



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 2011

No. 53

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEMING).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 12, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN FLEMING 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 1:50 p.m.

ATTACK ON CAMP ASHRAF

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week Iraqi forces unleashed a surprise attack on Camp Ashraf, the home of thousands of Iranian exiles, including innocent men, women and children; 2,500 members of the Iraqi military, armed with military weapons, attacked those 3,000 unarmed Iranian exiles.

These Iranian civilians are pro-American. They are exiles from Iran because of their opposition to the evil dictator, the little tyrant of the desert, Ahmadinejad.

The Iraqis showed no mercy in their attack. They used live ammunition against these people who could not defend themselves. They ran over these citizens, smashing them with their American-made Humvees. Reports indicate an estimated 300 people were injured and 33 people were murdered in their vicious attack.

And it doesn't stop there. Iraqi soldiers still occupy parts of Camp Ashraf. We don't even know if the attackers are all Iraqis. It has been reported that some of these occupiers could be Iranian agents who seek to harm the Iranian dissidents living in this camp.

The international community cannot tolerate this unprovoked, violent attack by the Government of Iraq. We have a legal and moral obligation to ensure the safety of Iranian dissidents in Camp Ashraf.

The innocent people who live in Camp Ashraf continue to be in danger as we speak. It has been reported that the Government of Iraq blocked the delivery of American humanitarian aid to the wounded until Sunday, 2 days after the attack. And just yesterday the Iraqi Government announced that they plan to close Camp Ashraf and move its residents out of the country. This is exactly what Ahmadinejad wants.

If this happens, Mr. Speaker, these people's lives are in total danger. Why? Right now, some citizens of Camp Ashraf are members of the MEK. The MEK is on the United States' list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations.

The FTO organization designation by the United States is still being used by Iran to justify the harsh treatment of its own citizens, of the MEK worldwide. Many nations have already removed the MEK off the FTO list. So the Government of Iran uses our designation as a justification to harm the MEK citizens. That is why the Iranian Government praised the attack in Camp Ashraf on the Iranian dissidents.

Mr. Speaker, by not taking the MEK off the FTO list, we are endangering in-

nocent people and empowering the Governments of Iran and Iraq to harm them. They are on our side. They oppose the evil dictator in Iran.

This is just another example of the inconsistency the United States presents with our foreign policy. In one breath we say publicly we need to protect Camp Ashraf. Yet in the second breath we won't take MEK off the Foreign Terrorist Organizations list.

Fifty-four of my colleagues have joined me on a resolution urging the Secretary of State to immediately remove the MEK from the FTO list. The State Department has yet to give convincing evidence that the MEK is an FTO. It is time they make their case or remove them from the designation.

Failure to do this sends mixed signals to both the Iranian and Iraqi Governments. These governments think they have a license to kill these dissidents.

This is a matter of life or death for the people in Camp Ashraf. If more Iraqi attacks occur against these people, the blood will be on the hands of the Iraqi Government and the little tyrant of the desert, Ahmadinejad.

We must make it clear to the Iraqis that they do not have the right to attack Camp Ashraf just because America is leaving town. We must not tolerate these crimes against innocent civilians that we have legally and morally promised to protect.

And that's just the way it is.

REPUBLICAN PATH TO THE PAST

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget for fiscal year 2012 that the House will take up later this week is not a Path to Prosperity. Rather, it is more accurately a Path to the Past.

Just like President Bush's ill-fated attempt to privatize Social Security,

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.

H2577

the Path to the Past eviscerates Medicare, forcing retirees to bear the brunt of cost increases and severely jeopardizing their access to health care, replacing today's guaranteed access with a limited voucher system.

Today, thanks to Medicare, every one of America's senior citizens has access to health care coverage. Before Medicare was enacted in 1965, roughly half of all seniors suffered without health insurance. The Path to the Past would send American seniors back to the times of scrambling to find coverage while always worrying how they will be able to afford rising health care costs on fixed incomes.

The Republican Path to the Past brings back the doughnut hole in Medicare part D prescription drug coverage. Under the doughnut hole, many seniors have been forced to pay thousands of dollars out of pocket for prescription medication because they weren't covered by part D.

I was proud to fix that inequity and eliminate the doughnut hole during the previous Congress. Unfortunately, the Republican Path to the Past brings it back once again, requiring many seniors to pay thousands of dollars extra for their prescription drugs. That's a past Americans don't want.

The Republican Path to the Past destroys Medicaid, replacing it with a vastly limited monetary grant to the States, forcing them to either reduce benefits to lower-income families or to reduce the number of eligible families or both. Currently, 34 million children receive health care through Medicaid.

From 1997 to 2009, the percentage of children without health insurance dropped from 13.9 percent to 8.2 percent, largely because of Medicaid. The Republican Path to the Past risks the future of millions of America's children by risking that health care coverage. That's a past America does not want.

The Path to the Past incredulously blames rising college tuition on efforts to make Pell Grants more accessible to kids and would return the Nation to a system where only the wealthy can afford college. Contrary to what the Republican budget states, college tuition costs have been rising long before the expansion of Pell Grants.

In fact, from 2002 to 2007, tuition costs rose 31 percent more than the rate of inflation, the worst 5-year increase in college costs in over 30 years.

In response, last year we reformed the student loan program, expanded the Pell Grant program, and allowed hundreds of thousands of students the ability to make higher education more affordable. The Republican Path to the Past returns the Nation to the years of rising tuition without any relief. That's a past America does not want.

The Republican Path to the Past ignores the economic recovery under way and indiscriminately slashes investments in ways that Goldman Sachs said will lower economic growth by 2 percent and increase unemployment by

1 percent. During the height of the Great Recession, for several months, 700,000 Americans lost their jobs.

According to Mark Zandi, an economist with Moody's Analytics and an adviser to Senator MCCAIN's Presidential campaign, those policies would cost American workers another 700,000 jobs. The Economic Policy Institute projected a loss of 800,000 jobs, while the Center for American Progress said it will cost 900,000 jobs. That's a past America does not want to go back to.

The Republican budget proposal, the Path to the Past, returns us to the law of the jungle and the survival of the fittest, throwing the young, the elderly, the sick, and the disadvantaged on their own fates.

That's not an America I believe in.

□ 1210

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, as many people know, and I do not say this with pride, but for years, I've been signing letters to the immediate and extended families of those killed in Afghanistan and Iraq. I have signed over 9,966 letters. It is a constant reminder to me of the high cost of war.

Our country is in deep financial trouble. It continues to amaze me that we would raise the debt ceiling, spend money we don't have and cut much-needed programs from our seniors and children while we continue to spend \$8 billion a month in Afghanistan.

Karzai is a corrupt leader. His government is corrupt. He has stated that he would rather side with the Taliban than the United States. This is based on an article in the Washington Post on December 8, 2010. What sense does it make to sacrifice our young American lives, our money and our resources for a man who does not want our troops in his country? It simply does not make any sense at all.

According to a March 15 Washington Post/ABC News Poll, 73 percent of Americans want our troops out of Afghanistan this summer. Last week, every Member of Congress received an Associated Foreign Press article from Congressman PETER WELCH. I do not have time to read the whole article, but let me share some excerpts from his letter to each of my colleagues and his colleagues, and I will quote the letter from Congressman WELCH.

"I want to draw your attention to a recent Associated Foreign Press article detailing the funneling of USAID dollars to the Afghan Taliban, reportedly making Western reconstruction funds the main source of income for insurgents.

"According to the story, an estimated 10 percent of the cost of every development project is used to pay off the Taliban. The United States has

spent \$56.1 billion in Afghanistan since 2002."

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the Congress and the American citizens that the Taliban are killing and maiming American soldiers and marines. It is time that this Congress debate the Afghan war and to bring our troops home. Here we are talking about cutting spending for programs that help the American people, but yet we continue to send billions and billions of dollars to a corrupt leader. It doesn't make sense. Mr. Speaker, we could save American lives, which is the most important, but also \$8 billion a month if we were to bring our troops home from Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to come to the floor once a week, and I will bring photographs in the way of posters to remind the American people and my colleagues in Washington of the price of war. Right beside me now is the Air Force Honor Guard at Dover bringing a hero home in a transfer case, which is known as a coffin as well, flag draped.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Congress to debate the issue of bringing our troops home from Afghanistan. How much longer can we afford to give lives of our young Americans to a corrupt leader? It makes no sense. I want my colleagues in both parties to awaken.

JIM MCGOVERN, Democrat, and WALTER JONES, a conservative, will soon have a bill that we will put on the floor to debate bringing our troops home. I want the American people to join us in bringing our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, as I do always when I close, I will ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I will ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I will ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

And, Mr. Speaker, I will ask God to please bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for the American people. And 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 for His people.

And I will close by asking God three times, please God, please God, please God, continue to bless America.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Congress this week will focus on the Ryan Republican budget, probably the most profoundly negative and cynical plan ever advanced by a major party in the House of Representatives.

There are lots of individual analyses that are available to Americans, not from spin masters, but from serious journalists and analysts. I strongly

hope that people will take the time to look at it. They will find in the course of their research that there are a number of very fundamental flaws.

First and foremost, there is no fundamental reform of our defense spending, something that is driving the deficit dramatically. We sidestep opportunities to reform agricultural programs. It actually takes us backwards on health care. And there are \$4 trillion of program cuts over the next 10 years, falling primarily on low- and moderate-income Americans. It is a hypocritical approach.

Last year, Americans were given television ads from Republican candidates accusing Democrats of slashing Medicare for senior citizens. Now we see that the Republicans are taking all of those proposed slashes in spending and using it to finance their program to reduce taxes for those who need it the least.

In addition, people will be able to verify that senior citizens, starting in 2020, will be bearing a far greater burden for paying for their own Medicare than ever in the Affordable Care Act in any of the reforms. It replaces a steep curve of increased Medicare spending, no doubt about it. That's why in the Affordable Care Act we embedded reform proposals to bend that cost curve. It's replaced without proposals to reduce Medicare spending. It just simply slashes the support that seniors can get. It's replaced with the much greater cost curve increase for private insurance. Their approach is to give a voucher to insurance companies to provide insurance for senior citizens for health care.

Bear in mind, the reason we got Medicare in the first place is because senior citizens' insurance policies were not profitable. They couldn't buy comprehensive health insurance in an affordable fashion before Medicare. What leads anybody to believe that somehow aging Americans are going to be more attractive to the health insurance industry in the future? And by replacing Medicare, which actually has reduced cost increases below what it cost in the private health insurance company, you are actually going to increase overall health care costs.

But nowhere is that cynicism more evident than in a bill that is coming to the floor, I think tomorrow, the legislation to end the Prevention and Public Health Fund under the Affordable Care Act. Already in States like mine we've received millions of dollars for prevention activities and for wellness clinics to help people stop smoking and to improve the training of health professionals. These are investments to help make Americans healthier in the first place and reduce the demand for health care costs.

There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when prevention was a bipartisan issue. In fact, in our deliberations in the Ways and Means Committee in last Congress, people on both sides of the aisle were talking about the need to help deal

with prevention programs to keep people healthy in the first place. What a sad state when one of the first actions of this Congress is to repeal this bipartisan concept of a prevention and public health fund.

RECOGNIZING HOME FARMING DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Home Farming Day, an initiative launched by the nonprofit organization Urban Farming in partnership with the Kraft Foods Triscuit brand. The event celebrates those who are growing food at home or with their communities and, in turn, nurturing and inspiring healthier eating habits nationwide.

Last year, the first Home Farming Day resulted in the planting of 50 new farms in unused urban spaces in 20 cities. I was pleased that my office could participate in the groundbreaking on one of those gardens in my congressional district.

This year, Triscuits and Urban Farming plan to replant all 50 gardens and add 15 new farms throughout the country, totaling 65 community-based home farms. Food grown at these community farms goes directly to the volunteers who grow the crops, along with their families and communities. Volunteers can also donate to local food banks for those that are in need.

In my home district, crops are delivered to the Loaves and Fishes Community Pantry in Naperville, Illinois, where they provide low-income families with fresh, healthy meals.

□ 1220

Mr. Speaker, from the White House to our own backyards and windowsills, more and more Americans are taking up the fun and healthy pastime of growing their own food. It is not unlike what many of our parents and grandparents did during World War II when they planted 20 million "victory gardens." I can recall stealing into my own mother's victory garden to eat the raspberries and gather crops of rhubarb, squash, and tomatoes.

In fact, home gardening already is an activity that most Americans enjoy. A 2010 Garden Writers Association survey found that 66 percent of Americans have some form of lawn or garden, and younger Americans between the ages of 25 and 40 are now gardening at the same rate as the general population. And Home Farming Day is an opportunity to encourage that trend, especially among young people in urban communities where fresh fruits and vegetables may be less available.

Whether on a kitchen countertop, in a balcony flower box, or at a community plot, home farming is a great way for people of all ages to celebrate natural living, and treat themselves to some fresh fruits and vegetables while they're at it.

It is a goal worth pursuing, and I'd like to commend Triscuit, the 109-year-old cracker brand manufactured in my congressional district, and the home farming movement for helping to show Americans how easy it is to grow fresh vegetables and herbs right in their own backyard.

I'd like to congratulate Urban Farming and their partners on their success in expanding Home Farming Day across the country, encouraging communities to utilize open spaces to bring fresh ingredients to our homes.

HOME RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to celebrate the 41 District of Columbia elected officials and residents led by Mayor Vincent Gray and five members of the D.C. City Council who were arrested in front of the Hart Senate office building yesterday evening, and hundreds of other residents who gathered to protest their second-class treatment as American citizens by the Republican House, the Democratic-led Senate, and the administration.

The 2011 continuing resolution due on the floor this week contains a sinister trade that takes the District of Columbia's self-governing rights to spend its own local funds on abortion services for poor women, as many jurisdictions have long done. The CR also funds the start-up of a new, private school voucher program but only in D.C., about which no local elected official was consulted.

It is the House Republicans who have been on an undemocratic warpath against the District's home rule. But yesterday, residents did not spare Senate Democrats or the President who, in the end, accepted Republican demands. The House will hear from me again as I try to remove these anti-home rule riders; but this body has repeatedly turned a deaf ear to me on violations of the city's most basic rights to local control.

Congress continually and summarily refused my bill and several amendments to allow the District to spend its own local funds to avoid a shutdown of the city government that would have occurred with a Federal shutdown, even though only our local funds were involved.

Yesterday, however, Congress and the country heard from the people themselves. House rules do not allow Members to organize demonstrations, and yesterday's spontaneous outpouring of citizens, where I was not present, showed why the people must always speak for themselves. D.C. Vote organized yesterday's mammoth demonstration in a couple of days; and residents poured onto Constitution Avenue, anxious for an outlet for their accumulated outrage at being traded on a congressional auction block.

Yesterday, the House, the Senate, and the administration heard the voices and saw the faces of our city. The House may disagree with the views of our American citizens on women's constitutional reproductive rights, but no American would sanction congressional mandates on how our local citizens may spend the local taxes they raise. The Speaker may favor private school vouchers, but no American would agree that his preference should override a city's local decision for public charter schools as the alternative to our private schools.

The House may continue to ignore me; but yesterday D.C. elected officials and residents, like millions of others throughout the world, showed that the people will not be ignored forever.

I will offer a separate statement including the names of the residents and officials who were arrested, with gratitude.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Together, let us take the words of Daniel Webster, which hang high over the Speaker's chair, and make them our own solemn prayer today.

Lord God, let our age be the age of improvement. In a day of peace, let us advance the arts of peace and the works of peace.

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and our generation, may not perform something to be remembered.

Let us cultivate a true spirit of union and harmony. Let our conception be charged and enlarged to the circle of our duties. Let us extend our ideas over the whole of the vast field in which we are called to act. Let our object be our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country.

And by Your blessing, Almighty God, may that country, itself, become a vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror, but of wisdom, of peace, and of liberty upon which the world may gaze with admiration forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WOMACK 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.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1093

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) from H.R. 1093. It was added inadvertently due to a clerical error.

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

There was no objection.

REAL REFORM NOW

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, remarkably, the reliably Democratic Washington Post, in a lead editorial last week, quoted Senator Barack Obama in 2006 as saying, "The fact that we are here today to debate America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren."

Today, President Obama is warning that the debt limit must be passed or there will be economic Armageddon. Sadly, it is more clear than ever that reckless government borrowing is out of control with the President proposing a nightmare of endless borrowing.

For a debt limit increase, there should be real reforms to end out-of-

control spending. Former Senator Phil Gramm of Texas pointed out that Republicans agree that families and nations should always honor their debts; but in so doing, they should also make sure they don't pile up new debt. For Congress, it means passing budget reforms that impose hard and enforceable limits on new spending and debt.

Republicans and Democrats should work together truly to protect senior citizens, younger generations, and to create jobs. Specific reforms are needed to protect American families.

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

GOVERNOR HALEY BARBOUR SPEAKS AT CONGRESSIONAL HEALTH CARE CAUCUS

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today the Congressional Health Caucus was joined by Governor Haley Barbour from Mississippi as part of our "Thought Leaders Series." His leadership in health care in his home State is an example of how States can take a more prominent role and, in doing so, bend the cost curve in the correct direction.

In the last fiscal year, Medicaid, which is a joint Federal and State program, cost our country more than \$400 billion, and the price is only expected to increase in the years to come. Governor Barbour has been a leader in transforming Medicaid in his home State. He has made commonsense decisions to reduce rising drug costs to ensure that people who are enrolled in the program are, indeed, eligible for the program. Coordinated care and increased compliance all have led to improved outcomes.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act will only compound the financial problems that States are facing. In 2014, States will see their Medicaid enrollments grow substantially when all people below 138 percent of the Federal poverty level will be covered. It is essential that we examine this and other parts of the Affordable Care Act to ensure that our States are not pushed into an even deeper budgetary crisis.

