



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 2011

No. 48

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 5, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KEVIN YODER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

UPPER BIG BRANCH MINE TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, a massive explosion ripped through the 2-mile area of the Upper Big Branch Mine in Montcoal, West Virginia. The explosion bent railroad tracks like pretzels and killed 29 miners.

This disaster laid bare the loopholes that riddle our mine safety laws. These loopholes allowed dubious mine opera-

tors, like Massey Energy, to violate mine safety rules repeatedly and with impunity. In fact, the Upper Big Branch Mine was allowed to remain open even though it had been ordered to stop operations 51 times in the previous year because of severe safety hazards.

After the disaster, there were proclamations made from both sides of the aisle about taking meaningful action to honor the victims so that something like this would never happen again. However, standing here a year later, miners still face many of the same dangers as they did the morning before the tragedy in West Virginia.

Unscrupulous mine operators are still gaming the system by clogging it with thousands of appeals as a way to avoid paying strong penalties. Miners are still paralyzed with the fear of being fired for speaking out because of weak whistleblower protections. Decisions made in the boardrooms to maximize coal production at the expense of miners' safety remain unchallenged. Management practices of illegally giving advance warning of pending inspections are still a mere misdemeanor.

Shortly after the Upper Big Branch tragedy, the Education and Labor Committee held the only hearings where Congress heard from families and miners affected by this tragedy. Many were reluctant to testify because they feared retaliation. For others, there was a strong desire to tell their stories to prevent another tragedy in the coal mines of America.

Eddie Cook told us about the dangerous practices he heard from the miners at the Upper Big Branch Mine after the explosion. He lost his 21-year-old nephew, Adam Morgan.

Adam's father, Steve Morgan, said that when he spoke to his son about the unsafe conditions, management told him that he might just have to find another job. They did nothing about the unsafe conditions.

Gary Quarles lost his only son at Upper Big Branch. Gary asked us to make a commitment to make sure that it doesn't happen again.

Alice Peters testified about how her son-in-law, Dean Jones, was afraid to work in the mine because of the ventilation problems, but Dean needed the job in order to keep health insurance coverage for his special-needs son.

Clay Mullins lost his brother Rex at Upper Big Branch. Clay testified how the management would give advance warning of an impending mine safety inspection so that they could quickly cover up any violations before the Federal inspectors got to that part of the mine.

And Stanley "Goose" Stewart was working at the Upper Big Branch Mine the day it exploded. He testified twice before the committee about the persistent fear and intimidation faced by workers from Massey management.

Every mine law has been written with the blood of miners; and savvy political interests know that, as attention to the tragedy fades, so does the willingness of the Congress to act decisively. Families and miners also expressed their concern about this skepticism. Looking back now, a year later, their skepticism was entirely justified.

Congress has utterly failed to respond to the real problems that miners, themselves, have identified as safety hazards in their workplace. A toxic political environment has failed these families. The pay-to-play nature of our politics has failed these families.

While congressional action was stymied, the Mine Safety and Health Administration has been working hard to make adjustments in the limited ways it can to help prevent rogue mine operators from recklessly putting lives at risk; but even with these measures, we are hearing the familiar cries from Big Coal to maintain the status quo while they continue to game a legal system designed to protect the miners who go to work in those mines every day.

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.

H2295

They cry about their so-called “due process”; but what about the due process for the 29 miners who died in the Upper Big Branch Mine explosion—and their families? What about the miners who went to work today in the coal mines of America—and their families?

Is Congress just going to sit here and simply wait for the next explosion? the next tragedy? the next loss of life? Are we going to let the special interests continue to paralyze this institution?

These should not be hard questions for the Congress of the United States. Our ability to respond goes to the heart of who we are as a Nation. There are things that Congress can and must do right now—and that only Congress can do—to better ensure that every coal miner who goes to work is able to return safely to their families at the end of their shifts. Congress has an obligation to make sure that that is the case.

It is long overdue to honor our promises to the families of the 29 miners who perished a year ago for doing the job that our Nation relies on to provide its energy, and it is also long overdue to give the rest of our Nation’s miners modern health and safety protections.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE LASALLE LANCERS AND THE TAFT SENATORS

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, boxing legend Muhammad Ali once said, “Champions aren’t made in gyms. Champions are made from something they have deep inside them—a desire, a dream, a vision.”

I would like to recognize two high school basketball teams from my district which proved that they are, indeed, champions. They had the desire to make every practice count and to play every game as if it were their last. They shared a dream that was strong enough to overcome the many distractions all high school kids face, and their coaches gave them the vision that all their hard work and sacrifice would pay off in the end.

The schools? The LaSalle Lancers and the Taft Senators.

First, congratulations to the LaSalle Lancers on winning the 2011 Ohio Division I Basketball State Championship. LaSalle is a boys’ Catholic high school in my district that is particularly special to me since it’s my alma mater. Regardless of my personal attachments to the school, I’d like to recognize them on a job well-done and a season well-played. They represented themselves and our community with an outstanding display of athleticism, sportsmanship and class throughout the season—but especially in the playoffs.

The players and coaches stuck together in the face of adversity, especially when their head coach, Dan Fleming, suffered a heart attack, which placed sports and the tour-

namment in perspective. The LaSalle family rallied around their coach, and the Lancers, led by their seniors and the assistant coaches, went on to win their first basketball State championship in 15 years and the second in school history.

□ 1010

I would also like to congratulate Coach Tom Grippa and the LaSalle Lancer football team for their tremendous season. You made us proud. Congratulations Lancers.

I also rise today to congratulate the Taft High School Senators, who won the Division 3 Basketball State Championship. Now I acknowledge that it’s rare that a Member of this esteemed body, the House of Representatives, ever says anything positive about Senators, but I’d like to make an exception today.

Led by their head coach, Mark Mitchell, the Senators defeated Cleveland Central Catholic High School to win the first State championship in school history. The Senators went into the tournament ranked number 1 by the Associated Press. They not only made school history by winning their first State championship, but they also set a Division 3 boys basketball record for the most points scored in a championship game. Finishing the season at 26 and 1 is quite a feat. It is an honor to have them represent our district, and I congratulate them on their success.

I would be remiss if I didn’t also commend former Cincinnati Bengal star Mike Martin for the tremendous effort that he has made in turning around the Taft High School football program, mentoring his players to be successful in life as well as on the football field.

Let me conclude by once again congratulating the players, the coaches, the students, the faculty, and the fans of Cincinnati’s LaSalle Lancers and Taft Senators for the inspirational seasons you’ve just completed. You’ve made all of us very proud. Your accomplishments will be long remembered. Go Lancers! And go Senators!

1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF UPPER BIG BRANCH MINE TRAGEDY

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been 1 year since the fatal explosion at Upper Big Branch Mine, 365 days since we lost 29 courageous coal miners—fathers and sons, brothers and friends. We vowed then that some good would come from this terrible tragedy. We can say that criminal investigations are almost complete, enforcement has toughened, the Congress has increased funding to target pattern violators, and yet coal miners are still dying in our coal fields.

It’s easy to doubt. It’s easy to question whether things can be made bet-

ter. I find inspiration in the Biblical verse from Romans: “Glory in tribulations also, knowing that tribulations worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope.” Never lose hope that we can improve the health and safety of miners in the coal fields. Never lose hope that we can pass tougher mine safety laws and that we can enforce those laws and save lives.

There are plenty of good coal companies in America, companies that put time and effort and money into making their workplaces safe in which they operate. They are forward-thinking coal companies, with strong safety records that have designed programs aimed at protecting the lives and preserving the health of their miners. They want to see those bad actors, those companies that have tarnished the reputation of an important industry, reined in. They do not accept a world in which they must compete against companies that would sacrifice the health and lives of their own employees for competitive advantage and blatant profit.

There are plenty of Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who recognize that legislation is necessary. Congressman MILLER, Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY and I, along with many others, will continue fighting for reforms to give the agencies the tools they need to target the bad actors. We want to ensure that sound companies that have good records can continue to perform and produce, but we just as surely want to ensure that the worst operators can be reined in and that lives can be saved. We can strike a balance, and we will.

Changes and improvements may come slowly, but they will come. As long as coal miners and these brave, courageous families continue to demand that the loss of their loved ones not be in vain, they will come.

The April 5 disaster of 1 year ago was a tragedy that never, ever should have occurred. We must provide accountability, and we have a duty to institute changes that will help prevent a repeat of that awful day. Those 29 coal miners should not have perished, and for them and all those miners on the job today, we must keep speaking out.

Tonight, I will be at the 1-year anniversary with the families of all of these perished coal miners. I will look in the eyes of their loved ones once again as I did that painful week following their tragedy 24 hours, 7 days a week. We will join and we will commemorate these good men and the people who came together to try to rescue them—to them we say thank you—and to provide comfort and a final closure to these families, which we have yet to do.

These families want accountability, they want the truth, and they want to ensure that no other families ever have to suffer the way they have. Chairman MILLER, LYNN WOOLSEY and I remain committed to their cause. I urge my colleagues to join us in this life-saving, important endeavor.

IT'S TIME TO BRING OUR TROOPS HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, Congresswoman SUE MYRICK and I went to visit the wounded at Walter Reed. These trips are always a vivid reminder of the true cost of war. Seeing the men and women who have lost limbs for this country make we wonder how many more are going to be in that hospital, both at Walter Reed and Bethesda, with severe wounds.

After hearing Secretary Gates, and I have great respect for Secretary Gates, but he has made it clear that we will be in Afghanistan until 2014. He said it will be 2014 or 2015 before we can start substantially bringing down the number of troops in that country. Here we are in Washington battling right now about the 2011 budget, what should we do or not do and cut this and cut that, yet we seem to find \$8 billion a month for a corrupt leader in Afghanistan named Karzai. He's corrupt and his government is corrupt. Yet we're saying to the American people, if you're a senior, we can't be sure that you can get a sandwich at the senior citizen center in your county. We're saying to the children that cannot afford milk at home, there will be no programs for you. But yet we can find \$8 billion a month for a corrupt leader in a country in a war that we cannot win.

Our troops have already won, but history says you will not change Afghanistan—and I won't go through the history because of time. One day Karzai likes American troops being over there and the next day he doesn't like American troops being there. In fact, in December 2010 in the Washington Post, and I will paraphrase this, Karzai said to General Petraeus:

I have three main enemies—the Taliban, the Americans, and the international community. If I had to choose a friend today—and again, this is the President of Afghanistan—I would choose the Taliban.

They're the ones killing Americans and blowing their legs off and their arms off. How much longer does this have to go on?

I say to my colleagues in both parties, join Representative KUCINICH, RON PAUL and myself—and many others—let's bring our troops home.

I have a photograph here, Mr. Speaker, that was in the Raleigh, North Carolina, paper about a year ago. This is a young Army sergeant. His legs are gone. They've been blown off. His right arm has been blown off and he has a left arm. He is what they call a triple amputee. His lovely wife is there pushing the wheelchair.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for the American people to say to those of us in Congress, do not keep our troops there until 2014, 2015, 2016 for a corrupt leader. It's time to bring our troops home.

I have the fortune of representing Camp Lejeune Marine Base in my dis-

trict. I talk to the Marines, who are as brave as brave can be, that have been there three, four and five times. I've talked to the families as they're breaking up, the families when their loved one has committed suicide upon returning from Afghanistan. It's time to bring them home. How many more will be like this sergeant, without legs, without arms?

Mr. Speaker, last week on Tuesday, SUE MYRICK and I saw two young men, one from Florida and one from Nevada, that have no body parts below their waist. The body parts are gone. Everything is gone. Wake up, Congress, and let's bring our troops home from Afghanistan.

My close is this, Mr. Speaker: I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God, in His loving arms, to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. Mr. Speaker, I ask God to bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in God's eyes. I will ask God to give wisdom, strength, and courage to President Obama that he will do what is right in the eyes of God. And I will ask three times: God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

IN MEMORY OF FORMER MEMBER GERALDINE FERRARO

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

Mr. RANGEL. My colleagues, I rise to pay tribute to one of the great Americans that we have ever had in this body, Congresswoman Geraldine Ferraro. Most of the people remember her as an exciting Vice Presidential candidate, but those of us in the New York delegation remember her as just a great personality, a great legislator, and a great American.

We in the New York delegation have been fighting for time in which we could express ourselves, but the legislative calendar has not been very kind to us. So this morning we have two of her dear friends in Congresswoman MCCARTHY and Congresswoman MALONEY, and I suspect that every time a New York Member gets an opportunity, we will grab that time so that no one will ever say that she did not leave footprints here that all of us were just so proud.

□ 1020

She succeeded Jim Delaney, who was known to be a very conservative Democrat from Long Island. And we all awaited to see just who was going to succeed Jim. And to see this beautiful, intellectual former teacher, former assistant district attorney to come here, we all waited with breath held back to see just what type of woman she would be.

And even though she held closely those conservative views, it has never been presented to this body in a more

eloquent, a more charming way as we found ourselves with this new exciting candidate who later became a Member and became a part of the leadership of the New York delegation. And once Tip O'Neill saw her, she became a part of the congressional Democratic delegation and just went on. Wherever she went, she excelled with her smile, with her brains and contributed so much in raising the standards of Members of Congress and those who would run for national office.

I worked pretty closely with Senator Fritz Mondale when he ran for President of the United States. And while he was looking for a Vice Presidential candidate, I was so pleased, much surprised that Tip O'Neill said that he thought that within our delegation the answer to Fritz Mondale's problem would be the nomination of Geraldine Ferraro. I was surprised but so excited that I could serve on the Mondale team and to be able to say not only do we have a New Yorker, but we have an exciting candidate that could provide that shot in the arm that the Mondale campaign so badly needed.

And I felt so much like an American when we found out that her background was one of near poverty. Her dad had come here from Italy. She just made the Italian American community just so proud. She made women from all over the country proud. She made New Yorkers proud. And certainly while she did not succeed in becoming a Vice President, as Mondale did not get the numbers that he needed, she became a national figure, a compassionate figure serving in the United Nations, serving on television in terms of the expression of views of the Democratic Party, raising funds for candidates.

Then when she was stricken with this terrible disease that she died from, you would only hear her talking about her husband, John, her beautiful children, and how she can help to make it a better, more effective Democratic Party as well as what contributions can she make to this great country.

So we in the New York delegation feel extremely proud that she was a part of us. She had her own personal family that she loved, her own church, her own community. She had the respect and support of all Americans and the deep-seeded feelings Italian Americans have. She was so well respected in Democratic circles and congressional circles.

But most of all, we remember what a gentle lady she was. We have an expression in this House of Representatives, "the gentleman from Wisconsin," "the gentlewoman from New York." But anyone who had known Gerry, as we so affectionately called her, would know that she was indeed a strong leader but a gentle leader from Long Island and from New York.

PILL MILLS MUST GO

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, in my home State of Florida, seven people die a day, each day, of prescription drug abuse. We had three teenagers a couple of weeks ago die in 1 week. A gentleman, a friend of mine, buried his daughter on a Saturday. I talked to him on Monday, and he pleaded with me to do something about killing these pill mills all across our State.

Florida prescribes 10 times more oxycodone pills than all other States combined. To put it simply, we have more pain clinics than McDonald's restaurants.

It's time to put these pill mills out of business. We have 1,300 pill mills in Florida. We need to shut them down now. Four thousand deaths in Florida in 2008.

I've introduced legislation to crack down on pill mills. My bill will stiffen penalties and fines and use the seized assets to fund prescription drug databases. Forty-two States have databases. Florida does not. We need a database today.

The time to act is now. I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join me in this fight, to put these pill mills out of business and stop these needless deaths.

HONORING GERALDINE FERRARO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with the New York delegation to honor the memory and many contributions of one of our favorite daughters, Geraldine Ferraro. Last Thursday, New Yorkers poured out in great numbers to honor her at her funeral. Her three children—Donna, Laura, and John, Jr.—spoke eloquently and movingly in support and love of their late mother. And at the funeral and speaking in a eulogy beautifully for her, Vice President Mondale, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, Congresswoman JANE HARMAN, Senator MIKULSKI, and former President Clinton.

It would have thrilled her to see four women precede a President in eulogizing and speaking about her, two of whom were Secretaries of State, because it was her life that helped inspire and move women forward in our national life, not only in politics but in every area—business, finance. All areas of American life, Geraldine Ferraro inspired with her life and her historic run for Vice President of the United States.

With her passing, America lost a leader who was as wise as she was warm; a trailblazer who broke down barriers for women. For women everywhere, not just in the United States but across the world, Geraldine Ferraro

was a champion and a heroine. For me, personally, she was a dear, dear friend and a mentor.

What seemed to non-New Yorkers as a feisty and fast-talking woman seemed to us as just another mom from Queens. She inspired us with her personal story.

The daughter of Italian immigrants, raised by her seamstress mother after her father died at 8, she became a public school teacher, a lawyer—one of just two women in her law class—and a Member and leader of Congress, elected in 1978. She also, after her historic run, became a commentator on television, a delegate to the United Nations. She headed the World Conference in Beijing in 1995, and I was proud to be part of her delegation at the World Conference on Women.

Last August, on her 75th birthday, we renamed the Post Office in Long Island City in her honor. It used to be in her district; it is now in mine. And I was honored to be able to author the legislation and work with my New York colleagues and others to pass it. And she was so thrilled at that naming to see so many of her friends, not only from New York and her district but across the country, come in one place to honor her.

Later that day, which happened to also be Women's Equality Day, she rang the bell at the New York Stock Exchange in honor of the progress for women.

I know that a post office is only the start of the memorials to this wonderful, charming, talented trailblazer who continued blazing trails her entire life. I met with her shortly before she died, and she had a list of constituents she wanted helped and causes she wanted completed.

We do stand on her shoulders and women like her who came before us.

I will never forget, as an eager, young delegate to the 1984 Democratic National Convention, and I can tell you firsthand that Geraldine Ferraro thrilled us when she took the stage as the first woman ever nominated by a major political party to be its candidate for Vice President of the United States.

□ 1030

It was absolutely electrifying. She changed my life, and she changed the lives of women everywhere. She changed the aspirations of women and how they view themselves.

I will never forget being on the floor. Many of the men gave their delegate card to the women delegates who were part-time delegates. So the floor was filled with women. People were handing out cigars saying, "It's a woman." And when she went to the floor, there was literally applause for over 10 minutes.

I shall miss her dearly and shall honor her passing by redoubling my efforts to complete her unfinished work to pass the ERA. It is time to enshrine in our Constitution the high principle

of gender equality that Geraldine Ferraro so courageously stood for in her life.

Geraldine, we will miss you, we honor you, and we thank you for your many, many contributions to American life.

MEMORIAL FOR GERALDINE FERRARO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I also am part of the New York delegation, and I want to talk about Geraldine Ferraro. My good colleague, CAROLYN MALONEY, basically laid out her life and all the good things that she did. I guess I want to talk about what she meant to so many of us that weren't even in politics back then.

I think the first time that I ever saw Geraldine or heard of Geraldine was when she was announcing that she was going to be running for Vice President. So all these things from last week, when we were notified that Geraldine had passed away, many of us wanted to go back to New York for the funeral. Unfortunately, our business here kept us here so we couldn't go back. We're kind of used to that.

A lot of times it is said you can spend a lifetime here in Congress, but 2 minutes after you die they will say, "Who was that?" But that's not Geraldine. Geraldine was someone that was a force. Again I say in 1984, like most Americans, I took notice of Geraldine Ferraro when she did accept the Democratic nomination for Vice President at the national convention in San Francisco.

She struck me as a unique figure on TV, a woman in a male-dominated profession. She had a smile. She had confidence. When she got onto that stage, you just knew this radiance that came out of her. For myself, I was not in politics, didn't follow politics too well, but she certainly gave a strong impression to me.

Her message was also full of hope. I happen to believe that, especially when we say to people, "If we can do this, we can do anything." I am one of those people that believe that. I am here in Congress. Everybody said I couldn't do that. Somehow I got here. Somehow I have stayed here. Somehow I keep fighting for my constituents back at home.

She inspired women to get involved. She inspired them to get involved in politics, whether at the staff level or as a candidate. And while I understood the importance of the event, I had no idea that I would be standing here praising this woman that I first saw on TV. As I said, I had no political ambitions. I was a nurse, just several miles away from the city where Geraldine was. Like most Americans, I did vote and I followed the news, but I never thought I would get involved in politics.

Fast forward 12 years, it's mid 1996, and I'm still a nurse in Nassau County and still not thinking about politics whatsoever. Something happened to my life, as it does to so many other lives. An event happens, and all of a sudden you change and become an activist. Gun violence was unfortunately the issue that hit my family and many families on the Long Island Railroad. My husband was killed. My son was seriously wounded. I decided that I was going to do something about it. Geraldine Ferraro, the person that I saw on TV, called me. She said, "Carolyn, you should really think about running for Congress." There were other people calling me, too. And I'm thinking, "I'm a nurse. What do I know about politics?"

But you know what? If I was going to try and do something, then I had to run. Everybody told me I was going to lose. Maybe I would have. But I didn't. I won. But Geraldine was always there to give advice. Just because you're a woman doesn't mean you can't be tough. Just because you're a woman, you can be tough and you can be gentle, and you have to use that to get legislation done.

Well, here I am in Congress, and I am proud to be following in the footsteps of Geraldine Ferraro. I wouldn't use the words, the kind words that people use for her on myself like "pioneer" or "trailblazer." I actually followed Geraldine and her advice to come to Washington and try to make a difference.

