the aftermath of the Republican proposal. These two stations serve predominately poor, minority populations in my district, and the House Republicans are attempting to eliminate their opportunity to provide National Public Radio to their listeners. If this bill were to become law, radio stations in my district would no longer qualify to receive over \$743,000 in Corporation for Public Broadcasting grants, and prohibiting the use of these funds to purchase popular NPR programming will make it difficult for stations to attract local listeners and raise funds for the production of local content and station operations. Hundreds of stations rely on public broadcasting funding as a major source of funding, especially rural and minority stations.

Some people in my district exclusively listen to these stations. These two stations in Houston and hundreds across the country do not have the money to compete with big corporate stations, and they cannot compete with conservative talk shows because they do not spew out biased, partisan, uncomplimentary, critical messages. They are just reporting the news and bringing it from all over the world.

Further, I think it is shameless that once again the Republicans have violated their so called promises of transparent government by refusing to allow this bill to go through normal committee processes. There have been no hearings or expert testimony for Members to review. There has only been politically charged rhetoric and lies about the impact of public radio.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot believe we are focusing on this right now. At a time when millions are out of work, people are looking for jobs, and trying to get back on their feet, why is this body focused on NPR, of all things? Is this really the best we can do?

For a minute, let's put aside the fact that national public radio is a part of our tradition as a country and provides quality programming to millions of listeners in urban, suburban and rural America. Let's put aside for a minute that funding for NPR is but a drop in the bucket compared to the giveaways and budget busting tax breaks Republicans support for Big Oil companies.

Here we are, eleven weeks into a new Congress—still putting politics over policy. Make no mistake about it, cuts to NPR will not solve our budget crisis and it will not create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we can and we must do better. This body should be focusing on jobs. Plain and simple. Instead we are focused on defunding NPR. I urge a no vote.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my strong opposition to HR 1076, a bill to eliminate federal funding for NPR and prohibit local public radio stations from using federal funds to acquire programming content.

Mr. Speaker, National Public Radio provides 27 million Americans with access to high-quality, non-commercial programming every week. In many cases, NPR's network of 900 local public radio stations is the only way Americans can access this kind of news and information. For that reason, public opinion polls

routinely show large majorities of American in support of federal funding for NPR—and that breadth of support is consistently strong across the political spectrum.

So what are we doing here today? Creating jobs? Exactly the opposite. Enactment of this bill would endanger 9000 jobs at local public radio stations in communities across the country. Reducing the deficit? Hardly. CBO says this bill produces no savings. Honoring the majority's commitment to 72 hours notice and transparent governance? Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced on Tuesday and is now being rushed to the floor 48 hours later without a single hearing.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the people's business, and it is no way to run this House. It won't create a single job. It doesn't reduce the deficit. The American people haven't asked for it, and they don't want it.

I urge a "no" vote.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker I rise today to express the voices of the hundreds of people flooding my offices with calls and emails to plead for us to do the right thing and vote down this misguided legislation.

H.R. 1076 would cripple the public radio system in this country that currently provides vital news and information to over 27 million Americans each week.

I would first like to set the record straight—this bill will not save a single taxpayer dollar. Not one. And it will not reduce our federal deficit by one dime. Not one.

My colleague from Colorado and his leadership have tried to portray this bill as a savings to taxpayers—and with all due respect, that is simply untrue.

This bill is no more than a punitive measure reflecting an extreme agenda.

It would devastate 900 public radio stations across the country unfairly targeting smaller stations in rural and regional areas where there are fewer news outlets and where broadband is insufficient.

The bill threatens almost 9,000 jobs in the broadcasting community and, frankly is an unwarranted attack on the content of public radio.

And the ultimate agenda of my Republican colleagues is laid bare when one considers that the Leadership rushed this bill through, ignoring promises to take legislation through regular order, and in short, breaking all their own professed rules to get this legislation to the Floor.

Mr. Speaker, we've now been in session for 11 weeks, and the Republican leadership has not yet introduced a single bill to create jobs.

They've instead focused on advancing an extreme agenda that does nothing to get Americans back to work.

And today, rather than coming together to create jobs for the American people and address the fiscal situation squarely before us, we are spending our time debating and voting on a bill that is nothing more than social commentary in action to impugn one of our nation's most vital news sources.

When we began our session, we all proudly read from the Constitution, and in that process were reminded of our core values as a nation and a government.

One of those values is reflected in the First Amendment which supports the ability of Americans to access news and information through a free press.

Sadly Mr. Speaker, this bill would ultimately limit vital news coverage millions of Americans so desperately need.



So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this damaging and unwarranted bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today, on March 17, 2011, the House will consider H.R. 1076, to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content. Unfortunately, I have a prior commitment that will prevent me from taking this vote. However, I feel strongly about this issue and I wanted to make those feelings known.

According to people that I have met with at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), a public radio or broadcasting station is considered critically dependent on federal funding if thirty percent or more of its funding comes from federal funding. There are twenty-six National Public Radio (NPR) stations in Alaska and nearly half of them are critically dependent on federal funding. These stations serve cities, like KUAC in Fairbanks and KSKA in Anchorage. They serve salmon runs, like KDLL in Kenai and KDLG in Dillingham. The even serve places that are seemingly at the end of the world, like KHUB on St. Paul Island and KBRW in Barrow. In many cases, these radio stations are the ONLY broadcast signal that many Alaskans get. To deny them access to basic news, early childhood education programming, and even emergency alerts, merely to serve a political agenda, is irresponsible.

I must, first and foremost, consider what is best for Alaska. When 11 NPR stations in Alaska would have to close their doors to the public if this bill becomes law, I must stand up for all Alaskans. As Alaska's lone voice in the House of Representatives for the last four decades, I am proud to support NPR.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of swift U.S. troop withdrawal from Afghanistan. This decade-long war is costing our country tens of hundreds of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars. In 2010 alone, nearly 500 brave American men and women lost their lives, which is 63% more than the 2009 death toll. And as I speak, our government, which has vowed to reduce the deficit, has sent millions more overseas for a war with no foreseeable end. From 2008 to 2011, overall government spending has increased by 9%, while funding for the war in Afghanistan has increased by a startling 25%. As many of my colleagues demand \$100 billion budget cuts, they need look no further than our reckless war spending. For the good of our troops and the health of our economy, this war must end.

And this viewpoint is shared across the nation. According to a recent Washington Post poll, nearly two-thirds of the American people support an immediate withdrawal from Afghanistan. Mr. Speaker, our job in this chamber is to represent our constituents, and they have spoken loud and clear. The American people are fed up with a war that has done little to improve our national security or bolster our international standing. Furthermore, after nearly ten years of fighting, it is crystal clear that the problem in Afghanistan cannot be solved by military means alone. Stabilization and reconstruction, governance, and peace-building activities can help to stabilize states, promote rule of law, and bring enduring peace at a sliver of the cost we pay for troops on the ground.

Make no mistake about it: I firmly support our men and women in uniform. For this reason, we must bring them home from a battlefield with no real hope of military victory. I

thank my colleague, Mr. KUCINICH from Ohio, for re-introducing this Resolution. I was proud to cosponsor it in the last Congress, and I will firmly offer my support today in hopes that we can finally end this war.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1076, a bill to prohibit federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of federal funds to acquire radio content. Our constituents sent us to Congress to address the economy and jobs, and to date we've only considered legislation to cut jobs and cut investment in our local communities. CBO projects this bill will have \$0 impact on the deficit, and this bill represents nothing more than an attack on news and programming that is valuable to 34 million Americans, and a further attack on American jobs.

National Public Radio programming provides a breath of “Fresh Air” in a toxic media environment, and this bill would threaten the ability of Iowa Public Radio in my home state to continue to provide access to that content. By prohibiting funding use on national programming, Iowa Public Radio expects to see a reduction in corporate underwriting and other fundraising, fundamentally impacting their ability to operate.

I'm proud to be a long time listener of Iowa Public Radio. This Iowa treasure provides access to valuable national content like Morning Edition, All Things Considered, Prairie Home Companion and Car Talk, and local programming like The Exchange covering current events and news from across the political spectrum, and programs that highlight the arts in Iowa communities like Orchestra Iowa in Cedar Falls. This bill would jeopardize this valuable source of non-partisan news and entertainment to fulfill a political vendetta.

“All Things considered,” Mr. Speaker, we need to address the deficit, but this bill does nothing to solve our problems. The CBO projects this bill will save the taxpayers nothing, and threatens 9000 jobs across the country. I know National Public Radio is a constant companion in my home, just as it is across the nation, and I have heard loud and clear from my constituents, do not cut funding for NPR.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 174, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. SUTTON. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Sutton moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1076, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 2, after line 24, insert the following:

(3) AMBER ALERTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, nothing in this Act shall limit the eligibility of an organization described in subsection (a)(1) or an entity that makes a payment described in subsection (a)(2) to receive Federal funds to broadcast or otherwise disseminate alerts issued by the AMBER Alert communications network regarding abducted children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, there are many times when we come to this floor and engage in heated debate, and we have heard some heated debate on the bill before us; but in this moment, Mr. Speaker, my amendment offers us the opportunity to come together and to do something extraordinarily important, and that is to protect our children.

I happen to oppose the underlying bill, but regardless of how one feels about the underlying legislation, this amendment is something upon which we can all agree. Nothing is more precious, more valuable than our children, and when a child goes missing in a community, no one asks whether he or she is a Republican or a Democrat. We simply ask: How can we help find the child and return him safely home? When the unthinkable happens, we all seek in common purpose to do all that we can to ensure a successful outcome, and it is in pursuit of that successful outcome that this amendment is offered today.

This amendment will ensure that, when a child goes missing, every resource available to find that child and to return him or her to safety will be utilized, including NPR's satellite. We all know that, when a child is abducted, a rapid and coordinated response can make a life-and-death difference. This amendment will make sure that we do not undermine the AMBER Alert System that has been effectively used to recover missing children.

The AMBER Alert System was created after Amber Hagerman, a 9-year-old girl from Arlington, Texas, was abducted while riding her bicycle and then was brutally murdered in 1996. Her kidnapping and murder still remain unsolved. Amber's tragic story led to a partnership between broadcasters and police to develop an early warning system to help find abducted children. Named in Amber's memory, it stands for “America's Missing: Broadcasting Emergency Response.” The AMBER Alert program began as a local effort in Texas, and it has since grown into a successful national program, saving hundreds of lives of children.

Today, all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands have AMBER Alert plans. The AMBER Alert program instantly galvanizes the entire community to assist in the search for and in the safe recovery of an abducted child. Since its inception, the AMBER Alert has helped to find and successfully recover 538 children nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, we go to great lengths to protect our children from sexual predators and abductors—and rightfully so. We talk to them about keeping themselves safe. We teach them how to recognize and how to avoid dangerous situations, and we talk to them about making smart decisions. Today, we have the chance to make a decision to ensure that, regardless of how we feel about the underlying bill, we will not undermine the effectiveness of our AMBER Alert network system.

NPR is designated as a disseminator of AMBER Alerts via arrangements with the Department of Justice and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The deployment of next-generation emergency alert systems is in progress, and NPR is positioned to play a vital, necessary role with its satellite-based capabilities.

Recklessly eliminating funding critical to the effective functioning of the AMBER Alert System would be a tragic mistake. Children of every age, gender and race are vulnerable to child abduction, and when it happens, time is the enemy. Communities must mobilize quickly.

The widespread use of the AMBER Alert network is the Nation's most powerful tool for bringing abducted children home. AMBER Alerts also serve as deterrents to those who would prey upon our children. AMBER Alert cases demonstrate that some perpetrators release the abducted children after hearing the AMBER Alerts on the radio or seeing them on television.

In my hometown of Copley, Ohio, a 1-year-old little girl was taken by her father after a domestic fight grew violent. The father, known to have a drug problem, took the young girl from her home and drove erratically off with her in a car. An AMBER Alert was issued, and because of the continued press coverage, the man made the decision to return his daughter. Thankfully, she was brought to safety.

Let's be clear. The passage of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If the amendment is adopted, it will be incorporated into the bill, and the bill will be immediately voted upon. So, though we may disagree on the bill, today we have the opportunity to speak with one voice to protect our children. It is up to us. I urge everyone to vote "yes" on this final amendment.

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

□ 1450

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think we all agree that this Nation's children, our children and our grandchildren are an incredibly important part of our lives and protecting those children, protecting their future.

We all agree that it is important that we put this Nation on a firm fiscal footing. Now, while we all heartily support the AMBER Alert program, we also know there is nothing in the H.R. 1076 that would prohibit the AMBER Alert program. What we also know is that this is a procedural move by the minority to try to derail the funding to NPR.

As I said, as we talked about the bill, it is imperative that we be good stewards of the taxpayers' money, that we get this fiscal house in order. It is time to get NPR out of the taxpayers' pocket. The underlying bill does that.

I encourage a "no" vote on the motion to recommit. I encourage an "aye" vote on H.R. 1076.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit H.R. 1076 will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 1076, if ordered; and adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 28.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 235, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—184

Ackerman	Cuellar	Johnson (GA)
Altmire	Cummings	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews	Davis (CA)	Kaptur
Baca	Davis (IL)	Keating
Baldwin	DeFazio	Kildee
Barrow	DeGette	Kind
Bass (CA)	DeLauro	Kissell
Becerra	Deutch	Kucinich
Berkley	Dicks	Langevin
Berman	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Larsen (CT)
Bishop (NY)	Donnelly (IN)	Lee (CA)
Blumenauer	Doyle	Levin
Boren	Edwards	Lewis (GA)
Boswell	Ellison	Lipinski
Brady (PA)	Engel	Loeb
Braley (IA)	Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe
Brown (FL)	Farr	Lowe
Butterfield	Fattah	Lujan
Capps	Filner	Lynch
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Maloney
Cardoza	Gonzalez	Markey
Carnahan	Green, Al	Matheson
Carney	Green, Gene	Matsui
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)
Castor (FL)	Gutierrez	McCollum
Chandler	Hanabusa	McDermott
Chu	Hastings (FL)	McGovern
Cicilline	Heinrich	McIntyre
Clarke (MI)	Higgins	McNerney
Clarke (NY)	Himes	Meeks
Clay	Hinche	Michaud
Cleaver	Hirono	Miller (NC)
Clyburn	Holden	Miller, George
Connolly (VA)	Holt	Moran
Conyers	Honda	Murphy (CT)
Cooper	Hoyer	Napolitano
Costa	Insee	Neal
Costello	Israel	Olver
Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Critz	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Crowley	(TX)	Pascarell

Pastor (AZ)	Ryan (OH)	Sutton
Payne	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (CA)
Pelosi	T.	Thompson (MS)
Perlmutter	Sanchez, Loretta	Tierney
Peters	Sarbanes	Tonko
Peterson	Schakowsky	Towns
Pingree (ME)	Schiff	Tsongas
Polis	Schrader	Van Hollen
Price (NC)	Schwartz	Velázquez
Quigley	Scott (VA)	Vislosky
Rahall	Scott, David	Walz (MN)
Rangel	Serrano	Waters
Reyes	Sewell	Watt
Richardson	Sherman	Waxman
Richmond	Shuler	Weiner
Ross (AR)	Sires	Welch
Rothman (NJ)	Slaughter	Wilson (FL)
Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Woolsey
Ruppersberger	Speier	Wu
Rush	Stark	Yarmuth

