



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2012

No. 30

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 27, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DENHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Compassionate and merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of this people's House as they return from busy days away from the Capitol.

Give them strength, fortitude, and patience. Fill their hearts with charity, their minds with understanding, their wills with courage to do the right thing for all of America.

In the work to be done now, may they rise together to accomplish what is best for our great Nation and, indeed, for all the world. For You have blessed us with many graces and given us the responsibility of being a light shining on a hill.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

COMMENDING DETROIT CATHOLIC CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend my alma mater, Detroit Catholic Central High School, for winning Michigan's 2012 Division I State Wrestling Championship. It is the team's ninth State wrestling championship.

After winning the Catholic High School League title, CC dominated the district and regional meets; and, in the finals, defeated Oxford to cap a 25-3-0 season.

Coach Mitch Hancock's team not only claimed their second title in 3 years, they are sending 10 Shamrock wrestlers to the individual State finals. Truly, the toil and devotion of every CC teammate is inspiring and well reflects upon the entire Catholic Central family, which celebrates these student-athletes' achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Coach Hancock's Catholic Central Shamrocks for having earned the 2012 State wrestling title and for exemplifying the Basilian Fathers' teachings of goodness, discipline, and knowledge.

Live and die for CC High.

NEW PARTNERSHIP WITH KYRGYZSTAN

(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, last week, I was grateful to be part of a Congressional delegation, led by Chairman DAVID DREIER, that established a partnership with the parliament of Kyrgyzstan, the Jogorku Kenesh. We traveled as members of the House Democracy Partnership, which works with parliaments in new democracies to build stronger legislatures.

Following parliamentary elections in 2010, the Kyrgyz Republic last year completed the first peaceful democratic transition of Presidential power in Central Asia after an open and competitive election. New President Almazbek Atambayev is committed to parliamentary democracy.

Under the leadership of Speaker Asylbek Jeenbekov, the parliament and HDP will work together to strengthen committee operations, budget analyses, constituent relations, and other institutional reforms.

Kyrgyzstan is a bright star in Central Asia, with a growing economy, dedicated President, the prestigious American University of central Asia, and dynamic parliamentarians working with an engaged population to establish a democracy.

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

SAY YES TO DOMESTIC ENERGY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when the President took office, gasoline cost \$1.96. Now it's almost \$4 a gallon. Spring breakers in Disney World can

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.

H951

expect to pay nearly \$6 a gallon to fill up their individual cars.

Americans have no choice but to pay the higher price because the government is stonewalling a domestic energy policy. Deana from Huffman, Texas, put it best:

I go to work to make money to pay for the gas just to get to work.

The President's energy policy is "nothing from below"—nothing from below the ground, nothing from below the sea.

We're the only Nation in the world that places most of our offshore territory off limits to oil and gas exploration. Meanwhile, the government continues to subsidize failed green energy projects.

We should be saying yes to all types of American energy: Yes to more offshore drilling; yes to ANWR; yes to faster approval of permits; and yes to the Keystone XL pipeline.

Let's make gasoline affordable for Deana and all Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

DOCUMENTARY FILM "UNDEFEATED" WINS OSCAR

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend many of us watched the Oscars, and among the winners of an Oscar was a documentary film called "Undeclared."

"Undeclared" was about a football team at Manassas High School in Memphis, Tennessee, and a gentleman named Bill Courtney, who was a volunteer coach there. He went to Manassas during their 2009–2010 season to try to help the kids, help them get through and have a better life. It's in a tough part of the city—a lot of poverty and a lot of one-parent households and a lot of things to overcome.

They had a football player named O.C. Brown, who was an outstanding offensive tackle. He got a scholarship eventually, because of this, to go to Southern Mississippi. He's a great ball player. Coach Courtney worked with him and others to make sure that he got an opportunity to advance.

It's a lot like "The Blind Side," except that it was a story about Coach Courtney and O.C. Brown of Manassas. It won an Oscar, and it deserved it. It's about people not giving up and making a success of things. In just under half a semester, O.C. Brown was able to achieve a 3.0 grade point average and get that scholarship at Southern Mississippi.

Manassas High School is filled with talented young people. We wish them good luck.

This hat belonged to Isaac Hayes, a proud alumnus of Manassas High School.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHARLIE PEAVYHOUSE

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a great man who lived in my district.