Like so many women in New York politics today, Geraldine helped me as I went through from private citizen to candidate to public official. She opened so many doors for me, introducing me to people that I needed to meet. She was well known for this, for spending as much energy helping lift up others and having another woman follow.

We will all remember you, Geraldine. I will always remember you. God bless you. We do remember you. Thank you.

Again I thank my colleagues, CHARLIE and CAROLYN and PETER, for arranging this moment we could pay tribute to Geraldine.

With only 17 percent of members of Congress being women, we still have a long way to go when it comes to equality in representation.

But certainly we couldn't be where we are today if it weren't for Geraldine.

I for one am looking forward to making a living tribute to Geraldine, to take her philosophy of helping others, of lifting people up the ladder behind you, as I continue my career here.

Thank you very much.

1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF UPPER BIG BRANCH MINE DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it was exactly 1 year ago today that an explosion ripped through Upper Big Branch Mine in Montcoal, West Virginia, killing 29 workers. It was the deadliest

mine accident in 40 years. But perhaps "accident" is the wrong word to characterize what happened in Montcoal, West Virginia, last year April 5. This wasn't a hurricane, it wasn't a tsunami or some other act of nature.

Although the Mine Safety and Health Agency, MSHA, has yet to complete their investigation, it is absolutely clear from the preliminary reports that this tragedy was avoidable but for negligence and carelessness on the part of Massey Energy.

When Chairman MILLER and I traveled to West Virginia with Congressman RAHALL, miners told us that Massey routinely cut corners on safety. And yet the miners were afraid—they told us this too—to come forward for fear of losing their jobs. That's why we need stronger Federal whistleblower protections, Mr. Speaker. MSHA inspectors can't be everywhere all the time. So we need to rely on the people who know best. We need to rely on the workers, those that can report safety violations, because they are living with them. We must ensure that these workers have job protection when they come forward.

The questions we need to be asking ourselves are what can we be doing to make sure this does not happen again to them? What can we do to ensure that our Nation's coal miners, some of the hardest working and courageous people you will ever meet, aren't descending into a potential death trap every time they clock in?

But the silence from the United States Congress has been positively deafening. It is incomprehensible to me that we still haven't passed the Robert C. Byrd Miner Safety and Health Act. How many miners have to die before we take action?

□ 1040

Worker safety, not just in mines, but in workplaces above ground and across the Nation, is under siege thanks to irresponsible cuts in the Republican continuing resolution. Fully half of OSHA's staff would be furloughed if H.R. 1 becomes law.

A weak economy like this one that we are living in right now also further undermines worker safety, because as workers who want to report violations know, there are dozens who would take their jobs in spite of unsafe conditions just to have work.

Mr. Speaker, last Congress I was chair and now this Congress I am the ranking minority member of the Workforce Protection Subcommittee, and in that role I am absolutely committed, along with Congressman GEORGE MILLER and NICKY RAHALL, to bringing OSHA and MSHA into the 21st century, strengthening regulations to protect people from injury, sickness, and possible death on the job.

Needless to say, the Upper Big Branch explosion has devastated a tight-knit community with so many families still coping with grief. Gary Quarles, who testified before the Edu-

cation and Labor Committee last year, said "The life's been sucked right out of me" because he lost his only child in the explosion. Another man says of the death of his twin brother, "It's like part of me is gone." One woman lost her fiancé, whom she met when they worked side-by-side in the mine. And I cannot imagine the ordeal of Timothy Blake, who survived the blast and tried in vain to save eight coworkers.

But on this one 1-year anniversary, Mr. Speaker, let's do more than look back. Let's do more than remember and be sad. Let's use this tragedy as a call to action. In honor of the 29 fallen miners, let's give their coworkers the safety and protection they deserve.

CUTS TO THE BUDGET

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. A lot of talk around here about millions, billions, and trillions, but let's just try to put a face on some of the cuts the Republicans put in H.R. 1.

I think one of the meanest of their cuts and the stupidest of their cuts is to eliminate a program called YouthBuild. Now, I'm sure most of them don't know what it is. They have never met with the kids who come back here every year.

This is a program that started in 1992 under George H.W. Bush. It's a program that takes kids who have generally dropped out of high school, had problems with drugs, alcohol, other things, but at some point decide they want to get straight and they want to do something better with their lives.

So this program takes kids between 16 and 24, helps them get their GED, gets them some counseling, gets them involved in peer groups. They learn leadership skills, teaches them how to build houses and the houses they build are for low-income Americans.

In the long term we have found incredible results with this program. Last year—and these are almost 100 percent high school dropouts with problems—78 percent of the kids completed the program. That's pretty extraordinary. Now, after, when they leave the program, the longevity of the effect of this program, 7 years after completing the program, 75 percent of the YouthBuild kids, kids who had problems with drugs, alcohol, homelessness, dropped out of high school, everything else, are either in college or employed in jobs earning more than \$10 an hour.

That's a pretty darn good investment. And what does this cost, and why would the Republicans zero it out? Well, it cost \$102 million last year for 20,000 students.

Now, we could, I guess, instead leave them in the street without their high school degree, hopeless, maybe they would get back on drugs, maybe they will get in trouble, maybe we will them in jail, and then we will spend \$30,000 a

year to support them in prison. Twenty thousand bucks for 1 year to get these kids straight and have them become productive members of our society zeroed out by Republicans.

Now, it is a lot of money. That's almost 1 hour of spending for the Pentagon across the river, almost 1 hour. And there's no waste at the Pentagon, though. We are not allowed to look at the Pentagon for waste. It's almost 2 days—that's a lot—of agriculture subsidies, paying people not to grow things.

So 2 days of paying people not to grow things or a year's funding for a program that takes kids who have been in trouble but want to do better, want to learn some skills, want to be productive members of society and helps them get a leg up. But, no, in the Republican world, that's wasteful spending. They have zeroed out this program.

I met with eight of these kids last week. I meet with them every year when they come back—I urge my Republican colleagues, for once. I asked if they had seen their Republican member of my delegation. They said no. They met with a staff person, maybe an intern. Republicans can't seem to be bothered.

But they should listen to these kids, there's a lot of wisdom there and, I think, future leaders there. They have gotten their lives straight and they have gone through some hard times, and we gave them a little help, yes, 1 year. They get \$500 a month while they are in the program, while they are building houses for low-income people, learning skills. And as taxpayers in the future, they will pay that back pretty darn quickly.

Now I wonder why they eliminated this program. First of all, I am sure they don't know what it is. They have never met with the kids, they don't care. These aren't people who go to the country club after all. But, secondly, probably because it's housed in the Department of Labor, and we hate anything on the Republican side of the aisle that has the word "labor" in it.

God forbid that America should do things for working people in this country or working people should be allowed the right to organize and have a better life. Well, this is a program that should be continued. It should, in fact, be enhanced. They had 19,000 kids who couldn't get in the program last year, on the waiting list, 19,000.

We should double the size of this program, maybe triple it. That would be a huge amount of money. That would be 3 hours of spending at the Pentagon, or almost a week of subsidies, paying corporations not to grow things on surplus lands.

Boy, I guess we can't afford that, can we? But we can't cut the subsidies, and we can't look for waste at the Pentagon, but we can stick it to these kids.

Good work, Republicans.

HONORING GERALDINE FERRARO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a great American and one of the great political trailblazers in American history, Geraldine Ferraro. Many of us speaking today, myself included, would likely not have achieved our successes without her paving the way ahead of us.

Of course, her contributions did not benefit just those of us in the political sphere. Her life was an important symbol to girls and women who aspire to succeed in any field, particularly those who have struggled to break into professions traditionally dominated by men.

The 1984 Presidential campaign is remembered by many as a landslide for President Ronald Reagan. He was, in fact, a very popular President. But many of us who aspired to enter politics were electrified to see the first female on a Presidential ticket.

Of course, Gerry was more than just the first woman on a Presidential ticket. Those of us from the New York delegation remember her service to Queens and, really, to all five boroughs. Before coming to the House, her life had already been dedicated to the service of others in the district attorney's office and as an educator for our city's youth.

Perhaps most of all, she will be fondly remembered for her wit, kindness, and grace. Yet, despite her gentleness, she was not one to shirk from speaking her mind.

Mr. Speaker, women everywhere have lost an inspiration. New York has lost a public servant, and all of us have lost a great American.

Her legacy will be remembered, and I am proud to be on the House floor remembering her many contributions.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Rabbi Efrem Goldberg, Boca Raton Synagogue, Boca Raton, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, guard the Members of our esteemed House of Representatives. Instill within them the

wisdom, the courage and determination to provide for the physical, as well as the spiritual, well-being of the citizens of this great country.

May this body which hosts rigorous and robust debate continue to embrace diversity without resulting in divisiveness. May it seek and celebrate unity without imposing uniformity. May this House of Representatives, together with Houses of Worship across the land, promote justice, moral clarity, ethical living, righteousness, and acts of kindness.

As a grandchild of immigrants who fled the Nazis and came to this country 72 years ago this month to find refuge, freedom, and opportunity, I join this House in a prayer of profound gratitude and deep appreciation for the blessings we, the people of the United States of America, are privileged to enjoy.

Master of the Universe, protect our courageous Armed Forces, watch over our elected leaders, grant peace and prosperity to these United States and the entire world, and let us respond, 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.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. DEUTCH 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.

WELCOMING RABBI EFREM GOLDBERG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida

(Mr. DEUTCH) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to welcome Rabbi Efrem Goldberg to our Nation's Capitol and thank him for delivering such an insightful opening invocation.

Rabbi Goldberg's presence here today is especially significant to me, for I regularly study under his guidance. Since entering public life, I have become all the more grateful to have him as a spiritual mentor. His insights help me serve my constituents and work to better our world in a way that honors our Jewish tradition.

As Senior Rabbi of Boca Raton Synagogue, Rabbi Goldberg leads a wonderful congregation of over 700 families and 1,200 children. This February, after an extraordinary first 5 years as Senior Rabbi, it was announced that he will continue to lead the congregation for the next decade.

His energy, vision, and wisdom touch everyone he meets, just as it did for us here this morning when he provided us with his compelling and thoughtful invocation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING SHERIFF'S OFFICER DANIEL CHARLES MURPHY

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

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sheriff's Officer Daniel Charles Murphy, a fine public servant, who passed away on Saturday, April 24, 2010.

A lifelong resident of Toms River, New Jersey, Charles graduated from Toms River East High School in 2002, and went on to attend Montclair State University. After graduating in 2006, Charles began his career in public service at the Juvenile Justice Commission for the State of New Jersey. He was then named a dedicated Sheriff's officer for the Ocean County Sheriff's Department and held this position for 3 years.

Charles' commitment to justice was honored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 9503 on Sunday, March 20, 2011, where he was named the Sheriff's Officer of the Year at the VFW Citizenship Awards Ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Sheriff's Officer Daniel Charles Murphy, who dedicated his life to protecting the residents of Ocean County, New Jersey.

DEMOCRATS' ATTEMPT TO SHUT DOWN THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again condemn my Democratic colleagues' attempts to shut down the Federal Government. Even with total control of spending, Democrats failed to pass a budget last year. In the meantime, we have been operating on short-term spending bills only so that they can use their ace in the hole now, the government shut-down card. This has been their game plan all along, to attempt to divide the Republican Party, back us into a corner, and to shut down the government for their own political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, our Democratic counterparts are gambling with the future of this Nation, and it's a bet I'm not willing to take. I implore my colleagues to pass a long-term bill that protects seniors, protects veterans, and funds our troops so we can move on to next year's budget and work to get it right this time.

DEFENDING OUR SENIORS

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, the majority's proposed budget for fiscal year 2012 undermines our Nation's values and priorities, attacking our middle class and in particular our Nation's seniors. Today's seniors have a median income of only \$19,000 a year. Both the Medicare and Medicaid program enables seniors to have health care coverage they would not otherwise be able to afford. The proposed budget will end the Medicare program as we know it under the disguise of reform, threatening to turn it into a voucher program that will shift more and more costs to seniors and their families.

The majority's budget also attacks seniors from another angle, by proposing deep cuts in Medicaid, which serves as our Nation's primary payer for long-term care services. Medicaid will be starved by shifting the costs of the programs from the Federal Government to the States, which in turn could force seniors out of their own homes and communities into nursing homes.

Before Medicaid and Medicare, nearly one-half of America's seniors were uninsured. Mr. Speaker, we cannot go back to the days of the past. We must be committed to strengthening Medicare and Medicaid for the well-being of our seniors and future generations.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it's been 45 days since the House passed our bill to keep the government open and cut spending for the rest of this fiscal year. Forty-five days, and Senate Democrats still have not passed a bill or come up with a plan to reduce spending.

The American people have a right to know how we got here. For the first time since 1974, last year when the Democrats ran the House, the Senate, and the White House, the Democrat majorities failed to do their jobs, failed to pass a budget, failed to pass important spending bills.

To create a better and stronger America, we need to cut spending, balance the budget, pay down the debt, and slash the deficit. The American people want, need, and deserve better than trying to run a government deep into debt. A sign in my office sums it up well. It says, "It's the spending, stupid."

□ 1210

ON THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces serious economic challenges that require solutions that will create jobs and strengthen our economy. At a time when our top priorities should be creating jobs for the American people, our Republican colleagues have lost focus on working families.

The House budget that Republicans introduced this morning fails to put our country on a path to prosperity. Budgets are about priorities and values, and the Republican budget makes wrong choices for hardworking families.

Let's talk the Republican dictionary: Premium support system. When they talk about a premium support system, they mean vouchers and privatization.

Pro-growth changes to the Tax Code. When they talk about pro-growth changes, in fact, when they talk about anything that's going to change the Tax Code, they mean more cuts for millionaires and billionaires.

The Republican plan ends Medicare and Medicaid as we know it. By privatizing Medicare, millions of seniors who rely on this program will be left out in the cold.

While it's critical that we tighten our belts, we have choices to make. Let's choose not to do it on the backs of our seniors.

HONORING CHATTANOOGA POLICE OFFICERS TIM CHAPIN AND LORIN JOHNSTON

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor two members of the Chattanooga Police Department who were shot over the weekend, one of them fatally, while responding to a robbery in progress.

Sergeant Tim Chapin was a 26-year veteran of the Department. He lost his life in the line of duty on Saturday during a gun battle with an escaped

convict who had robbed a local store. Throughout my law career, I had the chance to interact with Sergeant Chapin on many occasions. I found him to be an outstanding officer and an even better human being.

Officer Lorin Johnston, who a few years ago donated a kidney to a fellow officer, was wounded during the gun battle as well.

I ask everyone to join me in saying many prayers for Sergeant Chapin's family and his wife, Kelle, as she now has to raise two boys as a single mother.

Today we remember officers Chapin and Johnston and those who serve alongside of them keeping our community safe. They are our heroes.

PROTECT AMERICANS FROM BIG POLLUTERS

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will consider a misguided and dangerous bill to repeal the Clean Air Act standards that protect Americans from big polluters.

Republicans are calling this bill the Energy Tax Prevention Act, except there is nothing to do with preventing taxes in the bill. Instead, this Dirty Air Act is a giveaway to any company who wants to dump pollution into the air free of charge and is a big gimme to all the Members of Congress hoping to collect their share of dirty campaign contributions.

If my Republican colleagues want to write a bill to overturn a decision by the Supreme Court, turn science on its head, increase our dependence on foreign oil, and put the interests of big polluters above taxpayers, they should at least come up with a catchier title, like the "Make Smog in America Act" or the "National Hot Air Distribution Act."

If my Republican colleagues want to write a bill to guarantee that more American children get sick with asthma, maybe they could call it the "Take Your Child to the Emergency Room Act."

Really, anything else would do.

DEATH BY REGULATION

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. To balance our budget, we have got to do more than just cut spending. We've got to cut excessive government regulation that keeps businesses from growing, expanding and hiring more people. We have got to get rid of the culture of "no" that infects our regulatory agencies like a cancer.

A small business from south Texas that knows firsthand the detrimental impact of shortsighted and excessive

regulation is Zarsky Lumber Company with its 135 employees. They survived the Great Depression and this economic downturn, and they now face another big threat—the EPA and its job-killing rules.

Another large business is considering locating a new plant in China instead of south Texas to avoid oppressive regulations. Our government has become too big and Federal regulations too onerous.

In a recent meeting with a Federal agency, I asked how long their permitting process took. They told me between 3 and 7 years. How do regulators sleep at night knowing that every day they delay is a day someone doesn't get a job they need to support their families?

Our job is to help create jobs. And we create jobs by getting the government out of the way. Cutting redtape is just as important as cutting spending to get our financial house in order.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE RYAN BUDGET

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, today we are beginning to get some of Budget Chairman RYAN's proposals for so-called "fixing" our economy.

He doesn't propose eliminating tax breaks for the hugely profitable oil and gas industries. He doesn't consider asking multimillionaires to pay a fairer share. In fact, he wants to reduce the top corporate and individual tax rates so that middle class Americans can pay even more.

Instead, he is focused on cutting the safety net programs for our seniors and those less fortunate. He plans to turn Medicare into a voucher plan and to dramatically restrict eligibility for Medicaid.

Last week, Majority Leader CANTOR clearly explained Republicans' plans for Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security when he said, "Listen, we're going to have to come to grips with the fact that these programs cannot exist if we want America to be what we want America to be."

It is clear whose side Chairman RYAN and Majority Leader CANTOR are on. I stand with the Nation's seniors and the working people who are counting on Medicare and Social Security when they retire. When will these heartless attacks on the most vulnerable members of our communities stop? How about a little aloha?

GET TO WORK AND PASS A BILL

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it's been 45 days since House Republicans passed a bill to cut \$100 billion in Federal spending, spending that quite honestly the prior Congress

didn't have to spend and should have never appropriated.

I want to remind you that we are here today because Senator REID, the Democrats in the House, and the President when they were in charge last year chose not to pass a budget. It was irresponsible of them then and it is irresponsible of them now to continue to do nothing.

House Republicans spent 72 hours debating spending bills. We held 107 votes on spending amendments. Senate Democrats, 4 hours, four votes—4 hours and four votes in 45 days, Mr. Speaker.

I want you to think about that. It's unacceptable.

Senator REID needs to get to work and pass a bill. The American people need it. American livelihoods are depending on it. Senator REID just needs to wake up in the morning, put on his big-boy britches, come to the Capitol, pass the bill, and help us reduce this big hairy deficit.

MEDICARE

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern over my Republican colleagues' cheering the impending prospect of a government shutdown, as was reported in the press.

Then, this morning, we wake up to find out that the Republican proposal to address the deficit and debt is not to address major tax loopholes or tax earmarks, but it's to undermine Medicare and to end Medicare as we know it. Now, for decades and decades, we have had this wonderful Medicare program that ensured that our older neighbors live their retirement in dignity. They can see the doctor. If they have to go to the hospital, it is there for them. And a hospice benefit in their last days. This is all at risk now because the new Republican plan announced this morning will end Medicare as we know it by eliminating benefits.

We're not going to stand for it. We're going to stand on the side of our older neighbors to ensure that, yes, they can live their retirement years in dignity and financial security.

□ 1220

CONGRATULATING WHEELING HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Wheeling High School students Preston Riley and Rajarshi Roy, who were selected as finalists in Samsung's national Solve for Tomorrow contest. I'm particularly proud of these students for their energy and creativity in using STEM education to tackle real-world challenges. Strong

STEM education is critical to ensuring that all of our young people have the skills and knowledge that they need for success in college and careers.

I would also like to recognize Wheeling High School science teacher Lisa del Muro and principal Lazaro Lopez for their commitment to STEM education, which focuses on the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

I recently visited Wheeling High School to get a firsthand look at their STEM for All program, where students of all backgrounds and academic achievement are challenged in the STEM subjects. This initiative incorporates all disciplines, including the arts, languages and humanities alongside a focus on career certifications, college partnerships and technology to prepare students for post-secondary opportunities.

Congratulations again to the students at Wheeling High School. They demonstrate what can be accomplished when we make STEM education a priority.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. In 1935 when President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act into law and then again in 1965 when President Lyndon Johnson made Medicare a reality, these were programs that our seniors depended upon. In fact, that promise was backed by a lifetime of hard work that they have backed on their own sweat and tears, and yet now we need to back it up with our commitment.

Mr. Speaker, my Democratic colleagues and I favor a budget that recognizes our dual responsibility to, yes, reduce our deficit, but not on the backs of our seniors who have already paid into Social Security and have now received Medicare benefits, who oftentimes have limited means to really have the opportunities to increase their salary. In my district, 52,000 people are over the age of 65. Only 11.9 percent of them are working. These are impossible odds.

Mr. Speaker, we need a budget, but we are not willing to do it on the backs of seniors. You make your choice. Democrats have a better way, and it's not called hurting seniors.

FANNIE MAE AND FREDDIE MAC CEOS GET HUGE SALARIES

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with some serious concerns with the continued egregious spending by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac approving large executive salary compensations

at the expense of our taxpayers. For example, the chief executive officer of Fannie Mae received \$9.3 million in compensation and salary for 2009 and 2010, while the chief executive of Freddie Mac received \$7.8 million for 2009 and 2010 together.