SPENDING-DRIVEN DEBT CRISIS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, \$14.4 trillion, that's the approximate size of our Nation's economy; \$14.2 trillion, that's the size of our Nation's debt—a record high and growing. Soon our debt will surpass our economy. Let's be clear: No nation that deep in the red can lead as it must or go on living as it wishes for very much longer.

Our spending-driven debt crisis is adding serious uncertainty to our economy, which is preventing businesses

from expanding, innovating, and creating jobs. Admiral Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has rightly called our debt “the single greatest threat to our national security.”

If we want to bring confidence back to our economy, jobs back to our citizens and hope back to our children’s future, we have to stop spending money that we don’t have. It is time for the Senate Democrats to stand up and join this fight.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 5 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

EXTENDING RONALD REAGAN CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1308) to amend the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act to extend the termination date for the Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1308

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

SECTION 1. RONALD REAGAN CENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) FINAL REPORT DUE DATE.—Section 7(c) of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 111-25; 36 U.S.C. 101 note prec.) is amended by striking “April 30, 2011” and inserting “November 30, 2011”.

(b) TERMINATION.—Section 8 of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 111-25; 36 U.S.C. 101 note prec.) is amended by striking “May 30, 2011” and inserting “December 31, 2011”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1308 was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) and is a straightforward bill to amend the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act by extending the Commission’s termination date, as well as the Commission’s final report deadline.

In June 2009, President Obama signed Public Law 111-25 to establish the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission. The purpose of the Commission was, and is, to plan, develop, and carry out activities that are both fitting and proper to honor the memory of our late great President.

President Reagan was born on February 6, 1911, and 2011 marks the 100th anniversary of his birth. Furthermore, the Commission was also tasked with being a crucial resource to Federal, State, and local government agencies as well as private groups as they go about planning and conducting events to honor President Reagan.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1308 is a very simple bill that extends the life of the Reagan Commission, and, unlike many prior Presidential commissions, costs the American taxpayer absolutely nothing. Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clear. The Reagan Commission does not receive a single penny of taxpayer dollars. The original bill and subsequent law prohibited the use of taxpayer money from going to the Commission, and this bill does not alter that provision in any way, shape, or form.

The Commission has and continues to operate solely on private donations—something I’m sure Mr. Reagan, as a careful steward of taxpayer money, would himself have been glad to hear.

The purpose of H.R. 1308 is to allow the hardworking staff and members of the Commission the opportunity to continue to provide their expertise and assistance as entities and groups all over the world continue to honor President Reagan.

The Commission has already played a major role in celebrations at the Reagan Library on the President’s birthday and has worked to establish a yearlong exhibit at the National Archives. Even the floor statements given by Members in this Chamber back in February were organized by the Reagan Commission.

While the Commission has contributed much to events and ceremonies over the past few months, many more celebrations and events are planned

throughout the rest of the year. In fact, multiple events to honor President Reagan’s role in the fall of the Soviet Union are scheduled this summer in Europe. Here in the United States, a Joint Meeting of Congress may take place this fall, and numerous other events will take place at the State and local levels all over our country.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission is currently scheduled to terminate on May 30 of this year, and this bill simply moves that date to December 31. In addition, H.R. 1308 moves the Commission’s final report deadline from the 30th of this month to November 30. Changing these dates would ensure that the Commission can help entities and groups all over the world deliver high-quality and fitting events to celebrate the life of a truly great leader and man.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1308, a bill to amend the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act. The bill would extend the termination date of the Commission by 7 months.

The Ronald Reagan Commission Act, which became law in the last Congress, created a Federal commission to honor and celebrate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ronald Reagan. The Commission is composed of Senators, Members of Congress, and other government officials, including the Archivist of the United States.

Importantly, in these challenging fiscal times, no Federal funds may be expended by the Commission to carry out its duties. Mr. Speaker, the Commission has been functioning for only 9 months, and there are important international and domestic events planned for this summer and fall commemorating President Reagan in which the Commission’s participation would be beneficial.

As such, I have no objection to the bill before us, which extends the termination date of the Commission from May 31, 2011, to the end of the year, and I would urge Members to vote for this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY. I thank my colleague from Illinois. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from the great State of California, the sponsor of this bill and a member of this Reagan Commission, Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1308, legislation to extend the termination date for the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission.

The work of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission is not quite finished. That’s why this legislation is needed to extend the commission through December 30 of this year, allowing the Commission to deliver additional events for the public.

Extending the Commission through the end of 2011 will allow it to accomplish several key goals—some including the support of official international events occurring the week of June 27 in Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and the United Kingdom, possibly convening a joint session of Congress this fall, coordinating a potential White House event, organizing a Capitol Visitor Center exhibit, serving as a resource for Federal Government centennial activities, and supporting State Reagan centennial commissions.

Extending this Commission will require, as my colleagues have said, no Federal funding. All funds needed are privately raised.

□ 1710

In conclusion, many other centennial commissions have operated for longer periods with significant Federal funding. Extending the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission will provide more opportunities to commemorate recognition of President Reagan. I want to thank Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member CUMMINGS, along with their staffs, for their assistance in helping bring this bill to the floor today.

I also want to express my appreciation to Speaker BOEHNER, Majority Leader CANTOR, and Minority Leader PELOSI for all their help in bringing the bill forward today. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, I reiterate my support for this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to leave this body with a simple, eloquent quote from President Reagan. He once said: "The problem is not that people are taxed too little. The problem is that government spends too much." This week, as we consider the 2011 spending bill and move towards funding the government for 2012, I want to urge all Members to keep that in mind on both sides of the aisle, because it is entirely fitting and proper that we honor his memory and his wishes as we go forward, and truly take this on, and do it in a bipartisan manner, and do it in a way that reflects the American people.

This is not about Republicans or Democrats. This is about America and America's financial health as we go forward. I am urging all Members to please back this and support this bill.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for H.R. 1308 which extends the due date of the final report of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission from April 30, 2011, to November 30, 2011; and the final termination date of the Commission from May 30, 2011, to December 31, 2011.

The Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission was formed to commemorate the 100th anniversary of President Ronald Reagan's birth and to celebrate the life of our Nation's 40th President. Earlier this year, I was appointed

one of the new members of the 2011 Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission by Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI. In that capacity, I am aware of the great events scheduled to commemorate the life of President Reagan past the original dates Congress set forth in the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act. Passing H.R. 1308 today will extend the timeline and allow for the appropriate completion of these events.

I worked with President Reagan prior to serving in Congress when I worked in the United States Border Patrol. During his administration, I served as Sector Chief for the McAllen Sector in south Texas, where I worked under one of the great leaders of the former Immigration and Naturalization Service, Alan Nelson, who was appointed by President Reagan.

While most Americans remember Ronald Reagan for his unwavering optimism, his sense of humor, and his unique ability to connect to a broad spectrum of Americans, what I appreciated most about President Reagan was his pragmatic approach to immigration and border security.

President Reagan was at his best when he shared his idealism of an America that stood as a shining city on a hill, a beacon of hope, and a place where people of all backgrounds are welcomed. He reminded us of all that was great about America—a place where people have for generations come here in search of a better life, often fleeing from oppression, persecution, and deprivation.

When America was faced with a growing wave of undocumented immigrants 25 years ago, he proposed common sense solutions to fixing the problem. He never demonized illegal immigrants; he never belittled them, never used them as a scapegoat, and never blamed them for the Nation's troubles. He never inflamed public opinion, and saw the good in people. His former speechwriter, Peter Robinson, once said:

"He could picture—in his own mind's eye, he could picture those little ships that the pilgrims sailed in. He could picture the difficult, oppressive conditions under which the Chinese were brought to California. He admired people for what they had gone through to achieve better lives for themselves and their families in this country."

He even felt compassion and empathy for those who had come here illegally. At the signing ceremony for the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, President Reagan said:

"The legalization provisions in this act will go far to improve the lives of a class of individuals who now must hide in the shadows, without access to many of the benefits of a free and open society. Very soon many of these men and women will be able to step into the sunlight and, ultimately, if they choose, they may become Americans."

While I did not agree with all of the President's policies, I admired and respected the character of his discourse on immigration, and I believe we should all learn from his example.

As we mark this historic occasion and celebrate the life of President Ronald Reagan, I hope all of us are inspired by President Reagan's ideals and the vision he had of an America that embraced immigrants and the compassion he showed even to those who came here illegally.

In his farewell address to the American people, President Reagan closed his speech by

making reference to the 'shining city on the hill' as he so often did during his political career. He said:

"I've spoken of the shining city all my political life, but I don't know if I ever quite communicated what I saw when I said it. But in my mind it was a tall, proud city built on rocks stronger than oceans, windswept, God-blessed, and teeming with people of all kinds living in harmony and peace; a city with free ports that hummed with commerce and creativity. And if there had to be city walls, the walls had doors and the doors were open to anyone with the will and the heart to get here. That's how I saw it, and see it still."

Mr. KELLY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1308.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

W. CRAIG BROADWATER FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 307) to designate the Federal Building and United States Courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the "W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 307

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, shall be known and designated as the "W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within

which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on Senate bill 307.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Senate bill 307 would designate the Federal building and courthouse on West King Street in Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse. A House companion bill was also introduced by the gentlewoman from West Virginia of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and I want to thank her for her leadership on this issue.

Judge Broadwater was a dedicated public servant, serving both as a Federal judge and as an assistant adjutant general in the West Virginia Army National Guard. He was appointed to the Federal bench in 1996, after nearly 20 years of legal service in private practice, as a hearing examiner for the West Virginia Workers' Compensation Fund and as a special prosecuting attorney.

He was commissioned in the U.S. Army in 1972 after completing the ROTC program at West Virginia University. He served on active duty as a military intelligence officer that included a tour in Korea. In 1976, Judge Broadwater joined the West Virginia Army National Guard as an operational detachment executive officer and rose through the ranks to brigadier general and his assignment as assistant adjutant general for installations and homeland defense in 2002. During his military service, he received countless awards and decorations, including the Defense Superior Service Medal and the Bronze Star.

I am impressed with his clear dedication as both a military officer and as a Federal judge. I think that it is appropriate for us to honor his service to our Nation and his memory by naming this Federal building and courthouse after Judge Broadwater. I support passage of this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of Senate bill 307 and am pleased today to speak in support of the bill that names the Federal building located at 217 West King Street in Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

Judge W. Craig Broadwater was born August 8, 1950, and grew up in Paden City, West Virginia. Judge Broadwater served as both an active district judge in the Northern District of West Virginia and as assistant adjutant general for installations and homeland defense for the West Virginia National Guard.

Judge Broadwater worked as a public servant for almost 25 years before his

untimely death. Judge Broadwater's public service ran the gamut from his time as a hearing examiner for the West Virginia Workers' Compensation Fund, two terms as special prosecuting attorney in Ohio County, West Virginia, and as a circuit judge in West Virginia.

In 1996, President Clinton appointed Judge Broadwater to become a U.S. District judge in the Northern District of West Virginia. During his nearly 10 years on the Federal bench, Judge Broadwater was well respected as a smart, fair, and hardworking member of the judiciary.

Judge Broadwater's service in the military was just as impressive as his service to the judiciary. After serving as a member of the elite Green Beret division of the U.S. Army during the latter stages of the Vietnam war, Judge Broadwater joined the National Guard in 1976, where he served continuously until his death.

Not one to sit idly by when there was work to be done, Judge Broadwater was recently deployed overseas in 2005 to support U.S. military operations in Iraq, as well as several other overseas missions in support of U.S. combat operations. During his deployment to the Horn of Africa, he oversaw the administration of personnel records issues for Reservists and Guardsmen in addition to oversight of the renovation of schools and medical clinics and the administration of veterinary and civil programs.

Judge Broadwater also was just as active in his local West Virginia community, where he was instrumental in establishing the Veterans Center in Ohio County, where he served on the facility's advisory board. He also served on various boards and commissions in the legal community.

Judge Craig Broadwater died on December 18, 2006, at the age of 56 from cancer, and he was laid to rest with full military honors. This designation is a fitting tribute to Judge Craig Broadwater, and I support the passage of S. 307, which honors his service to our country. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues for bringing this forward and for their very strong support of this measure.

I too rise today in support of S. 307, which will rename the Federal courthouse and the Federal building at 217 West King Street in Martinsburg, West Virginia for W. Craig Broadwater, as it will be designated as the W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

Martinsburg is in the eastern panhandle of West Virginia, very close here to Washington, D.C. It's also part of my district. Judge Broadwater was one of my constituents. I learned more from Judge Broadwater than he ever

learned from me, I can tell you that. He was a very kind, supportive, gentle person, but also a very fair-minded and humble public servant.

As we've heard, and I am going to repeat it, he served with distinction and honor to this country for over 40 years, first as an Army lieutenant, later as a Federal court judge, and a brigadier general for the West Virginia National Guard.

□ 1720

I know he was deployed the year before he passed away very suddenly. He came to West Virginia, where he attended West Virginia University in 1972, and he entered ROTC. It obviously made a large impression on his life, as he stayed not only for 2 years as a military officer, intelligence officer, but also retained his dedicated service to our country through the military throughout his life.

He graduated from West Virginia University in 1977, went into private practice as a practicing attorney until 1983. He then became the circuit judge of the First Judicial Circuit in West Virginia and served in that capacity from 1983 to 1996, where he then was appointed, as my colleague from Florida said, by President Clinton on January 26, 1996, where he served until he passed away December 18, 2006.

He was a lieutenant in the U.S. Army for 2 years. He joined the Army National Guard in 1976 as an operational detachment executive officer and, as I said, remained in the Guard the rest of his life.

He was deployed several times. He was deployed as a battalion commander from 1994 to 1996, where he led the battalion for service in Haiti during Operation Uphold Democracy. He became a brigadier general during Operation Iraqi Freedom, and was mobilized in 2003 and in 2005 at the Horn of Africa.

After serving, he was then sent to Djibouti, where he served as the deputy commanding officer. But what I would like to talk about are the several times that I actually got to meet and talk and get to know Craig Broadwater. He was very young when he was stricken quickly and taken from us and his family. He is missed, I know, every day in their hearts and certainly in the hearts of the eastern part of West Virginia.

Being a Federal judge is, I think, not only an awesome responsibility, it takes a special kind of person to do it well, and Judge Broadwater did it well. He was, as I said, kind, soft-spoken, considerate, a great listener and very respectful of all individuals, whether you would be talking to the Governor or whether you would be talking to the person who is helping you keep your building in order during the evenings. He loved his family, his State and his country.

I know that by naming this courthouse and this Federal building for Judge W. Craig Broadwater, that those who serve in that building and in that

courthouse will have an inspiration as they walk in. As they enter and see his name on the front of the building, they are going to realize that sacrifice of yourself and of your family is sometimes what's important in service to your country, to your State, to the law. He did this uncomplainingly, with great humor, and deep respect for our country, our laws of fairness and justice.

I think for those folks, whether you are going in as a person who is a judge or an attorney or somebody who is seeking representation, when you enter the building that's named for Judge Broadwater, you are going to feel like you are going into a building that's dedicated to the fairness and upholding the highest standards that he, himself, upheld during his life. We miss him to this day, and I think this is a fitting tribute.

I want to thank Senator ROCKEFELLER for joining together, the two of us, to put this forward. I look forward to the day when we can attach onto that Federal building in honor of Judge Broadwater the "W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 307.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF STEPHEN M. CASE AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous

consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 8 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 8

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the resignation of Phillip Frost of Florida is filled by the appointment of Stephen M. Case of Virginia. The appointment is for a term of 6 years, effective on the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of Senate Joint Resolution 8, to appoint Stephen M. Case to a six year term as a citizen regent of the Smithsonian. This action would fill an existing vacancy and bring the Board of Regents back up to full strength.

Mr. Case, a prominent philanthropist and entrepreneur in business, is exceptionally well-qualified for this position. He is a pioneer in innovative technology and communications and is probably best known as the founder of America Online, and later chairman AOL/Time Warner. The Smithsonian needs a continuing influx of innovative leaders to the Board to maintain its unique position as a leader in scientific research and educational endeavors.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 197 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 197

Resolved,
SECTION 1. ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY.

(a) JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.—The following Members are hereby elected to the Joint Committee on Printing, to serve with the chair of the Committee on House Administration:

- (1) Mr. Harper.
- (2) Mr. Schock.

(3) Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania.

(4) Mr. Gonzalez.

(b) JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY.—The following Members are hereby elected to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, to serve with the chair of the Committee on House Administration and the chair of the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch of the Committee on Appropriations:

- (1) Mr. Harper.
- (2) Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania.
- (3) Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR A CEREMONY AS PART OF THE COMMEMORATION OF THE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 33 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would just like to commend the gentleman for bringing this measure and how important it is that the Holocaust be remembered right here in the heart of our Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 33

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

SECTION 1. USE OF ROTUNDA FOR HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY.

The rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on May 17, 2011, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of House Concurrent Resolution 33, to allow the Capitol Rotunda to be used on May 17 for the purpose of the annual commemoration of the Holocaust.

This year's theme is "Justice and Accountability in the Face of Genocide: What Have We Learned?" It is important that as we reflect on one most notable tragedies in human history, we honor the memory of those who died so senselessly by not forgetting that there can be no tolerance for prejudice, oppression and hatred and pledge anew to stop those seeds of oppression from leading to atrocities like genocide.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S.J. Res. 8, H. Res. 197, and H. Con. Res. 33.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1308, by the yeas and nays;

S. 307 by the yeas and nays;

Approval of the Journal, by the yeas and nays.