Charlie Peavyhouse was born in Detroit and raised in Rhea County, Tennessee. A committed Methodist, Charlie earned his associates degree from Tennessee Wesleyan College and maintained a lifelong relationship with the institution. He also received degrees from East Tennessee State University and Vanderbilt.

After completing his education, Charlie went to work as a teacher and principal. Charlie touched many young lives in his career as an educator, which included serving as principal at Bachman and Falling Water Elementary until his retirement in 1990.

I got to know Charlie Peavyhouse through his work in local politics. Charlie was always a presence, whether as the Hamilton County Republican chair, a campaign manager, or a delegate to the Republican National Convention. He also served as Tennessee's wildlife commissioner under two Governors.

Last April, I joined many in Chattanooga to pay tribute to a man who inspired so many to serve. I was honored to call him my mentor.

Charlie passed away February 19 and is survived by his wife, Eula Mae, and daughters, Jane and Carol.

□ 1410

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1433, THE PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT OF 2012

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1433, the Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2012. This bill represents a return of basic property rights to the American people, rights we are guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution. In 2005, these rights came under attack when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of a corporation taking individual homes in the name of economic development. As a result, people lost their homes to false promises of jobs and tax revenue.

Now, instead of a booming business, there is only a city dump where the homes once stood.

I agree with Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas when he wrote in his dissenting opinion:

Something has gone seriously awry with this Court's interpretation of the Constitution. Though citizens are safe from the government in their homes, the homes themselves are not safe.

That is also why I supported an eminent domain amendment to the Mississippi Constitution, Mississippi Initiative 31, which 73 percent of Mis-

issippi voters approved last November. I urge my colleagues to support property rights to the Constitution in H.R. 1433.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH OBSERVES RARE DISEASE DAY

(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, this week is Rare Disease Day, which will take place on February 29. I want to acknowledge the work of the National Institutes of Health in their efforts to bring down rare diseases. I also want to acknowledge the thousands of Americans who are afflicted with diseases whose systems are so complex that they simply remain undiagnosed. The majority of these disorders have genetic causes, and over half affect children.

The National Institutes of Health has joined a worldwide effort with more than 40 countries to recognize and seek better ways to diagnose and treat patients. On February 29, the NIH is observing the fifth annual Rare Disease Day and hosting a daylong program of activities highlighting the rare disease research community.

In conjunction with that, NIH Director Dr. Francis Collins will announce the launch of the Genetic Testing Registry. This is an online tool developed by NIH scientists providing health care providers and patients access to information on genetic tests. I also have legislation that would expand on these efforts.

This Wednesday, February 29, the rarest of days on the calendar, we will pause to honor those who are working hard to research, diagnose, treat, and empower patients with the rarest of rare diseases. I want to acknowledge the work of the NIH. I'm grateful that they're organizing an event like Rare Disease Day.

TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Last December, the Speaker told us that the Republican signature jobs bill was going to be the surface transportation reauthorization. Yet, under pressure from the extreme right in his caucus 2 weeks ago, he said in the Republican caucus that this transportation bill is not a jobs bill. And they wrote for the first time since the founding of the Dwight D. Eisenhower National Highway System a purely partisan transportation bill in the hope of jamming it through.

Well, it's all fallen apart now. Yet there are 150,000 bridges falling apart in the Federal system. Forty percent of the pavement on the national system needs to be restored, and there's a \$70

billion backlog for critical equipment in our transit systems. These could be jobs—Made in America jobs.

But we need to work together. Transportation is not, never has been, and should not be a partisan issue. By trying to make it partisan, they've stalled and failed. It's time to go back to the drawing board and put together a bill that's good for America. We don't have to have partisan politics on every issue, and transportation investment should not be one of those.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DR.
LAWRENCE NEWMAN

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Lawrence Newman, a beloved educator, writer, and deaf advocate who passed away on July 4, 2011.

In 1953, Lawrence joined the faculty of the California School for the Deaf in Riverside. He distinguished himself as a talented and devoted teacher, becoming the first deaf person to be awarded the California Teacher of the Year Award in 1968.

Lawrence's contributions extend far beyond the classroom. As two-term president of the National Association of the Deaf, Lawrence was a tireless public advocate for deaf students, raising awareness of their unique needs and fighting for reforms in the law to support residential schools. He also fought for change from within the deaf community, encouraging sign language and total communication.