But it was a failure of these same types of company executives in the past that forced government intervention in the first place by then overstating past earnings and generating millions in improper bonuses. Now taxpayers, who have already spent \$153 billion to bail them out, which doesn't include legal fees that taxpayers have to pay to keep them afloat, may require more bailout money to counter the companies' mounting mortgage losses.

Mr. Speaker, allowing this gross mismanagement of public funds to pay for extravagant salaries is unconscionable.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET PROPOSAL

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Today, the Republicans released their budget. Budgets are really moral documents, and Republicans have made clear that their moral compass puts hedge fund managers and big corporations ahead of America's middle class and senior citizens. Republicans gut education programs and investments in job creation, privatize Medicare, slash Medicaid, but leaving plenty of money to help subsidize big oil companies and to give tax breaks to those companies that put our jobs overseas.

There is another way. I have a bill that would create new tax brackets for millionaires and billionaires, still lower than those under Ronald Reagan, and would raise \$74 billion in 2011.

We can bring down the deficit, and we can do it while protecting programs that create jobs and that don't further burden old people, the poor, and middle class Americans.

THE FAIR TAX

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as tax day is fast approaching. We've heard a lot about the budget that's being introduced today. I'm a proud supporter of this budget because in this country we don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem. But what we do have is a problem with the way that we contribute revenue to this country.

There is a better way, and it is called the Fair Tax. The Fair Tax will take the burden off American taxpayers paying on what they earn and change it to a burden on what they spend. The power to tax is the power to destroy, and when we tax income and productivity, we destroy that income and productivity.

Do you want to talk about jobs in this country? Do you want to talk about a magnet for jobs in this country? The Fair Tax is the only bill in Congress that abolishes every single corporate tax break, tax loophole and tax preference. It abolishes the corporate income tax rate and tells international businesses they can locate here with the most powerful, hardest working workers on this planet.

Folks, H.R. 25, the Fair Tax, is a better way. As you fill out your tax forms this year, think about how we could do it differently next time around.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 37, DISAPPROVING FCC INTERNET AND BROADBAND REGULATIONS

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 200 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 200

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 recommend.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, what we have today is a resolution that comes under the Congressional Review Act, an act passed by a Republican Congress and President Clinton that gives the Congress the opportunity to look at the regulatory burdens imposed by the executive branch and, in a simple up-or-down vote, say do we want this regulation on the books or do we not.

Today that regulation is the net neutrality regulation the FCC has promulgated. H.J. Res. 37, the underlying bill that this rule allows us to consider, disapproves of the December 21 FCC rule concerning net neutrality on the basis that Congress did not authorize the FCC to regulate in this area. According to a D.C. Circuit Court decision in April of last year, the FCC failed to demonstrate that it had the authority to regulate Internet network management. Until such time as the FCC is given that authority by this Congress, we must reject any rules that it promulgates in this area.

Now, we will hear a lot today in the underlying resolution about the effective compromise that was crafted by the FCC. We will hear a lot about the light touch that was used by the FCC to wade into this area.

□ 1230

But, Mr. Speaker, if you don't have the authority to do it, you don't have the authority to do it. It is Congress' responsibility to delegate that authority. If folks like the underlying rule proposed by the FCC, they are welcome to bring that back as a congressional resolution.

This bill today is about congressional prerogative: Will we or will we not stand up to an executive branch that does not have the authority to regulate? We have done a sad job in this Congress in years past, Mr. Speaker, of providing that oversight responsibility. Republicans had the responsibility of providing oversight to the Bush administration, and we didn't always live up to that measure. Democrats had the responsibility to provide oversight to the Obama administration, and they haven't always lived up to that example.

We have the opportunity today to begin that step forward. Until Congress acts to delegate that responsibility, the Internet should continue as the Internet has grown and always continued as an area free of government interference, as an opportunity for entrepreneurs and investors and students and the elderly to be out there using the Internet as they see fit, free from the hand of government regulation.

I would also like to comment briefly on the nature of this rule. It is a closed rule. I came to this Congress to advocate in favor of an open process, Mr. Speaker, but it needs to be understood that the Congressional Review Act is a closed process by nature. What my constituents said to me is, ROB, if you are doing something complicated, I want you to open up the House floor and have as many amendments and as much discussion as you can because that is the right way to do things. But, what I would really prefer is you bring one bill with one idea and have an up-or-down vote for all the world to see.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the call that we have responded to today: a simple bill, one page long that says the FCC does not have the delegated con-

gressional authority to act in this area; and as such, their regulations shall be null and void.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a simple bill, one page long. Nevertheless, it is a terrible bill, one page long, and I would like to tell you why.

Today with our economy only beginning to recover, I believe that this rule and the underlying bill will imperil one of the greatest sources of job creation and innovation in America: the Internet. Now over the past 15 years, the Internet has created more than 3 million jobs, according to a study by Hamilton Consultants. More than 600,000 Americans have part- or full-time businesses on eBay alone. And on average, new Internet firms have 3 million jobs.

Yet, the majority brings to the floor legislation that will harm the open Internet. I can speak to this with some degree of authority. Before I came to Congress, I created over 300 jobs myself through founding several Internet-related companies, including ProFlowers.com and BlueMountain.com. My first Internet company was an Internet service provider on the other end of this equation, so I have good experience from both the e-commerce side, as well as the access side which I bring to this debate. I have long supported open access to the Internet and continue to support net neutrality.

Let me bring this close to home. When I was starting a flower company, ProFlowers.com, back in the late 1990s, we offered a supply-chain solution. We brought fresher flowers to people at a better price by disintermediating the supply chain and allowing consumers to buy flowers directly from growers. Now, we were up against several legacy companies, companies like FTD and 1-800-FLOWERS, that had a different distribution model that we believed and argued in the marketplace was a less efficient distribution model.

Now, had there not been a de facto net neutrality at that point, it would be very difficult for a new company to break in, because you would have had the incumbent leaders in the marketplace buying the access through the broadband connections, much as companies will pay slotting fees to get into grocery stores, some book publishers pay fees to be out on the open table. The big difference is that we have robust competition between grocery stores, robust competition between booksellers.

With regard to broadband access, over 70 percent of the residents of this country live in areas with only one or two broadband providers. All of the dynamism—and I have not heard this disputed even by the chairman of the subcommittee who testified before us yesterday—really, the dynamism and the job growth from the Internet comes from the content and applications side.

Now, if there aren't legitimate economic considerations on the bandwidth side, clearly those who are providing both wireless and wire bandwidth need to have a return on investment calculus, but it is that very same dynamism around the content-driven Internet that drives the usage that then leads people to pay more for higher speed access to the Internet.

Now, the FCC has done an exemplary job with these rules, and they have actually received buy-in from all of the major players with regard to this matter: content providers, content aggregators, search engines. And, yes, even on the broadband access side, most of the major broadband providers have supported these regulations as well. So they have done an excellent job.

I realize that what they first put out there, many people were concerned with. And they then did their job, as they were told to by congressional statute, specifically, which authorized them to do this. They listened to all parties, and they revised their net neutrality regulations so they are something that I think we can all be proud of as Americans, and we can all be proud of as users of the Internet.

Now, just to be clear how they hit their mark, because I know yesterday the chairman of the subcommittee mentioned that he thought that some of the broadband providers were coerced into supporting the protocol standards before the FCC. I don't know enough to dispute that or not. But what I will tell you is that I have impartial third-party testimony that I think is very compelling from investment bankers who follow this sector. And the way the investment banking sector works is they have analysts who really cover different stocks, cover different sectors, and they inform people about the impact of market regulations on that sector.

What I have from the Bank of America and Merrill Lynch analysts, it says: "The agreement"—the FCC's net neutrality provisions—"is consistent with our view that the net neutrality regulatory overhang has been eliminated from telecom and cable stocks."

Now, let me elaborate. What that means, "net neutrality regulatory overhang," is there was fear among the analysts covering the telecom and cable sectors that the Obama administration would do something overarching with regard to net neutrality. There was fear based on some of the initial rules proposed. However, the FCC did their job and that fear has been eliminated. There is now no market overhang on companies in this sector, and they are no longer concerned that the regulations are overarching.

Let me go to the Goldman Sachs analyst from December of last year: The rules stuck largely to what was expected and will be viewed as a light touch.

Let me go to Raymond James: We are glad that the staff is making this

innocuous by simply placing official rules around what is already being done by the industry under a no-regulation scenario.

So again, all these rules do is essentially preserve the status quo. Why is that important? Absent this, there would be a major shift in power on the Internet to the broadband providers from the content providers. The Internet historically—again, a wonderful innovation for mankind—allows anybody with a great idea to link up a server in their garage, and their product, their service, their content is available to everybody across the world, the very same as a major corporation that spends \$100 million launching a Web site, and they compete in the marketplace of ideas.

Now, some people ask: Has there ever been an instance where a provider has used tiered access or censored anything? And there are a number of instances. An example, in 2005, Madison River Communications blocked voiceover IP on its DSL network. That was eventually settled with the FCC.

In 2006, Cingular blocked PayPal after contracting with another online payment service. This is a perfect example of why we need competition on the provider side. The consumers would have access to presumably a less-efficient payment service that they would not select given their own prerogative because it is locked in through some sort of slotting fee or other arrangement, sometimes vertical integration itself under the same capital structure, as an access provider.

So this rule is actually critical to continue to operate a free and open Internet. That is why the FCC moved forward, with explicit permission from Congress in the form of their statutory authority, with rules to address this issue. Their open process included input and got vast buy-in from all major parties, including Internet service providers.

Now, there are many on the left that wish that the rule went further. And, yes, there might be some in business that prefer that there were no rules at all. The vast majority of the business community strongly supports the consensus rules that the FCC came out with.

Of those commenting on the proposed rule before the FCC, well over 90 percent supported the Commission's effort, and over 130 organizations support the proposed rule and oppose this legislation, including groups like the American Library Association, the Free Press, League of Latin American Citizens, Communications Workers of America, and the vast majority of Internet-related companies.

I also want to emphasize that there has been a number of faith-based groups that have weighed in. One of the largest is the Conference of Catholic Bishops, representing millions of American Catholics, who weighed in in a letter opposing this legislation before us today: "The Internet is open to any

speaker, commercial or noncommercial, whether or not the speech is connected financially to the company providing Internet access or whether it is popular or prophetic." The letter goes on to state how the Catholics have used the Internet as an outreach tool.

Now, there is legitimate fear here from two perspectives:

One, among the nonprofit and religious community in general, is that their content would receive a lower tier because they are not necessarily able to pay the same type of slotting fees or access that a for-profit commercial provider would do. So your Web page from Nike might load faster than your Web page from the Catholic Church because, if there was tiered access, who would be more likely to pay for the speed of the access.

The other fear, also legitimate, is of political or religious censorship of the Internet.

□ 1240

You could have a provider who would say, You know what? I like Obama, so I'm going to block access to tea party sites or slow them down through our broadband access.

Now, again, in a market with complete dynamism and where there was a lot of competition and where every American could choose broadband providers, that would be less problematic. But what we have is a situation where over 70 percent of Americans only have one or two choices for broadband access. There has historically been broad support from both sides of the aisle for the "no blocking" rule, which simply states that broadband providers cannot block lawful content. It is the equivalent of telling the Postal Service they can deliver or not deliver your mail based on whether they agree or disagree with the content. The carriers—the Internet, itself—is one cohesive entity, and what a wonderful entity for mankind, the fact that you can plug in and have access to a wide breadth of information on the Internet.

I also want to refute the argument that there is no nor should there be any government regulation of the Internet. I, actually, have several pages listed here of government regulation of the Internet, including things like regulating child pornography, including, of course, the complex set of protocols around intellectual property and intellectual property enforcement to ensure that the Internet is not used as a medium to steal or to illegally profit from the creative works of others. We go on and on with regard to e-commerce, advertising, privacy laws—a number of laws designed to protect our privacy, to protect us from abuse, and to protect us from security breaches with regard to viruses.

This is another dimension. This is to protect us from the Internet being broken apart by a series of tiered pipelines rather than one cohesive Internet. The absence of any net neutrality regime would empower selective parts of cor-

porate America to censor the Internet in the same way that Communist China censors the Internet. If you search for Tiananmen and you're in Mainland China, you will get pictures of happy people. You will not get pictures of their crackdown on the pro-democracy demonstrators.

We risk the same potential here. The broadband actors play a critical role, and I want to make sure their concerns are balanced and that they will get their return on investment. We actually have a quote from the AT&T executive, who did appear before the committee, who said that they can use the 10- to 15-year time frame to justify a return on investments with regard to broadband infrastructure. Even Comcast has called the new rules a workable balance between the needs of the marketplace and the certainty that carefully crafted and limited rules can provide to ensure that Internet freedom and openness are preserved.

I would further argue that a free and open Internet is in the interest of the broadband providers, themselves. So not only is it not necessarily the case that they only agreed to these under duress, I think many of the forward-looking broadband providers realize that what drives Internet access and what drives consumers to want a faster, better connection is that very vibrancy in the information marketplace that net neutrality helps preserve.

So the real question is: Why are we here? Why are we here debating something that was thoughtful, that has buy-in from all sides of the debate?

I really had a tough time figuring it out even through our committee examination of this yesterday. But I think that we're here because of a knee-jerk reaction of the opposition that might have been initially opposed to some of the more overarching rules that were initially proposed before the FCC, but we've come a long way since then. This feared takeover of the Internet didn't occur. Overarching rules didn't occur. Most of the broadband providers now support the direction of the FCC. Yet, under the legislation that we will consider today, the open Internet rule and the repeal of it will provide more uncertainty to investors. They will again not know what's going to occur. The investment bankers will, once again, say there was uncertainty and overhang, hurting the valuation of the very broadband stocks that the majority is claiming to do this for the benefit of. Market analyses have found that the new open Internet rule removed the regulatory overhang—it's a light touch—which throws a monkey wrench into the market mechanisms at a critical time for our recovery and job creation.

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF
CATHOLIC BISHOPS, DEPARTMENT
OF COMMUNICATIONS,

Washington, DC, February 14, 2011.

DEAR SENATORS AND MEMBERS OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops ("USCCB") is committed to the concept that

the Internet continue as it has developed, that is, as an open Internet. The Internet is an indispensable medium for Catholics—and others with principled values—to convey views on matters of public concern and religious teachings. USCCB is concerned that Congress is contemplating eliminating the Federal Communications Commission's authority to regulate how the companies controlling the infrastructure connecting people to the Internet will offer those connections. Without the FCC, the public has no effective recourse against those companies' interference with accessibility to content, and there will be uncertainty about how and whether those companies can block, speed up or slow down Internet content. Since public interest, noncommercial (including religious) programming is a low priority for broadcasters and cable companies, the Internet is one of the few mediums available to churches and religious groups to communicate their messages and the values fundamental to the fabric of our communities.

Without protections to prohibit Internet providers from tampering with content delivery on the Internet, the fundamental attributes of the Internet, in which users have unfettered access to content and capacity to provide content to others, are jeopardized. Those protections have particular importance for individuals and organizations committed to religious principles who must rely on the Internet to convey information on matters of faith and on the services they provide to the public. The Internet was constructed as a unique medium without the editorial control functions of broadcast television, radio or cable television. The Internet is open to any speaker, commercial or noncommercial, whether or not the speech is connected financially to the company providing Internet access or whether it is popular or prophetic. These characteristics make the Internet critical to noncommercial religious speakers. Just as importantly, the Internet is increasingly the preferred method for the disenfranchised and vulnerable—the poor that the Church professes a fundamental preference toward—to access services, including educational and vocational opportunities to improve their lives and their children's lives. It is immoral for for-profit organizations to banish these individuals and the institutions who serve them to a second-class status on the Internet.

His Holiness, Pope Benedict XVI, has warned against the "distortion that occur[s] when the media industry becomes self-serving or solely profit-driven, losing the sense of accountability to the common good. . . . As a public service, social communication requires a spirit of cooperation and co-responsibility with vigorous accountability of the use of public resources and the performance of roles of public trust . . . , including recourse to regulatory standards and other measures or structures designed to affect this goal."

(Message of the Holy Father Benedict XVI for the 40th World Communications Day, The Media: A Network for Communication, Communion and Cooperation, Jan. 24, 2006).

Lastly, Pope Benedict XVI recently stated, "Believers who bear witness to their most profound convictions greatly help prevent the web from becoming an instrument which . . . allows those who are powerful to monopolize the opinions of others." (Message of His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI for the 45th World Communications Day, January 24, 2011).

USCCB urges Congress not to use the Congressional Review Act to overturn the FCC's open Internet rules.

Sincerely,

HELEN OSMAN,
Secretary of Communications.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to a gentlelady from the committee of jurisdiction, the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague across the aisle is having a tough time figuring this out, I think we can probably help with that explanation.

First of all, if you like the Internet that you have, we are saying we want you to keep it. Mr. Speaker, there has been no market failure. Over 80 percent of all Americans are pleased with the Internet service that they have. What they do not want to see is the Obama administration step in in front of these Internet service providers and say, We the government are here to change your Internet. We are here to take control of your Internet.

That is exactly what net neutrality would do.

Net neutrality is the Federal Government stepping in and saying, We're going to come first. We're going to assign priority and value to content. It basically is the Fairness Doctrine for the Internet.

As I said, there has been no market failure, and there is no need for this government overreach. So many are saying, Why do this? It's one of those issues of power and control, of government wanting to dictate what speed you will have, how often you will be on, the type of Internet service that you will have, being able to control them.

What the FCC did after Congress left town, mind you, during Christmas week, was to step in and bring uncertainty to the marketplace. What they did was to say, We are going to put ourselves, the government, in control of the Internet. It is the first time ever this has happened.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I yield the gentlewoman an additional minute.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Also, in their net neutrality order, if you read paragraph 84, what it does is to bring an incredible amount of uncertainty to the innovative community and to the creative economy that our jobs growth is going to be based on, because what it says to these innovators is, Look, if you want to innovate a new application, a new attachment, a new usage for a Web-based service or for the Internet, you'd better come apply to the FCC first because, if you don't, we can step in and require you to come make application to us.

Now, if you want to talk about a chilling effect—a chilling effect—on all of our high-tech innovation, on health care innovation with our telemedicine concepts, with our health IT concepts, I would encourage individuals to look at paragraph 84, which is found in the net neutrality order that was brought forward on a 3-2 vote by the Obama administration. It will do more to

squelch jobs growth and to pull back innovation than any other action in this administration.

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

It's hard to know where to begin in refuting the arguments of my good friend from Tennessee.

There were several comparisons that I view as simply out of hand. One of them that was given was that this is somehow some sort of Fairness Doctrine for the Internet, that this is somehow some sort of government involvement with the Internet. Quite the contrary is true.

I want to be clear. I was an original cosponsor last session of the bill that proactively would have prevented the administration from moving forward with the Fairness Doctrine. I oppose the Fairness Doctrine. I believe in a dynamic marketplace of ideas. The FCC's rulemaking around net neutrality moved forward and fostered that very dynamic marketplace of ideas that the Fairness Doctrine is contrary to.

If we do not have some sort of net neutrality regime in place, there will be a selective censorship of the Internet, and we risk the Internet deteriorating into a series of tiered structures, whether they are tiered economically or ideologically. The great human accomplishment that is the one common Internet will simply cease to exist as such. It is, in fact, the proponents of net neutrality and the regulatory regime proposed by the FCC after receiving input from all stakeholders that will preserve the Internet as it is.

I would agree with my friend from Tennessee's argument. She said 80 percent of people are happy with their access. I hope it's even higher.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Any time you allow the Federal Government to step in to a process where they have not been involved in a process—and we did this not once but twice. We did it not once but twice.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentlelady.

With regards to the Postal Service, would the gentlelady oppose an effort to say that the Postal Service can, perhaps, decide which mail to deliver, maybe based on which political candidates their unions support? Would the gentlelady say that that would be okay for the Postal Service to do that?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. The gentleman knows that that is not relevant to the discussion that we are having here.

Mr. POLIS. Is the gentlelady going to answer?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. What we are talking about is that the application of this is the Fairness Doctrine of the Internet.

□ 1250

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, the Fairness Doctrine is something that I oppose, I will always oppose, and it is completely consistent. The Fairness Doctrine is consistent with the approach that the gentlelady is approaching with regard to the Internet. By having net neutrality in place, we prevent any type of fairness doctrine or selective allowance of certain content to consumers of the Internet. The whole net neutrality regulatory structure is to ensure that everybody has access to putting content on the Internet in the same way, and that that content will not be discriminated against based on its ideology, based on economic considerations.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. We all know that anytime you give the government the ability to assign priority and value to content, you have inserted them into the decision-making process. They would precede the responsibility of the Internet service providers. And the gentleman knows there has been no market failure.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, the absence of a net neutrality regime would be the government deliberately conveying value as gatekeepers to the broadband providers and allowing them to decide, based on religious or ideological or economic—or whatever criteria that they want—what kind of Internet they intend to serve up to their users.

I would like to add that, under the legislation we consider today, that this open Internet rule will add the very certainty to investors and companies that we need and predictability in our marketplace that allows companies to continue to grow and invest in job growth.

It strikes a balance, and it solves a real issue. Some on the other side will say, oh, this could be an issue in the future, but it hasn't arisen. Well, the rules that we are talking about do enshrine in place the very Internet, the dynamism, the fruitful discussion between different ideologies that the gentlelady from Tennessee said that she aspires to preserve. And we have already reached a point where ISPs have blocked, as a matter of fact, voice-over-IP services. And they have blocked peer-to-peer traffic, they have blocked PayPal in favor of other financial transaction companies that might have economic relationships with them.