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

EXTENDING RONALD REAGAN CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1308) to amend the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act to extend the termination date for the Commission, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 18, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

YEAS—394

Ackerman	Berkley	Brown (FL)
Adams	Berman	Buchanan
Aderholt	Biggert	Bucshon
Akin	Bilbray	Buerkle
Alexander	Bilirakis	Burgess
Altmire	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Calvert
Austria	Bishop (UT)	Camp
Baca	Black	Campbell
Bachmann	Blackburn	Canseco
Bachus	Blumenauer	Cantor
Baldwin	Bonner	Capito
Barletta	Bono Mack	Capps
Barrow	Boren	Capuano
Bartlett	Boswell	Cardoza
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Carnahan
Bass (CA)	Brady (PA)	Carney
Bass (NH)	Brady (TX)	Carson (IN)
Becerra	Braley (IA)	Carter
Benishek	Brooks	Cassidy
Berg	Brown (GA)	Castor (FL)

Chabot	Hensarling	Myrick	Thompson (MS)	Walberg	Whitfield
Chaffetz	Herger	Napolitano	Thompson (PA)	Walden	Wilson (FL)
Chandler	Herrera Beutler	Neal	Thornberry	Walsh (IL)	Wilson (SC)
Chu	Higgins	Neugebauer	Tiberi	Walz (MN)	Wittman
Ciциlline	Himes	Noem	Tipton	Wasserman	Wolf
Clarke (MI)	Hinchev	Nugent	Tonko	Schultz	Womack
Clay	Hinojosa	Nunes	Towns	Waters	Woodall
Cleaver	Hirono	Nunnelee	Tsongas	Watt	Wu
Clyburn	Holden	Olson	Turner	Waxman	Yarmuth
Coble	Holt	Olver	Upton	Webster	Yoder
Coffman (CO)	Hoyer	Owens	Van Hollen	Welch	Young (AK)
Cole	Huelskamp	Palazzo	Velázquez	West	Young (IN)
Conaway	Huizenga (MI)	Pallone	Visclosky	Westmoreland	
Connolly (VA)	Hultgren	Pascarell			
Conyers	Hurt	Pastor (AZ)			
Costa	Inslee	Paulsen	Amash	Johnson (GA)	Schrader
Costello	Israel	Payne	Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Stark
Courtney	Issa	Pearce	Cohen	McDermott	Tierney
Cravaack	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Cooper	Nadler	Weiner
Crawford	Jackson Lee	Pence	DeFazio	Paul	Woolsey
Crenshaw	(TX)	Perlmutter	Ellison	Sánchez, Linda	
Critz	Jenkins	Peters	Honda	T.	
Crowley	Johnson (OH)	Peterson			
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Petri			
Cummings	Johnson, Sam	Pingree (ME)	Burton (IN)	Hanna	Rohrabacher
Davis (CA)	Jones	Pitts	Culberson	Hunter	Ruppersberger
Davis (IL)	Jordan	Platts	Dold	Johnson (IL)	Rush
Davis (KY)	Kaptur	Poe (TX)	Doyle	Maloney	Sanchez, Loretta
DeGette	Keating	Polis	Engel	Meeks	Shuler
DeLauro	Kelly	Pompeo	Giffords	Moran	Young (FL)
Denham	Kildee	Posey	Gutierrez	Reichert	
Dent	King	Price (GA)			
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Price (NC)			
Deutch	King (NY)	Quayle			
Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Quigley			
Dicks	Kinzinger (IL)	Rahall			
Dingell	Kissell	Rangel			
Doggett	Kline	Reed			
Donnelly (IN)	Kucinich	Rehberg			
Dreier	Labrador	Renacci			
Duffy	Lamborn	Reyes			
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Ribble			
Duncan (TN)	Landry	Richardson			
Edwards	Langevin	Richmond			
Ellmers	Lankford	Rigell			
Emerson	Larsen (WA)	Rivera			
Eshoo	Larson (CT)	Roby			
Farenthold	Latham	Roe (TN)			
Farr	LaTourrette	Rogers (AL)			
Fattah	Latta	Rogers (KY)			
Filner	Levin	Rogers (MD)			
Fincher	Lewis (CA)	Rokita			
Fitzpatrick	Lewis (GA)	Rooney			
Flake	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen			
Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Roskam			
Fleming	Loeb sack	Ross (AR)			
Flores	Lofgren, Zoe	Ross (FL)			
Forbes	Long	Rothman (NJ)			
Fortenberry	Lowe y	Roybal-Allard			
Foxx	Lucas	Royce			
Frank (MA)	Luetkemeyer	Runyan			
Franks (AZ)	Luján	Ryan (OH)			
Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Ryan (WI)			
Fudge	Lungren, Daniel	Sarbanes			
Galleghy	E.	Scalise			
Garamendi	Lynch	Schakowsky			
Gardner	Mack	Schiff			
Garrett	Manzullo	Schilling			
Gerlach	Marchant	Schmidt			
Gibbs	Marino	Schock			
Gibson	Markey	Schwartz			
Gingrey (GA)	Matheson	Schweikert			
Gohmert	Matsui	Scott (SC)			
Gonzalez	McCarthy (CA)	Scott (VA)			
Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Scott, Austin			
Gosar	McCaul	Scott, David			
Gowdy	McClintock	Sensenbrenner			
Granger	McCullum	Serrano			
Graves (GA)	McCotter	Sessions			
Graves (MO)	McGovern	Sewell			
Green, Al	McHenry	Sherman			
Green, Gene	McIntyre	Shimkus			
Griffin (AR)	McKeon	Shuster			
Griffith (VA)	McKinley	Simpson			
Grijalva	McMorris	Sires			
Grimm	Rodgers	Slaughter			
Guinta	McNerney	Smith (NE)			
Guthrie	Meehan	Smith (NJ)			
Hall	Mica	Smith (TX)			
Hanabusa	Michaud	Smith (WA)			
Harper	Miller (FL)	Southerland			
Harris	Miller (MI)	Speier			
Hartzler	Miller (NC)	Stearns			
Hastings (FL)	Miller, Gary	Stivers			
Hastings (WA)	Miller, George	Stutzman			
Hayworth	Moore	Sullivan			
Heck	Mulvaney	Sutton			
Heinrich	Murphy (CT)	Terry			
Heller	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (CA)			

Thompson (MS)	Walberg	Whitfield
Thompson (PA)	Walden	Wilson (FL)
Thornberry	Walsh (IL)	Wilson (SC)
Tiberi	Walz (MN)	Wittman
Tipton	Wasserman	Wolf
Tonko	Schultz	Womack
Towns	Waters	Woodall
Tsongas	Watt	Wu
Turner	Waxman	Yarmuth
Upton	Webster	Yoder
Van Hollen	Welch	Young (AK)
Velázquez	West	Young (IN)
Visclosky	Westmoreland	

NAYS—18

Amash	Johnson (GA)	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Stark
Cohen	McDermott	Tierney
Cooper	Nadler	Weiner
DeFazio	Paul	Woolsey
Ellison	Sánchez, Linda	
Honda	T.	

NOT VOTING—20

Burton (IN)	Hanna	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Hunter	Ruppersberger
Dold	Johnson (IL)	Rush
Doyle	Maloney	Sanchez, Loretta
Engel	Meeks	Shuler
Giffords	Moran	Young (FL)
Gutierrez	Reichert	

□ 1856

Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. CHU changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. CRAIG BROADWATER FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 307) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the “W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse,” on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 3, answered “present” 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

YEAS—408

Ackerman	Barton (TX)	Bonner
Adams	Bass (CA)	Bono Mack
Aderholt	Bass (NH)	Boren
Akin	Becerra	Boswell
Alexander	Benishek	Boustany
Altmire	Berg	Brady (PA)
Amash	Berkley	Brady (TX)
Andrews	Berman	Braley (IA)
Austria	Biggert	Brooks
Baca	Bilbray	Brown (FL)
Bachmann	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Bachus	Bishop (GA)	Bucshon
Baldwin	Bishop (NY)	Buerkle
Barletta	Black	Burgess
Barrow	Blackburn	Butterfield
Bartlett	Blumenauer	Calvert

Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Finer
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Klaine
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock

McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Neal
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Bahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)

Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman

Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)

Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins

Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Richardson
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Rivera
Kind
Roby
King (TN)
King (NY)
Kingston
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Ross (FL)
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock

Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)

Broun (GA)
Harris
Schrader

NAYS—3

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

NOT VOTING—20

Bishop (UT)
Burton (IN)
Culberson
Dold
Engel
Giffords
Grijalva

Gutierrez
Hanna
Hunter
Johnson (IL)
Meeke
Moran
Reichert

Rohrabacher
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Shuler
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left on this vote.

□ 1904

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 325, nays 79, answered "present" 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]
YEAS—325

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Calvert

Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Calvert

Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay

NAYS—79

Burgess
Capuano
Chu
Courtney
Cravaack
Cuellar
DeFazio

Dent
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Farr
Finer
Fincher
Fitzpatrick

Foxx	Lee (CA)	Reed
Fudge	Lewis (GA)	Renacci
Gardner	LoBiondo	Rooney
Gerlach	Marchant	Ryan (OH)
Gibson	McCotter	Sánchez, Linda
Graves (MO)	McGovern	T.
Grimm	McKinley	Sarbanes
Harris	Moore	Schakowsky
Heck	Napolitano	Schock
Heller	Nugent	Sires
Herrera Beutler	Olver	Sutton
Himes	Pallone	Terry
Hinchey	Pascarell	Thompson (CA)
Honda	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (MS)
Jackson Lee	Perlmutter	Tiberi
(TX)	Peters	Tipton
Johnson (OH)	Peterson	Visclosky
Kinzinger (IL)	Poe (TX)	Weiner
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Wu
Landry	Rahall	Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Amash Gohmert

NOT VOTING—26

Blumenauer	Hanna	Pitts
Burton (IN)	Hunter	Reichert
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Dold	Keating	Ruppersberger
Engel	McDermott	Rush
Giffords	Meeks	Sanchez, Loretta
Gingrey (GA)	Moran	Shuler
Grijalva	Neugebauer	Young (FL)
Gutierrez	Nunes	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left on this vote.

□ 1910

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall votes 254 and 255. I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 256.

IT IS TIME FOR THE CFTC TO ACT

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the investment firm Goldman Sachs came out with an amazing statement, which is that \$27 per barrel of oil today is the result of excessive speculation; it has no connection to supply and demand. What that means is a motorist in the State of Connecticut who is now paying \$4 a gallon for gas should be paying only \$3 a gallon; but all the speculation which oil delivery guys and gas station owners have been screaming about for the last 3 months is the factor that is driving up the price of gas.

Last year, the commodities trading commission in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform bill was given the authority to limit the amount of outside speculator participation in energy futures trading markets. They have not implemented those rules. It is time for them to act. It is time for the CFTC to issue these new rules and to protect America's consumers and small businesses.

U.S. COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION, Washington, DC, March 25, 2011.

Hon. JOE COURTNEY, House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COURTNEY: Thank you for writing to the CFTC regarding speculation. The agency considers most letters from Capitol Hill as "comment" letters on regulations being promulgated. I, however, wanted to take a moment to respond to your letter.

On Wednesday, oil prices reached nearly \$106 per barrel—up 29 percent this year. Not since 2008, when many of us raised concerns about excessive speculation, have prices been so high. This comes at a time when a fairly high supply of oil and stable demand exists. Obviously there are myriad factors impacting prices: the Middle East, Japan and crude transportation issues, to name a few. At the same time, however, we have speculators coming into energy markets at blistering pace. In fact, the latest data indicates that in the energy sector, speculative positions are at an all-time high—up 64 percent from June of 2008 when crude oil prices touched \$147.27 per barrel.

I'm not suggesting that speculation is bad. In fact we need speculation and there is ample evidence (in addition to common sense) that speculation can decrease volatility. On the other hand, speculation can become excessive. In these instances, as we may be seeing now and as I believe we saw in 2008 and even for some period in 2009, that excessive speculation can impact prices. I'm not suggesting that speculators are driving prices or that they are the cruise control on prices. I do think, however, that they tap the gas pedal at times.

I didn't come to this conclusion lightly and continue to cite many studies, paper and quotes that make this same connection between speculation and prices (not just in the energy complex, but also in agricultural commodities and metals).

As you know, Congress enhanced the CFTC's ability to address excessive speculation as part of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. Specifically, the Act mandates that the agency implement speculative position limits in the energy sector within 180 days. Obviously, that deadline has long since passed, which is unfortunate to say the least. I had urged the agency to implement limits on time.

We heard three primary arguments against implementation within the required implementation time period, that is, by mid-January, 2011.

First, some have suggested that when the statute says the Commission shall implement "appropriate" speculative position limits, that the word "appropriate" could mean that no limits whatsoever could be "appropriate." As many Members have said, this provision of the statute should not be interpreted with such elasticity as to mean no limits whatsoever. The reason Congress gave us the expedited implementation date was precisely because Congress wanted the agency to implement speculative position limits.

The second argument against implementing limits on time was that if we were to do so, there would be market migration. In essence, the suggestion is that if the CFTC set very restrictive position limits, traders would simply trade in other venues. First, there is the suggestion that the trading will migrate to currently unregulated over-the-counter (OTC) markets. These markets will, however, within months not years, be regulated by the agency. The other suggestion is that the trading will migrate to foreign boards of trades. Both of these suggestions are based on the dubious premise

that limits the agency establishes would be overly restrictive. There is nothing that requires us to set a certain position limit level, and, in fact, I have always said that we should err on the high side at first—precisely to avoid any negative consequences—and recalibrate as we move forward and know more about the markets.

The third argument against implementing limits on time was that the agency doesn't have the data to set reasonable, or appropriate, position limits. This is the only argument of the three that has limited merit. We do not yet have, and will not have for a few more months (September at the earliest) some of the OTC trading data that would facilitate setting position limits. Those who don't support position implementation now use that argument to say no limits should be in place whatsoever. Congress required that we have several limits: spot month, all month and aggregate month limits for currently regulated exchanges. The law also requires that we have those same three limits for OTC trading (spot, all month and aggregate limits). Those who oppose limits now don't agree that we could have already imposed spot month limits on all contracts (including OTC trades) using the available physical supply of the commodity. We could have done those in January, we can do them now. Similarly, we could have, should have and can now implement limits for all months and aggregate limits for currently-regulated exchanges. Finally, if there was a desire, I believe we could have developed an appropriate formula to impose limits on OTC trading for the very largest traders who also use the currently-regulated exchanges. This limit would have also had to err on the high side.

On summary, the agency could have implemented a speculative position limits regime in January. We can still do them now. I will continue to urge that we do so.

Thank you again for your letter. If I can ever be of assistance on this, or any other matter, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

BART CHILTON, Commissioner.

RECOGNIZING NORTH DAKOTA VOLUNTEERS

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

Mr. BERG. Yesterday, I had the opportunity to tour overland flood sites in North Dakota. River levels hit record highs, and thousands of North Dakotans volunteered their time and energy to save homes and lives. So today, I would like to recognize the thousands of high school students that helped fill and stack sandbags that protected property and lives. Together, they helped Cass County residents protect their homes as the river rose. Without the help of these young volunteers, many North Dakotans would have been left unprepared for the overland flooding that affected our State.

These students are students that care about their communities. Their dedication exemplifies the spirit that we see in North Dakota and the next generation of leaders. I am pleased that their efforts to protect our communities worked, and I would like to recognize them today.

A GOVERNMENT THAT WORKS

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

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue a discussion started by a good friend and former Iowa Congressman, Berkley Bedell, in yesterday's Des Moines Register, page 9A.

In Congressman Bedell's column titled, "Those Who Own America Should Help Pay for Government," Congressman Bedell argues that Congress's budget focus on cutting costs instead of generating revenue is fundamentally skewed and not good business.

He writes, "Show me a company that ignores revenue and focuses on cutting costs, and I will show you a firm that is headed for failure. Show me a government that ignores revenue and focuses on cutting costs, and I will show you a government that is a failure."

Congressman Bedell writes that corporations and the richest Americans need to properly contribute to the government through taxes that are relevant to their wealth. For me, this means eliminating billions a year in subsidies to multibillion-dollar oil and gas companies; it means ending mortgage deductions for vacation homes and yachts that cost taxpayers billions a year in lost revenue; it means ending the Bush-era tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent to increase our revenue by more than \$40 billion a year.

Americans deserve a government that works, and blindly cutting costs and services doesn't accomplish that.

[From the Des Moines Register, Apr. 12, 2011]

GUEST OPINION: THOSE WHO OWN AMERICA SHOULD HELP PAY FOR GOVERNMENT

(By: Berkley Bedell)

I started a fishing tackle manufacturing business, Berkley and Co., with \$50 saved from my newspaper route when I was 15 years old.

From the beginning, my main focus was on sales and revenue.

The business was successful.

In my 50s, I ran for Congress. I won and appointed a person to run the company. He focused on cutting costs rather than building revenue and the business was soon headed for bankruptcy.

My son, Tom, came back to Iowa to run the company. He focused on marketing and research to build revenue, and when he sold the company a few years ago, it was by far the largest most successful fishing tackle manufacturing company in the nation.

Show me a company that ignores revenue and focuses on cutting costs, and I will show you a firm that is headed for failure. Show me a government that ignores revenue and focuses on cutting costs, and I will show you a government that is a failure.

Today that is exactly what we have in our state and federal governments.

Like most people and most corporations, I would prefer not to have to pay taxes. I am now 90 years old. I lived during the middle of the 1900s when our top income tax rate varied between 70 and 91 percent—more than double that of today. I saw what we can do when we properly tax ourselves to build a better nation.

Today the top 1 percent of households have over 38 percent of all privately held stock, 60

percent of financial securities and 62 percent of business equity. The top 10 percent own 80 percent to 90 percent of stocks, bonds, trust funds and business equities, and over 75 percent of non-home real estate. Since financial health is what counts as far as control of income-producing assets, we can say that just 10 percent of the people own the United States of America.

My wife and I are part of that 10 percent. We are heroes in our hometown, just as Bill Gates and Warren Buffett are national heroes.

Like them, we are not bad people, we want to be good people and contribute so we have formed a foundation for alternative medicine (FAIM.org) to try to do good with our money.

But our government is all screwed up. Instead of using everyone's wealth to build a better society as we did in the 1950s, we are cutting taxes to the rich and corporate America while we cut back on services and jobs for the masses. You do not create jobs by firing teachers and lowering wages.