Perhaps Lawrence's most important role, however, was that of father of five and husband to Betty, his wife of 61 years. He is missed and will always be remembered for his contributions to the deaf community.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 4 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.

FEDERAL RESTRICTED BUILDINGS
AND GROUNDS IMPROVEMENT
ACT OF 2011

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 347) to correct and simplify the drafting of section 1752 (relating to restricted buildings or grounds) of title 18, United States Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Restricted Buildings and Grounds Improvement Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. RESTRICTED BUILDING OR GROUNDS.

Section 1752 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1752. Restricted building or grounds

"(a) Whoever—

"(1) knowingly enters or remains in any restricted building or grounds without lawful authority to do so;

"(2) knowingly, and with intent to impede or disrupt the orderly conduct of Government business or official functions, engages in disorderly or disruptive conduct in, or within such proximity to, any restricted building or grounds when, or so that, such conduct, in fact, impedes or disrupts the orderly conduct of Government business or official functions;

"(3) knowingly, and with the intent to impede or disrupt the orderly conduct of Government business or official functions, obstructs or impedes ingress or egress to or from any restricted building or grounds; or

"(4) knowingly engages in any act of physical violence against any person or property in any restricted building or grounds;

or attempts or conspires to do so, shall be punished as provided in subsection (b).

"(b) The punishment for a violation of subsection (a) is—

"(1) a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, if—

"(A) the person, during and in relation to the offense, uses or carries a deadly or dangerous weapon or firearm; or

"(B) the offense results in significant bodily injury as defined by section 2118(e)(3); and

"(2) a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both, in any other case.

"(c) In this section—

"(1) the term 'restricted buildings or grounds' means any posted, cordoned off, or otherwise restricted area—

"(A) of the White House or its grounds, or the Vice President's official residence or its grounds;

"(B) of a building or grounds where the President or other person protected by the Secret Service is or will be temporarily visiting; or

"(C) of a building or grounds so restricted in conjunction with an event designated as a special event of national significance; and

"(2) the term 'other person protected by the Secret Service' means any person whom the United States Secret Service is authorized to protect under section 3056 of this title or by Presidential memorandum, when such person has not declined such protection."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman

from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 materials on the Senate amendment to H.R. 347, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 347, the Federal Restricted Buildings and Grounds Improvement Act of 2011, introduced by Congressman TOM ROONEY, makes commonsense improvements to an existing Federal law that prohibits unlawful access to the White House, the Vice President's residence, and other restricted areas.

Current law prohibits unlawful entries upon any restricted building or ground where the President, Vice President, or other protectee is temporarily visiting. However, there is no Federal law that expressly prohibits unlawful entry to the White House and its grounds or the Vice President's residence and its grounds. The United States Secret Service must therefore rely upon a provision in the District of Columbia Code, which addresses only minor misdemeanor infractions when someone attempts to or successfully climbs the White House fence or, worse, breaches the White House, itself.

H.R. 347 remedies this problem. It specifically includes the White House, the Vice President's residence, and their respective grounds in the definition of restricted buildings and grounds. The bill also clarifies that the penalties in section 1752 of title 18 apply to those who knowingly enter or remain in any restricted building or grounds without lawful authority to do so. Current law does not include this important element.

The House passed this bill 1 year ago by a vote of 399-3. Earlier this month, the Senate passed the bill by unanimous consent. The Senate also clarified that the revised law applies to individuals the Secret Service is required to protect by statute or by Presidential memorandum.

H.R. 347 ensures that the President, the First Family, the Vice President, and others are protected whether they are in the White House or attending an event in a convention center or meeting hall.

I commend my colleague from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) for sponsoring this legislation, which enjoys overwhelming bipartisan and bicameral support.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support H.R. 347, as amended by the Senate, which will assist the Secret Service in performing its protective duties.

The bill before us today will help the Secret Service carry out its role in protecting the President, Vice President, and other dignitaries. Current Federal law prohibits individuals from entering or remaining in areas cordoned off as "restricted" because of protection being provided by the Secret Service.

This bill would simply clarify that the prohibition under the existing statute only applies to those who do not have lawful authority to be in those areas. The bill would also add the White House and Vice President's residence to the definition of restricted areas protected under current law.

The Senate made minor changes to the bill, including expanding the bill's protections to areas in which the Secret Service is protecting a person by the direction of a Presidential memorandum.

I support this amendment. This bill will assist the Secret Service, which did not have this protective function when it was created.