I believe strongly in Internet, in Internet as an achievement for mankind, in Internet that net neutrality will help preserve for our generation and the next.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from the committee, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this rule to block the FCC from regulating the Internet.

I thought the exchange between the gentleman from Colorado and the good lady from Tennessee was very telling because right now the marketplace controls the Internet. It is free—I call it wild, wild—in its applications.

Now, what the government is trying to do now, in the words of ED MARKEY during our hearing on this, was, "We need to regulate the Internet to keep it unregulated." I don't get that, but it is kind of the thought from the left side of the aisle that you have to regulate it in order to prevent anything that they may disagree with.

So what we have here is an instance where now the freedoms of the Internet and the marketplace that are driving it now have to be under a regulatory scheme decided by a group of appointees of the President; not to be free, it has to be built in relation to their image. Listen to his words, it's going to be built on their image.

The analogy of Communist China regulating the content can't happen today. They talk about blocking, that these ISPs will stop us from going to our Web sites. There have been a handful of those situations; and every time, the public marketplace chastises them openly. There were a few times the FCC even called up and said, hey, you can't do that under the principles that were adopted.

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

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

Mr. TERRY. And so those were resolved by, yes, a little bit of involvement, but the marketplace.

Now the comparison to Communist China here from the gentleman is appropriate when you look at how this measure was implemented. The President campaigned on net neutrality. Congress would not authorize it because Congress as a whole bipartisanly disagreed with net neutrality, giving a regulatory bureaucratic agency control over the Internet versus free market.

So since Congress wouldn't pass it, sua sponte they just rose up and said we don't have the authority—well, they didn't say they don't have the authority, but Congress never gave them the authority to regulate the Internet, so they're just assuming that they're going to take that power away from the people and the marketplace and do it themselves. That is where the analogy to Communist China is appropriate.

Mr. POLIS. I would argue that, in Communist China, the residents there do not have access to the Internet. What they have access to is an Internet minus, and Internet minus are sites that their government deems inappropriate. We risk going down that same route if we don't enshrine, in rule or in law, net neutrality provisions that ensure that there is an open and free Internet and that American citizens

have access to the Internet in its entirety, not with being sensitive because of economic or religious reasons.

One of the simple components of this rule is the no-blocking rule. This states very specifically, a broadband provider cannot block lawful content. A provider cannot say, I don't like Catholics; I'm not going to allow Catholic content through our broadband. A provider cannot say on my Internet we are blocking access to Tiananmen because I have business deals in China. We need to ensure that the Internet, as one entity, is available to all Americans who buy access.

And again, the broadband providers themselves, out of their own economic self-interests, endorse this concept because they truly understand, with the fiduciary responsibility of their own shareholders, that the very dynamism that leads to the increase in popularity of the Internet relies on it being an open and free Internet. And without these protections that are afforded by the FCC's open Internet rules, the abuses that have already occurred are just a small sign of far worse things that will come.

In expressing support for killing the open Internet rule with this bill, a witness for the majority brought to Capitol Hill said that ISPs should be allowed to block lawful content and said, "It is appropriate because you block the source of the problem. If the person that is violating your acceptable use policy is Netflix, you block Netflix." In effect, you would empower broadband providers to bully around content providers—be it Netflix, be it Yahoo—and say, you know what? I don't like the fact that you are renting this movie; I don't like the fact that you are linking to this news. That's the direction that Communist China has gone, and that is the direction that America and the global Internet will go if we fail to preserve the net neutrality regime that is before us.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the gentleman from the Rules Committee for his good work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues I would like to address as chairman of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee.

First of all, when it comes to the notion that the FCC—or let me back up—these carriers that give us the Internet might somehow regulate religious speech, it's interesting to note that the FCC, in its own order, threatens and pulls out specifically a threat to religious content. Paragraph 47, footnote 148, which I'm sure the gentleman from Colorado must know about, says that a religious organization would be prohibited from creating a specialized Internet-accessed service.

Now, there is an Internet provider out there called Koshernet that wanted

to have a special service for those religious subscribers who happen to agree, if they don't want to be exposed to things on the Internet that they are bound to regarding their religion. So the issue that the FCC points out is that, oh, we're not going to allow that to happen under these rules. So you can't have a separate Internet provider that is just set up for its own subscribers that just wants to have a filter on the Internet, if you will, for those who want to subscribe to that because of their religious beliefs. So already you see a government getting involved at the head end.

Now, we've seen in Egypt where the government is involved and had a kill switch and just turned it off when opponents of the government got engaged. We've heard a lot about China, and we all know the various back doors to the Internet there that they tried to put in to regulate speech, to control access to content and all of that.

□ 1300

That's the government doing that.

We know this country for many years operated under the Fairness Doctrine. That was the government trying to regulate political speech on the broadcast airwaves. It wasn't until President Reagan's FCC after a couple of court decisions basically said that trips right up against the First Amendment that President Reagan's FCC repealed the Fairness Doctrine. Congress tried a couple of times to put it back in place. What we should be about is a free and open Internet.

And that's what we've had, and that's what allowed this incredible explosion of technology and innovation to take place. And it has not taken place because the government picked winners and losers on the Internet because the engineers and scientists and technicians and innovators and entrepreneurs did that on the existing Internet.

Now, along comes the government, the Federal Communications Commission, on a 3-to-2 partisan middle-of-the-night sort of decision, if you will, right over the holidays to say, We're going to seize control and regulate the Internet. Now, that's not been done before, although they tried in the Comcast BitTorrent case where they tried to regulate the Internet once before. But the court here in Washington, D.C. said they lacked the authority. They had not proven—they had failed to demonstrate that they had the authority.

And so the court struck them down pretty clearly in part because they relied on a statement of policy, and the court said a statement of policy does not constitute statutorily mandated responsibilities.

Previously, the FCC rule, by the way, that section 706 did not constitute an independent grant of authority and has not overruled that prior decision. Now, that's important, because section 706 is part of the foundation upon which they think they have this authority, even though in a prior case they've said that

didn't grant them an independent grant of authority.

Regulating otherwise unregulated information services is not reasonably ancillary to the section 257 obligation to issue reports on barriers to the provision of information services.

There are a number of issues here that bring us to the rule that we have today on the Congressional Review Act that would repeal the rule that the FCC put in place at the end of the year and notified us on.

Now, why are we using the Congressional Review Act? It is a very specific, very narrow, very targeted bipartisan-created process.

The current leader of the Senate, HARRY REID, was an advocate and supporter of the congressional review process because it allows Congress to step in when an agency has overstepped its bounds on a major rule and say, No, you don't have the authority, or, We disagree with the rule, and so we chose this CRA process to overturn this rule that a partisan group of unelected officials chose to enact exceeding their authority.

Now Congress, whether you're for net neutrality regulation under title I or title XX or no title at all, you should not stand idly by when an agency exceeds its statutory authority.

I think, ultimately, this will be thrown out in court, once it's ripe for a court to review, as the court has slapped down the FCC in the past.

The long and the short of it, though, is that, in relying on section 706, they may have inadvertently opened the door for State regulation of the Internet, because section 706 says that the FCC and State commissions shall have certain authorities and goes on to explain that in the first title of that act.

I don't think any of us here wants that door to be opened, but the FCC, in its naked grab for power it does not have, chose to base part of their decision on section 706.

Now, I heard, as I was coming over here, a recitation of my comments last night in the Rules Committee by my friend and colleague from Colorado that all of the major companies support this, or virtually all, and, gee whiz, they did this voluntarily at the FCC. Well, come on. None of them will publicly admit to the fact that the FCC had, holding over their head, a title II proceeding that would have treated the Internet as a common carrier, as simple telephone service with a highly regulated environment.

And it's one of those Hobson's choices: either go with us with title I, which is "light regulation" but opens the door to government regulation for the first time of the Internet, or we may come after you on title II. Now, to back up that argument, I would point out that there's an open proceeding at the moment on title II. They have never closed their title II proceeding.

So these companies have a lot of other issues before the FCC, like mergers—has anybody ever heard of

those?—and other things. They are their regulator.

I was regulated by the FCC for 22 years as a license holder in broadcast stations. The last thing you're going to do is poke your regulator. And when your regulator has you by your license or by your next merger, you're probably going to acquiesce to the lesser of two evils, which is what happened here.

So, Mr. Speaker, and to the ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would encourage you to support this rule. It's narrow. It's defined. It's closed for a reason, because the parliamentarians and others have told us basically there's no real way to amend this and carry out its lawful action. And so in a rare instance, this makes sense to have a closed rule.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from Oregon mentioned KosherNet and other sites that might want to provide proprietary content. I want to be clear that this rulemaking and rulemaking process has nothing to do with proprietary networks. It refers to the Internet.

I hold several patents with regard to Internet technologies. In those, as is common among Internet patents, we describe the Internet as an open-ended gateway network. To the extent that there are thriving proprietary networks, be they religiously affiliated or commercial, the FCC is not talking about those with regard to this matter.

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentleman yield on that point? Because I don't believe that was the case.

Mr. POLIS. I will be happy to enter into a colloquy with you on your time.

An article from yesterday's StarTribune says, "Court rejects suit over Net-neutrality rules." This happened yesterday. A Federal appeals court rejected a lawsuit by Verizon and MetroPCS to challenge the Federal Government's communications rules, the FCC's communications rules.

Now, what I want to point out is, like many newspaper sites, this was a decision between me and the newspaper site, an economic decision about how I would get access. Now, some newspapers want to charge for access, others don't. I was happy the Minneapolis StarTribune allowed me access because I wasn't about to pay.

How do they pay for it? They have a couple ads in here. Apparently, Bill Maher is going to be at Mystic Lake Hotel and Casino, coming up. I won't be there, but maybe most of the folks who read the Minneapolis StarTribune would consider that.

And then there's something called License to Thrill, also at Mystic Lake Casino and Hotel. Now, I assume they found that many of the viewers of the Minneapolis StarTribune might be interested in Mystic Lake. And again, it was their decision, the Minneapolis StarTribune's decision, Do we sell for access?

By the way, The New York Times, I think, is starting to charge for access. I'm going to have to decide whether

I'm going to have to try to just make do with their free portion or somehow loop in an online subscription. I do pay for The Wall Street Journal online. It's worth every penny. It's a good publication. But it's hard to strike that balance.

What you are doing—what this body is considering by not having a net-neutrality regime in place is to add another party to this contract between me and the StarTribune. And you know what? It is not good enough, JARED POLIS and the StarTribune, that they're letting you access and you have to pay. There's also the provider. And you know what? You could have the provider say, You know what? We're not going to serve up these ads. We're going to serve up our own ads. You know what? We're not going give you access to the StarTribune unless you buy our newspaper plus service for an extra \$14.95 a month.

You're changing the value chain in a way that is unprecedented and conveying enormous value because you're putting them in charge of the whole Internet of the providers and the bandwidth and the pipelines. Yes, they are important to have and, yes, they need to have a return on investment and, yes, they support the FCC rules as a fair way to do that. Yes, given their druthers, would they rather have a reach and control of the Internet? Sure. They'd rather control all the ad space on every newspaper and every other Web site. But they know that's a reach. There's no serious market valuation that's given by investors or investment analysts to that reach scenario that would threaten and kill the very Internet itself by interspersing a third party on my private agreement with the Minneapolis StarTribune. That's why we need to have a free and open Internet for all to ensure that there's not another party that comes in and steals the intellectual property and the usage of others and conveys it to their own advantage. And that's exactly what the very reasonable FCC rules put into rule.

[From StarTribune.com, Apr. 4, 2011]

COURT REJECTS SUIT OVER NET-NEUTRALITY RULES

A federal appeals court on Monday rejected as "premature" a lawsuit by Verizon and MetroPCS challenging the Federal Communications Commission's pending rules aimed at keeping Internet service providers from blocking access to certain websites or applications. The decision, by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit, is a first-round victory for the FCC and its chairman, Julius Genachowski. But the real battle over the agency's attempt to regulate broadband providers has barely begun. Several broadband companies, and some consumer advocacy and public interest groups, are likely to return to court this year to challenge aspects of the rules. Edward McFadden, a Verizon spokesman, said Monday that the company intended to refile its lawsuit this year. The House will take up a joint resolution condemning the new Internet access rules this week.

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS TO BUY RIVAL FOR \$6.5B

Texas Instruments Inc. said Monday that it has agreed to buy competitor National

Semiconductor Corp. for \$6.5 billion. The all-cash deal, if it goes through, will give Dallas-based Texas Instruments a larger stake in the field of analog semiconductors—devices that are used to convert real-world signals, such as temperature readings or voice recordings, into digital signals.

GOOGLE BIDS \$900M FOR NORTEL'S PATENTS

Google Inc. said it was willing to pay \$900 million for patents held by Nortel Networks Corp., the bankrupt communications technology company. The Internet search giant couched its bid as a pre-emptive strike to defend against patent litigation. Analysts say Mountain View, Calif.-based Google is wrestling with a major increase in patent litigation from so-called patent trolls and competitors. A major patent portfolio such as the one from Nortel would give Google ammunition in these lawsuits. In the last 12 months, Google has been hit with 39 patent lawsuits involving its Android mobile phone operating software.

PFIZER TO SELL CAPSUGEL UNIT TO KKR

Pfizer Inc., the world's biggest drugmaker, agreed to sell its Capsugel manufacturing unit to KKR & Co. for \$2.38 billion in an effort to focus on its higher-profit business developing new medicines. The New York-based company lowered its yearly revenue forecast after backing out Capsugel, a unit that makes wholesale pill casings and had \$750 million in sales last year. Pfizer said it will use proceeds from the deal to expand a planned \$5 billion share repurchase.

JAPAN'S CRISIS WILL PUSH UP SOME COMMODITIES

Copper, iron ore and beef are likely to benefit from rising demand in Japan as the country recovers from a record earthquake and tsunami that triggered a nuclear crisis. Rebuilding may drive demand for steelmaking materials and metals used in construction, said Ben Westmore, a commodities economist at National Australia Bank in Melbourne. Demand for imported beef and dairy products may increase because of damage to local protein supply, Rabobank Australia analyst Wayne Gordon said.

GOLDMAN CEO'S COMPENSATION NEARLY DOUBLES

Goldman Sachs Chairman and CEO Lloyd Blankfein's \$19 million compensation for 2010, almost double the prior year, ended two years in which the firm's top executives gave up cash bonuses. Blankfein's pay included \$5.4 million in cash, \$12.6 million in restricted stock, a \$600,000 salary and about \$464,000 in other benefits, a proxy statement from the New York-based firm showed. Blankfein's \$9.8 million pay for 2009 included \$9 million in restricted stock plus salary and other compensation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I just want to point out that back on KoshNet, the Federal Communications basically singled that out and said, no, you can't, as an Internet service provider, have that kind of separate system. You can't filter out even if you want to. And I think that's different.

As for the court decisions the gentleman referenced, I don't necessarily know where he's going on that. But I understand the court said the time is not right yet for the appeal by Verizon and MetroPCS on the Internet rules, not right because the Federal Commu-

nications Commission has not put these rules into the Federal register because they haven't completed some of their due diligence, apparently, on the effects on business.

□ 1310

So that will still be ripe to litigate later on. The other point I want to make is understand that while these rules promulgated, I believe, outside the authority of the FCC apply to the Internet service provider, the pipes if you will, they do not apply to the content providers on the other end. So in other words, once you get on the freeway, as we know the Internet, you want to get out into the neighborhoods eventually. And so a lot of people go to a particular search site let's say, a search engine, and that search engine is making enormous decisions about where you end up on the Internet.

Those search engines and other providers like that, they are not under these rules at all. And I would suggest I am not eager to have them under these rules. But I find it fascinating that they can block, they can tackle, they can hide, they can change their algorithms.

So you know, by the time you search for something, you may get moved from number one in your category to No. 71 because they make some decision in their algorithm. So there is a lot going on out there.

But I would say this: Most Americans have access to broadband, most of us are on the Internet, and we are a very powerful community when somebody misbehaves. And generally, the Internet has been successful because misbehavers have been punished by the consumers in an open and free marketplace effectively and quickly and much better than through a government regulatory regime.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds just to say in this theme of folks with the best of intentions ending up with the tremendous burdens on small business, I have just been informed and would like to inform this body that the Senate has passed H.R. 4, the House's repeal of the burdensome 1099 regulation requirements in ObamaCare, by a vote of 87-12. The bill is now on its way to the President for his signature.

This represents a huge win for American small businesses, a huge win for the abolition of burdensome government regulation, and the first official partial repeal of ObamaCare that will go to the President's desk and become law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First with regard to the 1099 closing, I think again we can applaud this as a step forward for small business. Many of us wish that there could have been a different way of paying for it, and I did support it twice in the last session of Congress. While there are major winners, and small businesses are, and we

needed to close the 1099 loophole, and I am glad we did, the losers under this are American families making about \$80,000, \$85,000 a year, who will be stuck with a large Republican tax increase.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to net neutrality, it is indeed a brave new world that we face on the Internet. And I have been an Internet user since the early 1990s. As I mentioned, my first company was an Internet service provider. So I have experience on that front. It is the very dynamism of the Internet itself that brings its value to humanity and to Americans. That is why it is important to protect under net neutrality and open Internet provisions.

Another critical provision that has generally had support from across the aisle in prior sessions has been a transparency requirement that would require broadband providers to inform consumers about how or whether they are tiering access. Part of the issue has been we only find out about these things after the fact, after a very technical analysis, and accusations are made and have to be discovered. We would like to know. And one of the reasons I oppose this rule is Ms. MATSUI offered an amendment that would have increased consumer confidence and led to greater investment in broadband infrastructure by supporting a simple transparency requirement with regard to this matter.

Net neutrality keeps the Internet free and open. It is that simple. Just as the postal service can't discriminate in delivering legal content, so too the Internet should not discriminate in delivering legal content. Proprietary networks can work their will. And the gentleman from Oregon mentioned Koshernet or people, users, that might only want certain access on their machines. They are empowered to do that under open Internet regulations.

They can have programs on their local machine that can say, you know what—many parents do this—they want to have parental controls or block certain sites. They can only have certain sites that are accessible and block down all other sites. Many people, they are empowered to do this not by their provider, no. They are empowered to do this by choosing the software and the service that they use to be able to restrict the Internet for themselves or for a minor that lives in their home.

These decisions should not be made by large multinational corporations deciding which Internet you have your own access to. Seventy percent of American families only choose between one or two broadband providers. For them to have access to the Internet, not the Internet minus like they have in China, not the Internet minus that too many Americans could face if we don't encode open Internet regulations into rule or law, if we want to retain that access we need to make sure that the value of the Internet and the dynamism that is created by the content

and application providers have unfettered access to consumers in America and across the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to a thoughtful member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Let me just bring to the attention of this side of the aisle that some of the issues you are talking about, transparency, moves into privacy. We hope in the near future we do have a privacy bill, but I think some of the things you are concerned about impacted with the privacy, and not necessarily in this debate dealing with House Joint Resolution 37.

As a former ranking member of the Telecommunications Technology Subcommittee, both the ranking member, JOE BARTON, and I have sent three letters to FCC Chairman Genachowski expressing simply our strong opposition to his plan to regulate the Internet. In fact, I have introduced legislation the past two Congresses to try to prevent the implementation of the net neutrality rules, and other Members have supported us. So there is a long record here, I would say to my colleague on that side of the aisle, of our side trying to prevent Genachowski, the chairman of the FCC, from regulating the Internet.

In fact, he went so far as to step out and try to do it. There was a Comcast case. In an April of 2010 decision, the court found that the FCC failed to demonstrate it had ancillary authority under title I. So under title I, the courts ruled they did not have the authority to regulate Internet network management.

So I think the courts themselves have corroborated what Mr. WALDEN has indicated. So, you know, what you are arguing is against a court case that actually occurred. And as far as the technicality that Verizon was involved with, they are going to continue their suit. They feel they have a strong argument, and as Mr. WALDEN pointed out, it was just by a technicality. They are going to continue to go forward.

I will also mention a little bit what the chairman, Mr. WALDEN, has indicated dealing with the 706 rule. The FCC claims it has authority to enact this under the 706 rule of the 1996 Telecommunications Act. I was one of the conferees on that act. And they are using this as a way to advance telecommunications capability, saying they have the authority. But they can't rely on 706 because as the agency has previously acknowledged, acknowledged themselves, section 706 is not an independent source of authority, because 706 talks of removing barriers to infrastructure investment, but the rules themselves will erect barriers to investment.

So the FCC's claim simply stretches the authority under these provisions.

So I think between the Comcast case and the interpretation of 706, they don't have any authority to do this. In a larger sense, what we are talking about is when the FCC moves out and starts to regulate the Internet, that creates uncertainty in the economy, uncertainty into people who are investing vast sums of money for fiber optics so that they can spread broadband. And heaven knows we don't need in this economy this uncertainty.

So I think the FCC was unwise just from a standpoint of the economy to strike this uncertainty. The Internet, as has been pointed out, exists. It has been open and thriving for all these years because of a deregulatory approach. If we step in and let the FCC start to regulate the Internet under title I, then it's going to create this uncertainty, and that's in fact why Verizon is moving forward.