NAYS—235

Adams	Gibbs	Myrick
Aderholt	Gibson	Neugebauer
Akin	Goodlatte	Noem
Alexander	Gosar	Nugent
Amash	Gowdy	Nunes
Austria	Granger	Nunnelee
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Olson
Bachus	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Barletta	Griffin (AR)	Paul
Bartlett	Griffith (VA)	Paulsen
Barton (TX)	Grimm	Pearce
Bass (NH)	Guinta	Pence
Benishke	Guthrie	Petri
Berg	Hall	Pitts
Biggart	Hanna	Platts
Bilbray	Harper	Poe (TX)
Bilirakis	Harris	Pompeo
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Posey
Black	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Hayworth	Quayle
Bonner	Heck	Reed
Bono Mack	Heller	Rehberg
Boustany	Hensarling	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Herger	Renacci
Brooks	Herrera Beutler	Ribble
Broun (GA)	Huelskamp	Rigell
Buchanan	Huizenga (MI)	Rivera
Bucshon	Hultgren	Roby
Buerkle	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Burgess	Hurt	Rogers (AL)
Burton (IN)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Camp	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Campbell	Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Canseco	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Cantor	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Capito	Kelly	Roskam
Carter	King (IA)	Ross (FL)
Cassidy	King (NY)	Royce
Chabot	Kingston	Runyan
Chaffetz	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Coble	Klaine	Scalise
Coffman (CO)	Lamborn	Schilling
Cole	Lance	Schmidt
Conaway	Landry	Schock
Cravaack	Lankford	Schweikert
Crawford	Latham	Scott (SC)
Crenshaw	LaTourette	Scott, Austin
Culberson	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Sessions
Denham	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Dent	Long	Shuster
DesJarlais	Lucas	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Dold	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (TX)
Duffy	E.	Southerland
Duncan (SC)	Mack	Stearns
Duncan (TN)	Manzullo	Stivers
Ellmers	Marchant	Stutzman
Emerson	Marino	Sullivan
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Fincher	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Thornberry
Flake	McCotter	Tiberi
Fleischmann	McHenry	Tipton
Fleming	McKeon	Turner
Flores	McKinley	Upton
Forbes	McMorris	Walberg
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Walden
Fox	Meehan	Walsh (IL)
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Webster
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	West
Gallegly	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Gardner	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Garrett	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Wittman

Wolf Woodall Young (FL)  
Womack Yoder Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Cohen Gohmert Nadler  
Fudge Hinojosa Wasserman  
Garamendi Jordan Schultz  
Giffords Labrador Young (AK)  
Gingrey (GA) Moore

□ 1515

Messrs. DESJARLAIS and JOHNSON of Illinois changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 192, answered “present” 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

AYES—228

Adams Dold Jenkins  
Aderholt Dreier Johnson (IL)  
Akin Duncan (SC) Johnson (OH)  
Alexander Duncan (TN) Johnson, Sam  
Austria Ellmers Jones  
Bachmann Emerson Kelly  
Bachus Farenthold King (IA)  
Barletta Fincher King (NY)  
Bartlett Fitzpatrick Kingston  
Barton (TX) Flake Kinzinger (IL)  
Bass (NH) Fleischmann Kline  
Benishek Fleming Lamborn  
Berg Flores Lance  
Biggert Forbes Landry  
Bilbray Fortenberry Lankford  
Bilirakis Foxx Latham  
Bishop (UT) Franks (AZ) Latta  
Black Frelinghuysen Lewis (CA)  
Blackburn Gallegly LoBiondo  
Bonner Gardner Long  
Bono Mack Garrett Lucas  
Boustany Gerlach Luetkemeyer  
Brady (TX) Gibbs Lummis  
Brooks Gingrey (GA) Lungren, Daniel  
Broun (GA) Gohmert E.  
Buchanan Goodlatte Mack  
Bucshon Gosar Manzullo  
Buerkle Gowdy Marchant  
Burgess Granger Marino  
Burton (IN) Graves (GA) McCarthy (CA)  
Calvert Graves (MO) McCaul  
Camp Griffin (AR) McClintock  
Campbell Griffith (VA) McCotter  
Cansco Grimm McHenry  
Cantor Guinta McKeon  
Capito Guthrie McKinley  
Carter Hall McMorris  
Cassidy Harper Rodgers  
Chabot Harris Meehan  
Chaffetz Hartzler Mica  
Coble Hastings (WA) Miller (FL)  
Coffman (CO) Hayworth Miller (MI)  
Cole Heck Miller, Gary  
Conaway Heller Mulvaney  
Cravaack Hensarling Murphy (PA)  
Crawford Herger Farr  
Crenshaw Herrera Beutler Neugebauer  
Culberson Huelskamp Noem  
Davis (KY) Huizenga (MI) Nugent  
Denham Hultgren Nunes  
Dent Hunter Nunnelee  
DesJarlais Hurt Olson  
Diaz-Balart Issa Palazzo

Paul Paulsen  
Pearce  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita

NOES—192

Ackerman  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Caroza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Duffy  
Edwards  
Elison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Gibson

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Amash

Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stearns

Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchev  
Hirono  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
LaTourette  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loebsack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Luján  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McMorris  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oliver  
Owens  
Pallone

NOT VOTING—11

Cohen Hinojosa Pence  
Fudge Jordan Wasserman  
Garamendi Labrador Schultz  
Giffords Nadler Young (AK)

□ 1524

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AFGHANISTAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 28) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 93, nays 321, answered “present” 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—93

Baldwin Inslee Quigley  
Bass (CA) Jackson (IL) Rangel  
Campbell Jackson Lee Richardson  
Capuano (TX) Richmond  
Chaffetz Johnson (IL) Rohrabacher  
Chu Johnson, E. B. Rush  
Cicilline Jones Sánchez, Linda  
Clarke (MI) Keating T.  
Clarke (NY) Kucinich Sanchez, Loretta  
Clay Larson (CT) Schakowsky  
Cleaver Lee (CA) Serrano  
Coble Lewis (GA) Shuler  
Conyers Lofgren, Zoe Slaughter  
Costello Maloney Speier  
Crowley Markey Stark  
Davis (IL) Matsui Thompson (CA)  
DeFazio McDermott Thompson (MS)  
DeGette McGovern Tierney  
Doyle McNeerney Tonko  
Duncan (TN) Michaud Tonko  
Edwards Miller, George Towns  
Ellison Moore Velázquez  
Eshoo Moran Visclosky  
Farr Napolitano Waters  
Filner Neal Watt  
Frank (MA) Olver Waxman  
Grijalva Pallone Weiner  
Gutierrez Pastor (AZ) Welch  
Hastings (FL) Paul Wilson (FL)  
Hinchev Payne Woolsey  
Holt Pingree (ME) Yarmuth  
Honda Polis

NAYS—321

Ackerman  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Camp  
Cansco  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart

Carney	Himes	Pitts
Carson (IN)	Hirono	Platts
Carter	Holden	Poe (TX)
Cassidy	Hoyer	Pompeo
Castor (FL)	Huelskamp	Posey
Chabot	Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)
Chandler	Hultgren	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Hunter	Quayle
Coffman (CO)	Hurt	Rahall
Cole	Israel	Reed
Conaway	Issa	Rehberg
Connolly (VA)	Jenkins	Reichert
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Renacci
Costa	Johnson (OH)	Reyes
Courtney	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Cravaack	Kaptur	Rigell
Crawford	Kelly	Rivera
Crenshaw	Kildee	Roby
Critz	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Cuellar	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Culberson	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Cummings	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Davis (CA)	Kissell	Rooney
Davis (KY)	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen
DeLauro	Lamborn	Roskam
Denham	Lance	Ross (AR)
Dent	Landry	Ross (FL)
DesJarlais	Langevin	Rothman (NJ)
Deutch	Lankford	Roybal-Allard
Diaz-Balart	Larsen (WA)	Royce
Dicks	Latham	Runyan
Dingell	LaTourrette	Ruppersberger
Doggett	Latta	Ryan (OH)
Donnelly (IN)	Levin	Ryan (WI)
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Sarbanes
Duffy	Lipinski	Scalise
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Schiff
Ellmers	Loeback	Schilling
Emerson	Long	Schmidt
Engel	Lowe	Schock
Farenthold	Lucas	Schrader
Fattah	Luetkemeyer	Schwartz
Fincher	Luján	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Flake	Lungren, Daniel	Scott (VA)
Fleischmann	E.	Scott, Austin
Fleming	Lynch	Scott, David
Flores	Mack	Sensenbrenner
Forbes	Manzullo	Sessions
Fortenberry	Marino	Sewell
Fox	Matheson	Sherman
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (NY)	Shuster
Galleghy	McCaul	Simpson
Garner	McClintock	Sires
Garrett	McCollum	Smith (NE)
Gerlach	McCotter	Smith (NJ)
Gibbs	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Gibson	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
Gingrey (GA)	McKeon	Southerland
Gohmert	McKinley	Stearns
Gonzalez	McMorris	Stivers
Goodlatte	Rodgers	Stutzman
Gosar	Meehan	Sutton
Gowdy	Meeks	Terry
Granger	Mica	Thompson (PA)
Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Graves (MO)	Miller (MI)	Tiberi
Green, Al	Miller (NC)	Tipton
Green, Gene	Mulvaney	Turner
Griffin (AR)	Murphy (CT)	Upton
Griffith (VA)	Murphy (PA)	Van Hollen
Grimm	Myrick	Walberg
Guinta	Neugebauer	Walden
Guthrie	Noem	Walsh (IL)
Hall	Nugent	Walz (MN)
Hanabusa	Nunes	Webster
Hanna	Nunnelee	West
Harper	Olson	Westmoreland
Harris	Owens	Whitfield
Hartzler	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)
Hastings (WA)	Pascrell	Wittman
Hayworth	Paulsen	Wolf
Heck	Pearce	Womack
Heinrich	Pelosi	Woodall
Heller	Perlmutter	Wu
Hensarling	Peters	Yoder
Hergert	Peterson	Young (FL)
Herrera Beutler	Petri	Young (IN)
Higgins		

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amash

## NOT VOTING—17

Baca	Garamendi	Labrador
Cohen	Giffords	Marchant
Dold	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Fudge	Jordan	

Nadler	Sullivan	Young (AK)
Pence	Wasserman	
Rokita	Schultz	

□ 1530

So the concurrent resolution was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 193, Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

COMMEMORATING BRAIN  
AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Brain Awareness Week and to highlight the progress scientists are making to better understand the brain and brain-based illnesses that impact millions of Americans. Such illnesses include multiple sclerosis, autism and a disease that affects my family personally, Alzheimer's disease.

During Brain Awareness Week, scientists work to educate students and the public about the work that they do to unravel the mysteries of the brain and how their work can result in treatments for many brain-related illnesses.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that during this upcoming constituent workweek, I will join students from Shawnee High School in Medford Township, New Jersey, as they recognize Brain Awareness Week during their sixth annual Brain Day. I applaud the students at Shawnee High School, along with scientists engaged in this important work. Their hard work is key to finding future treatments that we need desperately.

SUPPORTING A NO-FLY ZONE  
OVER LIBYA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, while we are here in the United States, and I am privileged and honored that we are comforted by our flag, our values, and the fact that we can live in peace and security, Mr. Speaker, there are those who are fighting for freedom all over the world, but in this instance in the Mideast, and they are dying as we speak.

We had the uprising in Egypt and Yemen and Bahrain. Bahrain is moving people out of the streets. But then you move to Libya and people are dying.

Today I stood with a mother who lives in the United States, and her Libyan American son, who was born here, is lost in Libya. At first she thought he was dead, but she is looking to see whether or not there is news that he was only wounded. Even so, he was not in battle. He was providing food to

those who needed the food, and yet he was brought down.

It is important that we not enter a war, but that we create with our allies a no-fly zone. Otherwise, Qaddafi is going to slaughter the people of Libya. Where is our heart? Where is our compassion?

As we seek to bring our heroic soldiers home from Afghanistan who have fought for peace and freedom, let us not forget those who stand unarmed almost in their civilian clothes fighting against tyranny. We must have a no-fly zone. We cannot tolerate the slaughter. We must stand for peace.

NEW YORK TIMES JOURNALISTS  
DISAPPEAR

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the first casualty of war is the truth. In war, the way information reaches the people is through the messengers of truth, a free and independent press.

One way to hide the truth in Qaddafi's war is for the dictator to prohibit the media from finding out the facts, from finding out the truth. So it should come as no surprise that four New York Times journalists covering the war have disappeared in Libya, presumably captured by Omar's troops. They are Anthony Shadid, Stephen Farrell, Tyler Hicks, and Lynsey Addario, all veteran journalists and photographers that have covered other world conflicts.

More than 300 other journalists have been attacked during the recent turmoil in the region, and four have been killed. Last year, 57 journalists were murdered worldwide.

Journalists are the eyes and ears for the world, so when they are assaulted, kidnapped, harassed, censored, or murdered by dictators, those actions are a direct attack on truth and human freedom.

And that's just the way it is.

CALLING FOR A NO-FLY ZONE IN  
LIBYA

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for a no-fly zone in Libya. I don't think that the United States should do it ourselves, but I think in conjunction with our European allies, the European Union, and the Arab League, we should do it. The Arab League called for a no-fly zone, so it certainly would not be interpreted as if we were doing something unilaterally.

But I would like to take it one step further. We have been selling to our Arab allies multiple planes and weapons for years and years and years, and I certainly think if there is a no-fly zone, the Arab nations which called on

us to support a no-fly zone ought to participate with us in terms of making sure that no-fly zone is sustainable.

We cannot sit by and allow Qaddafi to kill more and more innocent people in a bloodbath, to use the power, air power, of his force to massacre civilians. We cannot allow that.

So I think the time is now. We can't keep waiting, because if we wait, it will be too long and the bloodbath will have already occurred. I think the time for action is now. Let's do it in conjunction with the EU and the Arab League.

□ 1540

#### SUPPORTING PUBLIC RADIO

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I'm standing here opposing the action taken by this House today and urging the Senate to allow the valued listeners of Metro Detroit's WDET to hear the best quality national programming, and here's why. What happens around the world impacts the quality of life of people living in Metro Detroit. The valiant listeners of Detroit's WDET deserve to hear this news and this programming.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes.

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution providing for the acceptance of a statue of Gerald R. Ford from the people of Michigan for placement in the United States Capitol.

#### END THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. KUCINICH. March 20, 2003, 8 years ago, the United States launched a full-scale attack on Iraq. Many of us remember watching the images of shock and awe as violence was wreaked against the people of Iraq and, in particular, the city of Baghdad. That moment at which America arrived to express its military might had antecedents that we should study this evening.

I want to review, Mr. Speaker, the climate that was created for this Congress that caused this Congress to make a decision back in October of 2002 to go to war against Iraq—a war that was executed beginning March 20, 2003.

It was 9 years ago to this date that Vice President Cheney said the fol-

lowing of Iraq: "We know they have biological and chemical weapons." That was March 17, 2002.

On March 19, 2002, Vice President Cheney said: "And we know they are pursuing nuclear weapons."

On March 24, 2002, Vice President Cheney said of Saddam Hussein: "He is actively pursuing nuclear weapons at this time."

Later, on May 19, 2002: "We know he's got chemicals and biological and we know he's working on nuclear." That was Vice President Cheney on "Meet the Press."

August 26, 2002, speaking to the VFW's convention, Vice President Cheney said: "Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction. There is no doubt that he is amassing them to use against our friends, against our allies, and against us."

September 8, 2002, again, on NBC's "Meet the Press," Vice President Cheney said this: "Based on intelligence that's becoming available, some of it has been made public, more of it hopefully will be, that he has indeed"—he's speaking of Saddam Hussein—"he has indeed stepped up his capacity to produce and deliver biological weapons; that he has reconstituted his nuclear program to develop a nuclear weapon; that there are efforts underway inside Iraq to significantly expand his capability."

On September 8, 2002, on "Meet the Press," Vice President Cheney went on to say of Hussein: "He is in fact actively and aggressively seeking to acquire nuclear weapons."

March 16, 2003, a few days before the attack: "And we believe he has in fact reconstituted nuclear weapons."

I mention this, Mr. Speaker, because, for those Members who were not in the House of Representatives at the time of the October debate and at the time that the attack commenced and for those who are just citizens watching these events unfold, there was created in this country a climate of belief, a certainty, as to the grave peril which Saddam Hussein of Iraq was alleged to represent. That was the Vice President.