□ 1610

The role of the Secret Service has expanded greatly since it was established in 1865 to fight the counterfeiting of U.S. currency.

The Service became part of the Treasury Department in 1883 and took on many additional investigative responsibilities with respect to safeguarding the payment and financial systems of the United States. It wasn't until 1894 that the Secret Service first started protecting our Presidents; and that protective role with respect to the President, Vice President, and other dignitaries has grown substantially since that time.

The men and women of the Secret Service conduct themselves with valor and professionalism while carrying out the protective function of their agency. They provide protection for a variety of people and events, including the President and national special security events.

The Secret Service has other important functions which also deserve recognition. For example, the investigative role of the Secret Service has expanded greatly from protecting the currency against counterfeiting to investigating a variety of crimes related to this country's financial institutions and credit systems.

I commend the gentleman from Florida, Representative TOM ROONEY, for his work on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 347.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY), who is a sponsor of this legislation and also a member of the Armed Services and a former member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the protections provided by the United States

Secret Service are vital to assessing security threats and providing a secure environment for our Nation's leaders.

One key aspect of the Service's mission is to secure buildings and grounds where our leaders work and live, including the White House and the Naval Observatory. My bill would explicitly protect these residences of the President and the Vice President from intruders and would clarify current law to distinguish between those who are able to enter the grounds lawfully, like the Secret Service, and those who enter without permission.

This bipartisan bill would improve existing criminal law to ensure that the Secret Service can continue to implement strategies that prevent potentially catastrophic security breaches. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense, bipartisan piece of legislation to protect our Nation's leaders and national security.

I thank Mr. SMITH from Texas for his leadership on this issue, the Judiciary Committee, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 347.

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. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2117, PROTECTING ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-404) on the resolution (H. Res. 563) providing for consideration of

the bill (H.R. 2117) to prohibit the Department of Education from overreaching into academic affairs and program eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FEDERAL RESTRICTED BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 347) to correct and simplify the drafting of section 1752 (relating to restricted buildings or grounds) of title 18, United States Code, 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 Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 3, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—388

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

Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan

NAYS—3

Amash Broun (GA) Ellison

NOT VOTING—42

Akin Gutierrez Paul
Amodoi Hirono Payne
Bilbray Inslee Platts
Brown (FL) Jackson (IL) Rangel
Campbell Johnson (IL) Rush
Carnahan Kaptur Shuler
Clarke (NY) Kingston Smith (WA)
Clay Kucinich Speier
Cleaver Landry Stark
Culberson Langevin Thornberry
Dingell Lee (CA) Tierney
Filner Marchant Towns
Franks (AZ) Marino Woolsey
Grijalva Pascrell Young (AK)

Ryan (WI) □ 1854
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
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)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Messrs. BARLETTA and JONES changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 2012, I missed the one rollcall vote of the day.

Had I been present I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote No. 73, on the Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 347—Federal Restricted Buildings and Grounds Improvement Act of 2011.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 73, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 27, 2012 I had a previously scheduled meeting with constituents in Urbana, Illinois. As a result, I am unable to attend votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on the Senate Amendments to H.R. 347, the Federal Restricted Buildings and Grounds Improvement Act of 2011.

REMEMBERING FORMER U.S. REPRESENTATIVE KATIE HALL

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a moment of silence. We just lost a former Member of Congress, Katie Hall, from Gary, Indiana. After that, Mr. Speaker, if you would be so kind, we would like to have a moment or two to make some comments about Ms. Hall.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALAZZO). The gentleman from Indiana will please suspend. The House will be in order.

The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just start off real quickly, before I yield to my colleague from Gary, Indiana, and say that Katie Hall, who was a Member of this body, died just this last few days from an unknown illness. She was 73 years old.

She came from very humble beginnings in Mound Bayou, Mississippi. She grew up on her grandfather's cotton farm, and she was a teacher for more than 30 years. She was a very fine teacher.

She moved, in 1962, to Gary, Indiana, where she became a very good friend of Richard Hatcher, the mayor. When a good friend of mine, Adam Benjamin, who was once a Member of this body, died, Mayor Hatcher appointed her as the nominee of the Democrat Party to succeed him. She also served in the Indiana Senate. I served with her there.