As others have pointed out, a lot of people are fearful of the FCC. That's why they won't say anything. As many of us know, lots of times when you are in a situation where you have an empowering authority up there that can regulate you, you don't want to get those people upset with you. So you are very delicate in how you move. So the people are saying basically that, oh, we are not going to say anything; but silently they are telling us, certainly they are telling us on this side that they cannot see any reason for the FCC to start to regulate.

□ 1320

There is no crisis warranting them to do this. The example used with his newspaper in Minneapolis is not a crisis. So the FCC hangs its adoption of network neutrality rules based upon speculation and future harm.

I urge the passage of this rule.

Mr. POLIS. The net-neutrality rules are consistent with the D.C. circuit ruling in Comcast v. FCC and, in fact, that advances the congressional mandates. The rule fulfills the FCC's mandate from Congress and their mandate to encourage broadband deployment by supporting innovation and investment among their other duties.

And, in fact, last year Congress had a chance to advance legislation in the area around protecting Internet freedom, and that legislation was supported by many public interest organizations, high-tech companies and, yes, many broadband carriers. That would have put in statute a set of net neutrality rules and that would have definitively, through statute, removed the threat of title II classification. Unfortunately, that legislation was blocked by Republicans in the House.

So, again, I think when Mr. WALDEN mentioned that there were some folks on the broadband side that might have been coerced into supporting something, fearing that there would be a threat of title II reclassification, it was the activities of Republicans that specifically prevented the removal of that title II reclassification threat. And,

again, I would like to point to remarks by many investment bankers that it has not been seen as any serious regulatory overhang with regard to the valuation of stocks in that area because there is no effort to move forward with title II regulation.

Obviously, with regard to this matter, if it's creating, somehow, this much controversy around what should be noncontroversial rules enshrined into place the current free and open Internet policies that have seldom been violated, but we fear might be violated more in the future, if that's provoking this kind of discussion, even though all the major stakeholders discuss it, you can imagine what type of discussion would ensue if there was a serious effort to reclassify under title II.

Mr. STEARNS also mentioned that maybe the committee will begin work on what type of statutes we might have. Certainly, specifically, I am curious. I asked Mr. WALDEN as well yesterday if the committee would consider no-blocking rules, would the committee consider transparency requirements, do they think that they, in fact, could do a better job than the FCC and that this body, with its vast knowledge of the Internet and DNS architecture, would do a better job than the FCC.

I think, you know, one of the clear things that I would like to see and I think this body would like to see, and why I oppose this rule, is if we are talking about repealing the FCC's rules, what is the work product of this body? What is the replace? It's repeal and replace.

I think there has been some acknowledgment. In fact, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) mentioned that the committee might work on some of these areas. What is that proposed body of work? Why are we not looking at repeal and replace and what we are replacing it with. Is it going to be similar to former Chairman WAXMAN's net neutrality bill of last year? Are there substantial changes that have—buy-in across the aisle?

Can we do better? Frankly, I'm skeptical. But if the gentleman would like to advance the work product of his committee and come forward with a clear decision between what we would be replacing it with, I would be certainly open to seeing if, in fact, the work product of the committee is better than the work product of the FCC with regard to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the Internet has been of immense value to mankind, to America, to me personally and to all of us personally. It's contributed to our culture, our economic advancement, to the flow of free ideas.

We should not trade the freedom of the Internet, the freedom of the Internet has been an open, superhighway for a toll road controlled by and for Internet service providers alone. There is a balance to be struck, and the process of finding that balance is under way by thoughtful people in an open and inclusive process.

Today's action by the Republicans short circuits that process and imposes simplistic, highly ideological solutions on what is actually a complex issue that has shared ideals for preserving a free Internet, free of government involvement. We can find bipartisan consensus.

The FCC order came close to striking that correct balance, far closer than the status quo. That's why it's supported by Internet service providers themselves, consumers groups, the high-tech community, content providers, and faith-based organizations.

We must keep the Internet free by allowing the FCC to move forward with the open Internet role, and we should be debating this on an H.R. bill under an open rule. I encourage my colleagues to support the open Internet by opposing the previous question and this rule.

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

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

There is a promo out these days for a new television show that's coming on. It's about the CIA and chronicles the fellow's first day at the job at the CIA. He walks in and he looks around and he can't believe the disarray that he sees there. And his senior adviser there steps up and he says, son, have you ever walked into a post office and said, my gosh, I have stepped into the future?

And the answer is, no, the government is not the location where innovation thrives.

To hear this conversation today about how we need government regulation to protect the Internet, Mr. Speaker, we need to protect the Internet from government regulation, and that's why we are here today with this underlying resolution.

This FCC proposal is a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. To quote my friend from Colorado, as he was quoting the investment banks, these official rules are around what is already being done in the private sector. It's a solution to a problem that doesn't exist.

Mr. Speaker, it's a solution to a problem that doesn't exist using authority that the FCC does not have. It's interesting being down here today, as my colleague from Colorado talks about all the big businesses that have bought in and all the investment banks that bought in.

I have to say I don't give two hoots that big business and investment banks have bought in. If the authority does not exist to do it, then it should not be done. Over and over again, Mr. Speaker, we hear from this administration about how they can help, how they can help to solve problems, problems that exist and apparently now problems that don't exist.

If the authority does not exist, they cannot be allowed to regulate in this area, and that's why the subcommittee has brought this forward.

So we have a solution to a problem that doesn't exist using authority that doesn't exist, and where does this lead us?

I want to read to you, Mr. Speaker, from the FCC order dated December 21 of last year: Finally, we decline to apply our rules directly to coffee shops, bookstores, airlines, and other entities that acquire their Internet service from a broadband provider.

Although broadband providers that offer such services are subject to these rules, we note that addressing traffic is a legitimate network management purpose for these premise operators.

Authority that does not exist and the FCC says, in its benevolence, in its benevolence, that at this time it chooses, it chooses, Mr. Speaker, not to regulate the way that coffee shops, bookstores, and airlines provide Internet service to their customers.

Folks, this is the camel's nose under the tent. That is why we have to be vigilant. It doesn't matter if we like the underlying rule. It doesn't matter if the authority does not exist, Mr. Speaker.

We are obligated as one of three branches of government, we are obligated to step in where regulatory authority exceeds its bounds. Now, as we have said, the courts have already looked at this decision and decided, as we have, that the FCC does not have authority to act in this area, solution to a problem that doesn't exist, using authority that it doesn't have that starts to pave the way to regulate coffee shops, airlines and bookstores.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple rule for a simple bill. We have talked so much about 2,000-page bills with lots of hidden consequences. We have talked broadband section 1099 of the health care act now being repealed and passed now by the Senate and going on to the President's desk. I want to read to you this bill in its entirety if you will permit me the time:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rules submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to the matter of preserving the open Internet and broadband industry practices, and such rule shall have no force or effect."

□ 1330

That's it. That's it, eight lines, "no force or effect."

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support from my colleagues for this rule that will then bring to the floor H.J. Res. 37 and allow, in its brevity, its complete and total consideration.

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.

Mr. POLIS. 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 ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 175, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—241

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

Wolf
Womack

Woodall
Yoder

Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—175

Ackerman	Green, Al	Pastor (AZ)
Altmire	Green, Gene	Payne
Andrews	Grijalva	Pelosi
Baca	Gutierrez	Perlmutter
Baldwin	Hanabusa	Peters
Barrow	Hastings (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Bass (CA)	Heinrich	Polis
Becerra	Higgins	Price (NC)
Berkley	Himes	Quigley
Berman	Hinojosa	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Reyes
Blumenauer	Honda	Richardson
Boswell	Hoyer	Richmond
Brady (PA)	Inslee	Ross (AR)
Braley (IA)	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Capps	(TX)	Rush
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Cardoza	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Carnahan	Kaptur	T.
Keating	Carney	Sarbanes
Kildee	Kissell	Schakowsky
Paul	Kucinich	Schiff
Chandler	Langevin	Schrader
Chu	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cicilline	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Clarke (MI)	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Hall	Levin	Sewell
Pitts	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Platts	Loeb sack	Shuler
Clarke (NY)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sires
Clay	Lowey	Slaughter
Clyburn	Lujan	Smith (WA)
Cohen	Lynch	Speier
Connolly (VA)	Maloney	Stark
Conyers	Markey	Sutton
Costello	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Critz	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Crowley	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Cuellar	McCollum	Tonko
Cummings	McDermott	Towns
Davis (CA)	McGovern	Tsongas
Davis (IL)	McIntyre	Velázquez
DeFazio	McNerney	Visclosky
DeGette	Michaud	Walz (MN)
DeLauro	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Deutch	Miller, George	Schultz
Dicks	Moore	Waters
Dingell	Moran	Watt
Doggett	Murphy (CT)	Waxman
Donnelly (IN)	Nadler	Weiner
Doyle	Napolitano	Welch
Edwards	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Ellison	Oliver	Woolsey
Eshoo	Owens	Wu
Farr	Pallone	Yarmuth
Farr	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—16

Cleaver	Giffords	Sanchez, Loretta
Cooper	Hinche	Schwartz
Courtney	Holden	Van Hollen
Engel	Kind	Young (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Lipinski	
Garamendi	Meeks	

1355

Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Messrs. CONYERS and GUTIERREZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. LATOURETTE 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:

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 226, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and their families, and all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 37, DISAPPROVING FCC INTERNET AND BROADBAND REGULATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 178, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

YEAS—241

Adams	Costa	Guthrie
Aderholt	Cravaack	Hall
Akin	Crawford	Hanna
Alexander	Crenshaw	Harper
Amash	Culberson	Harris
Austria	Davis (KY)	Hartzler
Bachmann	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Barletta	Dent	Hayworth
Bartlett	DesJarlais	Heck
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Heller
Bass (NH)	Dold	Hensarling
Benishek	Dreier	Herger
Berg	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Biggert	Duncan (SC)	Huelskamp
Bilbray	Duncan (TN)	Huizenga (MI)
Bilirakis	Ellmers	Hultgren
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	Hunter
Black	Farenthold	Hurt
Blackburn	Fincher	Issa
Bonner	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins
Bono Mack	Flake	Johnson (IL)
Boren	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Boustany	Fleming	Johnson, Sam
Brady (TX)	Flores	Jones
Brooks	Forbes	Jordan
Broun (GA)	Fortenberry	Kelly
Buchanan	Fox	King (IA)
Buchson	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Buerkle	Gallegly	Kingston
Burgess	Gardner	Kinzinger (IL)
Burton (IN)	Garrett	Kline
Calvert	Gerlach	Labrador
Camp	Gibbs	Lamborn
Campbell	Gibson	Lance
Canseco	Gingrey (GA)	Landry
Cantor	Gohmert	Lankford
Capito	Goodlatte	Latham
Carter	Gosar	LaTourette
Cassidy	Gowdy	Latta
Chabot	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Coble	Graves (MO)	Long
Coffman (CO)	Griffin (AR)	Lucas
Cole	Griffith (VA)	Luetkemeyer
Conaway	Grimm	Lummis
Conyers	Guinta	

Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rogers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri

Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Bachus
Cooper
Engel
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi

NOT VOTING—13
Giffords
Hinchev
Holden
Kind
Meeks
Sanchez, Loretta
Terry
Young (FL)

Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rogers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell

Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Scalise
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David

Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IN)

NAYS—178

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote. A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 310, noes 104, answered “present” 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]
AYES—310

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clay
Clever
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dingren
Dortch
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Heger
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)

NOES—104

Altmire
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Burgess
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Cuellar
Cummings
DeFazio
Dent
Dicks
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Farr
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Foxy
Fudge
Gardner
Gerlach
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heller
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Keating
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Maloney
Marchant
Matsui
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
Miller (MI)

Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Napolitano
Oliver
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Poe (TX)
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schilling
Sires
Slaughter
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Weiner
Wu
Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—17

Carter
Cooper
Culberson
Engel
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Giffords
Gohmert

Kind
MeeksNeal
Ryan (WI)Sanchez, Loretta
Young (FL)

□ 1411

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently voted "yes" on rollcall votes 226 and 227. It was my intention to vote "no" on both votes.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY AND COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 5, 2011.

Speaker JOHN BOEHNER,
The United States Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write to inform you that effective immediately I am resigning from the House Judiciary Committee and will be taking a leave of absence from the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to join the House Committee on Rules. If you have any questions please contact me directly or your staff can contact Steve Pfrang, my Legislative Director.

Sincerely,

TOM REED,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 202

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON RULES.—Mr. Reed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUNGER-FAST COALITION: GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY IS A NATIONAL PRIORITY

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last week USAID Administrator Raj Shah

testified before the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. In his testimony he stated, and I quote, "We estimate, and I believe these are very conservative estimates, that H.R. 1 would lead to 70,000 kids dying." This means, conservatively speaking, that the GOP budget cuts could result in the deaths of 70,000 children around the world from disease, from hunger, from lack of basic immunizations, mosquito nets, and food.

These callous and brutal cuts are not only a stain on the moral conscience of this House; they directly undermine our national security and our economic future. Over 23,000 people from faith groups and other organizations are fasting in protest of these draconian cuts. Join them at www.hungerfast.org. I urge my colleagues to restore funding for these humanitarian and development programs. The lives of 70,000 children are at stake.

SHAH: GOP BUDGET WOULD KILL 70,000 CHILDREN

(Posted by Josh Rogin, March 31, 2011)

As Congress struggles to negotiate a budget deal to keep the government running, the head of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) told lawmakers Wednesday that the GOP version of the budget bill would result in the deaths of at least 70,000 children who depend on American food and health assistance around the world.

"We estimate, and I believe these are very conservative estimates, that H.R. 1 would lead to 70,000 kids dying," USAID Administrator Rajiv Shah testified before the House Appropriations State and Foreign Ops subcommittee.

"Of that 70,000, 30,000 would come from malaria control programs that would have to be scaled back specifically. The other 40,000 is broken out as 24,000 would die because of a lack of support for immunizations and other investments and 16,000 would be because of a lack of skilled attendants at birth," he said.

The Republican bill, known as H.R. 1, was passed by the House, and would fund the government for the rest of fiscal 2011. It would effectively cut 16 percent from the Obama administration's original fiscal 2011 request for the international affairs account.

Rep. Jesse Jackson Jr. (D-IL) pointed out that H.R. 1 would provide \$430 million for the International Disaster Assistance (IDA) account, which is 50 percent below the president's fiscal 2011 request and 67 percent below fiscal 2010 levels.

Shah said that such a cut "would be, really, the most dramatic stepping back away from our humanitarian responsibilities around the world in decades." The IDA account supports 1.6 million people in Darfur, so halving the account would place 800,000 people at risk, he said.

"[T]his would lead to a significant amount of reduction in feeding programs, medical programs and food and water programs for people who are incredibly vulnerable," he added.

Shah was also testifying in defense of the administration's fiscal 2012 budget request, which also faces the axe on Capitol Hill. Subcommittee Chairwoman Kay Granger (R-TX) opened the hearing by announcing that the administration's fiscal 2012 request was dead on arrival.

"While I understand the value of many of these important programs, the funding request for next year is—is truly unrealistic in today's budget environment," she said. "We simply cannot fund everything that has been

funded in the past. And we certainly cannot continue to fund programs that are duplicative and wasteful."

Granger said she would support USAID programs that have national security implications or contribute to the ongoing missions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Her Democratic counterpart, Rep. Nita Lowey (D-NY), said that national security is threatened by instability in other parts of the world as well.

"Drastic cuts to USAID would risk a great deal in stability and security around the world which could spawn the kinds of threats that cost this country the lives of men and women in uniform and billions in treasure," she said.

Shah argued that foreign assistance is crucial to the long term economic recovery because it helps develop markets for American goods.

"USAID's work also strengthens America's economic security. By establishing links to consumers at the bottom of the pyramid, we effectively position American countries to enter more markets and sell more goods in the economies of the future, promoting exports and creating American jobs," he said.

FAREWELL TO MARK GAGE

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my appreciation to Mark Gage of our Foreign Affairs Committee staff for his guidance, his insight, and his counsel throughout the years.

After a distinguished career in the House, which started with Congressman Solomon's office in 1981 as an intern and 5 years as a political appointee at the Department of State, Mark has decided to retire from government service.

Our committee will be losing an immense talent and a dedicated public servant, someone driven by an unwavering commitment to doing what is right for our Nation and by the Members that he has served throughout the last three decades. Mark's expertise and sharp wit will be sorely missed.

I wish Mark a wonderful retirement with his lovely wife, Linda, and their three terrific dogs.

UCONN HUSKIES: 2011 NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Coach Jim Calhoun and the UConn men's basketball team for their win last night. That is the third national championship under Coach Calhoun, who hails from the Second Congressional District of eastern Connecticut.

This was a remarkable year. When the season started, they weren't even on the top 68 by Sports Illustrated. But under the leadership of Kemba Walker, three freshmen and a sophomore, they defied the odds, won 11 consecutive single-elimination games over the last 20-some-odd days, and prevailed last night

against a great Butler Bulldog team led by a great young coach, Coach Stevens.

Again, congratulations to Coach Calhoun, who is a great leader in the State of Connecticut and a great leader for student athletes.

Go Huskies.

OUR FISCAL PROBLEMS

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the debt we are dealing with as a Nation. It is time to stop ignoring the debt problem that we have in America.

The budget we released this morning is focused on solving our fiscal problems, not scoring political points. Key elements: fiscal responsibility; understanding this is not our money; it's owned by the American people; finding common ground with the President's debt commission and bipartisan CBO proposals. We have some areas where we've agreed, and those areas are included.

Shocking as it may seem, conservatives have also included some practical solutions to solve our long-term systemic issues with entitlements and welfare. Our focus was to protect programs that are working, encourage work for every person who's able to work, and set a course for future economic stability.

It's also focused on cutting spending. Raising taxes on Americans to fund more government would be like a family running up a huge credit card bill and then going to their boss at work to tell them they need a raise to pay off their credit card. Their boss would most likely respond, You don't need a raise. You'll just spend more. You need to get your family on a budget and you need to cut your spending to what's absolutely necessary. That's what we must do.

Some in Congress have already called this proposal extreme. Well, I'd have to tell you, I agree. I think this budget is extreme—extremely responsible, extremely forward-thinking, and extremely overdue.

WE CAN'T SPEND MONEY WE DON'T HAVE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, despite the heated rhetoric over the fiscal year 2011 budget and the failure to responsibly address our Nation's \$14 trillion debt, there is one simple truth that we should all take away from this current budget standoff: Washington can no longer fail to deal with America's looming debt crisis as Americans continue to tighten their belts and make ends meet.

Constitutionally, all spending bills must originate in the House. In Feb-

ruary, the House performed its duty and passed a long-term spending bill that represents tough but necessary choices we must take. Even if we all agree a program is efficient and needed, we can't spend money we don't have. At a time when the Federal Government is borrowing 40 cents of every dollar, we must be responsible stewards of the taxpayers' dollars in a manner that ensures the long-term promises and commitments the government has made to the American people are met and fulfilled.

It's time the Senate leadership do what's right. We still have a government to run and cannot adequately deal with a 2012 budget if last year's business is left hanging in the wind.

DRILLING FOR BRAZIL BUT NOT FOR US

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President says that he wants to cut the country's oil imports by one-third over the next 10 years. Well, that's fantastic and well-timed for the announcement of his reelection campaign yesterday. But let's face reality. Gasoline is up to \$4 a gallon. Americans don't want to hear about what's going to happen 10 years from now.

The President's answer to the energy crisis and \$4 gasoline is to give money to Brazil while at the same time stonewalling drilling in our gulf. Why are we doing that?

Instead of propping up energy companies in Brazil and letting them drill off their coast, let's keep jobs and money in America and drill off of our coasts and on our land. Let's develop our own domestic energy instead of developing Brazil's.

Are you in for that, Mr. President?
And that's just the way it is.

REMEMBERING JOHN ADLER

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of our departed colleague, John Adler of New Jersey.

John Adler came into the Congress as part of our freshman class in 2009. He was an honorable public servant who served 17 years in the New Jersey State Senate and, before that, on the town council of Cherry Hill, New Jersey.

John brought a wealth of knowledge, legislative expertise, but good humor, compassion, and a respect for his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. His bipartisanship, his compassion, his commitment to his community and especially to his family will be sorely missed.

Our hearts go out to Shelley, his wife, and his four children at this difficult time.

COME TOGETHER FOR THE NEXT GENERATION

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, America is at a huge crossroads right now. We're in a situation that whenever we spend \$1, 40 cents of it is borrowed. Our national debt is about 95 percent of our GDP. We are losing our edge as a global leader. It hurts our job creation, it smothers the private sector, and it denies you and me of some of our basic freedoms; because the bigger the government gets, the smaller your personal freedom gets.

That's why the budget that has been introduced today is so worthy of a strong debate by both of us—both parties, that is. This is about the next generation, not about the next election. I urge my Democrat friends and my Republican friends to come together and do the best thing for the United States of America, not just for partisan politics of the day.

We are Americans. We can do better. We can get this job done, and we must get this job done.

□ 1420

REVERSE ROBIN HOOD

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today in the VA we had a hearing on how would the shutdown affect the veterans. You know, you can tell something about a country or an organization as to how they spend their money.