People are starting to rise up in Wisconsin, Ohio and other states. They are correct to be disturbed and to protest. I hope they will keep it up. I hope they realize the basic problem. It is, revenue matters!

Until we properly tax corporate America and those of us who can afford it, and use those revenues to put our people back to work, clean up the environment, replace fossil fuels, reduce the deficit and bring back the prosperity we had in the middle of the last century, I believe we all need to join those protesters.

Having served in Congress, I have seen how political contributions from the wealthy, and now corporations, control our government. It is time for the people—all of us—to do as did the people of Egypt and join the street marches to demand that our government bring back the time we had in my youth, when we worked together, rich and poor, to contribute the tax revenue needed to build a nation that was the envy of the world.

SHUTTLE SNUB

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

Mr. POE of Texas. "Houston, we have a problem." These were the words from space when Apollo 13 was in trouble. The NASA folks in Houston, Texas, helped bring Apollo 13 back to Earth safely.

Now, Houston, we have another problem, because for obvious political reasons none of the four shuttles are going to be retired at Space Center USA—Houston, Texas—the home of NASA, the Johnson Space Center, and the home of the astronauts.

For nearly 50 years, Houston, Texas, has been the center of world space exploration. Why the apparent shuttle snub to Houston and to history? Well, it's blatantly political. Texas is a red State, and the four winners of the shuttles—one of which has nothing to do with NASA—all are States that voted for the President.

When the U.S. won its race to the Moon in 1969, the first word on the Moon was "Houston," not "New York City." Now it should be said, "Houston, the shuttles have landed, but only in the blue States that voted for the President."

This ought not to be, but that's just the way it is.

HONORING SERGEANT ROBERT TREADWAY

(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, I rise today to honor U.S. Marine Sergeant Robert Treadway, who gave the ultimate sacrifice in service to our Nation.

Sergeant Treadway was killed in a plane crash in 1976 while on active duty; however, it wasn't until earlier this week, nearly 35 years later, that Sergeant Treadway received the memorial service befitting all of our fallen heroes. On Monday, a memorial service was held for Sergeant Treadway at the Sante Fe National Cemetery, helping bring closure to his mother, Theresa Treadway.

For nearly two decades, Mrs. Treadway tried several times to arrange for the memorial service that Sergeant Treadway had earned. Her unwavering dedication to her son brought her to my office. I was honored to have the opportunity to help Mrs. Treadway pay tribute to her son, a marine to his core.

The men and women who serve our country in the armed services sacrifice a tremendous amount, but so do their loved ones they leave behind while they protect and serve our great Nation. This is why I was honored to be able to help Mrs. Treadway finally give her son a memorial that is befitting of his sacrifice and honors his memory.

To Sergeant Treadway and his mother, thank you for being examples of the American spirit at its finest.

THE BUDGET

(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, the spending debate in Washington boils down to a couple of fundamentals: We spend 23 percent of our GDP; that is the level of spending of Congress. The revenues to GDP are only 18 percent. So you have a 5 percent difference in what your revenues are and what your spending is. Years of doing this means that, right now, for every dollar we spend, 40 cents is borrowed. You can't continue to defy gravity.

This week, we will consider the Ryan budget. It has tax reform; it has spending reform; it has regulatory reform—all things that are very good. I'm glad to see that the President will be reintroducing another budget this week, because I think it's very important that if you do not like the Republican Ryan budget, that's fine, but put your budget on the table because surely the Democrat Party has some ideas.

So far all we've heard from the Democrats is criticism. That's not

good enough in times like these. We've got to come together as a country to do what's best not for the next election but for the next generation and, indeed, for our future.

MEDICARE ELIMINATION AND MIDDLE CLASS TAX INCREASE ACT OF 2011

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

Mr. WEINER. Ladies and gentlemen, later this week, we are going to be considering the Medicare Elimination and Middle Class Tax Increase Act of 2011. We've heard it called the "Ryan bill," but that's what it does.

First, it does some things that I'm sure are very popular in America. It says let's eliminate the Medicare program. Let's say to senior citizens, You know what? We're going to give you a voucher, and you go out and shop for health care—and good luck finding it. That's one proposal.

And then it says, let's take \$750 billion of Medicaid expenses and shift them to the States so that the States have to raise taxes and localities have to raise taxes. This is some new interesting idea?

It was said by the previous speaker that Democrats haven't come forward with any ideas. Yeah, we came up with the idea of Medicare to provide health care for seniors and Social Security to provide a safety net for seniors in their advancing years. These are the programs that we care about and are going to fight for.

This week on the House floor, Republicans are going to say we're against Medicare. They want to eliminate it as it stands. Now, isn't it ironic? They spent all last year criticizing the health care act because it harmed Medicare, now suddenly they want to eliminate it. Hypocrisy.

□ 1920

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, America is facing some very perilous times because of the joblessness, because of the poor economy, because of the outrageous spending that's been going on for the last 2 years through the last Congress.

I come tonight, Mr. Speaker, to discuss something that I think is critically important for the American people to understand, because we've gotten away from what the Constitution says and what the original intent of the Constitution might be.

I've seen Member after Member, Mr. Speaker, hold up a copy of the Con-

stitution. I carry a copy in my pocket. And they'll hold up a copy of the Constitution and talk about this being a living and breathing document. Nothing could be further from the truth in the philosophy of our Founding Fathers.

In fact, our Founding Fathers meant this to be a very solid foundation. The Declaration of Independence expresses the philosophy of liberty in America, and the Constitution is an embodiment of those principles into a governing document.

Mr. Speaker, if we don't have a solid foundation upon which to build all of our laws, all of our society, then we're building our society and laws on shifting sand. You can ask a 6-year-old, if you build a house or a building on shifting sand, what's going to happen? It's going to fall, it's going to fail. That's exactly what's happening in our country today, because we've gotten away from the original intent of the Constitution.

In Hosea 4:6, God says, "My people are destroyed for a lack of knowledge." We have a tremendous lack of knowledge about the foundational principles, what our Founding Fathers meant for government to be. We have a tremendous lack of knowledge in this Nation even in Federal jurists, even in jurists sitting on the U.S. Supreme Court, about the Constitution.

In fact, I was very shocked—as I got interested in politics, I started talking to lawyers who had gone to law schools all over this country. The majority of lawyers that I've spoken with—law schools, public and private all across this country, they all have a course called constitutional law. But the American public would be absolutely shocked to understand that lawyers, even when they take constitutional law—and in a lot of law schools it's an elective even—when they take constitutional law, they don't study the Constitution. All they study is case law, what the Federal court system has said about the Constitution.

And we've got Federal jurists all the way up to the Supreme Court, but in all levels, from Federal district courts to the appellate system all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, that bring down ruling after ruling that is not based upon the Constitution in its original intent. That philosophy leads to tyranny in all possibility.

Our Founding Fathers never meant this. In fact, if people would read the Constitution and read what our Founding Fathers said about the Constitution, they would understand that.

There's a great resource that talks about what our Founding Fathers meant for the Constitution to be. The architect of the Constitution, James Madison, John Jay, the first U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice, and Alexander Hamilton, who was an ardent Federalist who believed in a strong Federal Government, wrote a series of essays. These essays were printed in the newspapers in New York State.

They were written to tell New Yorkers about what government should be under the Constitution in its original intent.

They explained in minute detail what government should be not only then but 200, 400, 600 years later, because they knew very firmly, very strongly that if we didn't have that original intent and a strong, solid foundation of government, that we could lose our liberty. That's the reason they wanted us to stay with their intent in the Constitution.

They wrote these series of essays. Those essays have been bound together—this little booklet, "The Federalist Papers," contains these essays. These essays were written by James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay about the Constitution to explain the Constitution.

If people will get "The Federalist Papers" and read them, they will see how far off track we have gotten as a Nation. They will see that our Nation is being destroyed from within, being destroyed by a philosophy of big government, and this philosophy has been fostered upon us by Democrats and Republicans alike, by liberals and conservatives alike. We've got to change that.

Mr. Speaker, the only way that we're going to change governing here in the United States is not here in Washington, not here in the U.S. House of Representatives, not over across the way in the U.S. Senate, not down the street on Pennsylvania Avenue in the White House. The only way we're going to change the philosophy of governance is if the grassroots, the good people across this Nation, start demanding a different kind of governance.

We've got to stop this outrageous spending. We've got to get our economy back on track. We've got to start creating jobs. What's made this country so rich, so powerful, so successful as a political experiment, the greatest political experiment in all of history, in all of mankind, is right here in the United States based on the Constitution of the United States in its original intent.

We have a tremendous lack of knowledge.

Now, "The Federalist Papers" in the old language, it's a bit difficult to read. Their style of writing, their style of English was a bit different from ours.

We've got another resource that I highly recommend, which is "The Federalist Papers in Modern Language." A person can buy this off Amazon, they can get this in Barnes and Noble bookstores around the country. If they don't have it in stock, it can be ordered.

The editor, Mary Webster, got some folks to transliterate "The Federalist Papers" from old-style English into modern English. What "transliterate" means is to change one word in the old style to another word in the new style. This is not an editorialization of "The Federalist Papers," it is not a commentary on "The Federalist Papers."

It's strictly a transliteration. In other words, it's changed from old-style English into new-style English. And that's all it's done.

People can go and read either "The Federalist Papers" in its original English form or "The Federalist Papers in Modern Language," and can become knowledgeable.

We've got to light grassfires all across this country to demand a different kind of governance or we're going to destroy everything that our Founding Fathers have given us.

This Nation was built on personal responsibility and accountability. It was based on freedom and liberty. I use those words separately.

Let me explain "liberty" for you, give you a definition. I don't know if this is my original definition or not. I don't remember ever reading it anywhere. I haven't seen it when I've gone to look it up. I'm not claiming it as my own, though I don't know who wrote it, if someone did: Liberty. Liberty is freedom bridled by morality.

□ 1930

Liberty is freedom bridled by morality. You see, a wild bear is free. All the wild bear's constrained by is the instincts that our Creator put in a wild bear. It can go anywhere it wants to. A male wild bear will even kill its own cubs just to try to get to the sow, to breed her. He doesn't care about anybody else but himself. That sow will protect her cubs, but other than that she's free, and she chooses to do so by her instinct.

But absolute freedom is anarchy. It's anarchy. You see, if I am totally free, if I don't like somebody, I can just kill them. In fact, we see that by dictators around the world, historically as well as in present times. But you see, freedom bridled by morality, liberty, means that my freedom stops where another person's freedom starts. And we can come together and work in concert for the greater good, for the greater good of our families, our communities, our cities, our States, as well as our Nation.

This country was founded upon liberty, personal responsibility, and accountability. It's been so successful economically because it's been based on the free enterprise system. Free enterprise. Free enterprise is the engine that pulls along the train of economic prosperity here in America. But we're destroying that.

Our President has a philosophy that I believe is totally against free enterprise. A lot of my colleagues, Democrat and Republican alike, believe the Federal Government ought to control virtually every aspect of our lives. George W. Bush was a big-spending, big-government President. He gave us No Child Left Behind, which has been a disaster. I call it Leave No Teacher Unshackled. We've got to get the shackles off teachers, let the local school boards run the education system, not by a Federal Department of Education, or I

don't even think by a State Department of Education. But the States have the right to do that constitutionally.

The most powerful political force in America today is embodied in the first three words of the U.S. Constitution: "We the people." And if we the people will become knowledgeable about the Constitution and about the Founding Fathers' philosophy of government, the philosophy of liberty and freedom, the philosophy of a free enterprise system, a philosophy of individual responsibility and individual accountability, then we can put this country back on the right course by the American people demanding their freedom back. We've lost a lot of it. A tremendous amount of freedom has been lost. We're losing our liberty, and we have a government that has taken away our freedoms.

The Preamble to the Constitution of the United States: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our prosperity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States."

Tonight I am going to talk about one little phrase in this Preamble. It's also in another place in the Constitution. I'm going to talk about the general welfare clause. We'll come back on another night, and I am going to talk about the commerce clause. And then we'll talk also about the elastic clause, and the Bill of Rights, and other parts of the Constitution.

But three phrases out of the Constitution have been utilized to pervert the idea behind the Constitution, to destroy its original intent, to cause us to continue to lose liberty here in America. The general welfare clause is one of those. You see, Congress has strayed from the clear-cut path, the certainty and liberty that our Founding Fathers outlined in the most basic and fundamental document to ever exist, and that's our Constitution.

The single most important part of this revered document is embodied in those first three words, because we are supposed to be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, as Abraham Lincoln said. Our government's purpose is to protect and preserve freedom and liberties of we, the people. Government is supposed to be governing at the consent of the people, not the people being dealt with at the consent of the government.

Yet nowadays it seems as though the Federal Government has inserted itself into almost every aspect of our day-to-day lives, monitoring what kind of health care we can have, bailing out the automobile industry, and regulating the education standards. Just a few examples of the Federal Government's hand's overreach into things where it should not go.

Mr. Speaker, over time it's become the norm for the Federal Government

to keep expanding in both size and scope by absorbing powers and rights that were intended for the States and the people. In fact, in the 10th Amendment of the Constitution, it says if a right is not specifically given to the Federal Government by the Constitution, in other words these things that are in article I, section 8, as well as a few others, but these are the things we can pass laws about, if it's not prohibited from the States, then those rights are reserved for the States and the people.

One of my primary goals while serving here in Washington is to send these powers back to the States and to the people and to ensure that, do everything that I can to ensure that the Constitution is applied as the Founding Fathers intended. I will work very hard to try to build those bridges, to send those powers back to the States and people. These are the powers created in article I, section 8.

The necessary and proper clause, the so-called elastic clause, allows Congress to pass laws about these other things; but this is all the Federal Government, all the House and the Senate is supposed to be passing laws about. Now, we have some say in the courts, we have some say with the executive branch, but these are the things that Congress is supposed to be passing laws about, and nothing else. Nothing else but these things.

Well, the general welfare clause is one of the most commonly abused and misapplied powers that the Federal Government has utilized to expand the size and scope of government and to destroy our liberty. Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, clause 1: "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." This is the second place, I mentioned just a few minutes before, in the Preamble our Founding Fathers mentioned general welfare.

□ 1940

Here it is in article I, section 8, clause 1, the general welfare.

This clause generated the most debate during our Founding Fathers' period because the term "general welfare" is vague and leaves much room for interpretation. Now we hear judges talk about interpreting the Constitution. Judges shouldn't be interpreting the Constitution. Words make a difference. And when we use the word "interpreting," that means somebody can apply their own bias what should and what should not be constitutional.

Well, you should be utilizing the word, apply the Constitution in its original intent. I am an original intent constitutionalist, as I just mentioned. I want to apply the Constitution as our Founding Fathers meant.

Alexander Hamilton and James Madison famously disagreed about the meaning of "general welfare" and the

limits to Congress' spending. Madison wanted the clause to be very, very narrowly interpreted, and Hamilton wanted a bit broader interpretation.

Now, if Alexander Hamilton were to walk into the doors of this U.S. House today, he would be absolutely shocked and chagrined at how much liberty we have lost, because he never, as a Federalist, envisioned the size and scope of government today. I think if he knew what was going on today, a little over 200 years since the Constitution was passed, ratified, he would be arguing just like I am today.

Yet the Founders, as they laid out in the Federalist Papers, neither Madison nor Hamilton would have agreed with the modern-day view that there are no limitations whatsoever on Congress' power to spend and that "general welfare" means whatever Congress, the President, and the Courts say that it means, even though a sort of Federalist would not agree that we have an open invitation to have whatever kind of government that we want to have.

Today, no project seems too local or too narrow, which is a big part of why this country is buried in so much debt—\$14.5 trillion. And then if you look at the finance gap, it's over \$200 trillion.

The powers of Congress are not unlimited, which is why we must get back to the basics of the Constitution, and we are going to talk tonight about that original intent of the general welfare clause and highlight just how far we have moved away from it.

James Madison, number 41, in the Federalist Papers, wrote this:

"Some, who have not denied the necessity of the power of taxation, have grounded a very fierce attack against the Constitution"—well, it sounds like that today, doesn't it—"on the language in which it is defined. It has been urged and echoed, that the power 'to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States'"—

We just showed you that. That is in article 1, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution.

As he goes on, "amounts to an unlimited commission to exercise every power which may be alleged to be necessary for the common defense or general welfare. No stronger proof could be given of the distress under which these writers labor for objections than their stooping to such a misconstruction."

Now, that's that old kind of language. Basically, he was saying that it is insane to think that the general welfare clause, this clause, can allow the Congress to pass laws about anything, collect taxes, et cetera, collect anything. No stronger proof could be given.

Under the distress, that means under the problems that are going to arise, under which these writers labor, the Supreme Court today, the President today, the last President, Republican and Democratic Presidents for the last

many decades, labor for objections, and they are stooping to such a misconstruction.

He was very, very clear. We do not have the power to do so. We don't have the power to do so.

James Madison, Federalist 45:

"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined." They are defined. Article 1, section 8, other articles, strictly interpreted, strictly defined, strictly according to what it says, not of broadening of those powers, few and defined, "to be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce."

James Madison in Federalist 45 was saying basically right here what the primary purpose of the Federal Government is: It's national defense, national security, foreign affairs. And also in the Constitution we have the rights to postal roads, post offices, things like that, to establish a currency to make this one Nation.

But the principal purpose of the Federal Government and the original intent of the Constitution is national defense, national security, and foreign affairs. The American people need to understand that firmly. That's foreign commerce.

We see over and over again the Courts defining general welfare in a different manner, much different manner. In fact, the Courts have held that anything that has to do with anybody's welfare, an individual's welfare, is okay under the Constitution, but that's not the original intent. The original intent was the general welfare, the general welfare of the Nation, not welfare of individuals.

We have developed this big welfare system in this country. It all started in earnest with Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt just exploded the size and scope of government through his New Deal—both Progressives; both had socialist beliefs.