Now, the President, in various appearances and statements and in the legislation he presented to this Congress, the President made the following material representations with respect to Iraq. He said that Iraq was continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability. He said that Iraq was actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability; that Iraq was continuing to threaten the national security interests of the United States and international peace and security; that Iraq had demonstrated a willingness to attack the United States; that members of al Qaeda, an international organization bearing responsibility for attacks on the United States, its citizens, and interests, including the attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, are known to be in Iraq. That attacks on

the United States of September 11, 2001, underscored the gravity of the threat that Iraq will transfer weapons of mass destruction to international terrorist organizations.

President George W. Bush represented to this Congress that Iraq will either employ those weapons to launch a surprise attack against the United States or its Armed Forces or provide them through international terrorists who would do so; that an extreme magnitude of harm would result to the United States and its citizens from such an attack; and that the aforementioned threats justified action by the United States to defend itself.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation as a Nation to defend ourselves. To provide for common defense is one of the foundational principles of this country in the preamble to our Constitution. Those who are charged with the responsibility of guiding the affairs of our Nation, the President and the Vice President—in this case, President Bush, Vice President Cheney—had a responsibility to be totally clear and honest with the American people. It is to their shame that they were neither honest nor candid with the American people and with this Congress.

Here we are on the eighth anniversary of the attack on Iraq. And I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be instructive for this Congress to have the opportunity to review what it is we were told in early October of 2002, when we voted as a Congress to authorize the President to take action against Iraq, action which commenced 8 years ago. Listen to some of these claims that were made. I will state the claims that were made and then I will rebut them.

□ 1550

We were told that, in 1990, in response to Iraq's war of aggression against an illegal occupation of Kuwait, the United States forged a coalition of nations to liberate Kuwait and its people in order to defend the national security of the United States and enforce United Nations Security Council resolutions relating to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that was said then at that time in response: I pointed out that, in the Persian Gulf War, there was an international coalition. World support was for protecting Kuwait. There was no world support for invading Iraq.

The resolution that President Bush submitted to this Congress which resulted in the invasion of Iraq 8 years ago said: Whereas, after the liberation of Kuwait in 1991, Iraq entered into a United Nations-sponsored cease fire agreement, pursuant to which Iraq unequivocally agreed, among other things, to eliminate its nuclear, biological, chemical weapons programs and the means to deliver and develop them and to end its support for international terrorism;

Whereas, the efforts of international weapons inspectors, United States intelligence agencies, and Iraqi defectors

led to the discovery that Iraq had large stockpiles of chemical weapons and a large-scale biological weapons program and that Iraq had an advanced nuclear weapons development program that was much closer to producing a nuclear weapon than intelligence previously had indicated.

In advance of any attack, to answer what the President was saying, I pointed out more than 8 years ago: U.N. inspection teams identified and destroyed nearly all such weapons that President Bush referred to in his resolution. A lead inspector, Scott Ritter, said that he believes that nearly all other weapons not found were destroyed in the gulf war. Furthermore, according to a published report in *The Washington Post*, the Central Intelligence Agency had no up-to-date accurate report on Iraq's WMD capabilities.

The President said: Whereas, Iraq, in direct and flagrant violation of the cease fire, attempted to thwart the efforts of weapons inspectors, to identify and destroy Iraq's weapons of mass destruction stockpiles and development capabilities, which finally resulted in the withdrawal of inspectors from Iraq on October 31, 1998.

I pointed out back then, more than 8 years ago, that Iraqi deceptions always failed. Inspectors always figured out what Iraq was doing. It was the United States that withdrew from the inspections in 1998. The United States then launched a cruise missile attack against Iraq 48 hours after the inspectors left. In advance of a military strike, the U.S. continued to thwart the weapons inspections.

President Bush went on to tell this Congress: Whereas, in 1998, Congress concluded that Iraq's continuing weapons of mass destruction program threatened vital U.S. interests and international peace and security. It declared Iraq to be in "material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations," and urged the President to take appropriate action in accordance with the Constitution and relevant laws of the United States to bring Iraq into compliance with international obligations.

The President went on to assert to this Congress: Whereas, Iraq both possesses a continuing threat to the national security of the United States and international peace and security in the Persian Gulf, and remains in material and unacceptable breach of international obligations by, among other things, continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability, and supporting and harboring terrorists.

It was pointed out back then, Mr. Speaker, that there was absolutely no proof that Iraq represented an immediate or imminent threat to the United States. A continuing threat does not constitute a sufficient cause for war. The administration refused to provide Congress with credible intelligence

that proved that Iraq was a serious threat to the United States and was continuing to possess and develop chemical and biological nuclear weapons; and there was no credible intelligence connecting Iraq to al Qaeda in 9/11. Iraq didn't have anything to do with 9/11. Iraq had nothing to do with al Qaeda's role in 9/11.

The President went on to assert to this Congress in the resolution which was a call to war against Iraq that Iraq persists in violating resolutions of the United Nations Security Council by continuing to engage in the brutal repression of its civilian population, thereby threatening international peace and security in the region by refusing to release, repatriate or account for non-Iraqi citizens wrongfully detained by Iraq, including an American serviceman, and by failing to return property wrongfully seized by Iraq from Kuwait.

It was said at the time that the language of this resolution was so broad that it would allow the President to attack Iraq even when there was no material threat to the United States. The resolution authorized the use of force for all Iraq-related violations of U.N. Security Council directives, and the resolution cited Iraq's imprisonment of non-Iraqi prisoners.

This resolution would have authorized the President to attack Iraq in order to liberate Kuwaiti citizens who may or may not have been in Iraqi prisons even if Iraq had met compliance with all requests to destroy the alleged weapons of mass destruction; though, in 2002, at the Arab summit, Iraq and Kuwait agreed to bilateral negotiations to work out all claims relating to stolen property and prisoners of war.

So this use of force resolution enabled President Bush to commit U.S. troops to recover Kuwaiti property.

The President told this Congress: The current Iraqi regime had demonstrated its capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people; that the Iraqi regime had demonstrated its continuing hostility toward and willingness to attack the United States, including by attempting in 1993 to assassinate former President Bush; and by firing on many thousands of occasions on United States and Coalition Armed Forces engaged in enforcing a resolution of the United Nations Security Council.

It was pointed out back then, prior to Congress passing the resolution to authorize an attack on Iraq, that the Iraqi regime had never attacked nor does it have the capability to attack the United States. They couldn't attack us. The no-fly zone was not the result of a U.N. Security Council directive. It was illegally imposed by the United States, Great Britain, and France and not specifically sanctioned by any Security Council resolution.

The President went on to say: Members of al Qaeda, an organization bear-

ing responsibility for attack on the United States, its citizens and interests, including the attacks that occurred on 9/11, are known to be in Iraq.

But back in October of 2002, when we were having the debate on President Bush's war resolution, there was no credible intelligence that connected Iraq to the events of 9/11 or to the participation in those events by assisting al Qaeda.

The President told Congress back in 2002: Iraq continues to aid and harbor other international terrorist organizations, including organizations that threaten the lives and safety of American citizens.

It was pointed out back then, in response to President Bush's assertions, that any connection between the Iraq support of terrorist groups in the Middle East is an argument and was an argument then for focusing great resources on resolving the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. It was not sufficient reason for the U.S. to launch a unilateral preemptive strike against Iraq.

The President went on to say that the attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, underscored the gravity of the threat posed by the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by international terrorist organizations.

It was pointed out again that there was no connection between Iraq and the events of 9/11. Yet think about this: there was a consistent effort to try to link Iraq to 9/11 and to al Qaeda's role in 9/11, but there was no connection. The President kept on insisting there was, as did the Vice President.

□ 1600

The President went on to say that Iraq demonstrated capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction, the risk that the Iraq regime would either employ those weapons to launch a surprise attack against the United States or its Armed Forces, or provide them to international terrorists who would do so. The extreme magnitude of harm that would result in the United States and its citizens from such an attack combined to justify action by the United States to defend itself.

The picture that was painted for the American people, for the Congress at that time was that we had no choice but to get ready to attack Iraq; and yet, back then, prior to Congress voting on a resolution to authorize use of military force against Iraq, an attack having occurred 8 years ago, on March 20, 2003, we knew back then that there was no credible evidence that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction. There was no credible evidence that Iraq had the capability to reach the United States with such weapons.

In the 1991 gulf war, Iraq had a demonstrated capability of biological and chemical weapons, but didn't have the willingness to use them against the U.S. Armed Forces. Congress was not

provided with any credible information which proved that Iraq had provided international terrorists with weapons of mass destruction.

President Bush went on to assert that the United States could unilaterally enforce U.N. resolutions and that we could do so with military force. He went on to assert a chronology of international process; and when you look at where we are today, \$3 trillion, according to Joseph Stiglitz and Linda Bilmes, will be the minimum cost of this war.

One has to ask, what was going on in this Congress at the time? When we were told by the President of the United States and by the Vice President of the United States that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, it had the intention and capability of attacking the United States, the implication was that Iraq worked with al Qaeda to bring about 9/11. That's what they led this Congress to believe. That's what they led the American people to believe.

But you know what, Mr. Speaker, way back then I didn't buy a word of it, and there are other Members of Congress who didn't buy a word of it either. We know that there was no proof. We knew that there was no proof offered by the administration at that time that would give us a cause to go to war against Iraq, but we executed the war against Iraq. This is a great tragedy upon the Iraqi people and upon the people of our Nation, too.

We executed the war against Iraq that, according to Joseph Stiglitz, extrapolating from a study that was done by the Lancet organization, as many as 1 million innocent Iraqi people have died in that war. I want everyone here to wrap their thinking around this statement. Joseph Stiglitz in his book, "The Three Trillion Dollar War," wrote it with his associate Linda Bilmes, citing the Lancet report on civilian casualties in Iraq, extrapolated from that report and the figure that comes up is approximately 1 million innocent civilians lost their lives as a result of the United States' attack upon, and occupation of, Iraq.

People will criticize the Lancet study; and they will say, well, you know, that can't be true. But what they did was they looked at how many excess deaths occurred during that period, and they did a very comprehensive study; and they were able to come to this determination that these were all deaths that should not have occurred or they attributed them to the war. A million people. Why? Because this Congress was told that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and was going to use them against the United States of America.

Could I ask how much time is left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has approximately 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCINICH. So I was saying, Mr. Speaker, over 1 million innocent Iraqis

died pursuant to the bloodshed and chaos that occurred during the Iraq war. How can anyone in public life who understands that not come into public forums and demand justice?

This Nation was led to war based on lies. The U.S. has already lost 4,439 of our brave men and women. We've had over 33,000 troops wounded. There are casualties on all sides here. And certainly some of the nations who closed ranks with the Bush administration, their sons and daughters also suffered as well.

It's hard to believe, though, that we could have known all that we knew in advance of passing the legislation and it was passed anyway; know all that we knew in advance of passing the legislation, the legislation's passed, and we go to war anyway; know all that we know today back then and still be in Iraq today, March 17, 2011. And I quoted to you at the beginning of this from Vice President Cheney 9 years ago. The Iraqis are still paying a price and so are the American people.

I'm going to say something on this floor, Mr. Speaker, that seldom gets discussed here, and that is, that I sincerely believe that President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary Rumsfeld and others should be held accountable under international law for waging a war against people who had no quarrel with the United States of America at all.

□ 1610

There have to be international laws that have to be followed by U.S. officials, and, in fact, there are: the Geneva Convention, the U.N. Charter. There are express prohibitions against waging aggressive war.

It doesn't matter what this Congress blesses because of what we were told. The President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of Defense, they all knew better. They are all trying to cover their tracks right now with various books and PR tours, but they knew better. They put the lives of our young men and women on the line for a lie. They put the lives of 1 million and more Iraqi people on the line for a lie. They put over \$3 trillion of our precious resources here on the line for a lie.

I challenge anyone in this Congress to prove me wrong on any of this, because it is impossible to prove to the contrary the statements that I have made today about assertions that were made to this Congress, to the American people for a cause of war against Iraq, and they were all lies.

And now, Mr. Speaker, we are about to begin another year of occupation of Iraq. There is no question that occupation fuels insurgencies. There is no question that we are likely to be in Iraq for some time to come. Just in the last 24 hours, it was reported that while the U.S. troops who are there at this moment, 50,000 troops, are supposed to leave at the end of the year, there are problems with the negotia-

tions, that Mr. Maliki, his government, is stalled on appointing ministers, that the U.S. wants a contingency force of 10,000 to remain, that the State Department is increasing contractor presence of 17,000 at the cost of \$2.5 billion. We are not going to be done with this war for God knows how long.

We know the war in Iraq is being privatized. We know that all these private firms that are lining up to provide security in Iraq will be there for some time. As a matter of fact, it's in their interest to keep the environment unstable because they will keep making money.

So this handoff to the State Department occurs with much skepticism. But at this very moment, Mr. Speaker, it's not clear that we are truly going to be leaving Iraq. I mean, you are either in or you are out. You can't be in and out at the same time. You can't talk about going and you still have 10,000 troops there or 50,000 troops there. We are told that it's the end of combat operations. Well, some of the insurgents aren't getting that message, because they are still attacking our troops.

There have been 4,439 U.S. casualties, approximately 33,000 wounded. I have been to a number of funerals of young people who believed in this country, who loved this country, who saw service to this country as the highest purpose of their lives. I remember all of them, but there is one in particular that I want to share with you. It was a young man who, when he died in combat, his mother was notified that he would at last be made a U.S. citizen.

I grew up at a time when we were dealing with the Vietnam War. And years ago, before I got into politics, I was a copyboy at a newspaper in Cleveland called The Plain Dealer. My job at The Plain Dealer, among the things I had to do, I had to go out on what they called art runs to pick up pictures of young men, primarily, who were killed in Vietnam. I remember driving the company's car up to a house. And, Mr. Speaker, all these houses after a while, they look the same. The houses were wooden clapboard houses that needed a little bit of paint, and the front door was flapping a little bit in the breeze. There wasn't a latch on it. When you walked up the steps, the steps would creek, and you would see faded white curtains in the window with a shade pulled down and a blue star in the window, signifying that they had someone who served.

When I knocked on the door, people would invite me into their house, and I would sit on a worn sofa, a threadbare rug. At that time, they would have a picture of the President of the United States, often a picture of President Kennedy, who, by then, had been deceased, and a picture of Christ, you know, around the TV. I would sit down on their sofa, and they would go over the pictures. Then I would take one of those pictures to the newspaper so they could print it the next day to announce that this young person had been killed.

And I remember how incredible it was to be there at that moment when the family was in such incredible agony and grief and to get the feeling of their loss, just to feel it. Even thinking about it right now, I can feel it.

I went out and picked up so many pictures over the course of a year or so, just while I was doing that job; and it was just the same thing over and over again, people talking about how proud they were of their young person who served and wanting everyone to know how much they loved the country and how much they loved service.

Those memories stay with me. I mean, all of us who had friends who fought in Vietnam and didn't come back. They included people who I played baseball with, people who I just used to pal around with. And when you know people who get killed in war, it becomes personal. When you have family members who are out there and are exposed to that environment, it's very personal.

So here I am in the United States Congress. Here we are, 2011. And I think back to those times, and I think, you know, if we're sending these young men and women to put themselves in harm's way, we had better be right. We cannot afford not just to not make a mistake, but there cannot be any deception involved in things like that.

So, you see, when I talk about the importance of holding people accountable for the deceptions, I come from a place of great sadness about the tragedy of war generally, but the compounded tragedy of war specifically when it is based on something that is really not true.

□ 1620

Whether those of us in Congress voted for the war or not, we all have grave concerns for the safety of our troops. But there's a sense in which the troops themselves become hostage to the war. We had so many moments where we were told that we should vote to continue to fund the wars to support the troops.

Now, Iraq, March 20, 2011, the eighth anniversary. Afghanistan, already the longest war in our history, more than 10 years. How can we afford the lost lives anymore? How can we afford the deaths of innocent civilians? How can we afford the trillions upon trillions of dollars?

There's a point at which we have to ask ourselves some fundamental questions. If we didn't go to war to make America safer, why did we go to war against Iraq? I maintained then and I maintain now that oil certainly had something to do with it.