In December, when we gave \$700 billion tax breaks to the richest people in the world, then we are worrying about in 2 or 3 months whether or not we are going to have money to pay for the veterans' pensions or their health care, it is unacceptable. It is unacceptable that we continue to practice what I call reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the poor and working people to give tax breaks to the rich. Unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

CATCH 'EM IF YOU CAN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the third front that the United States is engaged in, and I am not talking about the war in Libya. I am talking about the border war on our southern front between the United States and Mexico, the war with the narcoterrorist gangs that are coming into the United States daily, bringing their wares into this country.

Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano recently said that

the border now is better than it ever has been. I take issue with that comment for a lot of reasons. One, I have been to the southern border of the United States, primarily in Texas with the border with Mexico. Been there numerous times. I just recently got back from the border at Arizona and Mexico. What I saw does not look like a secure border. Of course, she said it was better than it ever has been, but that's not the question.

The question is, is the border of the United States secure? And the answer to that question, in my opinion, is, no, it is not secure. Let's talk about this issue. This issue has been around for a long time. There seems to be a lot said about it. But as my grandfather used to say, when all is said and done, more is said than done. And the border between the United States and Mexico is not secure. I don't know that it's better than it ever has been.

There are problems on both sides of the border. In my visits to the border, it is not just the people in Mexico who live in concern and fear for their own safety about the narcoterrorists running up and down the border with automatic weapons, but it is people on the American side as well.

The National Border Patrol Council, that's the group that represents the Border Patrol agents, recently made the comment if the border was better now than it ever has been, Agent Brian Terry would not have been brutally murdered by heavily armed Mexican criminals operating over 13 miles inside the United States. That makes quite the point.

Just recently, in the last 24 hours, two Americans that live in Mexico but work in the United States and have worked in the United States for some years were legally crossing at a regular port of entry, and they were gunned down in Mexico while they were waiting to cross into the United States. Two Americans murdered. Of course, when an American is murdered in Mexico the chances of anybody in Mexico being prosecuted are almost nonexistent.

Last year, 65 Americans were murdered in Mexico. I know of no case where anybody in Mexico was held accountable for those crimes, because the crimes are out of control in Mexico. And to think that it does not affect the United States is living in never-never land.

This map here, I want to show some statistics about the border counties in Texas with Mexico. There are 14 border counties in Texas that border Mexico. Every so often I will call the sheriffs of those 14 border counties and ask them this simple question: How many people in your jail are foreign nationals? I am not asking the question how many are legally or illegally in the United States. You know, we can't ask that question in States. We can only find out if the person is in the United States from a foreign country.

So recently, 2 weeks ago, I called the sheriffs, the 14 border sheriffs in Texas,

and asked them that question: How many people in your jail are foreign nationals charged with crimes? That would be a State misdemeanor or a felony crime. This does not include immigration violations. That's a whole different group of people.

So how many people are in your jail, not people charged with immigration violations, but they are just charged with cross-border crime? And the answer is 34 percent are foreign nationals, 34.5 percent to be exact. Now, think about that number. Thirty-four percent of the people in a local jail are from foreign countries. And they are not just from Mexico; they are from all over. Because everybody in the world knows if you can get into Mexico, you can get into the United States.

You see, Mexico doesn't protect its border any better than the United States does. So people all over the world go into Mexico, and they sneak across into the United States. In these border county jails, 34 percent of those people are foreign nationals who have committed a crime and gotten caught and are locked up in local jails.

Now, to say that there is not a crime problem on the border is not reality because, you see, if the border was secure—and that is the Federal Government's job to secure the border—if the border was secure, you wouldn't have these people coming into the United States committing crimes because they couldn't get across, the ones that are illegally crossing into the United States. And these are not rich counties. These are poor counties. These counties don't have a lot of revenue. It's very difficult for these counties to house and feed and take care of the medical issues of cross-border crime. But they are saddled with that responsibility because the Federal Government does not protect the border of the United States in an adequate manner.

So the question is, is the border of the United States secure? The answer to that question is, no, it is not. The proof is in the statistics in this one area.

Let's spread it out a little bit further. Let's talk about the Federal prison system. Now, the Federal prison system is where people have been caught for a felony in the United States and tried in a Federal court and sent to a Federal penitentiary somewhere across the entire United States. The Federal Government keeps up with the number of people who are in Federal penitentiaries serving time that are criminal aliens.

Now, that's a different term. Foreign nationals, that term, I use that term as a person from a foreign country, legally or illegally in the United States. But the Federal Government keeps specific statistics on criminal aliens. A criminal alien is a person that is illegally in the United States, commits a crime, gets caught, gets convicted, and goes to the Federal penitentiary.

So how many people have we got like that in the United States? The latest

statistics show that the total number of criminal aliens in U.S. prisons is 27 percent. Now, we are talking about some real numbers. We are talking about all the Federal penitentiaries in the United States where people are charged with crimes and convicted; 27 percent of our population in the Federal penal system are people who are criminal aliens. Now, if the border was secure, people wouldn't come into the United States illegally, commit crimes, get caught, tried in Federal courts, and go to Federal penitentiaries.

□ 1430

Yet, over one-fourth of the people we house in the Federal prison system are in that category. So the question is, is the border secure? And the answer is no, it is not secure.

One-fourth of the people that are incarcerated in our prison system, in the Federal prison system, are called criminal aliens. It doesn't sound like it's a very secure border to me if those people are able to come into the United States.

While I am talking about the prison system, let me give another scenario that occurs, which is really frustrating. We have people who come into the United States, they commit crimes, they are foreign nationals, some are criminal aliens. They commit crimes, they get convicted in a court somewhere in the United States, either a State court or a Federal court. They are sent to the State penitentiary or the Federal penitentiary. While they are incarcerated, serving their time, the system works very well because ICE comes in, puts a detainer on them for deportation, they have a deportation hearing, so that as soon as they get out of the penitentiary, they are supposed to be deported back to the country that they came from. That's the way the system is supposed to work, and it works like that sometimes but not all the time. Because, you see, there are some countries who won't take back their criminal aliens.

What do you mean they won't take them back? Well, their criminal aliens come into our country, they commit a crime, they are sent to the penitentiary. While incarcerated, they are ordered to go back home as soon as they get out of the penitentiary.

And when we get ready to deport them back from whence they came, their country says, Don't send 'em back to us—we don't want 'em. I mean, you know, they've got enough criminals of their own, I guess. But they refuse to take back their criminal aliens.

Now, how many people are we talking about? The current number is 140,000 of those people, 140,000 people from foreign countries, committed crimes in the United States, ordered to be deported back and their countries refuse to take them back; 140,000.

So what happens to them? Well, under our Constitution we just can't

keep them in jail after they've served their time. So after 6 months, where they are not deported after their time is served, they are released into the United States because their country won't take them back.

Who are those countries? Well, there are a whole lot of them. The top five, you would never guess this, but China is in the top five, you know, our good buddies, the Chinese, who own most of our debt, our great trading partners. They don't take back their criminal aliens.

Other countries, Cuba, Vietnam, Jamaica and India, those are the top five nations that refuse to take back their criminal aliens after being convicted. So those 140,000 people continue to be our problem because their countries don't take them back.

If the border were secure, those people would never have gotten in the United States to begin with to commit crimes, and now we are stuck with those individuals. We need to have a consequence for those countries that refuse to take their lawfully deported criminal aliens back.

Those countries should have some type of consequence for failure to take their lawfully deported individuals back. I am not sure what that would be, but we must consider all of our options, including if those countries receive any type of foreign aid, we shouldn't give them foreign aid. You don't get foreign aid if you don't take back your criminal aliens.

Those countries that don't get foreign aid, maybe we should reconsider their lawful visas for people that are coming into the United States. See, all these countries do get visas, except maybe Cuba, into the United States, and maybe we should reconsider that.

But it's a massive problem in the criminal justice system alone for the fact that the border remains unsecure. The border is a long way, just the Texas border, from El Paso down to Brownsville. I mean, if you are not from Texas you don't know how far that is, it's just a long way. But it's the same distance as from New Orleans to New York City. That's how long a border it is.

And the entire southern border of the United States is 1,957 miles long. Now we are talking about a lot of territory. So how much of that land is secure?

Well, recently, Richard Santana, who works for the Homeland Security Department, said that the United States only has 129 miles of that 1,957 mile border that is secure. Now, that doesn't seem like a very long amount; 129 miles is not very much of a border when you have 1,957 miles of that border that is not secure.

Taking another organization, the GAO, that is the Government Accountability Office, that is the group of people that keep up with all the statistics that we, Members of Congress, ask them to keep up with.

They have released a report talking about that one question. How secure is

the southern border of the United States? And their answer is this: 44 percent of the border is considered secure but, really, only 15 percent of the border is airtight. That means we will catch you if you come across 15 percent of this massive border.

So if 44 percent is somewhat secure, that means 56 percent of the border is controlled by somebody else. Who controls that portion of the border? It's not the United States. It's not Mexico. Who controls 56 percent of our southern border?

It seems like anybody who wants to cross controls it and, to my opinion, primarily it's those narcoterrorists, those people who bring drugs into the United States, those violent drug cartels who operate not only in Mexico but other parts of the continent, including South America.

So we need to make sure that we talk about what is correct, and the people who live on the border, you ask them. You go down there and you just pick somebody out and you ask them, whether it's in Texas or whether it's in Arizona, whether they feel secure on the border, and the ones I have talked to don't feel secure.

Now, recently, last weekend, weekend before last, I had the opportunity to go to Arizona. I was a guest of Congresswoman GABBY GIFFORDS' staff. GABBY GIFFORDS, as Members of Congress know, has been working on border security issues for a long time. Last year she sponsored a letter to the President, myself and others cosigned it, to put more National Guard troops on the border. The President responded with some National Guard troops on the border, and she has worked on that issue.

And before her tragic incident where she was shot, she and I had been talking about the fact that I had invited her to Texas to come down and look at the Texas border, and she had invited me to Arizona to go meet with the people on the southern border of Arizona.

And so last week, I had the opportunity, thanks to Ms. GIFFORDS' staff, to go down to the Arizona border. I will say this about her staff: They are a tremendous group of individuals. I am highly impressed with how informed Ms. GIFFORDS' staff was and appreciate the fact that they took me and part of my staff down there to see the way it is in Arizona.

But here is a map of Arizona, and the portions of Arizona where I was were in the southeastern portion of Arizona, over here. Everybody has heard of Tombstone, but I was a little further south than Tombstone, all the way to the border and Douglas, Arizona, which is in the corner, the southwestern corner of Arizona and next to New Mexico, and along that portion of the southern border of the United States, visiting primarily with the people that were in charge of border security, the Border Patrol and the ranchers who live along the border.

Let me talk about the ranchers first. One of those ranchers, Mr. Krentz, a

year ago was murdered on his ranch, apparently by illegals coming into the United States. He was gunned down and killed. The culprits that committed that crime, by the way, have not been brought to justice.

I met with other ranchers in the entire region and just asked them the question: Tell me what it's like to live on the border of the United States and Mexico as a ranch owner. And they went on forever and forever and told me things that I was just really somewhat surprised about, how they feel like the border is wide open, that people cross across their ranches.

People come in, they destroy their property, they destroy their water lines. All of this costs money to the ranchers and, of course, they have to be the ones that pick up the bill for the destruction on their property.

□ 1440

And they don't feel safe about the people that cross into the United States across their land. They feel like the Federal Government has really not protected them and their rights and seems to neglect them, even though the Border Patrol, who I also met with, I believe, is doing as good a job as they possibly can do. I want to make that clear. The Border Patrol is doing as good a job as they can do, as we will let them do as a nation. And they are trying to protect the border the best that they possibly can.

And so I talked to both groups. But in reality, the people who live there are very concerned about their own safety and the consequences they have to pay for people illegally coming into the United States.

I heard something that was kind of surprising to me. When illegals, not all, but when some come into the United States and they are captured by Border Patrol, some of them ask the question, are they in the 9th court or the 10th court? And I said, what are they talking about, the 9th court or the 10th court? Well, what they're talking about is the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals or the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. You see, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, that is a Federal appellate court, has jurisdiction that includes Arizona but goes up to the New Mexico border.

And so when illegals cross into the United States near New Mexico or Arizona, some of them ask the question, am I in the 9th court, which would be in Arizona, or the 10th Circuit Court, of which the jurisdiction is New Mexico? And the reason for that, in my opinion, those two courts have different reputations about enforcing the rule of law on the border. And, of course, those that cross into the United States hope if they are caught the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals would eventually have jurisdiction over their case when in their perception it's a much more friendly court to folks who cross in illegally than the 10th Circuit. So I thought that was somewhat interesting.

They are also given, when they come into the United States, if captured, their property. Some of them, you will find a whole list of things and places they can go, the churches that give them sanctuary, places that they can go for medical help. And they are given, in a very organized way, what they can do when they come into the United States. That is provided in some cases by the coyotes that make money off those immigrants who come into the United States, because immigrants have to pay the coyote money. And sometimes the coyotes and the drug cartels all work together because, you see, drugs and people are going north, and money and guns are going south because, you see, Mexico doesn't protect its border any better than the United States does.

But in any event, while I was down there in the corner of Arizona, I learned firsthand about the seriousness to the ranchers, the people who live on the land, their concerns about the fact that they believe that the border is not secure. In reality, they have to worry about their own safety on a daily basis.

After visiting a corner of the southeastern corner of Arizona, we moved and traveled across Interstate 10 to Interstate 8 over here to San Luis, Arizona. So that travels, goes up to San Luis across Interstate 10, Interstate 10 turns into Interstate 8, comes all the way across Arizona into California, goes into Yuma, Arizona, and I went down here into the southwestern corner of the State of New Mexico to also see what that border was like.

Now, coming across Interstate 8, right here, Interstate 8, we pulled off the side of the road to the Sonora National Reserve, and that is a national reserve that the Federal Government controls, because I wanted to see the Sonora National Reserve.

Interestingly enough, you get about a quarter of a mile, almost a half-mile off of Interstate 8 right up here by the Sonora Desert, and you come across this sign. This sign is facing toward Mexico. So Interstate 8 would be to this direction, and Mexico would be behind the sign. How far behind the sign? It's 80 miles to the Mexican border. And here is a big sign that says, "Traveling Caution: Smuggling and Illegal Immigration May Be Encountered in This Area."

So, it seems to me that the Federal Government's answer to border security is to warn people that it is a smuggling and illegal immigration area. Once again, this sign is not on the border. This sign is 80 miles this side of the border. So, what is the government saying? Are they just ceding that entire portion of Arizona to the drug cartels, saying it's a smuggling area and that you need to take care of yourself because we can't protect you? I don't know. But I was somewhat surprised to see that our Federal Government's answer to border security was to erect this sign and other signs that are similar to it. I don't believe, of course,

that's the answer to border security. You wouldn't need these signs if the border were secure in reality, not in just political statements that seem to be made by different individuals.

The Texas Department of Public Safety has issued some statistics regarding cross-border crime. I have already mentioned about how the 34.5 percent of the people in local county jails on the border are foreign nationals. But just since 2010, January 2010, the Texas Department of Public Safety has identified 22 murders, 24 assaults, 15 shootings and 5 kidnappings, among other crimes, directly related to spill-over violence from Mexico.

Now sometimes we hear this comment: Well, the violence in Mexico isn't coming to the United States. The question is, is the crime from Mexico coming into the United States? We have already shown that that is occurring because 34 percent of the people in those local jails are committing crimes, and they're foreign nationals. But also the violence is coming into the United States because of the statistics that I just gave you.

And now we learn of another phenomenon that is taking place. You don't hear much about it because the victims of these crimes don't say much about it. People who live in border towns, the populous border towns in the United States, periodically would get somebody who would come to their front door, or they would get an email or a text from someone who says, we know your cousin who lives in Mexico, and unless you pay us so much protection money, your cousin in Mexico is going to disappear, something to that effect. So we hear reports of that, extortion on the American side of the border. This is primarily among Hispanic Americans.

And what do they do? Well, they may or may not report it. What they, I think, generally do is pay the extortion because they want their relative in Mexico on the other side of the border to be safe. So we have that extortion racket taking place. If the border were secure, that certainly would not have occurred. So it concerns me that we have that crime on the American side.

Going back to the southern border of Arizona, I was asking the Border Patrol, which was very gracious and explained a lot of their operations to me, how do they bring drugs into the United States? And they said every way they can bring them into the United States. One of the ways that they are using now is the concept of ultralights. An ultralight, for lack of a better description, is a kite that has a motor on it. One person can fly that at very low altitude, and they bring in 200 or 300 pounds of drugs into the United States. They never land the ultralight into the U.S.; they just fly across from Mexico into Arizona and they drop their load, 200, 300 pounds of drugs, and then they fly back to Mexico. Then there is someone at a rendezvous point who picks up those drugs.

□ 1450

I say that because the drug cartels are using every means necessary to exploit the open borders and do everything they can to make sure that they bring in those drugs. And they will continue to do so.

The Border Patrol is the agency that we have to protect the border of the United States. Like I said, I think they are doing as good a job as we will let them do. But primarily the Border Patrol patrols the border up to 25–35 miles inside the United States. That is their duty. That is their jurisdiction, the place that they are supposed to protect the U.S. Past that 35 miles or so, they don't patrol that. That is somebody else's responsibility.

Now, of course the bad guys know that is the duty of the Border Patrol, to patrol that section of the border. So when people are smuggled into the United States, when drugs are smuggled into the United States, the goal is to get past the Border Patrol demarcation line because once you do that, you are pretty much, in my opinion, home free to get into the United States with people or drugs. So that is the area of their primary concern, and it is certainly the area of the jurisdiction that they are trying to patrol the best they can.

I have asked the Border Patrol: Tell me how you do this. And I think they use as many different means as they can to patrol the border. They will have vehicles go up and down the border. They will have Border Patrol agents behind the border. They will have some use of the National Guard behind the border with the use of electronic equipment to view what takes place on the border. So they use the equipment that they can. But they obviously don't have enough Border Patrol agents to be directly on the border. So they have some on the border and some behind the border monitoring the activity of the people coming into the United States. And then they try to catch those that they can.

When I was visiting with one of the Border Patrol agents, this is a photograph of one of their vehicles. It is a typical Border Patrol vehicle that patrols near the border of the United States and Mexico. Now, Mr. Speaker, you notice that this vehicle has steel mesh on the windshield and on the side windows. It has steel mesh even above the lights, the red lights on top. So I asked the Border Patrol agent that drives this vehicle: Explain to me the steel enclosure you have on your vehicle.

He said here is what happens: we will drive close to the border. As we drive close to the border, there are people on the other side of the border who, when they see us, start throwing rocks at us. They throw them over the fence. If we don't have this protection—and they are not little bitty pebbles, these are rocks—they throw them over the fence and break the windshield. The Border Patrol agents are injured.

They do that for various reasons. One of those reasons is a diversion. They will try to divert the attention of a Border Patrol agent at one location so that other folks illegally can sneak into the United States.

Now, we don't hear much about assaults on Border Patrol agents unless somebody is murdered, which has occurred. But in the last couple of years, assaults on Border Patrol agents by people illegally coming into the United States is about 1,000 a year. A thousand assaults on Border Patrol agents a year in the last couple of years; and they are by every means necessary, including the rock throwers who try to injure Border Patrol agents.

So you can see the relentlessness of some people who want to come into the United States. They violate the law, of course, by coming here illegally. And they will continue to violate the law and take on our Border Patrol agents, even by assaulting them, so they can sneak into the United States.

So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, maybe we need to refocus on the primary mission of the Federal Government and its responsibility. The Federal Government does have the responsibility under the Constitution to protect the American people, and the United States Government should do that.

Now, the United States protects the borders of other nations. We protect the border of Afghanistan with Pakistan. We are protecting the Korean border between the two Koreas. We protect the borders of other nations, and we use our military to do it. Why don't we have the same resolve to protect the American border, both borders, the southern border and the northern border? Because, in my opinion, we don't have the moral will to do so. We should make sure that we understand that people, and other people should understand, you don't come to the United States without permission. It is the rule of law: you don't come to the United States without permission.

Now, we have to solve that immigration issue. That is a different issue, but you can't solve that issue until you solve the issue of people illegally coming into the United States. You know, we are getting everybody. We are getting the good, the bad, and the ugly. And right now, we're getting a lot of bad and ugly crossing into the United States. So the rule of law must be enforced by the Federal Government. That is their duty.

Now, many of us do not believe the Federal Government has secured the border. Obviously, people in Arizona feel that way because they have passed legislation to try to protect their own State using State law enforcement. Of course, the Federal Government's answer to that was rather than help Arizona, sue Arizona. Take them to court. You know, it's kind of like this sign. Their answer to border security is erect a few signs and sue States that try to protect themselves. Why don't

we deal in reality and make sure that the border is secure and make sure that it is an area that is safe on both sides. By securing our side, we can protect the Mexican side as well. Of course, we need to work with the Mexican Government to do so. They are our neighbors to the south.

While the United States now has decided to go into Libya and spend \$100 million or \$200 million a week, I don't know, by bombing that country, maybe we should come back home and focus on national security in the United States and spend that money on border security and securing the United States at the border because it is not secure in spite of what the Secretary of Homeland Security has said.

Border Patrol, it seems to me, should have the mission to secure the border. I will say again, they are doing as good a job as we will let them do, but they cannot stop people from coming into the United States, although they are trying to. When they had those vehicles going up and down in front of the border, that keeps people from coming across. We have fences in some appropriate areas. We don't have fences everywhere, but we have some fencing.