In fact, Franklin Delano Roosevelt sent his advisers, his closely held friends, his Cabinet people, to go visit with Stalin in Communist Russia to study what he was doing, what Stalin was doing there so that FDR could replicate it here in the United States, and he did everything that he possibly could to do so. He packed the Courts because the Courts originally said the welfare clause, commerce clause, could not be expanded to include all this size and scope of government.

Thomas Jefferson: "Congress has not unlimited powers to provide for the general welfare, but only those specifically enumerated." Back to article I, section 8.

When my colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, vote for things that are not enumerated in the original intent, they are violating their oath of office. Every single one of us has stood up here and has taken an oath of office.

The first I time I did that was when I was sworn in the Marine Corps, 1964;

when I came to Congress in a special election in 2007, and then again in 2009, and then again this year. I stood right here in this Chamber and I held up my hand, and I swore to uphold the Constitution against powers both foreign and domestic. One of the greatest domestic powers that is anti-Constitution resides right in this House, right in this House, because we are destroying our liberty.

□ 1950

We are destroying it by the philosophy of big government. Thomas Jefferson said, "They are not to do anything they please."

Seventy years ago, in a court case called *United States v. Butler*, we started moving into this loosey-goosey idea about the Constitution being anything that a court says that it is, anything that a President says that it is, and anything that the Congress says that it is. And we have seen just recently where Congress passed the McCain-Feingold law. President Bush said, we will let the Supreme Court tell us whether it is constitutional or not. Well, the Supreme Court is not the final arbiter of what is constitutional. Neither is the President. Neither is Congress. We all have something to say about that, certainly. So do the States.

We the people are actually the final arbiter. We the people need to demand original intent of the Constitution by becoming knowledgeable about it. The final arbiter of what is constitutional or not is what is in the Constitution and what our Founding Fathers said about it, not what some Supreme Court ruling has said about it, because most Supreme Court justices have no clue what the original intent is and don't care. They just don't care I don't think.

United States v. Butler 70 years ago dismissed Madison's and Jefferson's narrow view of the Constitution, the original intent of the Constitution, and the Supreme Court held that the power to tax and spend is an independent power, and the general welfare clause gives Congress the power it might not derive elsewhere.

In *Helvering v. Davis*, the Supreme Court interpreted the clause even more expansively, conferring upon Congress a plenary power to impose taxes and to spend money for the general welfare subject almost entirely to its own discretion, our own discretion. Even more recently, the Court has included the power to indirectly coerce the States into adopting national standards by threatening to withhold Federal funds in *South Dakota v. Dole*.

Today, the Hamiltonian view predominates in the application of the general welfare clause, which has led to the expansion of the government to its \$4.5 trillion debt. We spend up here without considering the repercussions. ObamaCare is a great example. ObamaCare is a destroyer. It's going to destroy jobs. It's going to destroy budgets, people's budgets, companies'

budgets, cities' budgets, States' budgets, and the Federal budget. And it's going to destroy the quality of health care. And we have no constitutional authority, as a judge in Florida upheld.

James Madison a little later on in his life wrote a letter to James Robertson in 1831. In this letter he said, "With respect to the words 'general welfare,' I have always regarded them as qualified by the detail of powers connected with them." Connected with them. In other words, those things in article 1, section 8 and the rest of the Constitution as it was intended. "To take them in a literal and unlimited sense would be a metamorphosis of the Constitution into a character which there is a host of proofs was not contemplated by its creators." The creators of the Constitution are those folks who wrote it and those folks who ratified it.

This literal and unlimited interpretation is destroying America. It's destroying our economy. It's destroying everything that has been good in this Nation. We need to cut our outrageous spending for the well-being of our Nation and apply the general welfare clause as James Madison originally intended.

It's got to stop. Mr. Speaker, when I come to the floor to vote or when I write legislation, my staff and I write legislation, we have a four-way test that I apply to every vote I make and everything I do here. The first question is, "is it right?" By that question I mean, is it morally right? Does it follow the Judeo-Christian biblical principles that this Nation was founded upon? A lot of liberals across this country who are watching this will start blogging, and some of the liberal news media will say that I want to set up a theocracy here in America. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our Founding Fathers didn't want a theocracy either. Freedom of religion in the First Amendment is very dear to me. It's very dear to all of us. But we have freedom of religion in this country so that Jews, Buddhists, Muslims, Hindus, atheists, humanists, yes, even Christians, can make a personal choice of what their religion is and can celebrate and worship in their religion as long as it doesn't infringe upon somebody else's rights, because this Nation was founded upon biblical principles, the principles of freedom and liberty.

We have gotten away from it. I believe so much in these four questions that I have them printed up. If somebody comes to my office, they'll see them on the desk of all my legislative people in my offices. There's a copy on my desk. It's on the home page of both of my Web sites. I wish every Member of Congress would apply these four principles. Is it right? Is it constitutional in its original intent? Not this perverted idea of the Constitution that Presidents, Congresses, and the Federal court systems operate under. Is it necessary? And can we afford it? Four simple questions.

You see, we've gotten away from the original intent of the Constitution.

We've created this huge Federal Government that has taken our freedom away. It's killing our liberty and our Nation. And it's because of a perverted idea of the general welfare clause, as well as the commerce clause and the elastic clause, that the courts have allowed this to happen, the Presidents and the Congresses have allowed it to happen.

Mr. Speaker, we the people need to stand up and say no to taking our liberty away. Our Founding Fathers over and over again during the original period would rush to the floor with this book in hand, the holy Bible, and they would come to the floor, the House and the Senate, go to the floor of the Constitutional Convention and say, look what I found, what our Creator says. Benjamin Franklin proposed prayer in the Constitutional Convention. We pray today every day that Congress opens because of that prayer that Benjamin Franklin recommended.

In his speech, and I encourage you to go read it, he said, if our Creator notices when a bird falls to the ground, how can we build a nation without the help of Providence, of our God, our Creator?

You see, the Constitution was written on biblical principles. In fact, our Founding Fathers quoted the holy Bible more than any other source. David Barton has a ministry in Aledo, Texas, called WallBuilders. He has more original source documents than probably anybody. He wrote a book called "Original Intent: The Courts, the Constitution, and Religion." I highly recommend this, too. WallBuilders is a great resource of what the original intent is and what our Founding Fathers have said about the Constitution.

□ 2000

But, you see, back to something I mentioned earlier, God says in Hosea 4:6: My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge.

I have heard that beginning line preached a number of times, but very seldom do I hear a pastor go past that line. The whole verse says, and remember, this is a promise from a holy, righteous God that can do nothing else but fulfill the promise. His promise is this when he spoke through Hosea to the Israelites, he speaks to us today, our Creator says: My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge. Because you have rejected knowledge, I also will reject you from being priest for me. Because you have forgotten the law of your God, I also will forget your children.

And I get goose bumps and shivers every time I say that, literally, because it is a promise from a holy, righteous God that can do nothing else but fulfill that promise.

You see, the future of our Nation depends upon we the people, the most powerful political force in this Nation becoming knowledgeable, becoming knowledgeable about the Constitution,

getting a copy, looking at it online. In my district, people can come by my office and get a copy. We give them away by the hundreds out of my office here in Washington. Get a copy of the "Federalist Papers." Or if you don't want to read it in old-style English, get the "Federalist Papers" in modern language, this document.

Read what our Founding Fathers said about the Constitution. Read the anti-Federalist Papers. Those are the guys who did not want a strong Federal Government. But you will see in the "Federalist Papers," those who argued for a strong central government, we have enumerated, very limited and defined powers as James Madison states, Thomas Jefferson states.

Former U.S. Senator Everett Dirksen once said when he feels the heat, he sees the light. Members of Congress in the House and the Senate, need to see the light by feeling the heat of we the people.

You see, in Psalms 11, God asked the question: If the foundations be destroyed, what are the righteous to do?

God has given us free will. He has given us freedom. He has given us liberty, unlike any society ever in history has seen, ever experienced; but we are losing it. And the only way we are going to put it back on the right course is for people to become knowledgeable about the foundational principles so that we can put this country back on a solid foundation so it is not built on shifting sand so that we can change the course of history.

The direction we are heading today is going to destroy everything that has been good about this country. It is going to destroy our liberty. We are not going to have the freedom that we have enjoyed, even in the past few decades, which is much less freedom than they experienced in this country 100 years ago.

Look at these questions. I think they are very reasonable. Is it right? Does it fit the Judeo-Christian principles the Nation was founded upon? Is it constitutional in its original intent, not this perverted idea that we are operating on today? Do we need it? And can we afford it? If we went to these questions, we wouldn't have \$14.5 trillion of debt. We wouldn't have all of the unfunded liabilities of the Federal Government which are tremendous. We wouldn't have the loss of liberty and freedoms that we see going on here today. We wouldn't have a lot of the debates that we have here in Congress.

We the people need to start holding every single Member of Congress, every President, every public official, local, State, as well as Federal, because they all take that same oath, to defend the Constitution. The vast, vast majority are violating that oath; and the only way that we the people are going to change things, the only way we are going to put this country back on the right course is for we the people to demand it.

So please contact your neighbors, your friends, get them to read the Constitution. Read the "Federalist Papers." Read what our Founding Fathers said about government. Understand how far we have gotten away from those original principles, how much we have lost our freedom, how much we have gotten away from liberty and how close we are to becoming a socialistic, communistic nation in this country. That is where we are headed.

The only way it is going to change is if the American people will stand up and demand something different, start throwing people out of office that violate their oath of office, and put people in office that are going to stand firm for freedom, for liberty.

I am going to stand firm for the Constitution as it was intended, and I am going to continue to fight for the Constitution as it was intended. There are precious few here in this body that will stand and even vote that way. The only way we are going to change it, the only way we are going to save America, is for we the people to stand up and demand it.

I believe we can; I believe we will. I believe we are at the beginning right now today of a new dawn in America, a dawn of liberty, a dawn of freedom, a dawn of limited government, a dawn of strong national defense and national security, a dawn where our children and grandchildren are going to grow up in an economically prosperous Nation where there are going to be jobs in the private sector, where people are going to be able to operate within their society without all of the constraints of government.

We have got to demand it. The future of this country depends upon it. Your children and your grandchildren depend upon it. Join in the fight.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1473, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. Con. Res. 35, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1473; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. Con. Res. 36, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1473

Mr. NUGENT (during the Special Order of Mr. BROUN of Georgia), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-60) on the resolution (H. Res. 218) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H.

Con. Res. 36) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1217, REPEALING PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND

Mr. NUGENT (during the Special Order of Mr. BROUN of Georgia), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-61) on the resolution (H. Res. 219) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1217) to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FISCAL CHOICES

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to be here on the floor of the House of Representatives talking to the American people about one of the most critical things that this body does, and that is to decide how much money we ask our citizens to contribute to the government and how that money is going to be spent.

I didn't come here intending to respond to the gentleman who spoke before me, but he cast in one respect the whole debate over our budget very well when we had Mr. BROUN's four-way test. The first thing that Mr. BROUN listed was: Is it right/moral? And I agree with him because when we debate the budget of the United States, when we debate how we are going to spend the taxpayers' money, the first question we should ask is: Is it right, and is it moral? The converse is if we don't spend something, is it wrong and is it immoral.

Today, I had the great honor of visiting Walter Reed Hospital. I got to speak with several of our extremely brave, courageous soldiers who have been injured in battle. And one young man who lost both legs, one just above the knee and one all of the way to his pelvis, and lost a little bit of finger on one hand was on what can only be described as bionic legs which he said are extremely good, the technology is extremely advanced; but they still don't help him walk. He talked to us for a long time about what he had been through, the progress he had made, and what he hoped to achieve with technology.

□ 2010

His parting comment to us was that this is the result of the Federal Government spending money on medical research. This is helping people not just in the military, not just in the

Armed Forces, but also in the private arena as well.

So I look at what the Republican budget has done, which we will consider later in the week; and it slashes money for medical research. I say let's apply Mr. BROUN's four-way test: Is it right? Is it moral? Also, does it make any sense to cut medical research when we have brave men and women who after making incredible sacrifices are reacquiring some of their lives because of the taxpayer money we have spent in funding critical research? It would be immoral—Don was his name—to deny Don his request that we continue to fund medical research that is going to help him regain his capabilities, his physical function, as well as to continue to fund the medical research that will help the thousands of young men and women who have sacrificed so much for us.

So as we enter this debate this week on the Republican budget proposal/the Democratic alternative budget proposal, we have choices to make. That's always what government is about. It's about choosing: How do we spend the taxpayer money that we ask our taxpayers to contribute to the general welfare of this country?

Last week, we sat in the Budget Committee and considered the Republican budget. I'm sure that my characterization of the Republican budget will be different than the Republicans' characterization of their budget. Yet I will say one thing, that we all agree that we have a fiscal challenge in front of us. We have enormous deficits. We can argue about how we got here, but I'm not going to spend time debating that tonight. We clearly have a challenge, and the future is even more challenging. So the question is:

As we approach this budget deficit, this future of deficits, a very, very large national debt, what is the best way to approach it?

Now, the Republican answer is that there is only one side of the ledger. Most homes, most businesses have two sides of the ledger. They have an income side, and they have an expenditure side. As far as the Republicans on the Budget Committee are concerned, we only have an expenditure side. You've heard the Speaker of the House say we only have a spending problem; we don't have a revenue problem. You've heard my senior Senator from Kentucky, the minority leader of the Senate, say we don't have a taxing problem, a revenue problem; we have a spending problem.

In fact, if you look at our situation right now, we're no different, in a lot of respects, from the average household or the average business. If we have a financial challenge, we do a couple of things. We ask, Okay, where can we cut costs? Then we ask, How can we generate more revenue? Those are the two options. As far as the Republicans are concerned, there is only one option. It is to cut expenditures. Unfortunately, my characterization is that they cut

the programs which help the most vulnerable people in our country.

On the other hand, what do they do on the revenue side? They say, Well, let's see. Millionaires and billionaires haven't done quite well enough over the last decade or so. Twenty years ago, they only earned 9 percent of all income in the country. Now they earn 35 percent of all income in the country. That's not quite good enough. Let's give them another tax break. The Bush tax cuts were okay, but they weren't quite large enough. So instead of cutting their rate from 39.6 to 35 percent, let's cut their maximum rate to 25 percent, and let's see what that does for the economy.

I think most of my Democratic colleagues would agree that, if we're going to approach this deficit and the national debt in a responsible way, we'll look at both sides of the ledger. We will ask people who have done extremely well and who have the capacity to give more to pay a little more, and we will make responsible cuts that are balanced across the sector.

There are so many ramifications to this debate, and we're going to be debating it all week, so I am proud to have with me today some members of the Budget Committee from the Democratic side to help me discuss this.

It is my great honor now to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative YARMUTH, and thank you for leading us in this discussion.

It is rather interesting to hear you, with your introductory comments, speak of the approach to one side of the ledger. What has been advertised out there, what has been messaged, is that what we have are these cuts that translate into savings: we're going to save at the expense of the middle class. We're going to cut programs for seniors, for veterans, for children, for working families, for small businesses. That will produce savings—this propensity for tens of billions of dollars' worth of cuts, for \$100 billion worth of cuts, and an insatiable thirst for cutting domestic programs that really provide the dignity factor for many families as well as provide for job creation and retention.

We saw what happened when we invested in job creation, which was to gain over 2 million private sector jobs in just over the last year. So we know that those investments oftentimes will lead to lucrative dividends. They will relate to programs that are required for our working families, for our middle class Americans across this great country. Also, they provide for an opportunity for job creation, which produces the sort of mix—that down payment, the priming of the pump, if you will—that makes it all happen.

So, Representative YARMUTH, you are correct in talking about this as a one-sided approach. Yet what troubles me is that there is this messaging effort under way that would try and convince

the American public that it's producing savings. But where do those savings go? There are trillions of dollars of cuts to the middle class in this Republican plan. Those trillions of dollars of cuts that they deem as savings are then that fuel that provides the resources to cut the trillions of dollars' worth of millionaire/billionaire tax cuts to provide for the continuation of services that contractors will provide, which have been deemed wasteful or at times fraudulent, with the Pentagon. They will continue to protect those investments. They will allow for additional relief for corporations.

So it's sliding dollars out of the pockets of the middle class and investing them, the spending that they do, as they accrue those savings. The new spending that they do is tax cut delivery for those in the upper echelon. To me, it sounds very much like the pre-recession situation under the Bush administration which led us to this deep and very painful and long-term recession. Their plan has been dubbed by themselves, by their own Members, as the Path to Prosperity. I would suggest that it's a road to ruin for the middle class and that it's a road to riches that paves the streets with golden opportunities for those who are the most comfortable in society, for those deemed on top of the perch.

This is a very interesting scenario that is being placed before this body, before all of Congress for that matter. We need to put it under the microscope, and we need to message to America what is happening. You take from the poor and the middle class. You slide it over to the most comfortable—to corporations and millionaires, billionaires, oil company handouts, mindless handouts. That's how they pay for those, by sliding that cash down that slippery slope and investing it in tax cuts, spending it on tax cuts for those, as you indicated, who just didn't get quite enough under the Bush tax cuts.

In a while, too, I want to go toward the Medicare situation. They want to end Medicare with this budget. I want to talk about that after we hear from some of our other colleagues.

This is an interesting scenario—a road to ruin, a road to riches. It's a complete separation, a dichotomy, of special needs out there, coming at the expense of middle class America. It's a raid on our middle class. It's paving the road to riches for the very fortunate, and it's creating the road to ruin for America's middle class.

□ 2020

Without a strong middle class, without enhancing the purchasing power of our middle class, we have a weakened America. That is easy enough to prove through history.

So thank you again, Representative YARMUTH, for bringing us together on a very important discussion here in the House of Representatives as we continue to fight for the middle class that

has been impacted severely and would take even more hits if this budget were allowed to pass through.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman. He mentioned the "road to ruin." It's also a road we've been down before.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Mr. YARMUTH. It is a road we've been down before.