We have to ask ourselves, why are we still in Iraq? Why are we still in Afghanistan? Why are we continuing incursions along the Pakistani border? Why are we still debating whether to become involved militarily in Libya? Don't we, as Americans, get to the point where we just say maybe it's time we started taking care of things at home first?

Fifteen million Americans out of work. Think of how many jobs you could create with trillions of dollars. Fifty million Americans still don't have health care. Over 10 million Americans have lost their homes. So many Americans go to bed hungry. So many Americans can't afford to send their kids to decent schools. So much of our public education system is failing because they don't have enough resources.

And yet, we are spending trillions of dollars now on wars, one war based on lies, the other one based on a fundamental misreading of history. I mean, who in history has conquered Afghanistan? Well, maybe somebody can go back to Genghis Khan's time and answer that question, but you can't answer it in this century or the last century.

Now, the House just had 2 hours of debate today on the issue of Afghanistan and the war powers resolution. I'm pleased to see that more voted in favor of withdrawal this year than voted last year. It's a good sign, particularly since about two-thirds of the American people favor getting out of Afghanistan in the near future.

I mean, it's easy to understand why the American people feel that way. The American people have to be feeling, how can we afford these wars? How can we afford to spend \$1 million a year to equip a soldier in Afghanistan, or Iraq for that matter? Don't we have things to take care of here at home?

Mr. Speaker, I look at our cities, and all across this Nation, we have cities that are falling apart. Our infrastructure's falling apart. It's fair to say that we have trillions of dollars in infrastructure needs that are unmet. They're not being met because we're being told, well, we don't have enough money. As a matter of fact, some States are using the deficit to be able to crush workers' rights.

But we know that when it comes to these wars, these wars are contributing to the deficit. In one way or another, we end up borrowing money to keep these wars going. How can these wars be more important than everything else in America?

We know right now that occupations fuel insurgency in Afghanistan. Our presence there has caused the Taliban to become stronger. Our actions there help ensure the Taliban will have even more support.

General Petraeus himself, with respect to Afghanistan said, well, al Qaeda doesn't have much of a presence anymore. What are we doing there? How can we keep affording the kind of money that we're spending there?

The American people are saying it loud and clear. They want out.

But what I wanted to do this evening, though, is to bring us back to the time that Congress was faced with the decision about going to war against Iraq; that we were told things by Vice President Cheney, we were told things by President Bush.

Now they want to blame it on some character called Curveball. Look, when I was growing up if somebody was throwing you a curveball you knew what that meant. It meant that it wasn't coming at you straight. It was coming like this, okay?

It was almost somebody in the CIA was telegraphing to all of us, hey, this guy's a curveball. Be very careful about this pitch that he's making.

But anyhow, this character, Curveball, when it comes to WMDs, he said he made it all up. He said that he had a problem with the Saddam regime. He wanted to get rid of them, and he had the chance.

Now, there are those who would say, well, see, it was this guy. He said this. We were fooled. Right. Yeah. No. Those who were charged with the responsibility of taking this country into war against Iraq, they weren't fooled. They cooked the books with respect to the intelligence. They had the intelligence shaped to fit their preconceived designs to go to war. For them to try to maintain they were fooled would be an interesting defense.

The former head of the CIA in Europe, Tyler Drumheller, wasn't fooled. He warned against the reliability of Curveball. But the administration at that time, the Bush administration, offered no alternatives to the Congress.

So instead of accepting the truth that Iraq didn't possess WMDs, the Bush administration decided to pick and choose their facts in order to sell a war to the American people, at a cost of trillions of dollars.

When I think of the road that we have gone down, when I think, Mr. Speaker, that someone in the Bush administration, way back when we were about to attack Iraq, announced that he thought the Iraq war would cost \$100 billion, Larry Lindsey, he was fired for that. One hundred billion. Imagine now, this war's going to cost 30 times that, if not 50 times it, when you look at the long-term effect of caring, for the rest of their lives, for the soldiers who come back maimed.

□ 1630

Let's bring it back. On March 20, 2003, the United States Armed Forces at the direction of President George W. Bush commenced a very vigorous and violent attack upon the nation of Iraq and its people. That was the beginning of the Iraq war, and it was the beginning of the United States assault on and subsequent occupation of Iraq. And he did it because this Congress approved of it; and this Congress approved of it because we were told that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, that Iraq had the intention and capability of hurting the United States, and Iraq had something to do with 9/11 and al Qaeda's role in 9/11. Mr. Speaker, all false.

Now, the Bible says you shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free. We are taught that truth crushed to the ground will rise again. We are waiting to be freed from the lies that



took us into war, but we cannot be free until we have a reconciliation with the people of Iraq. And we can't do that until we have truth. America is going to have to go through that period. We will never recover from 9/11 if we continue to move down the rabbit holes of war that were based on lies or based on a misreading of history and a misapplication of power.

So where do we go from here? Well, we have to get ready to leave Iraq and we have to get ready to leave Afghanistan, and we have to stop bombing the borders along Pakistan. And we have to start working with the international community on matters of security. And if we need to continue to track down anyone who is associated with mass violence against the people of our country or any other country, that should be a matter of international police action.

And we must stop the policies of interventionism. We must stop the reach for empire. It is destroying our Nation. It is destroying us morally, and it is destroying our capacity to be able to meet the needs of the American people for jobs, for housing, for health care, for education, for retirement security. We have to challenge the underlying premise about war being inevitable. Because as soon as people start beating the drums of war, there is an entire marching band and Shouter Society at the Pentagon and their people in the contracting business who are ready to try to make a case for war at any time and any place. We have to begin to critically analyze the mentality that issues forth that causes us to put so much of our resources on the line.

General Eisenhower warned about it. He served as President of this United States two terms, and he recognized in his valedictory that we should beware of the military-industrial complex, we have to be careful about what we are being told and the motivation of those from outside this Congress who are telling us certain stories about why we should go to war. It is time for us to try to come into resonance with our power to achieve diplomacy.

I am not naive about the world, but I also understand that if we do not try to exercise our capacity to relate to people in other places, people who may have different ideologies, different religions, different colors, creeds; if we do not try to pursue that, then we are destined to have more wars. But if we pursue what President Franklin Roosevelt called the science of human relations, then we have the possibility that we can move toward making peace, not war, inevitable.

It is that type of thinking that led me to bring forward a proposal to create a Cabinet-level Department of Peace. I know there are people who say, "Oh, peace. Right. Okay, Dennis. We got it. You want peace. Next." And they try to project peace as impractical.

Mr. Speaker, you want us to talk impractical? How about a war based on

lies that cost this country over \$3 trillion? That is impractical. How about a war that cost the lives of over 1 million innocent Iraqi civilians, a war that cost the lives of thousands upon thousands of our troops, and tens of thousands of our troops injured? That's impractical.

We need to summon our capacity and our capabilities to be able to take this Nation in a new direction that does not include a quest or reach for empire; that pulls back its military resources which are spread all around the world to the cost of tens of billions of dollars annually, and we need to start coming home, create peace at home. Let's look at gun violence in our society. Let's go to domestic violence, spousal abuse, child abuse, violence in the schools, gang violence, racial violence, violence against gays.

If we started to focus on addressing violence in our society, the causal nature of it, not just the symptoms of it, not just the effects of it, we may put ourselves on a path where we could in our Nation create what many years ago people called a New Jerusalem, a shining city on a hill, the potential to be able to have all of our material concerns met, and be able to have peace.

Frankly, I don't know any other way that we can do it except working towards peace. But we have to build structures of peace in our own Nation, in our own neighborhoods. That is what legislation to create a Department of Peace is about, not creating a new bureaucracy.

Think about it. If we spend more than \$1 trillion every year for wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the Pentagon budget all combined, wouldn't you think we ought to have a few bucks available to talk about how we can create a more peaceful society so we don't doom future generations to continue to support these endless wars?

We have to start redefining who we are as a people, and this is as good a time as any to begin to do it. We are on the eighth anniversary of the initiation of the war against Iraq, March 20, 2011.

In the last hour, Mr. Speaker, I have sought to create a review of the record of what was said at the time to bring about the war, how the President and the Vice President at that time did not tell the truth to the American people, did not tell the truth to Congress; how the consequences have been extraordinary for the people of Iraq, for the people of the United States; how many innocent civilians died; how we have to find a way to reconcile with the people of Iraq, how we will have to find a way to reconcile at some point with the people in Afghanistan the innocents who have died. How we have to recognize that there are some things in the world that are beyond our control, that we can't tell other people what kind of political system they should have. We cannot try to redesign the world according to what our idea of a democracy is.

Wouldn't it be nice if here in the United States we actually focused on

creating the fullness of the democratic process, which we were assured would have the chance to unfold with the independence of the United States and with the creation of our Constitution?

Mr. Speaker, I intend to keep bringing forth the truth of what happened that resulted in the United States being taken into war against Iraq based on lies, and I intend to keep bringing forward alternatives so that we can not just get out of Iraq and Afghanistan, but stop this reach for power abroad which comes at the expense of our vital needs at home.

□ 1640

#### AMERICAN ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish every one of my colleagues and everybody in America would listen to this Special Order tonight, not because I want the attention, but I just think there are some facts that the American people ought to know and my colleagues ought to know about our dependence on energy from other parts of the world.

It really bothers me that we continue to depend so much on our adversaries or people that aren't our friends rather than we do on ourselves. We could be energy independent within a relatively short period of time, and I am talking about 5 to 10 years, if we just did certain things. So tonight what I want to do is I want to point out to my colleagues and anybody else that might be paying attention where the energy is in America, what it is, and how difficult it would be to extract it.

Now, right now, people that are paying attention in their offices know that we are paying \$3.60 or more for a gallon of gasoline. Diesel fuel is over \$4 a gallon. And my chief of staff went to the grocery store the other day, and he told me he bought two tomatoes and it cost \$5. He bought one avocado and it cost \$3.

People are telling me there is no inflation. That is baloney. The cost of food is going up. The cost of gasoline is going up. The cost of everything is going up, and in large part it is going up because the cost of energy is rising very, very rapidly. And it need not be that way.

I talked to a fellow the other day that came in to see me about new technologies, and he told me if we developed our coal shale, converted it into oil, we could lower the price per barrel of oil from \$105 a barrel to \$30 a barrel. Do you know what that would do to the price of gasoline if we were to do that? It would lower the price of gasoline from \$3.60 down to about \$1.40 or \$1.30 a gallon. And what do you think that would do to the economy and what

would that do to lowering the prices of goods and services that we go all the way across the country in dealing with? Yet we are not doing anything.

So I want to read tonight a little bit about where we are, what we could do, and what we can accomplish if we just start paying attention to what is here in the United States.

The old adage goes that those who don't learn from history are going to make the same mistakes over and over again. And apart from creating what we call the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in this country, we haven't done anything over the last 30 years to become energy independent.

Now, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is a reserve we set up so that if we have an emergency, we will have some oil in the ground that we could use for energy purposes. And it goes for maybe 90 days, but 90 days is not a very long time, and we could exhaust that in a very short period of time if we don't move toward energy independence.

Right now on the northern tier of Africa, everybody that is paying attention knows we have got problems in Libya. We have problems in Egypt, problems in Tunisia, problems all along the Persian Gulf coast, Bahrain and the other countries, and we have got Iran there; and there is a real possibility that we could see a terrible problem occur there in the future which would minimize our ability to get oil from that part of the world.

We get over 30 percent of our energy from countries in that region and other places in the world where people don't like us very much. And if that place goes up in smoke, the cost of energy, the cost of gasoline, the cost of everything that we have is going to skyrocket. So we have to do something about that.

In 1972, we imported 28 percent of our oil and energy from outside this country. Do you know what it is today? It is 62 percent. So we said we are going to be energy independent. It was 28 percent in the seventies. We said we were going to be energy independent. A lot of people remember the long gas lines when OPEC tried to do us in. They remember people carrying gas cans to get 5 gallons of gas to get to work. They remember all that. But we didn't do anything but create the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is only a 90-day supply.

So we imported 26 percent or thereabouts in the seventies, and today, instead of being energy independent, we are importing 62 percent. We are more dependent on Saudi Arabia, Venezuela and other parts of the world now than we were then by more than double, more than double our dependency on foreign oil.

So today oil has gone up to over \$105 a barrel. It may be down a little bit now. We are paying in many parts of the country close to \$4 for gasoline and over \$4 a gallon for diesel fuel, which transports our goods and services across this country.

Oil is the lifeblood of this country. It supplies more than 40 percent of our energy needs and 99 percent of the fuel that we use in our cars and trucks. They talk about the new Volt automobile, electric car, that that is going to solve our problems. They talk about windmills that are going to solve our problems. They talk about nuclear energy, which is very problematic right now. They talk about all these other things, including solar energy. But all of that combined will not put a dent, not even a dent, in our energy needs. And as we know right now, 99 percent of the fuel that we need for our cars and trucks comes from oil, and our current energy demand is about 21.5 million barrels a day.

What a lot of people don't realize is for every one penny that it costs more for gasoline, it increases the cost to consumers by \$4 million a day. So every time you go to the gas pump and you see the gas price has gone up a penny or a nickel or 10 cents, for each penny it is a \$4 million hit on our economy each and every day.

Now, there are a lot of things I want to talk about, but I won't have time to get into all of them tonight. But the thing that is very disconcerting to me is that we have the energy that we need right here.

For instance, if you look at this chart, this is the oil production in this country. If we use the recoverable oil we have, the natural gas we have and the coal resources that we have, that is equivalent to 1.3 trillion barrels of oil, 1.3 trillion. Now, when you realize we are using only about, what, 21 million barrels of oil a day, you can see we would have an almost inexhaustible supply of oil if we just used the resources that we have.

Let me just give you some examples. In the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, we have about 10.4 billion barrels of oil, more than double the proven reserves of the entire State of Texas and almost half of the total crude reserves in the U.S., which is 22 billion barrels of oil. That is in ANWR alone, almost half of what we need. If we drilled in ANWR, we could increase our reserves by nearly 50 percent in that one area.

President Clinton vetoed the ANWR energy production in 1995, and the United States could be today getting almost 1.5 million barrels of oil a day if we did that. But instead of moving toward energy independence, we continue to talk about it, but we don't do anything about it.

Currently, the President of the United States will not allow us to get new permits to drill offshore in the Gulf of Mexico or off the continental shelf or in ANWR or anyplace else. We just aren't drilling, so we continue to import oil.

Now, a lot of people don't realize this, but we spill more oil from the oil tankers that bring oil from Saudi Arabia and Venezuela, we spill more oil each and every day than the oil that was spilled from that horrible tragedy

that took place in the Gulf of Mexico. And yet we continue to import with these tankers, and we say it is an environmental problem because look at what happened in the Gulf of Mexico. That is an excuse to not drill in this country, because we are wasting energy by not getting it right here. And, as I said before, we are spilling more out of those tankers than we had in the Gulf of Mexico tragedy.

So we ought to be drilling. And we could do it in an environmentally safe way if the government of the United States and our regulators made sure they watched these oil wells. The technology is there.

Now, as I said before, we have 1.8 trillion barrels of oil and as much as 8 trillion barrels of oil if we use the deposits that we have in oil shale. Maybe I haven't said that yet, but we do have.

Now, listen to this. I had a fellow come in to me the other day, and I may have mentioned it to some of the people earlier, and I sometimes get mixed up because we have covered this thing before, but he told me if we drilled here and used oil shale, we could reduce the cost of oil dramatically, dramatically, as much as 60 or 70 percent, and it would reduce overall costs of energy dramatically to our houses, our cars and our trucks which bring goods and services and food all across this country.

Currently, the United States produces roughly 30 trillion cubic feet of natural gas every year, 30 trillion feet of natural gas every year. If we went after the Marcellus shale formation where they have 500 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, we could more than double our domestic production of natural gas almost immediately, and we could use that natural gas to move our trucks.