She was a very fine person. During her time in the Congress, she sponsored, along with others, but she was one of the key sponsors, in 1983, of a national holiday in remembrance of Dr. Martin Luther King. She was credited for playing a very key role in getting that bill passed after it had stalled in the House for over 14 years.

Let me just say that she was a great lady and a great Congresswoman, and she will missed. We want to extend our deepest sympathy to her family and her friends.

With that, I will be happy to yield to my colleague, the senior Member from Gary, Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I would express my appreciation to the dean of our delegation, Mr. BURTON, for asking for a moment of silence and the Speaker's indulgence.

Mr. BURTON rightfully pointed out Mrs. Hall's ascendancy into the Congress and the sponsorship of the legislation that led to Dr. King's birthday being declared a national holiday. But I would also point out to my colleagues that Mrs. Hall also served in the Indiana House as well as the Indiana Senate, and following her service in the United States Congress also served as clerk for the City of Gary for 15 years, from 1988 to 2003.

She does leave a granddaughter, two daughters, and a husband. My sympathies, and all of ours, go out to the family, as well.

I also think that Mrs. Hall probably would want to be most remembered for her role as an educator who taught young people in the Gary public school system. She certainly always served her family, she always served those she taught and represented, and she certainly has served her country.

Again, our sympathies go to the family, and I deeply appreciate the respect shown by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness and great respect that I take this time to remember one of northwest Indiana's most valued citizens and my predecessor, former Congresswoman, Katie Beatrice Hall. Throughout her prestigious career, Katie's contributions to the people of northwest Indiana and across the Nation are exemplary, and she is worthy of the highest praise. Mrs. Hall passed away on Monday, February 20, 2012, but her legacy will live on forever in the hearts and minds of those she served.

Congresswoman Hall grew up in Mound Bayou, Mississippi, during the pre-civil rights era. Segregation laws were strict in the South during that time, and she learned early in life how to succeed despite great opposition. In 1960, Katie earned a bachelor's degree from Mississippi Valley State University. Later, she moved to Indiana and continued her education, earning a master's degree from Indiana University, Bloomington, in 1968.

The Congresswoman's involvement in politics began when she campaigned for former Mayor of Gary Richard Hatcher. Her work on the campaign further fueled her desire to serve others and inspired her to run for elected office. Prior to becoming a Member of Congress, she served in the Indiana House of

Representatives from 1974 to 1976 and was then elected to the Indiana Senate, serving from 1976 to 1982. As a member of the Indiana General Assembly, Mrs. Hall was influential in establishing the Genesis Center, Hudson-Campbell Fitness Center, and the Adam Benjamin Metro Center, in Gary. Katie also served as the Chair for the Lake County Democratic Committee from 1978 to 1980 and for the Indiana Democratic Convention in 1980. In 1982, following the untimely passing of United States Congressman Adam Benjamin, Jr., Katie won the special election to complete his term in office and to represent the First Congressional District of Indiana in the 98th Congress, becoming the first African American from Indiana elected to serve in the United States House of Representatives. While in office, Katie served as chairwoman of the Post Office and Civil Services Subcommittee on Census and Population. During her time in Congress, Representative Hall made a truly historic contribution through her sponsorship of the bill that made Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday a national holiday. This bill had been stalled in the House for fourteen years, and through her passion and persistence, Katie was successful in establishing this recognition of Dr. King. Mrs. Hall was a trailblazer for the Civil Rights Movement and a devoted public servant to her community, state, and Nation. In the years following her term, Katie continued her life of public service as city clerk for Gary, Indiana from 1988 to 2003.

Katie Hall leaves behind a loving family. She is survived by her cherished husband, John Henry Hall, as well as her adoring daughters, Jacqueline and Junifer, and her beloved granddaughter, Kristina. She also leaves behind many other dear friends and family members, as well as a saddened community and a grateful nation.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in remembering the Honorable Katie Hall for her tremendous contributions to the people of her community, the State of Indiana, and the United States of America. Her life of public service is to be admired. Her legacy will serve as an inspiration to us all.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I would be very happy to yield to my colleague from Indianapolis.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to join my colleagues to honor the life of former Congresswoman Katie Hall who passed last week at the age of 73. I met her as a young man. In fact, I had a chance to spend some time with her in the early eighties in San Francisco during the Democratic National Convention.

□ 1900

But she quickly made a name for herself, to my colleague's point, not only as a strong advocate and leader in the State of Indiana, but as an educator. She knew that America's children were suffering, and she supported alternative education, Mr. Speaker. She understood that children had different needs, and she made sure that she was an advocate of different educational models to meet those needs.