Back under the Reagan administration, this whole magical economic theory of trickle-down economics was developed. And the idea was, you let people at the top make as much as they possibly can, do as well as they possibly can, and that will trickle down and help everybody else. The man who was largely responsible for that policy under the Reagan administration, David Stockman, who was his budget director, he said just last year, "I find it unconscionable that the Republican leadership, faced with a \$1.5 trillion deficit, could possibly believe that good public policy is to maintain tax cuts for the top 2 percent." That was last year when we were actually debating whether to return to the Clinton-era tax rates—the Clinton era, by the way, which resulted in one of the most impressive decades of job growth in this country.

Now they even want to double down on that. They not only don't want to go back to the Clinton era tax cuts; they want to cut it even further. And their theory is that by cutting the tax rate by 10 percent more on the wealthiest people in this country, that they will create more jobs. Where do they get this stuff? Well, the only source they have for that theory is the Heritage Foundation. Now the Heritage Foundation was also the group that said that if we cut taxes under the Bush administration, that we're going to have this enormous job growth and this enormous surplus. It didn't quite work out so well. But they're saying now—this is what I call the "Harry Potter budget." You wave your magic wand and you make anything sound like it's true—cut taxes further on the rich, slash spending to help the low- and moderate-income people in this country, and the economy will bloom. Well, I'm not buying it. I don't think most Americans will buy it. But again, it's a road we've been down before, so we have some evidence.

At this point, I'd like to introduce and yield time to a great new Member of Congress and also the Budget Committee, the gentlelady from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS of California. Thank you very much, Mr. YARMUTH, for your leadership in this effort.

You know, as a new member on the Budget Committee, we had an interesting week last week. We really just completed a week where we saw the far right of the Republican Party take their party off the ledge and way out of the mainstream. They've declared war on seniors, on the disabled, on the sick, on children, and on the underserved by

proposing to end Medicare and Medicaid as we know it. They've championed the budget, entitled the Path to Prosperity.

This is a plan that simultaneously ends Medicare while giving billions in tax breaks to Big Oil and the wealthiest Americans. Mr. TONKO called it the "path to ruin"; I thought about the "Ryan-to-ruin" plan.

It generously gives senior citizens a gift, and that gift is a voucher to purchase health care. The senior citizen then has to identify an insurance carrier that will take the voucher; and if the person is lucky, the voucher will cover all the cost. I do think that this would be rare. And I don't know what happens in this plan if after a couple of years or a couple of illnesses the insurance company decides to drop the person or raise the rates. You know, under the Affordable Care Act, of course, they couldn't do that, but if the Ryan plan does what he wants, he wants to repeal the Affordable Care Act, so all of that would come back into play. The person would have to pick up the rest of the cost under the Ryan plan.

Now, I believe that we are simply foolish and we are fooling ourselves if we think all seniors will be able to just write a check and pay the difference. That's what is said, they will just pay the difference, they will just have to absorb more cost. A more likely scenario is that seniors will simply not have medical coverage, and we will be sent back in time to when seniors did not have coverage because insurance companies didn't want to cover them. I often say to people that you can judge a society by how it treats its elderly and its children. The "path-to-ruin" plan hurts both populations.

What I wanted to do today was to share a story, but just talk for a moment a little bit about the Ryan plan. When it takes effect in 2022—that's only 11 years from now—the average senior would receive an \$8,000 voucher to buy insurance. What I wanted to share with you was the years that I spent working in the emergency room. I worked in Los Angeles County, USC—one of the largest emergency rooms in the United States. And the emergency room is so large, it is divided into different sections. One section that I spent a couple of years working in is called ambulatory care, but we used to call it the "walking wounded" because, frankly, the people that came to that section of the emergency room shouldn't have even been in an emergency room, but the reason why they were there was because they didn't have health insurance, they didn't have access to care. And what typically happens is that if you don't have access to care, by the time you eventually see someone, you are much sicker than you would have been.

So I remember a case where a diabetic patient, who was not 65 and, therefore, he couldn't access Medicare, he came into the walking wounded area or the ambulatory care area with a

sore on the heel of his foot. He told me in the history that he was a diabetic. But he had tried a series of home remedies and he finally came to the ER when his heel started turning purple. Well, as I interviewed the patient and I asked about his medical history, he told me that he had been diagnosed with diabetes years ago, but he couldn't afford his medication. So he was trying to watch his diet and do the best he could. Well, for those of you who don't know, a patient with a history of poorly controlled diabetes who presents to an emergency room is likely to have a series of complications. Well, this man ended up as an amputee because the sore on his heel—that he didn't realize—had developed into gangrene, and that's why his foot was turning colors.

So just thinking about the cost of this, the total cost of this visit was \$12,000 and his leg. That bill included a \$2,000 charge for his emergency room visit and lab tests, a \$6,000 charge for an amputation, and a daily charge of \$1,400 for aftercare. If this patient had had access to routine preventive care, he would still have his leg, and \$12,000 would be saved.

So why do I share this story with you? Well, we're fooling ourselves if we don't understand that turning Medicare into a voucher and leaving seniors to fend for themselves is simply denying adequate health care that in the end will cost us so much more in suffering and in hospital costs that will ultimately be borne by taxpayers.

Today in my office I met with representatives from several hospitals who were describing the challenges that they face now. So there is an area of Los Angeles County where 600,000 people live—and the last time I checked that was around the entire population of the State of Vermont, 600,000 people—where there is not one trauma center, there is not one emergency room because all of the four hospitals in that area have closed. Now that's today.

Under the Ryan plan, vouchers for seniors and vouchers for States—because that's the bottom line as to what a block grant is, it's a voucher; instead of a voucher for an individual, it's a voucher for a State. The hospitals they represent that all border this area—that has no trauma center in it and has no emergency room and has no hospital because they're all closed up—they would essentially have to absorb—and they have been absorbing—the population, these 600,000 people. So they were concerned, and they came into my office today concerned that they could potentially face closure now, given the situation.

If we were to adopt the Ryan plan—the "pathway to ruin," however you want to describe it—I think we would be setting the stage for hospital closures to continue, for more patients to come into the walking wounded area of emergency rooms, for there to be more amputations, for people to be sicker

and eventually come to the emergency room—which is so incredibly short-sighted because in the end it winds up costing taxpayers so much more money because these people are going to be cared for. So we are fooling ourselves if we think that seniors are just going to be able to meet what the voucher doesn't cover.

Thank you very much for your leadership in this.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentlelady for her contribution and for her work on the Budget Committee.

I know somewhere toward the end there the gentlelady mentioned jobs, and this is something that is kind of at the core of what we're trying to work toward.

□ 2030

We're trying to find a budget, develop a budget that will stimulate the economy, that will create jobs. And we know that under the Ryan budget, again, according to the Heritage Foundation, the way they get to some kind of fiscal sanity is they project that unemployment in the country will be reduced to 2.8 percent by 2016.

Now, I don't know any reputable economist in the country that thinks that's feasible, particularly when you're slashing a lot of government spending that does create jobs, particularly in the health care arena; but no one has been more vocal and more knowledgeable and more articulate about what it takes in this country to create jobs than Mr. GARAMENDI from California.

I welcome him to the discussion and yield to him now.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. YARMUTH.

For the members of the Budget Committee, you've had a steep and difficult job as the Republicans have attempted simply to ram down the throats of this Congress a really unacceptable budget, one that does destroy opportunities.

I would love to talk about Make It in America, and I will in a moment, but I was just listening to my colleague from California, and she raised the issue of the medical care here in the United States.

It was 1964 that the United States set out on a very, very important mission, and that was to provide health care to seniors. Prior to that time, and I know from my own county where I grew up in Calaveras County, if you became a senior, you were destined for a very, very rough road. There was literally no insurance available for you, and there was no opportunity for you to get yourself out of poverty unless you happened to be among the wealthy. It was a terrible situation.

So during the Lyndon Johnson period in 1964, they created a program called Medicare so that when you became 65, you had an opportunity to get a solid health care program available to you—a doctor program, a hospital program. You had to pay a little bit for the hospital program, but it was guaranteed

available to you. And every American 65 and over had that policy.

Here we are, 40-some years later, and what's taking place? Our Republican colleagues are determined to terminate, kill, stop, eliminate Medicare. They do it in a subtle way.

But I want everyone to know that this year if the Republican budget goes forward, this will be the tombstone for Medicare: "Medicare: 1965–2011. Created by Lyndon Baines Johnson, LBJ. Destroyed by the GOP."

How do they do it? They do it by saying everyone that is 55 years old today will never get Medicare. It's over. And for those that are on Medicare, their lives will move on and eventually they'll be gone also. And Medicare dies with this budget. This is a central part of the American promise to every senior, and the Republicans are determined to terminate Medicare and put a tombstone dated this year, 2011.

You'll get a voucher; but as my colleague from Los Angeles so eloquently said, that voucher will be worth very little when the time comes. And you'll be thrown to the insurance sharks.

I understand insurance. I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years, and I know what the health insurance companies want to do. They want to make sure that they insure somebody who will never get sick. Pre-existing conditions, raise the rates, change the benefits, increase the co-pays, end the deductibles, all of that. So the future population of seniors in just 10 years will be thrown to the wolves, and they'll be at the mercy of the health insurance companies.

We cannot let that happen. This is a fight for the very nature of America. This is a fight not only to protect seniors but to protect those who want to become seniors. I want to know what American out there today does not want to live long enough to get to Medicare.

They know that today because of the Democratic Congress they have an opportunity to get insurance with the Health Care Reform Act, but they know that the Republicans want to take that away, too. The very first piece of legislation that the new Republican Congress passed was the repeal of the Affordable Health Care Act. This is step two, to dismantle.

Now, I'm going to take another 30 seconds and then turn it back to my colleagues on the budget side.

But here's what we must do. We must get to the root cause of the underlying inflation in health care.

Terminating Medicare does not stop health care inflation. What could stop it are the kinds of reports and the kinds of suggestions that I made 5 years ago when I wrote this document called "Priced Out." Forty-three separate things that we can do—specifically for California, but it's applicable for America—43 separate things that we can do to bring down the costs of medical care.

It turns out that about a dozen of those were in the Affordable Health

Care Act, very specific things to rein in the cost of medical care.

Two examples. One: hospital infections. Not only deadly, but costly. Now every hospital in the United States is forced by the Affordable Health Care Act to pay attention to hospital infections. It's probable that one of our colleagues who was with us here in this House last year died as a result of a hospital infection just last week. This is serious stuff. It's in the Affordable Health Care Act. Hospitals would be penalized.

Secondly, electronic medical records so that the mistakes are eliminated.

Let me turn this back to you, Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. TONKO. You on the Budget Committee have served so well, so hard, fighting the initial battle to protect America's seniors and to protect this Nation's future. Thank you for the opportunity to join you.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and also want to segue from what he said because he talked about Medicare and the ability to save money in Medicare. One of the ironic things about this debate has been that last year when we were passing the Affordable Care Act and found \$550 billion over 10 years that we could save in Medicare and reinvest in new benefits, during the campaign that year, we were chastised for slashing Medicare. Yet those same Republicans, in developing their budget and saying how great they are at cost-cutting, are using the same savings that we found, the same savings of \$550 billion, that they ran millions and millions of dollars against Democratic candidates last year. And they're taking credit for that in their budget, which is interesting.

I know Mr. TONKO is chomping at the bit to talk about Medicare some more, so I'll yield to him at this point.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative YARMUTH and Representative GARAMENDI. Thank you both for your input.

Now, Representative BASS of California talked about the Medicare transformation that would really hurt people across this great country, and it seems as though you would expect everyone that serves here to be an avid fan of history, that we would want to be taught by the history that has built this great Nation.

We heard earlier from Representative YARMUTH about the repeats of the tax cuts that were recent history. We saw it during the second Bush Presidency. We saw it during the Reagan era where we did this trickle-down theory: if we reduce the burden at the top, it will trickle down and everyone will have jobs galore.

Well, you look at the history, and those two scenarios just did not work. They did not work. And as students of history, all of us as Representatives, we should absorb that lesson, and we should know that a repeat of that kind is only going to wreak damage on the American economy and, more impor-

tantly, on the American families, the middle class.

What did work, what lesson in history stands very strong and tall is that during the FDR Presidency when this country was hurting from one of the worst economic struggles it had to face, they came up with a program that invested in job creation, invested in the American worker, invested in American families.

We created infrastructure; we built across America the needs of this great Nation. And today, some of those institutional efforts are still serving our needs. They stand as a monument of government responding in a way that embraced compassion, that came forward with an intelligence that enabled us to grow out of those economically difficult times. And we were benefited by that sort of leadership.

□ 2040

What we need today is an investment in job creation. Think of it. As we enter into a global race on clean energy and innovation, other nations are bulking up and we are defunding with this budget. We are defunding R&D, research and development for science and tech jobs. How can we expect to win a race, a global race, when we're tying our hands behind our backs and are not allowing us to go forward?

But to Medicare, the history learned there, and Representative GARAMENDI pointed it out, pre-1965 people were being cherry-picked, they were being led along without appropriate health care coverage, without insurance because they were perhaps dealing with a preexisting condition, they were a complex case, they were ignored, they were totally just abandoned by an insurance opportunity. Because of that, our Nation, with compassion again, the history it wrote through those LBJ years was to establish a Medicare program.

Look what happens. This chart will tell us when we get rid of Medicare, when this Republican plan, if it had its way, ends Medicare, we are going to see this very impact coming upon our seniors. We will go back to the pre-1965 years. Look at this. This is the current Medicare program, where benefits for our seniors enable them to avoid oftentimes the out-of-pocket expenses.

It is forecasted by independent groups out there, not by partisan thinking here in the House, but independent bodies are suggesting that it will double in the early years in terms of what is expected of our seniors digging deeper into their pockets. And by the year 2030, it's forecasted triple what they are paying today. This is another way to provide savings for the sole purpose of investing those savings in millionaire, billionaire tax cuts, in oil company handouts, in corporation relief. This is the effort here. It is a reverse Robin Hood. It is going after the middle class, which is the strength of America.

Give that middle class its purchasing power. Give our middle class seniors

their Medicare program. Let them have dignity. Let there be a quality of life. Let there be the opportunity for work, for employment, and let the masses enjoy the benefits of those sorts of programs. That's what we're talking about here. History repeated. Bad history repeated. Good history ignored. And our seniors will suffer from this Medicare program. This end to the Medicare program will bring about suffering for them because of greed and because of the road to ruin that has been established by this so-called path to prosperity.

Representative YARMUTH, I believe that we need to do better than this. We should not fail our seniors, our disabled, and as Representative GARAMENDI said, future generations of seniors, an onslaught of baby boomers that will be impacted by all of this activity.

Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO. There are so many aspects of this that deserve to be discussed. One of the things that's kind of sad is that the Republicans, in talking about their plan to privatize Medicare, say, oh, this is just like the plan that Members of Congress have. Well, first of all, Members of Congress have the same plan as every other Federal employee, so it's not necessarily anything special that we have.

But the only thing that is somewhat similar about this is that you have some options in the private sector. We buy insurance from private vendors, and we have a certain allowance. And under the Ryan plan, the Republican budget, seniors, all those under 55 now, when they become seniors they would have a certain amount that they could spend—not just could spend, had to spend in the private sector because they won't be allowed to buy into any Medicare program or a public option. The difference is, as you pointed out in your graphic there, that Members of Congress and Federal employees pay about 28 percent of the premium. Under the Republican budget, seniors are going to pay 68 percent of their premium.

This is shifting the burden, the cost, and putting it on seniors who are on fixed incomes, who don't have the ability to pay. And what's going to happen to them? This is so unlike the Federal insurance program. It's frightening in its dishonesty.

But I want to talk about one thing quickly and then yield to Mr. GARAMENDI again, because we talked about taxes and tax rates. In the Budget Committee last week I offered an amendment to the Ryan budget that would have restored the Clinton era tax cut, highest tax rate of 39.6 percent on Americans making \$1 million a year or more. Now, that is a very small percentage of Americans. Very small percentage. Less than 1 percent of the Americans make over a million dollars a year.

I said let's just have them pay what they paid under the Clinton era. Not

one Republican voted for that. And their argument was, and I know they believe this because they keep saying it and have always said it, that if you raise the tax rate on the highest-income Americans that they're going to lose incentive, that they're not going to work as hard, that they're not going to make investments because you are eliminating their incentive.

Well, for those with a long memory, the highest marginal tax rate in this country's history back in the sixties was 91 percent—I am sorry, under the Eisenhower administration—was 91 percent. When my father built his company in the sixties and seventies, the highest marginal tax rate was 70 percent. When Ronald Reagan took office it was 50 percent. Now it's down to 35 percent, and they want to cut it even further.

Now, they had this belief, again, that if you raise rates you're going to destroy incentives. I built a company, both my brothers have built very successful companies, my father built a very successful company. Not one of us has ever said, oh, my gosh, because I can only keep 60 cents of that next dollar I make rather than 64 cents or 65 cents, I am just not going to make that dollar. Just doesn't make any sense for me to work harder. Business people don't think that way. That is not human nature.

I have one brother who is very successful. He is in the barbecue restaurant business. You have all heard me tell this story a hundred times. I am going to tell it again. I asked him, "What about this marginal tax rate thing?" And he said, "You know, if people can't afford barbecue it doesn't matter what my tax rate is." And that's really where we are as a country. That's where we've come as a country. Because we have let the middle class decline, because their buying power has declined not just in relative terms, in absolute terms over the last decade, while the wealthiest Americans, these people making \$1 million, \$1 billion and more have done extremely well.

Right now 1 percent of the American people make as much as the bottom 90 percent combined. We have the greatest disparity in income and wealth in this country that we have had in almost 100 years. Yet ask millionaires and billionaires to pay a little bit more—not a lot more. We are not saying go to 70 percent. We are saying go to 39 percent from 35 percent. Not one Republican vote.