I had some of the leaders in the natural gas industry come to see me not too long ago, and they told me if we just converted our 18-wheelers that transport goods and services across this country and food, if we just converted those to natural gas, we could cut our dependency on foreign oil by 50 percent.

□ 1650

Just that one thing. Yet we're not drilling for that natural gas because the administration will not give the permits and move to utilize those resources that we have.

The Obama administration, for whatever reason, I don't know if it's intentional or just because of ignorance, they're not using our resources and not exploring for our resources. It makes we wonder sometimes if the environmental extremists in this country don't want us to go back to horse and buggy and using wood to heat our houses. They wouldn't want wood to be used to heat our houses because obviously they're concerned about things like the spotted owl.

But the fact of the matter is we in this country could reduce our cost of

living, could reduce our dependency on foreign oil. All we have to do is use our resources, but we need the administration to do what is necessary. And at a time when the world is on the precipice of some major wars, we need to move toward energy independence. If the Persian Gulf goes up in smoke, it's going to be disastrous for this economy. If Venezuela and President Chavez down there, who's a Communist dictator, if he decides not to let us have the oil that we've been buying from him, it will be tragic for this country.

And he's working with Tehran. They have flights going back once every week—back and forth—and they're working together for things other than the good of the United States of America. And so we're dependent on people that don't like us, would like to see our free enterprise system and the freedoms we enjoy dissipate into nothing, and we're continuing to depend on them for foreign energy.

The President has said it's a real danger to drill in the Gulf of Mexico; we want to protect the environment. Yet we just sent \$1 billion down to Brazil so they could drill offshore. Now think about that. We're concerned about the environment, and yet we're sending billions of our taxpayers' dollars to a country like Brazil so they can do deepwater exploration for oil. It makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.

The administration—just to let people know what is going on in their offices—the administration canceled 77 onshore drilling leases in Utah just weeks after taking office. So we had 77 onshore, in the Continental United States, drilling leases in Utah that were going to be used to bring oil to the surface—and natural gas—and they stopped those weeks after they took office. And they later re-offered only 17 of them. So we lost 60 potential areas of oil and gas.

The administration has consistently delayed oil and shale development leases. The administration has repeatedly blocked development, as I said before, in places like the ANWR. And I've been up to Alaska. People talk about how it's going to hurt the environment up there and the bears and all the other animals. The ANWR is way out in the boondocks. It's not going to hurt a thing. People don't realize Alaska is 3½ times the size of Texas. There's only 500,000 people up there. There's tremendous oil and other natural gas resources up there, and we can't drill for them because of environmental concerns. It makes absolutely no sense. No sense whatsoever.

America's reliance on oil and natural gas is going to continue for decades to come. There's no question about it. When the administration says we have to transition to other forms of energy—nuclear and solar and wind and hydro ways of getting energy—that's great. All of us want to do that. We all want a clean environment, but in the meantime we have to rely on fossil

fuels because we're not going to be able to get where they want us to be by relying on these other sources of energy for at least 10, 15, 20 years.

So what are we supposed to do in the meantime? I don't think we should continue to depend on foreign sources of energy. America's reliance on natural gas, as I said, is going to continue for decades to come; and trying to ignore that reality by arguing that it takes time for new fields to come on-line is simply passing the buck to the next generation.

If we responded to the widespread outcry to drill 3 years ago, the last time oil and gasoline prices were over \$3.50 a gallon, we would be that much closer to having additional supplies of domestic energy. But we aren't. We're importing 62 percent of our energy, and just a couple of decades ago it was only 26 or 28 percent.

Expanding America's energy production will lower prices, create new jobs, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and strengthen our national security and raise revenue to help tackle our historic \$14 trillion in national debt.

One of the things that I hope all young people in this country will realize and all the seniors will realize is that we're passing on to that young generation \$14 trillion in debt. The debt has increased in the last 3 years by \$4 trillion. From the beginning of the Republic to the last 3 or 4 years, we didn't come close to that kind of spending. Yet we increased the debt in 3 years by \$4 trillion. ObamaCare is going to add a great deal more to that, in addition to rationing health care and all the other things that people have heard about.

But the thing that concerns me the most is the standard of living that we have today and what we're passing on to the future generations. By not becoming energy independent, by running up these huge debts because we're coming up with these new programs that we can't afford, by creating a bigger bureaucracy in Washington, including 15,000 new IRS agents to implement the rules and regulations of things like ObamaCare, all those things are going to add to the debt and the quality of life that I've had and my parents had is going to deteriorate.

I'm afraid we will pass on to our children and our grandchildren higher taxes, higher inflation, a lower standard of living because we're living way beyond our means today. Natural gas and coal shale and oil are ways that we can cut our dependence on foreign oil and reduce that dependency on government and lower the cost that we're incurring as far as our national debt is concerned.

I don't know what we have to do to convince the administration. Sometimes I wonder if it's because they're not aware of the future, they're not aware of what is going on, or maybe they're just doing it on purpose because the President believes in more government control over various parts of our society.

One-sixth of our society is health care; and that's been nationalized by the ObamaCare plan, which we're trying to repeal because that will create long lines to get to see a doctor and socialized medicine. That's all a result of more government control and more government spending and more national debt.

Can you imagine what it would be like if we came back in 50 years—and I probably won't be around then; I'm sure I won't—but we come back in 50 years and there's some young person struggling to get along and they say, Why in the world did our fathers and grandfathers leave this kind of a society for us? They lived so much better. The cost of living was lower. The cost of energy was lower. The cost of health care was lower. Everything was lower. They lived so much better than us. Why didn't they do something to make sure we had that quality of life? And the answer is simply: we're not doing it. We're opening up the government credit card, we're charging all this money, we're depending on other sources of energy from other countries, and the credit card just keeps gathering steam and gathering more debt and gathering more debt and gathering more debt.

If my colleagues in their offices are paying attention right now and they said to their wives, We overspent last month by \$5,000; what are we going to do, their wives and the wives of the people that might be paying attention would say, We've got to cut back on spending. We've got to budget our money. We can't live like this. We'll go bankrupt. And I tell you right now, America is in the same situation. We will go bankrupt. In fact, we are bankrupt, but we're printing money as fast as we can to keep from declaring bankruptcy.

They talk about Social Security being insolvent in 15 or 20 years. If you go into the vaults and look at Social Security receipts, it's all a bunch of paper. They've used that money for other purposes. We're robbing Peter to pay Paul for Medicare and Social Security as we live today. So we just add to the debt and add to the liability that we leave to the future generations.

So if I were talking to the President tonight, Mr. Speaker, I would say: Mr. President, if you love this country as much as we love this country, then take steps to do what's necessary to cut spending, to do away with a lot of these wasteful programs that aren't accomplishing anything, to make sure that we come up with a health care plan that does not create a dependency on government but on the private sector by doing tort reform and coming up with savings accounts that people can deduct from their taxes so that they can pay for a lot of their own health care needs. There's a whole bunch of things we can do without socialized medicine.

So I would say: Mr. President, let's look at the other avenues. Let's re-evaluate ObamaCare and come up with

a solution that's not going to put this country in red ink ad infinitum. And I would say, These new programs you're talking about are the programs that we've tried for years and years that have been nothing but a drain on taxpayers' dollars but haven't improved anything.

Let me give you one example. I hate to digress from this energy issue, but I think it's important that we talk about this. If you look at the grade levels in our schools and high schools and our colleges across this country, you will find that the last 20 years, the grade levels have not gotten better. The quality of education has not gotten better.

□ 1700

If you look at the chart and see how much we're spending through the Department of Education at the Federal level, you'll find that we're spending billions and billions and billions of dollars, and they're not accomplishing a thing except for paying a lot of bureaucrats' salaries and sending money back to some of the unions that feel like they need that money to take care of their union members, and those union members continue to support people who want to keep that gravy train going.

So there are things we can do. We could say let's leave education where it belongs, at the State and local levels, which is where it has always been, instead of spending all this money at the local level. Do away with the Department of Education. We could do that and save hundreds of billions of dollars, and that money could be passed on to debt reduction and to lower our dependence on the future generations of this country.

I'd like to just end tonight, Mr. Speaker, by saying that, if you look at these charts, you'll see, first of all, we have—it's unbelievable—trillions and trillions of cubic feet of natural gas in the United States. All these pink spaces here show where shale gas is in the lower 48 States, and it doesn't even include Alaska. Those trillions of cubic feet of natural gas could be brought out of the ground and used to take care of our energy needs to a very large degree.

As a matter of fact—and let's put that chart up here—as to the coal shale that we have, they estimate that the amount of coal shale we have in this country would create 1.8 to 8 trillion barrels of oil—1.8 to 8 trillion barrels of oil—right here in this country and that it would immediately reduce our dependency on foreign oil. If you think that the Saudis and the others wouldn't lower their prices per barrel very quickly if they thought we were producing that, you're just not paying attention, because if they saw that we were becoming energy independent, they would want to keep their market share, and they would lower their prices as quickly as possible.

Then you talk about coal, itself. We have tremendous resources of coal—

584.5 billion tons. Our reserves in coal at these blue places that you see on the map are 4 trillion tons of coal. Now, they say that that will hurt the environment. Well, we've got to make sure that we protect the environment, and that we've got scrubbers on the generating plants and all kinds of things that do protect the environment, but even if we had an environmental problem, we would still work to clean that up.

Even if we had that, do we still want to be dependent for our existence, for the defense of this Nation, for the economy of this Nation on foreign sources of energy like Saudi Arabia and Venezuela and others that don't like us and would love to see us go down? Go under?

We need to use our resources, and the President is succumbing to pressure from radical environmentalists and others to not drill for these resources—natural gas, coal shale—that can be converted into oil, oil that we have onshore and offshore, and coal, itself.

It is time that we realize that we can be energy independent. The future of America can be great. We can see this city, as Ronald Reagan said, in 20, 30, 40, 50 years as a shining city on a hill if we move toward energy independence. That one thing alone would help solve our economic problems. It's a defense issue as well as a national economic issue.

So, like I said, if I were talking to the President tonight—and I presume, from time to time, the White House does watch what we're doing on the floor—I would say: Mr. President, if you love this country—and I believe you do—I would start doing what's necessary to move toward energy independence. You will be revered as a great President if you do that, and you'll probably get reelected. But if we continue with this huge deficit spending that, in large part, is caused by our dependence on foreign energy, then you run the risk of being a one-term President.

So I think the President, being a patriotic citizen as I believe and hope he is, will take to heart what we're talking about in this body and become as close as possible to energy independence within the next 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10 years. If he would do this, his legacy that will be left behind will be something that we'll all be proud of.

If we don't do that, and if I were talking to the President, I would say: Your legacy will not be very bright, Mr. President. I don't think any President wants to leave behind for history that kind of a legacy.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will just say that I hope that everybody has paid attention to this tonight, and I will be back on the floor to talk about this in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I am told we have another colleague who wants to come over, so I'm not going to do my imitation of Al Jolson or tap dance, but I guess I could talk about the deficit a little longer.

All right. Well, let's give you some facts and figures while my colleague is on his way over here. I was going to save this for my next Special Order, but we'll cover it right now.

The total demand for coal reached 1.12 billion tons in 2008. Over half of our electricity is generated from coal, so you can imagine, if we don't do what's necessary to get coal out of the ground, we're going to become more dependent on foreign sources of energy.

Nine out of every 10 tons of coal mined every year in the U.S. is used for domestic electricity. So, when they tell you we can't use coal anymore because of environmental concerns, well, what are we going to do?—because 9 out of every 10 tons of coal is used for electric generation.

Each person in this country and everybody who is paying attention uses 3.7 tons of coal a year. So what are we going to do without it if we don't have it? Coal is the most affordable source of power fuel per million Btus historically, averaging less than a quarter of the price of gas and oil. There are approximately 600 coal-generating facilities generating 1.4 generating units in manufacturing utilities across this country, according to the U.S. Energy Information. Coal accounts for 32 percent of U.S. total energy and 23 percent of total energy consumption.

Now, that's all I want to talk about as to coal, but it's important that we realize that we are dependent on that source of energy and that we need to continue to use it until we come up with an alternative that's going to work and will be with us. Solar and wind and the other sources will replace that over time, but we are still going to need oil, coal, and gas for at least 10 or 15 or 20 years at the levels or at more than the levels that we're using today.

May I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEEHAN). The gentleman has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I can talk about anything, I guess, but I don't want to bore my colleagues back in their offices or bore anybody else who's paying attention to this other than to say these charts that we have here are things that everybody ought to be familiar with, and I will be happy to make these available to my colleagues.

It shows that we have plenty of oil, coal, natural gas, and coal shale to take care of our energy needs within the next decade if we'd just get on with it.

I am told everybody has gone home. Everybody is going back to their districts. It's kind of interesting that these issues that we're talking about here tonight are so important, and yet people are going back to their districts to talk to their constituents. I wish I had been able to talk to them before they left and give them copies of all these illustrations so that they could go to their town meetings and show the people of this country that we do have

the energy we need to be independent. I will try to do that next week, the next time we have a recess and they go back to their districts for their town meetings.

□ 1710

For those who are wondering why I'm standing down here, the rules of the House are that when we adjourn at night we have what's called Special Orders, and when we have Special Orders, each side gets 1 hour, and I'm taking the leadership hour on the Republican side. Each side gets 1 hour to discuss issues of relevance to the American people and to their colleagues. And then after that, each side gets a half an hour, and we go back and forth like that until we've used up 4 hours of time.

So my colleague, Mr. GOHMERT, who is on his way over here right now, is going to use, I presume, part of our first half-hour when he gets here, and I imagine LOUIE is going to be talking about constitutional law because he was a judge, and he will also be talking about the national debt and the legacy we're leaving behind for our kids. And so when LOUIE gets here, after I hit him in the nose for not being here on time, I will turn it over to him and let him talk about these issues.

What are you laughing at? We have the staff up here, and I think they're getting a little giggly since we're here not talking about anything of relevance. Where is LOUIE? Coming from the Moon? I mean, we've got the press up there that's being entertained. Oh, it's St. Patrick's Day. You don't think he's been having a little green libation, do you?

I guess I should digress and talk about some of the other issues facing this country. There are so many. But I don't want to get started on that and then have LOUIE come in and have to stop my discussion right in the middle of our talk. You need to write about this in the papers, folks.

Well, there's a new movie out. You know, last night they had an Irish American function here in the Capitol, and they had some of those Irish dancers that were extraordinary. And I was watching television this morning, and they had Michael Flatley on, who's got a new movie that's coming out today about the Irish dancers, and I would urge all of my friends and neighbors to go see that movie if they like Irish dancing.

Folks, I want you to know that Judge LOUIE GOHMERT, with his green tie, has just arrived, and LOUIE, what are you going to talk about tonight?

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. We're going to talk some about the CR. We're going to talk about government spending and what we ought to be doing.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, there you have it, folks. I was very psychic. I told you he would be talking about government spending and how we can get control of this budget.

And so with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### CUT FOREIGN AID TO UNFRIENDLY NATIONS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my dear friend DAN BURTON. He is a patriotic American. He stands for what he believes in. And if we had a lot more DAN BURTONS in Washington, the country would be that much better off. So we're grateful to him and his service.

It is an honor to serve in this body. It's been rather frustrating lately, and one of the things I wanted to mention was that another good friend, former fellow judge as I was, a district judge—I lost credibility as far as some of the district judges believed when I became chief justice of the Court of Appeals—but my friend TED POE from Houston is pushing a bill that I'm sure glad to cosponsor with him. I'm glad he's doing it. It goes a bit hand-in-hand with a bill that I've been pushing ever since I've been here.

But Congressman POE's bill would allow an up-or-down vote on all the different countries that we provide foreign assistance. It's a good idea. I mean, for all of the years that I've been here in each Congress, three times we have filed a U.N. voting accountability bill, and my friend TED POE has been on that bill cosponsoring with us, and I'm glad to support his bill.