So my deepest sympathies go out to her family and friends who are mourning her passing. And we know that Indiana politics will not be the same.

I thank my colleague for acknowledging me.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Katie Hall will be missed. And once again, our sympathy goes out to her family and all of her loved ones.

HONORING SERGEANT T.J. CONRAD

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 23, Virginia and our Nation lost a true hero. Sergeant T.J. Conrad was killed in action in the Nangarhar Province of Afghanistan in the rioting there.

Sergeant Conrad, just 22 years old, was a husband, a father, a son, and a brother. Outgoing, determined, and a man of true grit, Sergeant Conrad truly personified the Army's old slogan, "Be All You Can Be."

Born in Newport News and raised in Roanoke County, Sergeant Conrad grew up attending Masons Cove Elementary School, Northside Middle School, and Northside High School. In high school, he was an outstanding wrestler. In his senior year, he helped lead his team to the Blue Ridge District titles for both the regular season and the tournament.

Today, I wish to extend my prayers and our prayers and condolences to Sergeant Conrad's wife, Holly; his infant son, Bentley; his parents, his relatives, and his friends. His father has stated that he will always be remembered for his great sense of humor, his infectious smile, his kind heart, and his desire to brighten anyone's day.

On behalf of a grateful Nation, we grieve the loss of our warrior brother, but we honor Sergeant Conrad for his courage, his sacrifice, and his selfless commitment to duty, honor, and country. He gave his all in service for the sake of our safety, our freedom, and our liberty.

MINNETONKA 2A GIRLS HOCKEY TITLE

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Minnetonka girls high school hockey team on winning their second consecutive Minnesota 2A State title this weekend at the Xcel Energy Center in St. Paul.

Mr. Speaker, after winning last year's championship in a nail-biting game, the Minnetonka Skippers this year defeated the Roseville Raiders 3-0. The first goal came early in the first period by defender Holly Korn, who scored on a power play. After that, forward Diana Drayaard followed up with

a second goal late in the third period. And then finally, there was a third goal by junior Laura Bowman, who scored the final goal. Of course this victory could not have happened were it not for the outstanding goaltending of goalie Sydney Rossman, who blocked 23 shots in the shutout.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to congratulate all the girls on the Minnetonka Skippers hockey team, as well as their coaches. I also want to thank them and recognize their hard work, their training, their perseverance, and their commitment because it really paid off. We're proud of these student athletes, and so is our entire community.

GET OUR TROOPS OUT OF AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Homeland Security Committee and have the privilege of serving on the committee dealing with foreign affairs here in the House.

I rise today to, as usual, offer our deepest sympathy for all of our soldiers that have fallen in battle. But I am particularly outraged at the incidents that are occurring around the unfortunate burning of the Koran—for which our President appropriately extended his apology, as we would want if someone had burned Bibles. But it is outrageous for our soldiers to be in harm's way, for them to lose their life. It is time now for the Afghan national security forces to stand up and be security forces. It's time for President Karzai to indicate that he will not be driven out by the Taliban. And it's time for us not to allow the Taliban again to grip ahold of the Afghan people.

This is a tragic and horrible situation. None of us would have wanted it to occur. But we cannot stand for our soldiers to be in the eye of the storm and be shot for something that they did not do, intentionally or individually.

So I would ask that our soldiers be taken out of harm's way around any Afghan national security forces that we cannot vet and ensure that they are intending to do the right thing. We need to hear from President Karzai in a way that denounces this horrible action. And we must stand up to the Taliban and have a transition out of Afghanistan in which the Afghan national security forces are protecting their people, and they're allowed, in essence, to have a nation that protects women and children and families, and has the adherence to the law that requires human decency.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS ON JOB CREATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for

60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I came here to the floor tonight to talk with some of my colleagues and the American people about what I believe is the most pressing issue facing our country.

A lot of us have been home working in our districts over the last week, seeing our constituents, speaking at local Rotary clubs, visiting with constituents in the office and around the district. It is clear to me that the top priority for the American people over the last year remains the same, and that is jobs. People back home are encouraged and are optimistic about the future, but they need some signs that jobs are increasing here in the United States. Jobs remain the number one issue.