We've seen in the past what's happened with tax rates. We have been talking a lot about history tonight. Under the Clinton administration, during the Clinton years, top tax rate of 39.6 percent, 20.8 million jobs created. After the Bush tax cuts, reducing that top rate to 35 percent, 653,000 jobs lost. That is not evidence for cutting the marginal tax rate on the highest-income Americans even further.

We have seen again right now the Bush tax cuts—this is the job loss

thing—the economy floundered after the Bush tax cuts went into effect. So again, all we're saying is if we're going to ask people to sacrifice as we try to get our fiscal house in order, we need to ask everybody. In particular, we need to ask the people who have done the best and who have earned the most and who have the most wealth.

Again, the person who has talked more about what it takes to create jobs in this economy is my colleague from California. I yield to him again.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. YARMUTH. This is what you were talking about here, a different way of saying the same thing that you discussed. This is over the period of time from 1979 to 2005. This is the income growth by each 20 percent of the population. So those people at the very bottom saw almost no income growth at all, 200 bucks. And as you go to the next 20 percent and the next 20 percent, you get up to the last 90 percent, they did okay. They made about \$745,000.

□ 2050

So that's the 90 to 99 percent of the population. Those are very, very wealthy people. They did okay.

But you go to the top 1 percent, the top 1 percent—excuse me, I am wrong. That's the top one-tenth of 1 percent, not even 1 percent. One-tenth of 1 percent. That population saw their wealth increase by nearly \$6 million each, and that's what you were talking about, a different way of displaying it.

What's happening in the United States is this enormous shift of wealth to the super wealthy, and our Republican colleagues want to reward them for their good success by reducing their tax rate. So much for shared sacrifice.

And as Mr. TONKO pointed out, the sacrifice is really the middle class, because the benefits that the middle class had, the future opportunity for Medicare, they are going to wind up paying more, getting less, as the Republicans terminate Medicare as we know it today.

The other part on taxes, and then I want to turn to one of my favorite subjects, and that is how did we get to this deficit, Republicans want to continue giving \$12 billion to \$15 billion of our tax money, this is money that you, I, the stenographer there, the people that work here, the men and women across America that are working, \$10 billion to \$12 billion of their tax money, and they want to hand it over to the oil companies.

Now, what in the world did the oil companies need a tax break for? They need a subsidy like, well, like they don't need it. Why? Because in the last decade, the oil companies, the big oil companies in the United States, have earned \$947 billion dollars in profits. That's just shy of \$1 trillion dollars in profits. And yet our Republicans demand that we give them another \$12 billion to \$15 billion a year.

Now, that's bad enough. But I just came across this fact. ExxonMobil was

the most profitable company in the world in 2008. In 2009, ExxonMobil made \$19 billion of profit. Well, good for them. And I am sure they paid their fair share of taxes, right? Wrong.

Their effective tax rate was zero. So since they didn't pay any taxes, we ought to give them another \$12 billion, to the oil industry. This is just plain wrong. This is not good economic policy.

One thing, and then I know you want me to talk about Make It in America, and I will in a few moments, but I get so concerned when people talk about the Democratic deficit. Hello? Not so, not a Democratic deficit; really, a Republican deficit.

That fellow over there, that's Ronald Reagan. President Ronald Reagan left at the end of his 8 years with a projected \$1.4 trillion deficit, followed by George H.W. Bush. At the end of the George H.W. Bush period the projected deficit going forward would be \$3.3 trillion. Thank you, George H.W. Bush. Between the two of you, you really ran up the deficit.

Then along came this fellow Democrat, Bill Clinton, put in policies voted by Republicans and Democrats, raised the tax rate to what you said, 39 percent for the super wealthy, and put in place PAYGO. That PAYGO required that any new spending had to be paid for with cuts or new taxes.

The result? Bill Clinton left office in 2001 with a projected \$5.6 trillion surplus.

Then along came George W. Bush, Jr. What did he do? First year in office, a tax cut. You were here weren't you, Mr. YARMUTH?

Mr. YARMUTH. I am sorry, no, I wasn't here. I didn't have the honor of voting against those.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Okay, so you weren't here. A tax cut year one, a tax cut year two, a war, two wars, Afghanistan and Iraq followed by a Medicare drug program that wasn't paid for and the deregulation of Wall Street. The result: He left office with an \$11.5 trillion projected deficit going forward. This is where we are.

The day Obama came into office, President Obama came into office with a \$1.3 trillion deficit the day he took office, and we worked ourselves out of it. Thank goodness the two of you were here to vote for those pieces of legislation. We are working ourselves out of it. That chart that you showed a moment ago shows the growth of the economy.

We need to understand that we are not going to get out of this deficit with the kinds of cuts that are being discussed by our Republicans. It's going to take a balanced approach.

President Obama has set out a balanced approach. He said no growth, no growth in the discretionary Federal budget. He will probably, tomorrow, talk about how to hold down medical costs, and I gave you some examples a moment ago. Those are the big drivers, and the military.

You want to deal with this deficit? End the war in Afghanistan and bring home \$120 billion a year. We can do this. Tax policy? Let's let the wealthy pay their share, let the oil companies pay their share.

Hold the expenditures steady and reduce it, as has been proposed, and do it in a way that creates economic growth. We can do this. I know you gentlemen on the Budget Committee fought hard for that kind of policy. The Republicans refuse.

In fact, their proposal, it's 30 years before you eliminate the deficit. We can't have that.

I will talk about Make It in America before we are finished here, but I am going to turn it back to you Mr. YARMUTH. But I think it's really important for the American public to understand where the deficit came from and how it can be solved over the long run without harming seniors, without taking away Medicare and by making the critical investments that you have talked about, Mr. TONKO, education, research, Make It in America, those kinds of things.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman. Just to elaborate a little bit on the issue of what creates jobs and what kills jobs, under H.R. 1, which was the Republican continuing resolution that was passed earlier this year—we are still fighting that battle, and we will be fighting it this week—but these are the principles that were reflected in here that are now are reflected in the Ryan budget.

And this is what various economists said would happen if H.R. 1 would go into effect, and this was just for 6 months of the year. Call it "Slashonomics." Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke—again this is 6 months, 200,000 jobs lost; Mark Zandi, who was JOHN MCCAIN's economic adviser during his Presidential campaign, 700,000 jobs lost; the Economic Policy Institute, 800,000 jobs lost; and the Center for American Progress, just shy of a million jobs lost. That's over 6 months.

Now as we saw on the chart before, contrast that with what's happened just under the Obama administration and the policies that we adopted when we were in the majority. Job growth now, over 200,000 private sector jobs last month created. We are on the right track.

And to slash spending the way that the Republicans have proposed, without an accompanying increase in revenue, is going to do further damage to what is now a solid recovery that's under way.

I just have to laugh a little bit again about the projections of the Ryan Republican budget, because they have made a big deal out of saying this is \$6 trillion better than the Obama budget over the next 10 years.

Well, the way they get to that, once again we said it earlier, is to project that unemployment will come down to 2.8 percent in 5 years, which no economist says it would be. But more impor-

tantly, they say, that we will increase revenues by almost double from \$2.2 trillion dollars last year to \$4.3 trillion 10 years from now.

Now, to put that into perspective, the 10 years before that we went from \$1.9 trillion in revenue to \$2.2 trillion in revenue. Now, we have been up higher, we have been up around \$2.5 trillion. That's the highest we have been.

□ 2100

Now they're saying we're going to cut taxes on corporations from 35 to 25 percent, we're going to cut taxes on the wealthiest Americans from 35 to 25 percent, and yet we're going to experience unprecedented growth in revenue even though we are cutting taxes. Again they can't get anybody to verify this except the Heritage Foundation, which has not been particularly accurate in the past. This is the Harry Potter budget. This is their theology: Cut taxes, the economy explodes.

We've been down that road before, Mr. TONKO. I would like to yield to you to talk about the Road to Ruin that we are about to be asked to drive.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative YARMUTH. I believe we don't have much time left in this hour of discussion. But let me just indicate that this entire House experienced an election last November. Everyone was up for election. And I would dare say in talking to many, many colleagues about the message that resonated back at home it was about jobs, jobs, jobs. It was about the economy. That was the driving dynamic I believe at the voting booth.

And look at our track record here for the first 3½ months for the 112th session of Congress. Not one bit of legislation that would produce jobs was brought to the floor. However, that budget, as you just pointed out in your Slashonomics bar graph, might take as many as 975,000 jobs off the picture for American workers, after we've spent just over a year creating over 2 million private sector jobs. Now that's in contrast with 8.2 million lost under the Bush recession. So we've got a long way to go.

But why would you reverse progress with a budget that, with Slashonomics, reduces nearly—well, we'll even take some of the lower estimates of 400,000; why would you want to do that at a time when we are recovering from that very difficult economic time?

I think it's so important for us to inform the constituents out there and tell middle class America this is a tipping point in our history. This is whether we fix an economy, create a situation where we come forth and produce products not yet on the commercial scene. A leading nation can do that when it embraces its intellectual capacity. You build products not yet discovered and engineered. That is making it in America. That's what we can do if we invest in our workforce and invest in our education. But we're

denying all those investments with this budget, just like this Medicare chart which, as you indicate, will have seniors receiving 32 cents on every health care dollar they require, and they're going to have to fend for the rest.

So we're asking middle class America to pay more, everything but 32 cents on the dollar for their health care as seniors qualifying for Medicare, and then we're going to take and destroy this economy and snuff out the dreams and the opportunities for America's middle class. We were told in November, America start growing the economy, stop draining and reducing the middle class. You are reducing, you're snuffing out that middle class. And that was the message.

And also on taxes I believe America is waking up to what has happened here with some of these scenarios. They understand it is not about who's cutting taxes but whose taxes are you cutting? Whose taxes will you cut? There's a big difference. And when you do this mindless handout to profit-rich oil companies, historically profit rich, sitting on about a trillion dollars worth of profit, and mindlessly for nearly a century we have handed out these benefits to oil companies. It's wrong. We can do better. This plan is the Road to Ruin.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman. We have a couple minutes left. I would just like to yield to my friend, Mr. GARAMENDI, for some closing comments about making it in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If America is going to make it, we have to make it in America. Once again, manufacturing matters. The problem with the Republican budget is it hollows out, continues the hollowing out of American industry by denying the research, reducing research and reducing job training and continuing the kind of tax policies that actually give corporations tax breaks when they send jobs offshore. We want to reverse that. We're putting together the Make it in America agenda, a real jobs agenda for the middle class.

Mr. YARMUTH, thank you so very, very much for bringing this to our attention and carrying this discussion tonight.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman and thanks for his participation. I just want to say in closing that budget battles are more about dollars, and I think all of us on both sides of the aisle believe that and live by that, or want to live by that. Budgets are about values. Budgets are about what we care for in America. And one of the things that I think we have always stood for in America is the idea that anyone has the opportunity to reach his or her full potential, and to be wealthy, but certainly to be happy and to be healthy.

What the Republican budget does is destroy much of that hope, destroy much of that dream, slashing education, slashing research and develop-

ment, and slashing investment in infrastructure while at the same time giving more and more tax breaks to wealthy individuals, millionaires, billionaires, oil companies, Wall Street hedge fund managers, and the people who have already had more than their share of the American blessing.

So as we proceed in this debate this week on the budget and throughout these next few months in the Congress, I want to make it very clear that our values are at stake, not just our dollars, but our values, and whether you call it the Road to Ruin, or as I look to call it, the Pay Back for the Prosperous, the Republican budget does not reflect our values. It does not lead to a brighter future for the vast majority of Americans, and it should be rejected. We should move forward with a budget that invests in our dearest, dearest asset, and that is the American people.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STUTZMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 27 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, any American that may be watching tonight is probably bewildered by all of the discussion of budgets and continuing resolutions and perhaps debt ceilings, as well as the appropriations process. In order to understand where we are currently, it is important to look back at where we were. And what I would like to do tonight is share a little bit of information about what the government spends, where the revenue comes from, and then how we got into this current situation we are in. Right now, we have a \$1.6 trillion deficit. We have \$14 trillion of debt. That means every man, woman, and child in America, if we were to pay it off right now, owes \$45,000. And the trajectory of spending is simply unsustainable. We are borrowing about 40 cents on every dollar that we spend. America cannot continue to do this. We all know that. We all know we are going to have to act with bold resolve to get the fiscal house in order.

But let's look at this chart, Mr. Speaker, for a moment. It shows the President's 2011 budget proposal. There was no budget in 2011, and this is part of the confusion. There was no finishing of the appropriations process. Right now we are trying to finish the appropriations process, cleaning up the mess from last year by passing what is called a CR, continuing resolution, that will fund the government for the rest of the year. But a lot of the numbers are based off a somewhat mythical budget, and it's just easier to talk about, I think, the President's 2011 budget to get a snapshot currently of where we are in terms of the fiscal situation.

Here is what the government spends and the categories in which it spends.

If you look at the blue side of that chart there, that is what we in Washington call discretionary spending. And defense is about 20 percent of the discretionary spending here in the United States. The other section of the blue slice of the pie there is what we call non-defense discretionary spending. That's about 14 percent of the overall budget. A lot of the negotiations about reducing the budget at this time have centered around that particular slice of the pie.

The other aspects of government that we fund, Social Security, this maroon slice right here, is about 20 percent of the budget. Medicare is about 13 percent, Medicaid about 8 percent, and then another mandatory spending category, these are programs that are on auto pilot, whatever the demand is, we spend, we write the check. And it has grown very rapidly since the year 2008 when it was 11 percent. It is now 17 percent of the budget. This includes unemployment, welfare, supplemental security income for the disabled, jobs programs, as well as some of the TARP money, the bailout money for banks and Wall Street. That's the lion's share of the budget here, 57 percent. It is called mandatory spending, discretionary, 36 percent spending, that's defense and non-defense discretionary, and then we add interest on the debt, that yellow section right there, and that's about 7 percent. So that's basically what the government spends right here. And that totaled about \$3.8 trillion in last year's projected budget for this year.

Now, where did the revenues for the government come from?

□ 2110

It is important to remember this number, \$2.567 trillion; \$3.8 trillion expenditures; \$2.567 trillion in revenues. In this blue area over here, this is the largest area where we obtain income for the government, and that is the individual income tax. That is about 44 percent of overall revenues to the government. About half of Americans are paying income tax. This orange area is what we call payroll taxes. That is about 36 percent. Anybody who is working is going to pay a payroll tax. Corporate income tax, this yellowish area here, is about 12 percent. And then the rest of the budget receipts come from estate and excise taxes, as well as customs and other receipts.

But the important number to remember is \$2.567 trillion as opposed to \$3.8 trillion in spending. This shows you the imbalance. Again, remember, this was last year's projections. We were projecting \$1.267 trillion based upon this spending level and this amount of receipts. But in reality we have just found out that the new deficit estimate is actually about \$1.6 trillion. It is skyrocketing. It is simply unsustainable.

Now, let's look at the next chart, which is the budget proposed for this year by the President; and it has spending a little less, down from about

3.8 to 3.7, revenues up slightly from about 2.5 to 2.6, and this is due to some spending reductions as well as tax increases, which gives you a different balance here. You have a deficit projection of \$1.1 trillion based upon these numbers.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, I said this is somewhat bewildering given that we don't have a 2011 budget or finished appropriations bill for this year, and we are now beginning to consider a 2012 budget in the midst of potentially, as well, bumping up against a debt ceiling vote shortly.

Again, it is important to understand how we got here with such enormous deficits. If we look back in time, the last 20 years, look at spending. In 1990, it was \$1.25 trillion. In 2000, it was \$1.79 trillion. This year, \$3.8 trillion. The size of the Federal Government has basically doubled in the last decade. If you look at deficits as well, in 1990 we were talking about \$200 billion deficits. I was a much younger person then, but I remember how shocking that figure was back then and how there were demands that something be done. In the year 2000, because of extraordinary productivity gains in the late nineties, we had a \$200 billion surplus to the Federal Government. But this year, a \$1.6 trillion deficit. It is off the charts. Our debt in 1990 was about \$3 trillion. In the year 2000 it was close to \$6 trillion. Again, this year it will be \$14 trillion, and it is set to continue to skyrocket in the coming years.

The debt per person, per capita, \$13,000; \$12,900. In 2000, it was \$20,000. Now it has doubled to about \$45,000.

Mr. Speaker, I used to be on the Lincoln City Council in Lincoln, Nebraska. One of the responsibilities we had every year with our \$90 million budget was that it had to balance. There was never enough money to have the ideal number of police officers that we wanted or the exact number of firefighting apparatus that we would have preferred or the street or road or park maintenance that we would have liked, but you had to make a decision. You had to make a decision about what were appropriate tax rates and reasonable public services and balance those. And by law, we also had to set a little aside.

Yet Washington doesn't have to do that. It can get away with enormous deficit spending because we have a big credit card. And for a long time, it really didn't matter.

At a negotiating table up here, there are really three factors: spending, benefits, and debt. And guess which one loses every time, Mr. Speaker? Debt. Just pile on the debt, because the consequences can be hidden from the American people. But the numbers now have gotten to be so shocking and the reality is coming home that I believe, I know, most Nebraskans and most Americans want this Congress to act with bold resolve to tighten the belt, to ask for some shared sacrifice to get this fiscal house in order, because this level of spending is unsustainable.

A business can't do it. A family can't do it. A government should not be able to do it, because the consequences are really threefold; and they are no longer hidden. They are out in the open.

This amount of debt and deficits creates basically three problems: one, it pushes off the obligation for the way in which we are currently living and spending onto children and grandchildren in terms of future taxes on them. It is unjust.

The second problem is that it creates the potential for inflation. There is already an argument going on that the Federal Reserve policies are monetizing our debt, basically printing money; and now you are seeing commodity inflation with price hikes in gasoline and other commodities. The effects are very real.