My bill simply says any country that votes against us more than half the time gets no foreign assistance the following year. We know there's sometimes when there are emergencies, there are things we need to do, and so there's an exception for that in the event of an international emergency, but otherwise, we're not going to tell foreign countries how they vote in the U.N., but you can tell a lot about who is your friend and who isn't by who stands with you during difficult times and on difficult issues, and you're able to discern who has the same moral beliefs as you do.

For example, there are countries where sharia law is the rule of the land, and life does not have the value that we in America believe that God gave life to have. So it's okay. In fact, you can find your way to paradise, some believe, and not all Muslims believe this, but there are those who believe that you can find your way to paradise and differing number of virgins waiting for you if you die while you're killing infidels, people that don't believe in the same things you do. Well, that's fine, but if you believe in torturing, killing, taking a life, taking innocent lives for nothing, or just because of someone's religious beliefs, then we should not be financing that.

It's deeply troubling to see that in Egypt, one account said that Presi-

dent—or king, whatever you want to call him—Mubarak had \$70 billion in the bank. Another account said he had \$7 billion in the account. Either way, can't help but wonder if that couldn't be a whole lot of U.S. taxpayer dollars back when we weren't having to borrow to give away money like we are now. We were giving \$2 billion or so a year, and it wouldn't be surprising if most of that money were United States dollars that had been given to Egypt.

□ 1720

On the other hand, we know that there are despots, there are dictators, there are corrupt leaders of countries around the world who believe that it's fine to even force women to have abortions. As my friend and I both believe, abortion is wrong. It is wrong. It is taking innocent life. Yet, we are just handing money out around the world hand over fist, and people taking innocent lives, the unborn of others.

We know that there was about to be a hanging of a man who converted from Islam to Christianity over in Afghanistan, and we're still just pouring money into Karzai's regime. There are issues about him and his brother, whether or not there is corruption there, and we're just pouring money in there that we don't have. And we're having to pay, 40, 42 cents in interest of every \$1 on loans because we don't have the money to do that.

In any event, my friend CHRIS SMITH is here, and I would be happy to yield to him.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my very good friend and colleague for yielding.

I do raise my voice today, and I join my friend from Texas and others in a bit of a celebration—although it needs to be a cautious celebration because the tyranny on the island of Cuba continues unabated for so many others. But Nobel Peace Prize nominee Dr. Oscar Biscet of Cuba, one of the bravest and brightest human rights defenders on Earth, was released on March 12 from a wretched Cuban prison where he had endured 8 years of torture with periods of solitary confinement for his exemplary human rights work. It was Dr. Biscet's second long-term, totally unjustified incarceration by Cuba, by Castro, totaling almost 12 years in prison. According to his wife, Elsa Morejón, he was arrested at least 27 periods and jailed for short periods of time between 1998 and 1999 alone, yet he persisted and has an indomitable will that continues to this day. Dr. Biscet's release and that of other prisoners of conscience was negotiated and announced by Cardinal Jaime Ortega, archbishop of Havana.

Yesterday, I had the high honor and the privilege to speak by phone with Dr. Biscet who is still in Cuba. And I conveyed my and, I would say, our collective respect, admiration, and abiding concern for his welfare and well-being as well as that of his wife. He said during the conversation that she

was pleasantly shocked and very happy to finally have him home. I let him know that he and his amazing work was never and will never be forgotten.

Awarded the U.S. Medal of Freedom by President George W. Bush, Dr. Biscet suffered the depravity of Castro's infamous gulag in order to bring the rule of just law, respect for human rights, and a robust democracy to Cuba.

In our phone conversation, he absolutely insisted that freedom will and must be procured only through peaceful means, and of course that work is far from finished. He said that faith in God was paramount and that "prayer is of utmost importance." He is truly a man of God.

Dr. Biscet, an OB/GYN, told me that the truth about what Castro has done to his people and continues to do must reach—these are his words—the truth must reach the Cuban people, and he singled out Radio Martí as a valuable means to that end.

"Were you tortured?" I asked him. He said last night, "Yes, yes." And his multiple serious health conditions that must now be addressed obviously are testimony to the cruel and severe mistreatment that he suffered. He told me that in prison, he had to eat putrified food and rice that was laced with worms. He endured solitary confinement with a mentally ill person, survived a dungeon with a knife-throwing criminal, and withstood burns all over his body from the prison's kitchen exhaust pipe that emptied into his cell. The Cuban Government even attempted to take him for shock therapy at a mental institution in order to rid him of his passion for human rights. None of it worked. And by the grace of God, he has persevered with unparalleled bravery.

Freedom House has ranked Cuba as one of the least free countries in the world. The only country which ranked lower on the freedom scale than Cuba was the nightmare gulag of North Korea. Yet in an insane paradox, the Cuban tyrants remain romantic heroes for many in the United States, including some Members of this Congress who in 2009 visited Cuba and gushed with admiration for the dictators Fidel and Raul Castro, showing no compassion for the pain their courting and their enabling of Castro gave to all those suffering under his dictatorship.

Castro has not succeeded in crushing the spirit of Dr. Biscet. That same spirit and vision animates the so-called ladies in white, Las Damas de Blanco, the wives and relatives of imprisoned political dissidents like Dr. Biscet who attend mass each week and march through the streets dressed in white to symbolize peaceful dissent. Cuban police have detained and beaten these women for their peaceful protest.

And lest anyone construe Dr. Biscet's release as the harbinger of immediate peace and respect for human rights in Cuba, consider this: Yesterday Amnesty International published an alert

that noted that "the repression of Cuban dissidents persists despite the releases." I will put the entire statement in. But they point out that numerous, numerous activists, new activists, men and women who are speaking out for human rights are now being rounded up, put under house arrest, and some held in detention.

They pointed out that on February 23, on the 1-year anniversary of a great man named Tamayo's death, according to the Cuban Commission on Human Rights, the authorities placed over 50 people under house arrest before freeing them hours later. And the president of the Cuban Youth Movement for Democracy was arrested after organizing an activist meeting. Where? Inside his own home. And he now has been arrested.

Dr. Biscet hopefully will receive the Nobel Peace Prize. As my friend and colleague knows, we have really orchestrated an effort all over the world—parliamentarians were gladly writing in letters, including the Prime Minister of Hungary, asking the distinguished body that gives out the Peace Prize to consider Dr. Biscet and hopefully the other Cuban dissidents for that prize. Liu Xiaobo got it last year. He couldn't travel. They put the Peace Prize on the empty chair. Dr. Biscet is out of prison, and it would be a great lifting of spirits and hopes for the people of Cuba for that Peace Prize committee to award him.

#### REPRESSION OF CUBAN DISSIDENTS PERSISTS DESPITE RELEASES

The Cuban authorities are continuing to stifle freedom of expression on the island in spite of the much-publicised recent wave of releases of prominent dissidents, Amnesty International warned ahead of the eighth anniversary of a crackdown on activists.

Hundreds of pro-democracy activists have suffered harassment, intimidation and arbitrary arrest in recent weeks as the Cuban government employs new tactics to stamp out dissent.

Of 75 activists arrested in a crackdown around 18 March 2003, only three remain in jail after 50 releases since last June, with most of the freed activists currently exiled in Spain. Amnesty International has called for the remaining prisoners to be released immediately and unconditionally.

"The release of those detained in the 2003 crackdown is a hugely positive step but it tells only one side of the story facing Cuban human rights activists," said Gerardo Ducos, Cuba researcher at Amnesty International.

"Those living on the island are still being targeted for their work, especially through short-term detentions, while repressive laws give the Cuban authorities a free rein to punish anyone who criticises them."

"Meanwhile, three of the prisoners detained eight years ago still languish in prison and must be freed immediately."

In one recent crackdown the authorities detained over one hundred people in one day in a pre-emptive strike designed to stop activists marking the death of activist Orlando Zapata Tamayo, who died following a prolonged hunger strike while in detention.

On 23 February, the one-year anniversary of Tamayo's death, according to the Cuban Commission of Human Rights and National Reconciliation, the authorities placed over 50 people under house arrest before freeing them hours later.

Activist Néstor Rodríguez Lobaina, was recently named a prisoner of conscience by Amnesty International after being detained without trial for over three months.

The president of the Cuban Youth Movement for Democracy was arrested after organizing an activists' meeting inside his own home.

"Cubans are still at the mercy of draconian laws that class activism as a crime and anyone who dares to criticise the authorities is at risk of detention," said Gerardo Ducos.

"In addition to releasing long-term prisoners of conscience, to properly realize freedom of expression the Cuban government also has to change its laws."

Seventy-five people were jailed in a massive crackdown against the dissident movement around 18 March 2003 for the peaceful exercise of their right to freedom of expression. Most of them were charged with crimes including "acts against the independence of the state" because they allegedly received funds and/or materials from US-based NGOs financed by the US government.

They were sentenced to between six and 28 years in prison after speedy and unfair trials for engaging in activities the authorities perceived as subversive and damaging to Cuba.

These activities included publishing articles or giving interviews to US-funded media, communicating with international human rights organizations and having contact with entities or individuals viewed to be hostile to Cuba.

Mr. GOHMERT. I certainly thank my friend from New Jersey. CHRIS SMITH, you are a leader. You are a man of conviction who cares deeply about those who have suffered for no good reason and standing for freedom. You are a true patriot, and it's an honor to serve with you as a friend here.

I don't know if you were aware; but in the discussion about all the foreign aid to countries who do not have the same abiding love and desire for freedom for all people and the same value of human life, I didn't know if my friend was aware of the fact that in 2008—I don't have the 2009 and 2010 numbers in front of me—but for 2008, this country, the United States, provided \$45,330,000 in aid to Cuba. And you can't help but wonder over the years, like with Dr. Biscet, how much American money might have ever been used to help restrain heroes of this whole Earth that should have been praised and appreciated. Yet we're giving money to brutal dictators who treat the best that humanity has to offer in this manner. Does the gentleman has some thoughts?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The gentleman from Texas makes an excellent point. When you provide foreign aid, when you provide economic lifelines to dictatorships, it enables them to continue their repression. Years ago, we took a very principled stance against South Africa because of that abomination known as apartheid. And when the world united and said, No more, it did lead to an end to that racist regime.

Now Cuba, for some reason—and China would fall into this category as well. But Cuba, to keep on point, has had trade with Canada and with the European countries and the European Union, and there's been no matriculation from dictatorship to democracy at

all. If anything, Cuba has gotten worse in many cases, clearly underscoring that when a brutal dictatorship is given the money and wherewithal, they will continue their repressive ways.

□ 1730

I believe, and I asked Dr. Biscet this last night, about lifting the travel ban and lifting the trade embargo, which are two things that the Obama administration is seeking to do. And he said don't do it unless there are conditionalities, human rights, democracy, free and fair elections. Otherwise, the secret police, the neighborhood block committees, and those who repress every person in Cuba who, especially those who articulate the vision of freedom and democracy and human rights, are given additional power.

Hard currency, as Dr. Biscet said on the phone, the Cuban Government runs everything. So when you lift the trade embargo, when you have people traveling to Cuba bringing hard currency, you throw a lifeline. Better condition it, all of it, to human rights conditions.

Again, had it worked, if that was the answer, as he said in the conversation last night, having a travel ability from Canada, and trade, and from the European countries, we would have seen a change towards democracy. It has not happened. It has gotten worse.

I appreciate you bringing up that very good point.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, thank you.

And what an anomaly to have a country that believes in freedom and liberty and human life and human value, and yet at the same time we demean it—whether it's giving money to entities that take unborn lives or whether it's giving money to brutal dictators who certainly don't believe in freedom of religion but are willing to take the lives of people because of their religion or who repressively say, We told you you could have one child, so we're going to kill your other children.

It is just a mind-boggling thing, as Bo Pilgrim used to say. I'm sure he still does. But it's mind-boggling. How do we think that we're helping the world when we give massive amounts of money to people that are the very antithesis of the things that Americans have given their last full measure of devotion to preserve and protect?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. You know, the date we lost China, in my opinion, was May 26, 1994. On that date, President Bill Clinton completely severed and de-linked human rights with Most Favored Nation status, after getting accolades when he linked it a year before. He said, unless there's significant progress in human rights, we're going to condition our trading relationship, and we will only look at performance. He shredded his Executive order. We had the votes to take away MFN that year, which dissipated over time.

I met with the human rights groups. I even went to China and realized that

we were talking out of both sides of our mouth, like Janus, the Roman god, saying two things, you know, like some in diplomatic circles often do. And the foreign ministry in Beijing told me, We're getting Most Favored Nation status. We don't care what you think about human rights.

Fast forward to just a few weeks ago when Hu Jintao, the unelected President of China, visited with President Obama; not a single public statement on human rights. It was so bad that when there was a press conference with Hu Jintao and President Obama at the White House, the President defended Hu, President Hu. When asked about human rights by an Associated Press reporter, President Obama said, "Well, they have a different culture and they have a different political system."

That was an outrageous statement that undermines all of the peace and freedom loving people of China, tens of thousands of whom are in the laogai or the gulag system suffering for peace and human rights and religious freedom. And it's as if to say somehow the Chinese people don't get it or they don't understand human rights. They sure do, and they want it. Ask Wei Jingsheng, Harry Wu, Chai Ling and all the great human rights defenders, many of whom have spent years in the gulag system.

It was so bad that The Washington Post did an editorial, and it said, President Obama defends Hu, Hu Jintao, on rights, and took the President, rightfully so, you know, a very liberal newspaper, The Washington Post, to task for being so silent.

Here it is, President Obama, 2009 Nobel Peace Prize Winner, Liu Xiaobo, 2010 Nobel Peace Prize winner, and the man who put him in prison, Hu Jintao, and they're at a State dinner, first at a press conference, all kinds of other meetings, and not a single word about Liu Xiaobo. He should have said, Mr. President, Release the dissidents. He did no such thing, kept it all to himself even if he had those thoughts.

And in China, because I went on People's Daily because I read it often. I read it the next day. Filled with accolades from the American President for a dictator. It demoralizes people in the laogai, just like people in this Chamber, just like the President I believe is demoralizing those suffering in the gulags all over the world, including in Cuba.

So the gentleman is absolutely right. We need to be very serious and use—what if it were I or my wife or my family that were suffering this? Would we just then look askance and embrace these dictators? I don't think so. I would hope not.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentleman's insights. But, unfortunately, based on our modern history in this country, the indications are if you were being tortured and held in prison, it doesn't appear that this government would do anything different than what we've been doing.

And the point that you make is so important. We've heard it from those who suffer and have suffered in gulags, who have been later released, and when we hear whether it was those held in Poland or in the Russian gulags or Chinese or Cuban, for example, when Ronald Reagan said this is an evil empire, what we've heard in the more recent years is that gave us hope. Somebody was willing to stand up and call it what it was. And at the time, that kept them going.

And our colleague here in the House, SAM JOHNSON, when he was a POW for 7 years in North Vietnam, being tortured daily, one of the most difficult things to endure was the information that our country did not care.

Now, it's heartbreaking to think about our friends who were suffering in horrible prison conditions, and we gave—not only gave the impression we didn't care, we had people running around blaming those very people for their own troubles when all they were trying to do was keep horrible, repressive regimes from taking over and killing millions, as they did when we left.

And so one of the great attributes of Reagan was he called things like he saw them, and it gave hope to the world.

And I don't know if my friend from New Jersey has heard me mention this, but last year, around Easter, I was in West Africa and met with some of the West Africans who were Christians. And the oldest said he wanted to make sure that I knew that they were so excited when we elected an African American president, that that was thrilling to them, until they began to see that his policies were weakening America. And this elderly, wonderful, wise gentleman, with others younger, all in agreement, said, You have got to make sure people in Washington understand. If you keep becoming weaker, we lose hope in this life. We know where our hope is in the next life. But as far as our hope for having a peaceful life in this world, it will be gone when you become too weak. Please tell your friends in Washington, do not let America grow any weaker.

And here we overspend. We give monies to countries who hate us, who hate the things we stand for, who hate the fact that we believe in freedom, because they believe freedom leads to debauchery, and so they believe you should have some dictator, caliphate, somebody that tells you everything you can do and what you can't do because freedom, they believe, corrupts; whereas, we know in our hearts, it's in our Constitution, it's in our Declaration of Independence, God gave us freedom to make choices.