Since I got here a little over a year ago with some of my freshman colleagues, a lot of us have made jobs our sole focus. There are a lot of different things that we can do to encourage job creation. My focus has been on the private sector. Private sector job creation, in my view, is the way that we get our economy going again, not through government stimulus. We've tried that to the tune of about \$1 trillion—almost \$1 trillion—and it has not done what the President promised.

□ 1910

It seems to me the best approach is to create an environment here in this country where the private sector can flourish, where people want to take risks, where they want to invest and compete with other countries. How do we do that? There are a variety of ways and that's why we're here tonight, to talk about some of these.

I'm joined by some of my colleagues, and I think that they would agree that one of the ways that we can encourage the private sector to grow and create jobs is through fundamental tax reform. Another way is regulatory reform. Job creators around my district tell me what a lot of us know and that is that not regulation but overregulation, not regulation but excessive regulation, is a tax on businesses and it is a tax on job creators. So we need tax reform and we need regulatory reform.

We need to further pursue our energy resources here in the United States. We need to construct, for example, the Keystone XL pipeline that the President first delayed and then denied. Thirdly, we need to further explore our energy resources. Fourthly, we need to live within our means as a government. That means dealing with our spending problem, our spending addiction, our debt, our trillion-plus-dollar deficit.

If you were to ask me what is your plan, what would you do, what are you trying to do, what have you been fighting for over a year to try to encourage the private sector to grow jobs in this country with, I would say tax reform, regulatory reform, increased energy exploration and development here in the United States, and making the Federal

Government live within our means. Those four things, if we can address them in bold ways, we can change the course of this country's fiscal situation and the economy and ultimately grow this economy and create jobs.

I'm going to turn now and yield to the gentleman from Virginia if he'd like to comment on some of this.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Thank you, Congressman GRIFFIN, I do. I agreed with what you had to say and wholeheartedly support your concepts and where we need to be moving this country.

Let me say to each and every one of you that the American worker is second to none in this world. When you look at our workers, they are the most innovative workers in the world, and they are the hardest workers in the world. Statistics, different reports continue to show us this point.

We will never compete with the Chinese and other countries on wages; nor do we want to. But our advantage, Congressman GRIFFIN, is that we have the ability to use our energy resources in a way that we can create jobs, and we can fight for American jobs by having affordable energy. That's our trump card. For some reason, those in the administration want to tie our hands behind our backs and not allow our businesses to use our trump card to keep jobs in the United States and bring great energy resources in this country.

The President was recently in Florida, and he mockingly described the Republican plan on energy and getting gas prices down. He said step one is drill, step two is drill, step three is drill. The President is just wrong. We have a true all-of-the-above policy. I like to describe it this way: it is drill. That's step one. Step two, dig. Step three, discover. Step four, deregulate.

Let me explain a little bit. Drill is easy. We have vast untapped resources in oil, and we have huge resources in natural gas. If we're allowed to drill for natural gas and for oil, we can turn around a lot of the things that are happening in this country.

Let's talk about gas prices because that affects jobs. Listen, some of this has to do with looking at the world market. If we signaled immediately that we were ready to start using our resources, the prices would come down because those people who are speculating that oil is not going to be available in the future and the not-so-distant future, but also even 2 or 3 years from now, would realize that the giant in the world of energy was finally awakened from its slumber and ready to go on the march for jobs. So I think it is important that we look at drilling. I don't think we should be mocking it.

Dig. Obviously we have a lot of coal resources in this country. My district has a lot of coal. It also has natural gas. We are number one in the world in coal resources. Everybody else in the world is using the coal. We are the ones who refuse to use it. As I said before,

we have our hands tied behind our backs. Ladies and gentlemen, I've got to tell you something. We need to have reasonable regulations, but we've got to untie our hands and be ready to use our coal. The Chinese are now buying our coal to use our coal to make the products, the goods that we used to make in this country.

Guess what, a lot of times folks say we don't want to use coal because it has pollution and it creates problems; but a NASA study has shown us that if we have the Chinese using our coal to make the products we used to make, they get the money for those products, their people have the jobs. And guess what happens to the pollutants in the air? It takes roughly 10 days to get from the middle of the Gobi Desert to the eastern shore of my beloved Virginia. Just 10 days. We know that a significant portion of the mercury in our air is coming from foreign sources. Not our plants, but foreign sources.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I would like to comment on something the gentleman just said. I think it is a great point.