Also, the Border Patrol knows they cannot stop people from crossing so they try to catch them if you can. That is the phrase that I think is our policy: catch them if you can. In other words, they cross into the United States. We see them, we try to catch them, but once we catch them, they become our problem. And then we have to send them through the entire legal process, as we should, but they are our problem. They become our medical problem. They become our prison problem if they go to prison if they have committed a felony. Then we have to deal with them, and we have to try to get them back to the country they belong to, in spite of those countries that refuse to take back criminal aliens. So it is catch them if you can.

Why don't we rethink that and prevent people from crossing into the United States? If our policy was border security not behind the border security, but have security on the border, then people coming up to the border can't get across. Why, because there are more boots on the ground. And I think we should use whatever we have available.

We certainly should use the Border Patrol, but also maybe we should use the National Guard. We have a few National Guard troops that are down on the border, although they are being relieved; and their primary purpose is not to be on the border, but behind the border looking at cameras watching folks cross.

Now, that is great to watch people cross; but when they cross and they come into the United States, once again they become our problem once they have crossed. And we catch them if you can, and send them back home if we can.

So it would seem to me to be a better use of the National Guard to put them

on the border. I have introduced legislation to put 10,000 National Guard troops on the 1,957-mile border between the United States and Mexico, and put them on the border to not allow people to cross into the United States.

It is the Federal Government's responsibility of national security to protect the people, so the Federal Government should pay for that and get the money out of the Department of Defense or somewhere, re-appropriate money to have the National Guard paid for, but put them under the supervision of the four State Governors so that the Governors can control their own border and protect them from entering the United States unlawfully no matter who it is.

I do not believe that we can say our border is secure when the Government Accountability Office, by their own statistics, say that only 15 percent of the border is airtight. That doesn't seem like a winning percentage to me. And when they say under the best circumstances, 44 percent partially secure. What does that mean? Well, it is sort of secure, but sort of not. But when you have 56 percent of the border is wide open spaces for anybody that wants to come back and forth, that is not protecting the dignity and the sovereignty of the United States.

So it is long past time we quit talking about border security and actually secure the border from people coming into the United States without permission. Everyone. And to say that the crime doesn't occur in the United States, well, it does. Not just to mention the border county jails that I mentioned, the 27 percent that are in Federal penitentiaries that are foreign nationals that are illegally in the United States, but all of the drugs that are sold throughout the United States, those are all criminal gangs, primarily, that are working with the drug cartels in Mexico and Colombia selling those drugs.

□ 1500

So the crime affects the United States. The insecurity of the border is something that all of us pay for. We pay for it in every way possible. Whether it's with health care, whether it's with education, we pay for it in the criminal justice system. Americans pay and legal immigrants pay.

The United States has the greatest, the most liberal immigration policy in the world. We let more people into our country legally every year than does any other country on its own. So we have to fix that immigration issue, but we have to secure the border first because, when all is said and done, so far more has been said and less has been done.

I urge my fellow Members of the House of Representatives that we come back home, that we come back to the United States, that we think about the security or insecurity of our borders,

and that we make sure that the Federal Government under the Constitution fulfills its first obligation—to protect Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

A VOICE NO LONGER—SURRENDERING THE ROLES AND RIGHTS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to address the House on issues that all of us may not be paying attention to but that all of us should feel are extraordinarily important. We have at this time in our Nation's history eased into constitutional concerns for our future. Those constitutional concerns arise in many different areas.

For instance, you might not be aware of it, but there is a policy to establish different things which Congress is supposed to establish. Yet, right now, agencies are taking over those responsibilities, agencies that are taking away the roles and the rights of this Congress. What that means to our citizens who vote is that they will not have a voice any longer in the policies of the United States. If they don't have access to unelected bureaucrats, they are not able to effect policy that comes from agencies because they can't elect or unelect those people. In the House of Representatives and the Senate, we are surrendering that capability to pass legislation.

A good example is that the Forest Service is closing roads in forests across the country. They are declaring these roadless rules that put off limits much of our Nation's forests. If you were to Google the words "forest" and "roadless," you would find that all of the articles deal with killing and doing away with timber jobs. The people who are in the agencies have adopted an extreme point of view regarding jobs in this country. They do not want any timber to be harvested, so they declare what sounds to be a friendly policy of roadless rules, but the offshoot is that we have no timber industry. In New Mexico alone, which I represent, we used to have 20,000 jobs in the timber industry, and today we have zero.

As we look at the problems of this Nation, we have to understand that the great pressure economically that we face is that our revenues to the government have diminished. That's because people are out of work. They're no longer receiving income and wages, and they're not paying taxes on those. So we're now at a deficit in our government where we're spending more than we bring in. Simultaneously, we're killing jobs in the forests.

You could say, Well, we like the wilderness. We like roadless rules. Our government has a process by which this body and the Senate are supposed

to declare the wilderness areas. Now, instead, the head of the Forest Service can actually just declare that those areas are going to be roadless. They are then made into de facto wildernesses, which shut down jobs. Even more, they shut down near access.

Recently, the Forest Service decided they would simply declare 95 percent of the Gila National Forest off limits because they're closing the roads. If you aren't able to backpack in 35 miles, then you probably will never see parts of this forest. When the law was passed, the forests were created for "our enjoyment"—those are the words—and then it was also to use the resources in the forests. So with an agency that is allowed now to establish these rules without congressional oversight, you would say, Aha, that's a constitutional thing that we should be a little bit concerned about.

Simultaneous with that particular endeavor, there has then come along the wildlands. That's a policy just recently announced by Secretary Salazar. Secretary Salazar has created the wildlands policy that allows him to create a de facto wilderness in BLM lands. BLM lands are a source of great production of oil and gas. So for our voters, for the constituents, for the citizens of this country, they are seeing their gas prices now climb to \$4, and we are limiting access to lands where that price could be diminished and lowered. We have an agency that is killing the jobs and putting off limits the drilling for oil and gas on American soil.

I saw the President of the United States just recently travel to Brazil and encourage the oil and gas company there that is creating offshore jobs. While he is encouraging the leaders of Brazil to develop their offshore production, he is killing offshore production here. There is a disconnect that is causing great problems in our country. Those great problems in the country are basically this:

Our Nation is faced with a \$3.5 trillion budget, and we are bringing in \$2.2 trillion. Now, you cannot live that way in your home. You cannot live with this kind of disparity in your home budget, and neither can the Federal Government. It doesn't work. It's not going to work. We are having to borrow the money. When we run a deficit—and you can do the math here—of 3.5 trillion spending and 2.2 revenue, and those are taxes paid by citizens and by corporations—that gives us a deficit of \$1.3 trillion. As that deficit then is accumulated and as it goes into our debt barrel, we owe \$15 trillion worth of debt. That's the black barrel you can see there.

Since our Nation's inception, since George Washington, we've accumulated \$15 trillion in debt. You can see the green sludge running over the barrel because we have actually more debt than we're willing to count in Washington, so we absolutely just quit counting at \$15 trillion. Social Secu-

rity, Medicare and Medicaid are the green sludge that has poured over the sludge of the barrel. We don't declare it as debt anymore. We are going to pay it; we owe it; we've made promises about it, so we just don't talk about it. It's so uncomfortable and it's so large. That's \$202 trillion we owe. We call that now the "fiscal gap." That's the difference between what we're bringing in and what we owe, \$202 trillion. That's 100 years' worth of revenue. That's 100 years to pay off what we have made promises for.

The U.S. Government is making promises for things that it cannot do. It is paying out money that it does not have, and it's doing it all on credit. The credit, itself, would be alarming enough except now there is a small wrinkle that's developing here. If you were running this sort of deficit and debt in your home, your banker would come to you and knock on the door and say, We need to visit. This is not sustainable. It's not workable.

Our banker is called China and Japan. They buy Treasury bills. Those Treasury bills are the way that our government borrows money to fund this deficit. As you have seen with the recent problems in Japan, Japan will not be buying Treasury bills from us anytime in the near future.

Also, China twice in the last year has knocked on the door and said, We really are alarmed at what you're doing here. We're alarmed at this situation. We're alarmed that you're taking on more debt than you can pay out ever—ever—and we're afraid that your currency is not going to sustain itself. So when the Premier of China recently visited the White House about 3 weeks ago, you might have heard him say—maybe you missed it—that they're concerned about the currency. Since they're concerned about the currency, they do what your banker would do to you. They simply say, We're not going to lend you any more money. We're not going to do this anymore.

□ 1510

Now, then, we're in real trouble. But our government again, working outside the Constitution, is printing money to make up the difference for what we can't borrow overseas. So the Federal Reserve is in the process of buying the debt for the U.S. We here in Washington give the Federal Reserve money, and then they turn around and they lend the money back on this hand. Now, that would be cool if you could do it for long, and we all dream of the situation where we have an unlimited supply of money coming to us where we can lend it here and borrow it here, and that is what we are doing to ourselves.

This entire sequence, then, is made complete if you look at the chart in the upper right-hand corner, and we see that the whole game fails. Just as the Soviet Union collapsed economically, President Reagan viewed that if he could cause them to spend more than they brought in, he could collapse their

economy. President Reagan assisted and helped, with the rest of the world, in the collapsing of the Soviet economy and the ultimate collapse of that entire country, the breakup of the Soviet Union.

And so now, then, we are doing it to ourselves. We are making those promises that we cannot keep. We're killing jobs that should not be killed on behalf of roadless rules and on wilderness, and we are accomplishing the funding of a government by the Federal Reserve which has basically no oversight by Congress. So you, as citizens and taxpayers, contemplate what that means for you.

When the government prints money, it begins to devalue the currency that you have in your pocket. If you have \$100 in your pocket and the government prints \$2.6 trillion, let's say, then the money in your pocket becomes worthless. That is: We have not created any more wealth in the country; all we created is more paper money. It's like in the Monopoly games when you suddenly start getting more and more properties, you know that is Monopoly. Well, this has become Monopoly money that our government is doing here.

You will notice, if you're watching, that the price of food is going up both in this Nation and worldwide. In fact, many of the disruptions in other countries—Egypt, Libya, other countries in Africa—those disruptions were caused by the shortages of food, and people were suddenly finding that the cost of food was outside their reach. All of us are going to demonstrate in the streets when we are not able to feed our kids, and that's what is happening there. The price of food is escalating because they're doing the same thing. They're living on borrowed money. They're living on money that no longer is available, and so they begin to print it. You're seeing the price of gasoline rise to \$4 a gallon. It's not because gasoline is worth more to you today than yesterday. It's that the dollars in your pocket are worth less.

Vegetables to you have no greater value today than yesterday. It's that the dollars in your pocket have less value, so it takes more of them to buy the food. The price of gold and silver are going up, skyrocketing. That's not because silver is used for any more manufacturing today than last week or the week before. It's because the dollars in your pocket have become worth less because we're doing this, because we're spending almost twice what we make, because we have a deficit each year of over \$1 trillion. It's going into an accumulated debt that we owe long term, and to solve the problem our government is printing money.

Now, you could object to it, but you can't object to anyone that listens, which takes us right back to the Constitution. The Constitution is very clear on who should create the money and the value of money. The Congress ceded that authority away, and when it ceded that authority away, they gave

away the responsibility, then we have no control over it. There is no process by which I can ask Mr. Bernanke, Please, don't keep buying this debt.

This is taking away savings accounts for our seniors. This is taking away the ability for families to make ends meet. This printing of money is sustaining a problem that is not sustainable, and it's making believe that we can make it work and just passing the buck down the road one more week, one more month, one more year.

The real sadness is that if we begin to do the things that are within our reach, if we simply begin to allow the cutting of timber—and I do not diminish the need to protect our environment one bit. I don't think we should clear-cut. I don't think that the spotted owl should be allowed to go extinct, but I do believe that we should create jobs and simultaneously protect our environment and simultaneously protect the species.

It's a false choice that we've been given the last 30 or 40 years that says you've got to give up the jobs in order to protect the species. That's management of our entire country for a single species. I think that's a mistake. That mistake is playing out here as we export jobs overseas that traditionally would have been here in this country. Oil and gas production is one. Timber production is another. If you read the quote above me, Daniel Webster, on the wall above us said, "Let us develop the resources of our land." That's a quote that is here on the wall of this House. They are visualizing, in an earlier period in our history, that our great resources are there to be developed, and that's what will make us jobs. That's what will make us be able to have homes, be able to move into new forms of transportation.

Whatever this country has done has been available because we had jobs and we had economic status in the country. And yet some believe that that economy should be diminished and given away around the world. I don't believe that we should average our standard of living down to the rest of the world. I believe that we should average the rest of the world's standard of living up toward ours.

But if we were simply to create jobs, then a magic thing happens—it's not magic at all. But every person that comes off of unemployment does not receive these government checks; instead, they're down here making a wage and paying taxes. So every time we hire one more person incrementally, we decrease the amount that our government is spending, and we increase the amount that our government is taking in. So employment, the creation of jobs, is not sort of a random possibility for us. It is an absolute necessity if we're to avoid this breakup of our economy that's projected down the road because of the way that we're living now.

The Constitution is the agreement between the people and the govern-

ment. Our Founding Fathers came from Europe where they were living under monarchies. Our Founding Fathers came from Europe where they had seen the excesses. They had seen the monarchies rule every single aspect of their lives. When they got to this country, they were fearful of a government that was too strong, so they visualized this contract called our Constitution between the people and the government. The purpose of that contract was to keep the government in check, to keep the government's powers limited and small and to increase the powers of the individual that gave us the liberties that we have so well trumpeted and used as a guiding light for the rest of the world.

Liberty and freedom are the great assets of this country. It's not our wealth. It's not the houses that we live in. It's the ability to choose for ourselves. That is what our Founding Fathers wanted to protect in this contract called the Constitution, and that is what right now in Washington agencies are walking past that Constitution as if it has no meaning. When it has no meaning, the individual, the voter, the person who just goes to work every day begins to have less and less rights and the government begins to take more and more rights away from them.

We see an alarming case in the issue of Libya. Now, I don't support Colonel Qadhafi at all in his reign, in his service, but I do wonder about a nation that will step aside from the rule of law and take the fight to Libya.

We have, in this country, an act called the War Powers Act, which describes circumstances that say there are issues when a President might be able to want to commit troops. But our Constitution doesn't quite give him the right without congressional approval, but we're going to allow it in certain instances and then he can come back to Congress for approval.

Just last week, we heard the administration, Secretary Clinton came and addressed Members of this body, and Secretary Clinton said that they had fully complied with the War Powers Act. Now, that's untrue because there are three very definite requirements for the War Powers Act, and we're not facing any of those. There were no U.S. soldiers that were attacked.

The President said, with all respect, that this country is different. Well, this country is different because we have a rule of law and we have a Constitution, and we abide by it and we transport freedom. And when we begin to walk away from that freedom, then we walk away from the essence of the country.

So he committed troops from the U.S. into actions in Libya with no clear and apparent reason, with no constitutional basis for doing it, and even the rule of law was simply ignored.

□ 1520

If they were using the War Powers agreement, which Secretary Clinton

said that they were, in order to justify this action, then the War Powers Act actually says that they should come to Congress within 60 to 90 days, 60 days under one circumstance, but we could extend it for another 30. She said they have no intention of coming for a 60-day authority, that they are well within their rights to accomplish the actions.

So by itself, it would be alarming, but when you put it into context of agencies who are willing to create de facto wilderness and the roadless rules of our forests, the agencies that are willing to say we are going to create wildlands, that is de facto wilderness, without congressional approval in the BLM, and now we're going to go to war without complying with the Constitution or with the laws that are on the books of the land, now then that should be an alarming trend no matter which party you're in. Now, then, this is about America and that essential agreement between the people and the government called the Constitution.

The rule of law is what differentiates this country from other countries. The rule of law is what protects the rights of citizens. The rule of law is the essence of what made this Nation great because the government can not come in and take private property from individual citizens. They can't just go out on their own and begin to make rules. And yet that's what we're finding is happening at an alarming trend right now.

The downside to all of that is economic. You can say, Well, I'm not much interested in all of that constitutional stuff and the Founding Fathers. That might be possible. But you cannot ignore what is going on in the personal lives of individuals right now struggling with the economic situation that is cast on them by decades of spending in Washington that is beyond our ability to sustain.

If we're to look at this debt, this \$15 trillion in the barrel, it's instructive for us to consider how that debt originated. You could take the time from George Washington up to President Bush and we accumulated, you can say that we basically accrued about a \$5 trillion debt in that whole period of time from George Washington up until President Bush, II was sworn in.

President Bush, II, with the war in Afghanistan and Iraq and Katrina and those problems, ran up about \$5 trillion in his time in office. So almost the equivalent in 8 years to what we had done from the founding of the country. But then in the 2½ years since President Obama came in, we've now bumped it up almost another \$5 trillion.

So we see that this filling of the debt barrel is now accumulating at a much more rapid pace, which simply means that our economy is going to fail at a period closer to us, not one further away from us.

And all the while, Americans are saying, How does the Constitution affect

this? The Constitution affects that because we're seeing different industries simply sent to other countries because it's too hard to do business in this country anymore. We make it against the law. We make the regulations too high. We make the circumstances too difficult. People would say, Now, in what ways do we make the circumstances too difficult?

One way that we should be creating jobs right now would be the medical field. Baby boomers are moving to retirement. Retirement is a very expensive age in anyone's life. And retirees are very expensive for governments to attend to. So baby boomers are moving to that area very quickly. They should be demanding tremendous amounts of medical service. And yet we find that those jobs that should be created in the medical field are frozen in place, unable to move forward because of uncertainty. And so rational people would say, What uncertainty?

That then leads us to another chart that shows the ability of government to make life more complex.

This is the medical system now since the passage of ObamaCare, since the passage of that 2,200-page bill. It created new agencies, new institutions. You can consider yourself at one end of the chart and your physician at the other end. And you have to make your way through and touch the appropriate agencies before you get to see your doctor.

Now, this is the reason this chart would cause anyone to sink back in horror and say, That's not what I wanted. I just wanted a checkup to see if I'm okay with my local doctor. It is this chart that has been creating uncertainty in the minds of the health care field, and they're saying, We're not sure how this chart affects us so we're simply not going to get into that new line of work. We're not going to expand and put money into research to create those jobs in the medical field because we have to go through so many pieces of this equation, and we are just going to let itself sort itself out. This is always the problem with government. Government will build in processes that just simply can't be overcome.

And so this country, which has been the source of so many good medical inventions and medical jobs, this country that has been outsourced now is being burdened down with regulatory agencies that simply say we're going to impose this in your life, and companies are saying okay, we're just going to wait it out.

Other companies are saying we're going to have to lay off other people. We've got 9½ percent unemployment—8 percent, whatever it is today. We've got unemployment, we need people to work, we're running at a deficit because we're spending more than we're bringing in. The last thing we need to do is put more people on welfare and unemployment and put them out of a job. And yet people in New Mexico, I'm

hearing employers say, "Well, we've got to cut employees to get down below the caps required in this bill." So people are voluntarily terminating employees in order to comply with some aspect of this bill that says if you have more than this, then you have to jump through different hoops.

So we, in many ways, our government, again, is creating the distress. It is man-created distress. It's government-created distress that is causing this 3.5 and 2.2.

This is the root of the problems that we face economically.

As our government is then spending more than it brings in, as it kills jobs so that we are bringing in even less and driving more people to unemployment and to welfare, the disparity grows greater, the government has to print more money, the money in your pocket becomes worth less, the uncertainty in the Nation increases, and uncertainty again causes business owners to say, "I don't believe I'll create jobs right now. I'm afraid they're going to go up on my taxes to try to make this balance."

When the government creates that mood on the part of employers, then they simply stop the creation of jobs, and that's what we're finding going on.

You would say, "Well, uncertainty is not really that big of a deal for a company." And I would simply ask you, do you put money in the stock market when you aren't pretty certain you're going to get a return? If you think it is just a roll of the dice to put your savings into the stock market, you would do that very hesitatingly. Well, companies are doing the same thing. They don't want to pour money into a venture and then have something regulated to end on them, to have the taxes go up, to have it made to where they can't get their money back. So companies are making the same decision that you would make personally.

Now, recently the President complained about 6 weeks ago about companies hoarding cash. He said it as an accusation. It is a true thing that companies have tremendous amounts of cash right now, but they're afraid because of the regulatory environment, they're afraid because of the prospect of taxes, they're afraid because of the prospect of new regulations to put money into industries. And so therefore jobs are being frozen again by the actions of our government.

Two things would cause this situation to begin to balance.

□ 1530

Number one is not raising the taxes, but lowering the taxes. There is a truism that says when you increase taxes you kill jobs, and when you decrease taxes you create jobs. So it is counter-intuitive that if we want to increase the 2.2 and lower the 3.5, then we need to lower taxes to where there is more certainty that the people can say, ah, I will invest in that. I am pretty sure I have got enough money for next year's tax bill. I'm sure that I have got

enough money in the bank to pay for this new equipment to hire a new person. On the other side, then, the regulations have to match also.

A friend of mine in Artesia, New Mexico, Bill Sweatt, recently said to a group that was asking what does it take to create a job; there is all this speculation in Washington what does it take to create a job if we want to increase the 2.2. Mr. Sweatt says, I will tell you what it takes to create a job. He has a company that runs bulldozers. He said it takes \$340,000 for me to create a job. That's what new bulldozers cost. He said, by the way, I have to have a pickup truck because they just frown on me driving the bulldozer down through the main streets of Artesia to get to the location, so I actually have to leave it out there on a truck and drive a pickup through town. So he said, basically \$400,000, I can put a new employee on.