□ 1740

And it is one of the greatest things that America has done that I think has helped cause this Nation to be blessed. We have stood for those freedoms. Not just for America. There is no country in the history of the world that has

ever given treasure and life of that country's people to get freedom for other countries and other people of whom we ask nothing in return. That is unheard of in the history of the world, and yet this Nation has done it over and over. We have done it to help protect Muslims and give them freedom of choice, Christians, Buddhists. It did not matter. It was all about human rights, human dignity, and human freedom. And we see that slipping away every time we prop up some brutal dictator, every time we look the other way and pat cruel, evil people on the back and say, "Oh, we're so proud of you; we're glad to be your friend," when those like who have been repressed by Cuba say, "Please, do not give more credibility to the oppressors."

I yield to my friend for any final thoughts.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Well, I think you just made an articulate defense of why a consistent, transparent human rights, pro-freedom, pro-democracy foreign policy is absolutely essential if we want a world that is free of tyranny.

Pope John Paul II once said: If you want peace, work for justice. Then he said: If you want justice, work on behalf of the disenfranchised, unborn child, which I feel is a very good connection of human rights from womb to tomb.

But you made an excellent point about Ronald Reagan. Yesterday, Natan Sharansky, the great dissident—and FRANK WOLF and I actually got into the prison camp, Perm Camp 35, where he spent so many horrible days and nights in the ShiZO, which was the punishment cell. We were there in the late eighties right after he got out. And you remember, he didn't just walk in a straight line when the KGB said you walk right across. He did a zigzag, his ultimate final act of defiance to the KGB.

But he said just what you brought out, Judge GOHMERT, and that was that when Ronald Reagan talked about the Evil Empire, he said it again yesterday, they knew that we got it, that there was hope. And it gave him hope. It gave the other political dissidents hope. Jewish, Christian, whatever their denomination or religious belief, they said America understands the inherent failure of communism, the militant atheism which it represents, as Solzhenitsyn said it in his books, and he had hope.

Wei Jingsheng correspondingly, who is the father of the democracy war movement in China, a great leader, he told me when they let him out to get Olympics 2000—not the one they just had, Olympics 2000, and the Olympic committee didn't give it to them because they were such violators of human rights. Unfortunately, they capitulated some years later. He said, "When you kowtow, when you enable, when you pander to dictatorship, including the Chinese dictatorship, espe-

cially the Chinese dictatorship, they beat us more in prison. But when you are tough, transparent, you look the dictator in the eye and say we are not kidding; we want these people released, they beat us less." That is from a man who spent 20 years in the Chinese laogai. Harry Wu and all the others have said the exact same thing.

So when President Obama kowtowed for the better part of a week in front of Hu Jintao, it was, in my opinion, a shameless exercise of lack of commitment to human rights and they beat the dissidents more because, "They will tell us, America has abandoned you."

Thankfully, in a bipartisan way—because when Hu Jintao came right here on Capitol Hill, it was our Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER, who raised human rights and raised the inherent violation of human rights in the one child per couple policy, the missing girls, 100 million missing girls in China, the result of a one child per couple policy where brothers and sisters are illegal. And over the course of 30 years, since 1979, when that horrific policy, the worst crime against women ever, went into effect, they have systematically exterminated the girl child, and now many of them are not here even as young women.

Forty million men won't be able to find wives by 2020 in China because women have been forcibly aborted as part of this one child per couple policy. It's a huge gender disparity, which raises problems about potential war. There is a book called "The Barren Branches" that talks about this restless male population that can't ever get married because women are not there. It is also a magnet for human trafficking.

Our President should have stood boldly, I say diplomatically. FRANK WOLF and I met with Li Peng when he was Premier. We had a list of political prisoners. We talked about the one child per couple policy. We talked about religious freedom. We looked him right in the eye. Almost no one ever does that. You will do it. I will do it. Our President should do it. President Bush did it. He raised religious freedom robustly with the Chinese Government on his trips. Mrs. Clinton on her first trip to Beijing said, I am not going to let human rights, quote, interfere with global climate change issues and the issue of debt.

So it really is a very serious abandonment of the people who need it most, who will be the next Lech Walesa or Harry Wu or Wei Jingsheng. You bring up an excellent point, and I thank you for your leadership on human rights and the peace agenda, which is really the freedom agenda.

Mr. GOHMERT. It is certainly an honor to serve with you. And I don't know if you are aware, our friend TED POE, our colleague, has a bill that is trying to force all foreign aid to come to a vote country by country. That would give us the chance to discuss

these very things on each country, on whether or not we should give them assistance. Isn't that wonderful? So I look forward to that in the time to come.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the time to discuss this very important issue, and especially now that money is so critically needed and that we should not be wasting it to help those who repress others.

#### IT IS TIME FOR THE SENATE TO ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the United States Senate to act. The Democrats in the United States Senate, the Democrat leadership in the United States Senate, have failed the American people.

Last year when the Democrats controlled the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the White House, their leadership failed to adopt a budget. In fact, for the first time since adopting the Budget Act of 1974, the House of Representatives failed to pass a budget. NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID left our country in a mess. Today, we are operating without a long-term spending plan. It must stop.

Earlier this year, a new majority came in to the House of Representatives; and under the leadership of JOHN BOEHNER, this new majority adopted a long-term spending plan that would outline the priorities of our government through September 30 of this year.

In this very Chamber, we stayed up late at night for four nights in a row. We debated and we hammered out a long-term spending plan. That plan included the largest cut in spending in American history.

□ 1750

We defunded Planned Parenthood, we defunded NPR, we defunded ObamaCare. We placed significant restraints on regulatory agencies that have gone out of control, such as the EPA. And then the bill moved down to the Senate, and the Senate has failed to act.

Since then, in order to give them more time, we have granted two budget extensions, one for 2 weeks and then earlier this week we extended it for 3 more weeks. But included in those budget extensions were \$10 billion worth of spending cuts. While we have offered those temporary extensions, the permanent plan that has passed this Chamber still languishes in the Senate. The leadership of that body has not passed our spending plan, or, for that matter, any spending plan.

We are waiting. But, more importantly, the American people are waiting. We cannot negotiate with silence. If they don't like our spending plan,



then let them put forth one of their own. But it is time for the Senate to act. These temporary extensions are no way to run a business, and they are certainly no way to run a country.

Earlier this week our negotiators asked for 3 more weeks. Since we have only been in office for a little over 10 weeks, I thought it was wise to grant that extension and I voted for it.

Here the House has been doing the work of the American people. We have passed H.R. 2, the bill that repeals ObamaCare. We have defunded ObamaCare in its entirety, including the \$105 billion of preapproved spending; and we are moving forward. In fact, I don't think we should stop until ObamaCare is completely defunded. The House is working on legislation that will eliminate permanently that mandatory slush fund, and I hope we will vote on that in the upcoming weeks. But it is time for the Senate to act.

America wants real spending reform so that we can give businesses large and small the confidence they need, the predictability they need, and they can go out and be about the business of creating jobs that will grow our economy. It is time for the White House and the Senate to listen. House Republicans can only do so much. We only have control of one-half of one-third of the government, so we cannot act by ourselves. It is past time for the Senate to act.

Over the next 3 weeks we will be waiting, and we will be watching, to negotiate a long-term solution that will get us out of this mess that they left us in when they concluded last year.

#### CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 2011

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today on a motion offered pursuant to this order, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Friday, March 18, 2011, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 30, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 48. Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, March 18, 2011, at 10 a.m., unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 30, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

903. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "2010 Packers and Stockyards Program Annual Report", pursuant to the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

904. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-deficiency Act in an account of the Department of Veterans Affairs, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

905. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Preservation of Tooling for Major Defense Acquisition Programs (DFARS Case 2008-D042) (RIN: 0750-AG45) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

906. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report that the Department is taking essential steps to award a Joint Service Multi-Year Procurement (MYP) contract; to the Committee on Armed Services.

907. A letter from the Executive Director and Designated Federal Officer, Military Leadership Diversity Commission, transmitting a report entitled From Representation to Inclusion: Diversity Leadership for the 21st-Century Military; to the Committee on Armed Services.

908. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-B-1143] received March 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

909. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received February 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

910. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Notice of Availability of the Proposed Models for Plant-specific Adoption of Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-423, Revision 1, "Technical Specifications End States, NEDC-32988-A", for Boiling Water Reactor Plants Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process [NRC-2009-0403] received February 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

911. A letter from the Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's Strategic Plan for

fiscal years 2011 through 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

912. A letter from the Inspector General, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the 2010 Consumer Product Safety Commission Improvement Act Report to Congress; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

913. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting Annual Operating Plan for Colorado River System Reservoirs for 2011, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1552(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

914. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic [Docket No.: 001005218-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XA195) received March 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

915. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting sixth annual report on crime victims' rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

916. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the granting of the application for a one-year extension of the District of Arizona's declaration of a judicial emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

917. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the Office's report entitled, "Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States" for the September 2010 session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

918. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Copayments for Medications After June 30, 2010 (RIN: 2900-AN65) received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

919. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updating Fire Safety Standards (RIN: 2900-AN57) received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

920. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Industry Director's Directive #3 on Super Completed Contract Method (LB&I Control No.: LB&I-4-1010-029) received March 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

921. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 10 Tax Sheltered Annuity Contracts (Rev. Rul. 2011-7) received March 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

922. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2011-6) received February 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

### 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. SMITH (TX): Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3. A bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide for conscience protections, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-38 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH (TX): Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5. A bill to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system; with an amendment (Rept. 112-39 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 471. A bill to reauthorize the DC opportunity scholarship program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 899. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to extend the sunset date for certain protests of task and delivery order contracts (Rept. 112-37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

### REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 358. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify special rules relating to coverage of abortion services under such Act; with an amendment, (Rept. 112-40 Pt. 1); referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period ending not later than April 15, 2011, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(t), rule X.

### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL PURSUANT TO RULE XII

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following actions were taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3. Referral to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than April 7, 2011.

H.R. 5. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than May 13, 2011.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 1144. A bill to increase the transparency of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1145. A bill to provide construction, architectural, and engineering entities with qualified immunity from liability for negligence when providing services or equipment on a volunteer basis in response to a declared emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1146. A bill to end membership of the United States in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 1147. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for certain payments made to reduce debt on commercial real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALZ of Minnesota (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 1148. A bill to prohibit commodities and securities trading based on nonpublic information relating to Congress, to require additional reporting by Members and employees of Congress of securities transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, House Administration, the Judiciary, and Ethics, 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. BILBRAY (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 1149. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to include algae-based biofuel in the renewable fuel program and amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include algae-based biofuel in the cellulosic biofuel producer credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. GOSAR:

H.R. 1150. A bill to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1151. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to make risk-based assessments on financial companies to recoup the amount of assistance made available for unemployed homeowners under the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program and for States and communities under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 1152. A bill to require all persons in the United States between the ages of 18 and 25 to perform national service, either as a member of the uniformed services or in civilian service in furtherance of the national defense and homeland security, to authorize the induction of persons in the uniformed services during wartime to meet end-strength requirements of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER,

Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 1153. A bill to provide for consultation by the Department of Justice with other relevant Government agencies before determining to prosecute certain terrorism offenses in United States district court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1154. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prevent the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from prohibiting the use of service dogs on Department of Veterans Affairs property; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1155. A bill to establish procedures for the expedited consideration by Congress of the recommendations set forth in the Terminations, Reductions, and Savings report prepared by the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. DENT:

H.R. 1156. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to a country that denies or unreasonably delays accepting the country's nationals upon the request of the Secretary of Homeland Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 1157. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to conduct levee system evaluations and certifications on receipt of requests from non-Federal interests; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 1158. A bill to authorize the conveyance of mineral rights by the Secretary of the Interior in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 1159. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act relating to the limitation on the Medicare exception to the prohibition on certain physician referrals for hospitals and to transparency reports and reporting of physician ownership or investment interests; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. KISSELL (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SHULER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina):

H.R. 1160. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey the McKinney Lake National Fish Hatchery to the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. BRALLEY of Iowa, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1161. A bill to reaffirm state-based alcohol regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKS:

H.R. 1162. A bill to provide the Quileute Indian Tribe Tsunami and Flood Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. SUTTON):

H.R. 1163. A bill to provide Federal contracting preferences for, and a reduction in the rate of income tax imposed on, Patriot corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. KING of New York (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 1164. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1165. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish an Ombudsman Office within the Transportation Security Administration for the purpose of enhancing transportation security by providing confidential, informal, and neutral assistance to address work-place related problems of Transportation Security Administration employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 1166. A bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 1167. A bill to provide information on total spending on means-tested welfare pro-

grams, to provide additional work requirements, and to provide an overall spending limit on means-tested welfare programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Rules, Agriculture, and Energy and Commerce, 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. RIGELL (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 1168. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that matching contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund for Members of Congress be made contingent on Congress completing action on a concurrent resolution on the budget, for the fiscal year involved, which reduces the deficit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1169. A bill to amend titles 5, 10, and 32, United States Code, to eliminate inequities in the treatment of National Guard technicians, to reduce the eligibility age for retirement for non-Regular service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. BACA (for himself and Mr. CULBERSON):

H.R. 1170. A bill to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, to provide for the use of gold in the metal content of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1171. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Marine Debris Research, Prevention, and Reduction Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Ms. BERTKLEY:

H.R. 1172. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide an increased payment for chest radiography (x-ray) services that use Computer Aided Detection technology for the purpose of early detection of lung cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 1173. A bill to repeal the CLASS program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 1174. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for the licensing of Internet gambling activities by the Secretary of the Treasury, to provide for consumer protections on the Internet, to enforce the tax code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, 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. CARDOZA (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CRITZ):

H.R. 1175. A bill to establish an Oleoresin Capsicum Spray Pilot Program in the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 1176. A bill to amend the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 to include farmed shellfish as specialty crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRITZ:

H.R. 1177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for tax preferred savings accounts for individuals under age 26, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. KISSELL):

H.R. 1178. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend military commissary and exchange store privileges to veterans with a compensable service-connected disability and to their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1179. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado):

H.R. 1180. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish small business start-up savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (for himself and Mr. CRITZ):

H.R. 1181. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to include firearms in the types of property allowable under the alternative provision for exempting property from the estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENSARLING (for himself and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1182. A bill to establish a term certain for the conservatorships of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, to provide conditions for continued operation of such enterprises, and to provide for the wind down of such operations and the dissolution of such enterprises; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 1183. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of interstate commerce for suicide promotion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Mr. WALSH of Illinois):

H.R. 1184. A bill to require greater transparency concerning the criteria used to grant waivers to the job-killing health care law and to ensure that applications for such waivers are treated in a fair and consistent

manner, irrespective of the applicant's political contributions or association with a labor union, a health plan provided for under a collective bargaining agreement, or another organized labor group; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Mr. WALSH of Illinois):

H.R. 1185. A bill to delay the implementation of the health reform law in the United States until there is final resolution in pending lawsuits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, House Administration, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Appropriations, and Rules, 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. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1186. A bill to repeal changes made by health care reform laws to the Medicare exception to the prohibition on certain physician referrals for hospitals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 1187. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to direct Medicaid EHR incentive payments to federally qualified health centers and rural health clinics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 1188. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate incentives for alcohol fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 1189. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to assist municipalities that would experience a significant hardship raising the revenue necessary to finance projects and activities for the construction of wastewater treatment works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1190. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. STARK, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 1191. A bill to affirm the religious freedom of taxpayers who are conscientiously opposed to participation in war, to provide that the income, estate, or gift tax payments of such taxpayers be used for non-military purposes, to create the Religious Freedom Peace Tax Fund to receive such tax payments, to improve revenue collection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. WU):

H.R. 1192. A bill to extend the current royalty rate for soda ash; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HIN-