The third problem is we are transferring ownership of America to foreign countries. China officially owns about a trillion dollars of this debt; but if you look at the numbers more closely, it could be as high as \$2 trillion. That means a transfer of the assets of this country overseas. So this level of debt, I believe, and I think most Americans know, is actually undermining the ability of the economy to turn around and create jobs. Now it is not only creating economic volatility and economic problems; it creates national security problems as we transfer more and more of this debt overseas and sell the assets of the country to others.

So it is simply unsustainable, Mr. Speaker, and we have to act with bold resolve. We are staring at white water rapids. The choice is we can either build a boat, put on life jackets and try to navigate those rapids as best we can, or we will be swept away by them. We are going to have to go through them; it is just how we do it.

That is what all the debates are this week, and will be in the coming weeks as to how do we set up the right framework of responsible budgets, responsible appropriations, so that we can reset our economic course, get our fiscal house in order, begin to give the economy some stability, create jobs and, in turn, revenues come into the Treasury. So that is the course before us.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to talk about another topic tonight as well, and it is very important that even in the midst of these budget negotiations that are going on, we not overlook the fact that the State Department recently released its annual report on human rights around the world. This report spanning 194 countries calls out those governments that routinely and brazenly violate their stated commitments to universal human rights.

I think it is important that we draw back the veil on cruelty that is often perpetuated by the world's most powerful against the world's most vulnerable and appropriately elevate the issue in our national dialogue, as well as our international diplomatic efforts. The report spans 194 countries; and to the

extent it is available, the report details the prevailing human rights conditions over the past year.

First, let me start with some good news. Of the countries surveyed, Colombia, Guinea, and Indonesia stand out for notable human rights improvements, the first democratically elected President since independence in 1958, and consistent improvements across a range of indicators, respectively, in those countries.

Countries where human rights conditions very sadly prompt serious concerns over the past year include Cote d'Ivoire, the Ivory Coast, where vicious fighting in recent weeks pursuant to a contested election has claimed numerous lives; in addition, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where rape is used as a political weapon; Iran, which still supports the stoning of women; Russia, which routinely and often violently suppresses the freedom of the press; and China, which has a history of forced abortion and sterilization to its demographic detriment.

Other countries highlighted in particular this year: Nigeria, Sudan, Zimbabwe, Burma, Cambodia, North Korea, Vietnam, Belarus, Ukraine, Bahrain, Iran, Libya, Syria, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Cuba, Nicaragua and Venezuela, where rapid deterioration of civil rights and evidence of tightening dictatorial rule are particularly tragic.

The fundamental message that this report conveys to the world is that responsible governance rests upon two pillars. The first is a respect for human rights, and the second is a respect and responsibility for the rule of law. No society can flourish and prosper without these important transcendent principles as they are exercised in the form of religious liberty, freedom of speech, the right of assembly and peaceful protest, as well as fair and free commerce.

□ 2120

The human rights reports describe abuses that shock the conscience and tear at the elaborate fabric of the community of nations in which we live. These include the ill treatment of dissidents, appalling prison conditions, extrajudicial killings, and, as I mentioned, forced abortion and sterilization policies that treat human beings like animals, violating their most intimate and fundamental human dignity. The reports present detailed accounts of systemic corruption, security forces run amok, acting with state-sanctioned impunity, kangaroo courts that condemn innocents without recourse, making a mockery of the rule of law. These dark trends are very often deeply entrenched, creating enabling environments that fuel violence—and even genocide in some countries—toward vulnerable persons and ethnic groups.

The reports address the barbaric scourge of human trafficking for sexual and other forms of ruthless exploitation, such as forced labor. The reports speak truth to perpetrators of

heinous crimes of violence against women and children, and they highlight the feckless enforcement of laws to protect civilians against torture and other forms of cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment. Taken together with related reports on human trafficking and freedom of religion, these particular reports on human rights provide keen insights into the state of our world in which we live today.

Mr. Speaker, even as we consider these sobering matters, let us also recognize with due humility that the struggle here in the United States for the right to life, the most basic of human rights, particularly for unborn persons as well as the terminally ill and elderly and those suffering from cognitive disabilities that render their deplorable marginalization as “vegetables” even in our most esteemed medical, political, and social circles, is a very deep problem that we must wrestle with here in our own country. Yet we have one basic advantage. This Nation has learned through bitter experience that self-determination and reasoned discourse are far more powerful engines of growth and prosperity than subjugation by the nature of a police state. Sadly, too many countries in the international community lag significantly in the development of this fundamental ideal, that of the notion of a people having a basic say, having a voice, in shaping the governments under which they live and the ability to shape their own futures according to transcendent and universal norms of justice.

Over the past year, as natural disasters summon us to compassion for people in Japan, New Zealand, Chile, China, Colombia, Haiti, Iceland, Indonesia, and Pakistan, as well as other nations ravaged by violent storms, including our own, we are witnessing another upheaval, a remarkable upheaval, in an important world region which calls for our focused attention. The Arab Spring movement has been driven by individuals joining their voices, motivated by a common thirst to realize their human potential and the desire to secure a decent operating space within civil society. This movement is emblematic of lessons learned throughout the centuries. History has shown us that rule by suppression in its various forms and degrees is very difficult to sustain over the long term, particularly now with the opportunity we have for the sharing of ideals and principles. State-sanctioned force and coercion against the innocent, in various manifestations, has tended to backfire against their enforcers and enablers sooner or later.

The human rights reports challenge today's leaders to shake off the archaic and destructive patterns of abuse that foster so much needless human misery, sapping the productivity and vitality of countless millions, perhaps hundreds of millions, Mr. Speaker, in our world today. However, as useful as these re-

ports are, they do not tell the full story. As the difficult work of societal transformation begins for newly enfranchised citizens in the key countries of Egypt and Tunisia, for instance, many people throughout the world, in places like China and North Korea and Iran, continue to suffer silently with no one to tell their story, with no one to document their plight, far from the gaze of cameras that convey real-time images for all the world to see.

But these reports hold an important message for us as well. In this interdependent world of shared technology, shared communication, travel, and commerce, we have failed to recognize a shared vision of justice. The United States is constantly called upon by the nations of the world to stand up against the forces of brutality. We are constantly called upon to engage in all matters of complexity that are causing human misery, which are really due to three factors: the generosity of the American taxpayer; the philosophical ideals that govern us and which do not allow us to sit by idly when we see human misery and suffering; and the fact that we are an exceptional and unique superpower. Though other nations are growing in economic strength, given our philosophical ideals and our historic role as that exceptional superpower, it is a bit ironic that the world still turns to us, even though many other economies are growing very, very rapidly, when people cry out for justice.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is time to elevate at the table of dialogue and negotiation basic norms of human dignity and the governmental structures which nurture and protect that dignity. Let those norms sit alongside the negotiations over trade, commerce, and security, for this is ultimately more valuable than any economic gain, which is transient and passing. I believe it is time to focus on the permanent things, those which last, which will be the legacy we will leave to the future of our country and to the future of the world.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of family medical reasons.

Mr. REICHERT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and April 13 on account of family reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 13, 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:

1218. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Horses From Contagious Equine Metritis-Affected Countries [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0112] (RIN: 0579-AD31) received March 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1219. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Benjamin R. Mixon, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1220. A letter from the Legan Information Assistant, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibited Service at Savings and Loan Holding Companies; Reinstitution of Expiration Date of Temporary Exemption [Docket No.: OTS-2010-0036] (RIN: 1550-AC14) received March 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1221. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the first progress report of the implementation of Section 3507 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1222. A letter from the Office of Exemption Determinations, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Prohibited Transaction Exemption (PTE) 96-23 for Plan Asset Transactions Determined by In-House Asset Managers [Application Number D-11221] (ZRIN: 1210-ZA09) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1223. A letter from the Policy Advisor/Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules to Facilitate Use of Spread Spectrum Communications Technologies [WT Docket No.: 10-62] received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1224. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Control of Electrosag Weld Properties [Regulatory Guide 1.34] (Revision 1) March 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1225. A letter from the Chairman, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Semiannual Report from the Office of the Inspector General and the Director's Semiannual Report on Management Decisions and Final Actions on Office of Inspector General Audit Recommendations, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1226. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, Department of Energy, transmitting the Commission's annual report for Fiscal Year 2010 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1227. A letter from the Director, Office of EEO and Diversity, Patent and Trademark Office, transmitting the Office's annual report for fiscal year 2010, in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1228. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 101126522-0460-02] (RIN: 0648-XA294) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1229. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan [Docket No.: 1101040009-1186-02] (RIN: 0648-BA25) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1230. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish (MSB) Fishery; Revision of 2011 Butterfish Specifications [Docket No.: 110218149-1182-01] (RIN: 0648-BA86) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1231. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Hawaii Bottomfish and Seamount Groundfish Fisheries; Modification of Fishery Closures [Docket No.: 101210611-1185-02] (RIN: 0648-BA58) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1232. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report on the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Science Improvement Grants Program, managed by the Office of Justice Programs' National Institute of Justice, pursuant to Public Law 90-351, section 2806(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1233. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Seaway Regulations and Rules: Periodic Update, Various Categories [Docket No.: SLSDC-2011-0002] (RIN: 2135-AA29) received March 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1234. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Feathering Propeller Systems for Light-Sport Aircraft Powered Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0812; Amdt. No. 1-66] (RIN: 2120-AJ81) received March 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1235. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30770; Amdt. No. 3414] received March 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1236. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the

Department's 2011 annual report on recommendations made by the Intelligent Transportation Systems Program Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1237. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Prohibited Area P-56; District of Columbia [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0077; Airspace Docket No. 10-AWA-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1238. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30769; Amt. No. 492] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1239. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France (Eurocopter) Model EC130 B4 Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0212; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-055-AD; Amendment 39-16632; AD 2011-06-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1240. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211-Trent 768, 772, and 772B Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0960; Directorate Identifier 98-ANE-90-AD; Amendment 39-16620; AD 98-09-27R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1241. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Board of Veterans' Appeals: Remand or Referral for Further Action; Notification of Evidence Secured by the Board and Opportunity for Response (RIN: 2900-AN34) received March 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1242. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on quality improvements and saving in a Medicare Gainssharing Demonstration program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1243. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Credit for Carbon Dioxide Sequestration; Modification of Notice 2009-83 [Notice 2011-35] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1244. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2011-10) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1245. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance for Phase II of the Qualifying Advanced Coal Program under Section 48A and the Qualifying Gasification Program under Section 48A [Notice 2011-24] received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1246. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue

Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Taxation of fringe benefits (Rev. Rul. 2011-8) received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1247. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Changes to the Medicare Advantage and the Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit Programs for Contract Year 2010 and Other Changes [CMS-4144-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ00) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and 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. MICA: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. S. 307. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the "W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse" (Rept. 112-59). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 218. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473 (Rept. 112-60).

Ms. FOX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 219. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1217) to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund (Rept. 112-61). 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. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 1474. A bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 1475. A bill to reform and modernize domestic refugee resettlement programs, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 1476. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude certain advanced diagnostic imaging services from the in-office ancillary services exception to the prohibition on physician self-referral; 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. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CLAY, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1477. A bill to require certain mortgages to evaluate loans for modifications, to establish a grant program for State and local government mediation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HELLER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 1480. A bill to delay enforcement and establishment of certain water quality standards within the Great Bay Estuary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado):

H.R. 1481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the purchase of residential property by providing an exclusion from tax on certain gains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 1482. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants for recruiting, training, and retaining individuals, with a preference for individuals from underrepresented groups, as teachers at public elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 1483. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve the safety of drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 1484. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the appeals process of the Department of Veterans Affairs and to establish a commission to study judicial review of the determination of veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 1485. A bill to address the public health and safety threat presented by the risk of catastrophic wildfire on Federal forestlands by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest restoration, forest health, and watershed restoration; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1486. A bill to direct the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to revise the Federal regulations applicable to the declaration of the trans fat content of a food on the label and in the labeling of the food when such content is less than 0.5 gram; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1487. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ban the use of the arsenic compound known as roxarsone as a food additive; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1488. A bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to prohibit discrimination on account of sexual orientation or gender identity when extending credit; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1489. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act and revive the separation between commercial banking and the securities business, in the manner provided in the Banking Act of 1933, the so-called "Glass-Steagall Act", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. HEINRICH):

H.R. 1490. A bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to improve compensation for workers involved in uranium mining, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 1491. A bill to protect public health and safety should the testing of nuclear weapons by the United States be resumed; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia):

H.R. 1492. A bill to provide for mandatory training for Federal Government supervisors and the assessment of management competencies; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1493. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit discrimination in the payment of wages on account of sex, race, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1494. A bill making appropriations to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and death gratuities on behalf of deceased members and other eligible persons notwithstanding a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1495. A bill to provide for an audit of all gold owned by the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1496. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to reform the manner in which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is audited by the Comptroller General of the United States and the manner in which such audits are reported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 1497. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to take whatever steps may be necessary to exhume and transfer the remains of certain deceased members of the Armed Forces buried in Tripoli, Libya, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. ROONEY (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1498. A bill to require the lender or servicer of a home mortgage, upon a request by the homeowner for a short sale, to make a prompt decision whether to allow the sale; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H.R. 1499. A bill to create clean energy jobs and set efficiency standards for small-duct high-velocity air conditioning and heat pump systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 1500. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a boundary study of the lands and waters in the greater Salem Sound and the city of Salem to determine the suitability and feasibility for inclusion within the boundary of the Salem Maritime National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALSH of Illinois (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WEST, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LONG, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 1501. A bill to withhold United States contributions to the United Nations until the United Nations formally retracts the final report of the "United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 1502. A bill to establish the Counterterrorism Competitive Analysis Council; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 1503. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain hydrogenated polymers of norbornene derivatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2011 and fiscal years 2013 through 2021; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. ADERHOLT (for himself and Mr. RAHALL):

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 400th anniversary of the publication of the King James Version of the Bible; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Res. 220. A resolution expressing support for designation of the first Saturday in October as "National Animal Rescue Day" to create awareness, educate humans of the importance of adoption, and create a humane environment for any pet, including the importance of spaying and neutering of animals, and the encouragement of animal adoptions throughout the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H. Res. 221. A resolution congratulating the Government and people of the Republic of Turkey as they celebrate Republic Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H. Res. 222. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism; 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. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—this bill regulates Commerce among the several states.

Amendment V—the bill assures that citizens' liberty and property (their businesses and livelihood) are not deprived, that the government does not take property (market share, potential for profit and livelihood) without just compensation.

Amendment X—Nothing in the Constitution authorizes the Federal government to do anything other than those things enumerated (coin money, enter into treaties, conduct a Census—which are inherently governmental). Thus, under Amendment X, the right to carry out commercial activities is reserved to the people. Note that the Constitution authorizes the Post Office. The bill exempts the Postal Service.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 1475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 1476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, §8, cl. 1 of the United States Constitution, which states "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;" and

Art. 1 §8, cl. 3 "[The Congress shall have Power] [t]o regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)."

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 1479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 ("The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises"), and the 16th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 1480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

To regulate Commerce with foreign nations and among the several states and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 1483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 1484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 1485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Clause 8, Section 3.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Clause 8, Section 3.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Clause 8, Section 3.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 1490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 1491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3, 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 1492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAUL:
H.R. 1495.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution:
"To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures"

By Mr. PAUL:
H.R. 1496.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution:
"To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;
To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States."

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:
H.R. 1497.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1
Section 8
Clause 13:
To provide and maintain a Navy
By Mr. ROONEY:
H.R. 1498.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

By Mr. SHIMKUS:
H.R. 1499.
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 as stated in Article I, Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. TIERNEY:
H.R. 1500.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALSH of Illinois:
H.R. 1501.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. WOLF:
H.R. 1502.
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 "provide for the common Defence," as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YARMUTH:
H.R. 1503.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 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. RIBBLE.
H.R. 10: Mr. HECK and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 23: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 49: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 58: Mr. OLSON, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 114: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 140: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 178: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.R. 181: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 198: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 240: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 262: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 365: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 375: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 432: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 452: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 459: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 466: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 487: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 509: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 520: Mr. BERMAN and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 607: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 674: Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 708: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 709: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 713: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 719: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 724: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 771: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FLORES, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 788: Mr. HOLT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 798: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 812: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 825: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 831: Mr. PLATTS, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 835: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 860: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 874: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 879: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 881: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 891: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 901: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 909: Mr. AUSTRIA.
H.R. 912: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 932: Ms. BUEKLE.
H.R. 998: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1001: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1028: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1041: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. COLE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1081: Mr. WATT and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1086: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1089: Mr. FILNER and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1093: Mr. FORBES, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 1113: Ms. BASS of California.
H.R. 1124: Mr. FARR, Mr. STARK, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1134: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1151: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1159: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1161: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. Gonzalez.
H.R. 1163: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1167: Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 1169: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1176: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1182: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1195: Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 1206: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. LONG, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1208: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1219: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1234: Mr. BACA and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1250: Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1259: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1264: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1270: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. MACK.
H.R. 1294: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1297: Mr. CRITZ, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1323: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 1330: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1334: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1340: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 1354: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1361: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1366: Mr. CRITZ and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 1380: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BONNER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. KELLY.
H.R. 1381: Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1383: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1404: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1409: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 1412: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1419: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 1425: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1445: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 1448: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. ELLISON.
H. J. Res. 5: Mr. WITTMAN.
H. J. Res. 45: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. OLSON.
H. Res. 59: Mr. GRIMM.
H. Res. 60: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 77: Mr. HERGER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H. Res. 98: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H. Res. 111: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H. Res. 137: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 161: Mr. GRIMM.
H. Res. 163: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 177: Mr. LANCE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H. Res. 208: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BROOKS.
H. Res. 209: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BROOKS.
H. Res. 210: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BOSWELL, and Ms. MATSUI.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks,

limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. LUNGREN OF CALIFORNIA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on House Administration in S. J. Res. 8, Providing for the appointment of Stephen M. Case as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 1473 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Budget in H.R. 1473, the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011, do not con-

tain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

**DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1093: Mr. HUNTER.