As we tax away money from businesses, it takes longer to accumulate the \$340,000. It takes longer for jobs to be created when we tax that money away. So our tax policy will cause Mr. Sweatt not to hire a new worker as soon as he would otherwise. That causes our economy to be stagnant. That's happening to businesses across the country.

But then the bigger thing is if the government passes, say, a new regulatory framework that is similar to this, the regulatory framework again alarms him, and he says, I can't make my way through that government regulation. I believe I am just not going to do it. Those two aspects are creating the great imbalance here between jobs and between our economy. Those can be balanced and should be for the sake of our future.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title.

H.R. 4. An act to repeal the expansion of information reporting requirements for payments of \$600 or more to corporations, and for other purposes.

STOP INTRUDING IN D.C. LOCAL AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor because in a very real sense I feel surrounded. Mr. Speaker, I was sent to Congress, like every other Member, to attend to the business of the Nation. But in fact, I have been surrounded. I have been surrounded by the new House majority that has decided to spend huge amounts of time,

in the most autocratic fashion, trying to deprive the District of Columbia of its self-governing rights.

Mr. Speaker, Congress delegated home rule to the District of Columbia in 1973. Before that time, the District of Columbia had no mayor, city council, was ruled by the federal government without any democracy. That was mostly the work of Southern Democrats, whose reasons were, among others, but most definitely, racial. What is happening today is not the work of Southern Democrats. It is the work of the new Republican majority.

I am pulled off the Nation's business day after day after day because of yet another zinger from Republicans to intrude into the local affairs and local spending of the District of Columbia. I had to call the administration and Majority Leader REID today, cautioning them that the District must not be used as a bargaining chip in the present battle over Federal spending underway here.

The latest intrusion is hard to bear. The District has decided to spend its local funds, among other things, on abortions for poor women. Dozens upon dozens of jurisdictions do that. No Federal funds. Funds raised by the taxpayers of the District of Columbia. What does that have to do with the Federal budget? What does that have to do with overspending or a deficit here? That has to do with somebody's, some majority's, ideological obsession with placing their autocratic desires on a jurisdiction that did not elect them, cannot put them out. It's the very definition of an autocracy.

So they pick on the jurisdiction that has no Senators and throw us into the pot because the far right social conservatives here want something in this CR. So give them the District of Columbia. You can't have us. Who do you think you are? The residents of the District of Columbia are free and equal citizens. We will not be traded off like we were slaves or a colony that can be thrown in by those who don't care. We care.

So whether it is the other body, or this body, or for that matter the President of the United States, get your hands off the local funds of the District of Columbia. You didn't raise a penny of it. We will spend it the way we please. And especially in this battle, which has to do with your deficit spending.

D.C. has a budget that is balanced. Why should that budget be over here in the first place? Our budget was approved last year. It came here and was approved by the House and the Senate before the lame duck. Yet last year's D.C. budget is still here, and we are now sitting on the possibility that when the Federal Government, which now looks like it's stupid enough to close down because the Republicans won't take the best deal anybody has had in the history of this body for what they wanted, that may shut down. And the American people will be shocked to

know that would mean that the local government of the District of Columbia, which is not in this fight, will be shut down too.

This has gone much too far. It's one thing to start the session with your first act being to strip the District of Columbia of its vote in the Committee of the Whole, although two courts have said that that vote is constitutional.

□ 1540

Then to move on to intrusion after intrusion, reinsert riders that we just got out, riders that have nothing to do with any Member of this body except me, who represents the citizens of the District of Columbia, a rider that would increase HIV/AIDS in D.C., the District of Columbia, by keeping the city from using its own funds to fund needle exchange.

Again, dozens upon dozens of jurisdictions have driven down their AIDS rate this way. We have the highest AIDS rate in the United States only because the Congress of the United States has killed—I use these words advisedly—killed men, women and children in the District of Columbia by keeping the District for 10 years from using needle exchange, so that AIDS spread throughout the city.

So we have a higher AIDS rate than Baltimore—poorer city—than New York, than Detroit, than Los Angeles because of the wishes of the Congress of the United States which is responsive to nobody in the District of Columbia.

They move to abortion. And if it wasn't enough to keep us from using our own local funds in this budget, as they still hope to do, they have put us in H.R. 3. H.R. 3 is a bill, and instead of a rider which lasts 1 year, they would permanently keep the District from spending its own funds on abortions for women. This is the majority that does not even want the Federal Government in Federal matters. What in the world are they doing in the matters of the local jurisdiction?

What kind of tea party Republicans are these who have just added to the deficit by voting \$300 million for private schools in the District of Columbia, adding to the deficit and not paying for it? How do you explain that back home? We didn't ask for these vouchers. Nobody even consulted with public officials in the District of Columbia before they put that voucher bill on the floor last week. That's the kind of contempt this majority has for the residents of the District of Columbia.

We are going to fight back each and every time, and we are going to say to this administration and to the Senate: Don't give in. Don't give us away because they want a chit and they have decided that chit is the District of Columbia.

I went to the Rules Committee from the very beginning when a shutdown looked like it was going to occur. I said, look, this is our money. We are

not in this fight. We all agree on that. This is about Federal spending, the Federal deficit, not a deficit from the District of Columbia. Let us have a provision here that says the District can spend its own local money for the rest of the year. I don't think that there is a single American citizen that would have said that we shouldn't be able to spend our own local money for the rest of this year. The Rules Committee turned a deaf ear.

And so we have had a threat of shutdown after shutdown. And the only reason the District of Columbia is open is because the Federal Government hasn't shut down. Now it looks like these people are going to shut it down anyway because the tea party Republicans have tied the hands of the Speaker behind his very back and taken him prisoner.

Well, look, don't take us prisoner with him. We don't have anything to do with that fight. Imagine what it would mean to shut down a big city in America, and especially since that big city is the Nation's capital. Imagine what we look like to the world that we even shut down the Nation's capital when the Federal Government was shut down. Don't do it. Don't shut the Federal Government down. Speaker BOEHNER, himself, said that it would cost the government more to shut it down than to keep it open.

But if you do shut it down, for goodness sake, keep the District of Columbia open. That's what Speaker Gingrich did when the Federal Government shut down. He kept the District of Columbia open after the first time—because it shut down several times—because he recognized you can't do that to a big city, a very complex mechanism. You simply can't shut it down and expect that it can keep on moving.

It's a terrible thing to have H.R. 3 on the floor in the first place. That would strip women of a vital portion of their reproductive rights, but it would also go after the insurers to make it almost impossible for a woman to get comprehensive insurance, because the insurer would almost surely have to exclude abortion.

What kind of a place is this? I thought that the new majority came to town on a bandwagon that said let's create jobs. Where is the jobs bill? Why the obsession with a local jurisdiction that has nothing to do with jobs or even with the cutting of spending that you have been so successful in getting?

It's your battle, not ours. To pull us into your battle is tantamount to what bullies do in the schoolyard. Somebody is watching the fight or is passing by, they just get pulled into the fight. We are not even onlookers. We simply are not in it.

It's as if Republicans had a meeting: How many things that we haven't done can we do to the District of Columbia, and how many things that we have done can we do? Well, they have introduced a gun bill. The courts have already found the new gun law the District passed constitutional.

They have introduced a new one that, among other things, would say that you could carry guns in the streets of the Nation's capital and conceal them as well. How would you like 20 million visitors to see people walking around with guns that you can see, and what do you think that means for the many official delegations who frequent the streets of the District of Columbia?

You know, there have been so many things that the Republicans have thought of to do, I need to sit down and consider: Is there anything they haven't thought of to do?

One thing that occurs to me to show you how deep is their contempt for democracy in the District of Columbia, when they put the District of Columbia in their bill that goes after women and insurers nationwide, they tucked us in there, too, to make sure we could never spend local money for abortions for poor women. I mentioned that earlier.

So, of course, as you might imagine, since mine was the only district named in the bill that I would ask to testify—denied. Excuse given? Well, the Democrats already had their witness. I wasn't a witness for the Democrats against the bill.

I asked for common courtesy, the right to be heard on a section of the bill that involved my District. Somebody else needed to speak for the Democrats as the minority witness on the bill itself.

If they look for every attempt, every occasion to deny us democracy, they also look for every occasion to deny the Member who represents this city the rights that I am due simply as a courtesy as a colleague.

□ 1550

Nothing is more precious to Americans than the right to be able to spend their local funds the way they want to. I thought that the new tea party House Republicans would be the first to understand that. Remember what we are talking about. We are talking about local funds of a local jurisdiction.

Time and again, the Republicans use the fact that our budget comes here in order to attach, in the most undemocratic fashion, matters that are their pet projects. Vouchers is an example of a pet project of the Speaker, so that gets priority in coming to the floor. The District is the only jurisdiction that has ever had federally funded private vouchers. There was wholesale resentment and demonstrations against that when it was first put on our city.

Ultimately, we made some compromises. We let the law go 2 years past its expiration date. The Obama administration said anybody who is still in private school can remain until they graduate. You can never compromise enough with the House Republicans.

Now they want it all over again. They want to restart it. I particularly resent the voucher bill because the District of Columbia is one of the only jurisdictions that has allowed public charter schools, separate from our pub-

lic schools, to flourish. Almost half of our children are educated in these independent, publicly accountable charter schools. You go to the jurisdiction of virtually every Member of this House, you will find that their local school board or their State school authorities have kept charters out and kept them growing. We let them in as a home rule matter, and they flourished.

I have appointed students from the charter schools for service academies. We've got terrific charter schools. We've got a Latin charter school. We've got eight KIPP charter schools. Those are the top of the mark of public schools. I don't know what we can do. We're the last to claim that our public schools are what they should be. In fact, our public schools have improved because of competition from the charter schools. That's the kind of competition you want because the charter schools and the public schools are competing for the same dollar. The private schools are funded out of a separate pot.

Now, a budget resolution comes out today, and it would trade off perhaps the most valuable education program the city has ever had for this voucher program which is unpaid for and should never pass the House. So they want it in next year's bill, and this is how they do it.

They take D.C. TAG, which Congress in the most bipartisan fashion passed because the District of Columbia does not have a State university system where you can go to any one of usually dozens of colleges. So it funds youngsters to go to other States. It has doubled college attendance in the District of Columbia. In order to get a decent job in the District of Columbia, because we are the upscale Nation's Capital, you need some college.

And yet what the budget resolution does is trade off the few for the many. He would make the program means tested. That defeats the whole point. By sending our students to the public colleges of other States, we are trying to replicate what is available as a right in the States regardless of income. So if you are rich or poor, if you live in Maryland, Virginia, Ohio or California, you go to the State university. If it were means tested, of course, it would mean that many, many of the students could not go. After all, they've got to go out of the District of Columbia simply to take advantage of the program in the first place, and it pays only for tuition. They have to pay for their room and board and for their food. If they had to, if it is means tested, then, of course, what you are doing is killing the program.

Somebody had to sit down and think that one up. And they thought it up as a way to pay for vouchers we never asked for, neither I nor any other public official in the District of Columbia was consulted about. We are tired of it.

We are depending on the Senate to be a bulwark against madness because that's what we have here. We see it in

the move to shut down the government. No, they don't want to shut down the government, but they don't have control of their own people. There's no discipline on the other side of the aisle. There's no democracy there. They let a few Members who are the most extreme slice of America decide what their whole caucus will do.

We simply will not be hostages to the new House majority. If you can't get what you want on the floor when you control it, don't put it on the District of Columbia. You should be able, because of your majority, to do what you want to do. We are not the repository for every pet idea that you otherwise dare not put on the House floor. And that is what we have become.

We had hoped that the new majority would focus on the Nation's business, what it said it wanted to do. It has focused on the deficit as the Nation's business, although it's taking food out of the mouths of children in the process. But at least that's a focus on national business.

The average American would ask those who voted to increase the deficit by \$300 million last week for private schools in the District of Columbia, why in the world did you do that? Why did you want to give them this? I will tell you why. It was the pet idea of the Speaker, and they don't dare put a national voucher bill on the floor.

The way to do it, you wouldn't have to coerce anybody. You would say, we have vouchers available nationally. Let's have competitive grants. Anyone who wants vouchers can have them. You compete for them. That's how we do things in the Federal Government.

Why didn't they do that? They didn't do that because there's been referendum after referendum in the states, and not one private school voucher referendum has been won by private school voucher proponents. You go home and you tell any American that you are spending Federal money for private schools now, you will get your head handed to you. That's how it was when these referenda ran their course.

Imagine now when the Republicans are cutting billions of dollars from every public school district in the United States, imagine how it looks when they are spending money for private school vouchers on a district that never asked for it and doesn't want it because it's somebody's pet project. Take your pet projects and you know what you can do with them. Do that with them; don't do it here in the District of Columbia.

We ask the majority to stop your obsession with one jurisdiction, the District of Columbia. We ask you if you shut down the Federal Government, for goodness' sake, don't shut down one of America's big cities and a city on which you depend greatly. Many of you live here. Many of the services for the Federal Government are taken care of by the District of Columbia.

□ 1600

This is not something you want to do to the Nation's Capital. It makes us look idiotic to the world at large. For myself, I want to go back to doing the Nation's business. I don't want to be taken off of that business every other day because some Republican or the Republican majority has decided to do something undemocratic to the district I represent.

I put forward an amendment that would get rid of the issue of who gets shut down when the Federal Government gets shut down once and for all. It simply says, look, when the Federal Government shuts down, if the District of Columbia budget is over here and it has gone through the process, the District of Columbia can spend its own local funds. Remember, the budget that comes over here was raised in the District of Columbia and should not be over here in the first place.

I had a budget autonomy bill last session that until the very last moment was going to get through this House and the Senate. It is the very essence of no democracy that somebody's own taxes that they raise in their own local jurisdiction would be subject to somebody else who didn't have anything to do with raising a cent of those taxes. That is what happens to the District of Columbia.

When the District of Columbia's budget comes here, they don't dare change anything in the complicated local budget of the District of Columbia. That is very complicated. You could throw everything out of kilter. So essentially they don't bother with the budget. They spend all of their time seeing what they can attach to the budget, substantive legislation that has no place in an appropriation in the first place and has no place in somebody else's budget above all.

Mr. Speaker, part of the problem may be that some Members either do not know because they are new or have forgotten, either because for 4 years of Democratic control these issues didn't come up, or because they want to forget. I come to the floor this afternoon to assure you I shall not let you forget, we will make sure that in your home districts, they know that you are attending not to the business of that district but to the business of the District of Columbia and that you are doing so in the most undemocratic and autocratic fashion. You who quote the Constitution ought to sit down and think for a moment what the Framers would have done had they seen the Federal Government, which they were afraid of, intervene into the local affairs of any district.

I ask you: hands off, lay off the District of Columbia.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1731

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REED) at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 910, ENERGY TAX PREVENTION ACT OF 2011

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-54) on the resolution (H. Res. 203) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 910) to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 6, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1034. A letter from the Legal Information Assistant, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act-Interagency Uniformity [No. 2007-03] (RIN: 1550-AC08) received March 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1035. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Certification, Compliance, and Enforcement for Consumer Products and Commercial and Industrial Equipment [Docket No.: EERE-2010-BT-CE-0014] (RIN: 1904-AC23) received March 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1036. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Human Reliability Program: Identification of Reviewing Official (RIN: 1992-AZ00) received March 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1037. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule —

Annual Update of Filing Fees [Docket No.: RM 11-5-000] received March 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1038. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Disclosures Regarding Energy Consumption and Water Use of Certain Home Appliances and Other Products Required Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (Appliance Labeling Rule) (RIN: 3084-AB15) received March 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1039. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-136, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1040. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-002, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1041. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-012, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1042. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-006, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1043. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-023, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1044. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-007, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1045. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-118, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1046. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-021, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1047. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-010, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1048. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Presidential Library Facilities; Correction [NARA-07-0005] (RIN: 3095-AA82) received March 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1049. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmit-

ting the Board's report entitled "Making the Right Connections: Targeting the Best Competencies for Training"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1050. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the semiannual report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period January 1, 2011 through March 31, 2011, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a Public Law 88-454; (H. Doc. No. 112—15); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1051. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Louisiana Regulatory Program/Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Plan [SATS No. LA-023-FOR; Docket No. OSM-2010-0005] received March 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1052. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Kentucky Regulatory Program [KY-252-FOR; OSM-2009-0011] received March 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1053. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Montana Regulatory Program [SATS No.: MT-031-FOR; Administrative Record No. OSM-2010-0010] received March 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1054. A letter from the Ombudsman for the Energy Employees, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's 2010 Annual Report of the Ombudsman for the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7385s-15(e); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1055. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Surety Bond Guarantee Program; Disaster and Miscellaneous Amendments (RIN: 3245-AF77) received March 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

1056. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Definition of Readily Tradable On An Established Securities Market [Notice 2011-19] received March 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1057. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2011-22] received March 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1058. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Field Guidance on the Planning and Examination of Sales-Based Royalty Payments and Sales-Based Vendor Allowances [LB&I-4-0211-002] received March 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1059. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Certain Amounts Paid in Connection with Insurance Contracts (Rev. Rul. 2011-9) received March 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1060. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — State and Local Location Tax Incentives (I.R.C.

Sec. 118 SALT) received March 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1061. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance under Section 1502; Amendment of Matching Rule for Certain Gains on Member Stock [TD: 9515] (RIN: 1545-BH20) received March 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1062. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Exclusion of Income: Non-Corporate Entities and Contributions to Capital [UIL: 118.01-02] received March 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1063. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2011-21) received March 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1064. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Protecting the Public and our Employees in our Hearing Process [Docket No.: SSA-2011-0008] (RIN: 0960-AH29) received March 11, 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. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 203. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 910) to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-54). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1364. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act concerning the distribution of information on legitimate scientific research in connection with foods and dietary supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1365. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to provide for use of excess funds available under that Act to provide for certain benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr.

LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. JONES, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 1366. A bill to require the President to prepare a quadrennial national manufacturing strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 1367. A bill to provide for a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application in vehicle technologies at the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1368. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the establishment of teacher evaluation programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOREN (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 1369. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1021 Pennsylvania Avenue in Hartshorne, Oklahoma, as the "Warren Lindley Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1370. A bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; 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. COHEN:

H.R. 1371. A bill to amend SAFETEA-LU to ensure that projects that assist the establishment of aerotropolis transportation systems are eligible for certain grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HURT, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia):

H.R. 1372. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct oil and natural gas exploration, leasing, and drilling activities on the outer Continental Shelf offshore the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1373. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order regarding secondary cockpit barriers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 1374. A bill to establish the Daniel Webster Congressional Clerkship Program; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida,

Mr. OLVER, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. STARK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SHULER, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. CHANDLER):

H.R. 1375. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify that fill material cannot be comprised of waste; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1376. A bill to require State governments to submit fiscal accounting reports as a condition to the receipt of Federal financial assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SUTTON (for herself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SABLON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1377. A bill to establish a grant program for automated external defibrillators in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. VISCLOSKY:

H.R. 1378. A bill to prohibit business enterprises that lay off a greater percentage of their United States workers than workers in other countries from receiving any Federal assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 1379. A bill to reauthorize Federal natural hazards reduction programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. HENSARLING:

H. Res. 202. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H. Res. 204. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National STD Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WEST (for himself, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H. Res. 205. A resolution congratulating the Town of Palm Beach and its citizens on its 100 year anniversary; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 and the 1st Amendment to the US Constitution.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1365.

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. LIPINSKI:

H.R.1366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate foreign and interstate commerce, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 1367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact H.R. 3246.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 1369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7, Section 8, Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1371.

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. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 1372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1373.

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. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 1374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. SUTTON:

H.R. 1377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 1378.

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. WU:

H.R. 1379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. HALL and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 27: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 104: Mr. WU, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 114: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 140: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 217: Mr. BERG.

H.R. 237: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 290: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 412: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 420: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr.

MARCHANT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 440: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 459: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 470: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 502: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 515: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 516: Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 575: Mr. HELLER.

H.R. 595: Mr. WEST and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 615: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 616: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 645: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. CARTER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SHULER, Mr. COLE, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 651: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 678: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

H.R. 679: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 735: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 763: Mr. HALL and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 764: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 765: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 795: Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 800: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. MCCAUL. H.R. 822: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. BROOKS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 827: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 883: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 895: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 904: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 930: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 959: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 965: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 969: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 977: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1040: Mr. WEST.

H.R. 1085: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1089: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1110: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1113: Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1131: Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 1132: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COSTA, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1140: Mr. FLEMING and Mrs. ADAMS.

H.R. 1142: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 1161: Mr. HOLT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1182: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1186: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1195: Mr. WEST, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MORAN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 1211: Mr. LONG and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1219: Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1221: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1222: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1224: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1225: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1226: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1227: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1234: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 1269: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1287: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1288: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1291: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1294: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1319: Mr. OLVER and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1326: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1343: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LANCE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. OLSON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 1351: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1361: Mr. COHEN.

H.J. Res. 47: Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 20: Mr. HIGGINS.

H. Res. 95: Mr. WALDEN.

H. Res. 134: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H. Res. 185: Ms. WOOLSEY.