CHEY, Mr. WEST, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 1193. A bill to ensure that the courts of the United States may provide an impartial forum for claims brought by United States citizens and others against any railroad organized as a separate legal entity, arising from the deportation of United States citizens and others to Nazi concentration camps on trains owned or operated by such railroad, and by the heirs and survivors of such persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign 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. McDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 1194. A bill to renew the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve demonstration projects designed to test innovative strategies in State child welfare programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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 Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H.R. 1195. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 1196. A bill to remove the incentives and loopholes that encourage illegal aliens to come to the United States to live and work, provide additional resources to local law enforcement and Federal border and immigration officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Education and the Workforce, House Administration, Financial Services, Homeland Security, Ways and Means, Natural Resources, and Agriculture, 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 Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1197. A bill to direct the Mayor of the District of Columbia to establish a District of Columbia National Guard Educational Assistance Program to encourage the enlistment and retention of persons in the District of Columbia National Guard by providing financial assistance to enable members of the National Guard of the District of Columbia to attend undergraduate, vocational, or technical courses; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1198. A bill to extend to the Mayor of the District of Columbia the same authority over the National Guard of the District of Columbia as the Governors of the several States exercise over the National Guard of those States with respect to administration of the National Guard and its use to respond to natural disasters and other civil disturbances, while ensuring that the President retains control of the National Guard of the District of Columbia to respond to homeland defense emergencies; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for con-

sideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 1199. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to support fire safety education programs on college campuses; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1200. A bill to provide for health care for every American and to control the cost and enhance the quality of the health care system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, Armed Services, 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. PAUL:

H.R. 1201. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a precious metals investment option in the Thrift Savings Fund; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 1202. A bill to restart jobs in the timber industry by providing for the protection of the Mexican Spotted Owl in sanctuaries; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. FALCOMA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1203. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to include the United States territories in the application of certain statutory copyright licenses related to low power television stations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. STARK, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1204. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate the exemption for aggregation of emissions from oil and gas development sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 1205. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to enhance authorities with regard to the disposal of real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. BARROW, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HECK, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 1206. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to preserve consumer and employer access to licensed independent insurance producers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HONDA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of

Georgia, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOREN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1207. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and operate a visitor facility to fulfill the purposes of the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 1208. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to permit a prevailing party in an action or proceeding brought to enforce the Act to be awarded expert witness fees and certain other expenses; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1209. A bill to reform the housing choice voucher program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1210. A bill to provide limitations on maritime liens on fishing permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. TOWNS):

H. Res. 176. A resolution commending the progress made by anti-tuberculosis programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. GRIMM:

H. Res. 177. A resolution expressing support for internal rebuilding, resettlement, and reconciliation within Sri Lanka that are necessary to ensure a lasting peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HECK:

H. Res. 178. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a committee report on a bill or joint resolution to include a statement of whether the legislation creates any duplicative programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. SARBANES):

H. Res. 179. A resolution recognizing and appreciating the historical significance and the heroic human endeavor and sacrifice of the people of Crete during World War II and commending the PanCretan Association of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H. Res. 180. A resolution urging Turkey to respect the rights and religious freedoms of the Ecumenical Patriarchate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BASS of California, and Mr. BACA):

H. Res. 181. A resolution honoring the memory of Christina-Taylor Green by en-

couraging schools to teach civic education and civil discourse in public schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. OWENS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OLVER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H. Res. 182. A resolution recognizing the historical significance of the Triangle Fire in the struggle to improve worker safety standards and protections on the 100th anniversary of the fire; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. WU, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FALDOMAEGA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BOREN):

H. Res. 183. A resolution recognizing Company E, 100th Battalion, 442d Infantry Regiment of the United States Army and the sacrifice of the soldiers of Company E and their families in support of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FALDOMAEGA, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H. Res. 184. A resolution expressing support for designation of a "Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1144.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1145.

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

Clause 3, of section 8, of article I of the Constitution, which states that the United States Congress shall have power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1146.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 1147.

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

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WALZ of Minnesota:

H.R. 1148.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Sections 5 and 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 1149.

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 Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1150.

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." Further, pursuant to the Supreme Court ruling in *United States v. South-Eastern Underwriters Association*, 322 U.S. 533, 552-53 (U.S. 1944), insurance is constitutionally subject to Congressional regulation. As set forth by the Court:

Our basic responsibility in interpreting the Commerce Clause is to make certain that the power to govern intercourse among the states remains where the Constitution placed it. That power, as held by this Court from the beginning, is vested in the Congress, available to be exercised for the national welfare as Congress shall deem necessary. No commercial enterprise of any kind which conducts its activities across state lines has been held to be wholly beyond the regulatory power of Congress under the Commerce Clause. We cannot make an exception of the business of insurance.

Speaking directly on the power of Congress to regulate insurance, or to exempt the insurance industry from monopolistic practices under the Sherman Act, the Court explained:

Whether competition is a good thing for the insurance business is not for us to consider. Having power to enact the Sherman Act, Congress did so; if exceptions are to be written into the Act, they must come from the Congress, not this Court.

*United States v. South-Eastern Underwriters Association*, 322 U.S. 533, 561 (U.S. 1944). This bill eliminates the exemption created by Congress, under powers expressly enumerated in the Constitution. As for the proscription on class action suits based on antitrust legal theories against insurers, the Constitution does not guarantee the right to a class action lawsuit. Rather, individuals are simply guaranteed an individual jury trial under the Seventh Amendment. There is no collective right to a civil legal remedy. This act preserves private rights of action brought by aggrieved individuals and therefore comports with the Seventh Amendment and maintains enforcement of the public goals by the appropriate public entities, the states or the federal government.

That the Interstate Commerce Clause has been construed to grant Congress the power to regulate unfair or anticompetitive business practices that harm interstate commerce, was recently commented upon by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Gonzales v. Raich*, 545 U.S. 1 (2005):

The Commerce Clause emerged as the Framers' response to the central problem giving rise to the Constitution itself: the absence of any federal commerce power under the Articles of Confederation. For the first century of our history, the primary use of the Clause was to preclude the kind of discriminatory state legislation that had once been permissible. Then, in response to rapid industrial

development and an increasingly interdependent national economy, Congress “ushered in a new era of federal regulation under the commerce power,” beginning with the enactment of the Interstate Commerce Act in 1887 and the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890.

*Gonzales v. Raich*, 545 U.S. 1 (2005). Finally, this Bill respects the Tenth Amendment and preserves the rights of each state to establish and enforce their own anti-trust or unfair competition statutes, and it narrowly construes the Interstate Commerce Clause to actions that involve actual commerce, a product that is purchased and sold, administered and utilized across state lines, and has a clear effect on national commerce. In this manner, this Act would satisfy even Justice Thomas’ concurring view of the Interstate Commerce Clause, set forth in *United States v. Lopez*, 514 U.S. 549, 586-87 (1995), that the Commerce Clause empowers Congress only to regulate the buying and selling of goods and services trafficked across state lines. Modern class action lawsuits typically seek out class members from multiple jurisdictions, advertise nationwide, and predominate interstate issues to such a degree courts of multi-district jurisdiction are sometimes appointed. In this regard, class action lawsuits also engage in commerce across state lines and have been subjected to Congressional regulation, including the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005.

The Interstate Commerce Clause does not, as some have suggested, contain federal powers that are “unlimited” and indeed, the original application of this clause was quite narrow, as most aptly described in *Federalist No. 42*. In that tract, James Madison explains that the purpose undergirding the regulation of commerce among the States was to prevent each state from imposing taxes, duties or tariffs on goods from another state that would in effect limit trade among the states and create animus that “would nourish unceasing animosities, and not improbably terminate in serious interruptions of the public tranquility.” We follow here today, however, an accepted and long standing interpretation of the Commerce Clause that is not broad in that it regulates actual commerce involved between or transacted across state lines.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1151.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause).

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1152.

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

Congress is given the power under the Constitution “To raise and support Armies,” “To provide and maintain a Navy,” and “To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.” Art. I, § 8, cls. 12-14. See also: *Rostker v. Goldberg*, 453 U.S. 57 (1981).

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 1153.

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

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 and the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 1154.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 1155.

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

Article I, Section 5, Clause 2.

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 1156.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 1157.

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

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution: “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.”

The specific Constitutional Authority cited here is not intended and should not be construed to be exclusive of any other general or specific Constitutional Authority that is otherwise applicable.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 1158.

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

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution: “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.”

The specific Constitutional Authority cited here is not intended and should not be construed to be exclusive of any other general or specific Constitutional Authority that is otherwise applicable.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1159.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 1160.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2. 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. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1161.

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

This law is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3, and the 10th and 21st Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DICKS:

H.R. 1162.

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

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1163.

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.

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. KING of New York:

H.R. 1164.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4. 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 Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 1165.

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

Commerce Clause of the Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1166.

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. JORDAN:

H.R. 1167.

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

The bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RIGELL:

H.R. 1168.

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

Amendment I, Section 6, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution. “All Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.”

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1169.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), 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; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers, and any other constitutional authority appropriate and relevant to the provisions of this bill.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 1170.

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, 16, and 18.

By Mr. FARR:

H.R. 1171.

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

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 1172.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1173.

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

Article I, Section 7.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 1174.

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

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARDOZA:

H.R. 1175.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to its authority under Clause 9 of Section 8 of Article I and Section 1 of Article III of the Constitution to create and regulate Federal Courts.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1176.

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

The Constitutional authority for this legislation can be found in Article I, Clause 8, Section 18, that grants Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested by Congress in the Constitution of the United States or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. CRITZ:

H.R. 1177.

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

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1178.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1179.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 1180.

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

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution which reads:

“The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 1181.

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

Article I Section 8 Clause 4 (Bankruptcy Clause).

Article I Section 8 Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause).

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H.R. 1182.

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

Under Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution, which states: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 1183.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1184.

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

Article I, Section 8 the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1185.

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

Article I, Section 8 the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1186.

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

“The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Arti-

cle I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United 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. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 1187.

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

According to clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution, Congress has the authority to control the expenditures of the federal government.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 1188.

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 Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1189.

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. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1190.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and as further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1191.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and as further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 1192.

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

Article IV, Section 3. 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 Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 1193.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which reads: “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1194.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution that grants Congress the authority, “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.”

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 1195.

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

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 1196.

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

Section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1197.

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

Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1198.

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

Clause 17 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1199.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1200.

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

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, and Clause 3, Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1201.

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

This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: “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.”

This includes the ability to hire staff to assist in the execution of the foregoing powers and to define the salaries and benefits of those staff.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 1202.

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

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1203.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to enact copyright law, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution, and to regulate commerce among the several states, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1204.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1205.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2. 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. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 1206.

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.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states "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."

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 1207.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 1208.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1209.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1210.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 21: Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H.R. 91: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. ADAMS, and Mrs. CAPITO.  
 H.R. 110: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 121: Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 140: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. FORTENBERRY.  
 H.R. 156: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.  
 H.R. 178: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 191: Ms. DEGETTE.  
 H.R. 192: Mr. OLVER.  
 H.R. 198: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. COBLE.  
 H.R. 210: Mr. FILNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
 H.R. 219: Mr. CHABOT.  
 H.R. 258: Mr. SARBANES.  
 H.R. 276: Mr. MORAN.  
 H.R. 308: Ms. BASS of California.  
 H.R. 321: Mr. FARR.  
 H.R. 333: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. CARDOZA.  
 H.R. 374: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 396: Mr. WEST.  
 H.R. 401: Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 402: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 412: Mr. CARTER.  
 H.R. 431: Mr. RIGELL.  
 H.R. 436: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
 H.R. 450: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 452: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
 H.R. 455: Mr. BACHUS.  
 H.R. 456: Mr. KISSELL.  
 H.R. 457: Mr. POMPEO.  
 H.R. 459: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.  
 H.R. 462: Mr. HURT and Mr. WOODALL.  
 H.R. 470: Mr. GOSAR and Mrs. BONO MACK.  
 H.R. 471: Mr. LATTA.  
 H.R. 515: Mr. MARINO.  
 H.R. 529: Ms. TSONGAS.  
 H.R. 539: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 546: Mr. HANNA, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. HALL.  
 H.R. 591: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 601: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 602: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 603: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 604: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 605: Mrs. EMERSON.  
 H.R. 616: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
 H.R. 620: Mr. CANSECO, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.  
 H.R. 639: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. YARMUTH.  
 H.R. 640: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.  
 H.R. 642: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
 H.R. 653: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. GARAMENDI.  
 H.R. 661: Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 667: Mr. POLIS.  
 H.R. 673: Mr. BOREN.  
 H.R. 674: Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BOSWELL.  
 H.R. 712: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
 H.R. 721: Mr. KLINE.  
 H.R. 729: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 733: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 735: Mr. LANDRY and Mr. PLATTS.  
 H.R. 748: Mr. GOODLATTE.  
 H.R. 756: Mr. LATOURETTE.  
 H.R. 763: Mr. DUFFY and Mr. BONNER.  
 H.R. 765: Mr. TIPTON.  
 H.R. 773: Ms. HIRONO.  
 H.R. 787: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LANDRY, and Mr. POSEY.  
 H.R. 822: Mr. CRITZ, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. POMPEO.  
 H.R. 826: Mrs. MYRICK.  
 H.R. 835: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PETRI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. CRITZ.  
 H.R. 853: Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 854: Mr. POLIS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. TSONGAS.  
 H.R. 863: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
 H.R. 871: Mr. CICILLINE.  
 H.R. 872: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SIREN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. AUSTRIA.  
 H.R. 881: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
 H.R. 892: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 893: Mr. RUNYAN and Mr. CRENSHAW.  
 H.R. 894: Ms. MOORE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
 H.R. 895: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 900: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 903: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. HUNTER.  
 H.R. 906: Ms. BASS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 910: Mr. POSEY and Mr. FLAKE.  
 H.R. 920: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.  
 H.R. 925: Ms. HIRONO.  
 H.R. 929: Ms. HIRONO.  
 H.R. 937: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 938: Ms. MOORE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 942: Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 960: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. MCKINLEY.  
 H.R. 968: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. PLATTS.  
 H.R. 984: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.  
 H.R. 993: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
 H.R. 998: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.  
 H.R. 1000: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1006: Mr. CHAFFETZ.  
 H.R. 1022: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NOR-TON, and Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 1032: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
 H.R. 1041: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. BARTLETT.  
 H.R. 1051: Mr. REICHERT.  
 H.R. 1055: Mr. BUCSHON.  
 H.R. 1057: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 1058: Mr. POSEY, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 1065: Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. LATOURETTE.  
 H.R. 1070: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.  
 H.R. 1075: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 1077: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 1080: Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 1081: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BONNER, Mr. LANDRY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. LUJAN.  
 H.R. 1082: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. BACHUS.  
 H.R. 1084: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. CLEAVER.  
 H.R. 1086: Mr. KISSELL.  
 H.R. 1089: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 1090: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. WOOLSEY.  
 H.R. 1093: Mr. POSEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. BUCHANAN.  
 H.R. 1106: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Ms. HIRONO.  
 H.R. 1111: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
 H.R. 1113: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.  
 H.R. 1118: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
 H.R. 1119: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.  
 H.R. 1121: Mr. HURT and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 1122: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.



- H.R. 1128: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 1142: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.  
 H.J. Res. 1: Mr. HELLER.  
 H. Con. Res. 21: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. RAHALL.  
 H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. CASSIDY.  
 H. Res. 44: Mr. LATTA, and Mrs. ADAMS.  
 H. Res. 77: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BILBRAY, and Ms. BERKLEY.  
 H. Res. 86: Mr. GOODLATTE.  
 H. Res. 98: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.  
 H. Res. 106: Mr. FORBES.  
 H. Res. 111: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. TOWNS.  
 H. Res. 130: Mr. SIRES.  
 H. Res. 137: Mr. FARR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. BOREN.  
 H. Res. 142: Mr. POLIS.  
 H. Res. 163: Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. HIRONO.  
 H. Res. 165: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H. Res. 172: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KEATING, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. PAYNE.  
 H. Res. 173: Mr. JONES.