A lot of times some of us think about this country and pollution here. I think what I hear you saying—it is a very good point—is that this is one world and we in this country through the processes and the regulatory structure that we have, we burn coal cleaner and we are a better steward of the Earth when it comes to using some of these traditional energy sources. What I hear you saying is—and I think it makes a lot of sense—if you believe that coal will not be used if we do not use it here, then that's not exactly accurate. Somebody is going to burn it. The question is: Do we do a better job with some of these traditional energy sources? Do we do a better job than other countries that will burn it if we don't? The Chinese can burn the same coal, yet regulate it in a way where they do a lot more damage to the environment.

That brings me actually to the Keystone pipeline. The President first delayed it, then he denied it so that the extreme environmentalists would be happy with him. If you apply what you are talking about, it seems to me we would rather be refining the oil sands from Canada in this country instead of the alternative that Canada has talked about, which is shipping it to China for refining. Why? Because we refine cleaner, we refine safer, and we do a better job.

□ 1920

Those oil sands are going to be refined. The issue is not if we don't refine them, no one will. The fact is they will be refined. The issue is do we refine them or do the Chinese refine them? I think what you're saying, and I wholeheartedly agree, we do a better job here.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Absolutely. I would have to say we do a much better job here.

It's almost like I can remember when I was much younger, liberals always said to conservatives, Well, you all act like the United States is the only country in the world, and we have to look at the whole world. Now the liberals are looking at it and saying, Well, the United States is the only country in the world. We have to only look at the United States and we don't look at the big picture.

I think, inadvertently, even with good intentions, there are, in fact, greater pollution risks by us not using our energy than there are with us using our energy with the reasonable regulations that have been in place for some time.

That being said, let's take a look at how that impacts on jobs. Not only do we get the pollution, but we don't get the jobs. We don't get the money.

You talked about living within our means and so forth. Let's take a look at my district.

AEP, American Electric Power, is the biggest power provider in my district. There are others. They have estimated, with new regulations, energy costs are going to go up 10 to 15 percent as they spend an additional \$6 billion to \$8 billion. Ten to 15 percent on hardworking American families is tough, but when you look at the job component, when you look at that job component, that means it's going to cost more in my district to make potato chips. It's going to cost more in my district to work the family farm. It's going to cost more in my district to make furniture. It's going to cost more in my district to make paper products, whiteboard. I just touched on the surface.

Every single retail establishment, every single business has to use electricity; but when you raise the cost of manufacturing goods or using electricity to manufacture goods by 10 to 15 percent over the course of the next few years, you're making us less competitive in the world, and we lose more jobs and we have more people who are unemployed and more people who aren't able to go out and buy products, which then means more people lose their jobs because they're not selling those Fords down at the Ford place. They're not selling washing machines and TVs and all of the products that are out there. We lose even more jobs because of the failure to recognize that the regulations are killing our jobs, and our jobs are going elsewhere.

I have to say, getting back to what I call the four Ds—drill, dig, discover, and deregulate—I'm not saying we don't look at all of the above. The President was in Florida. He said we only wanted to drill, drill, drill, and he was talking about algae. I'm not one of those people who's going to criticize the President for looking at algae. I think algae actually has a positive future, but it's a positive future that is probably 15 to 50 years away. We need energy now. We need affordable energy now. We need jobs now.

To be looking at something, I think it's absolutely right. That's the "discover" part of those four Ds. We need to encourage discovery. But one of the ways to encourage discovery is to deregulate and let people make a product without having all kinds of regulations put on top of them.

It's interesting how folks want to do all of these things, and then they come up with regulations and they find out that the new start-up companies oftentimes have difficulty creating the new alternative energies because they run into other regulations that prohibit them from going forward.

So I think we need to make sure that we look at drill, dig, discovery, looking at those alternatives, finding more ways that we can be efficient and finding new alternative energies. Then let's not regulate our industries out of existence, which is where we're headed at this point. When you do that, we continue to lose jobs, we continue to have a flat economy.

The unemployment situation has gotten better, but we're still in the neighborhood of 8 percent. I don't think that's anything to celebrate. I'm glad it's better, but I don't think it's something that you go out and go, woo hoo, we've solved our problems. I believe that we have not solved our problems at this point. We're working on it, and that's good.

The economy in this country, because of our hardworking Americans, because they're innovative and because they work harder than anybody else, is not going to just roll over and die, but at the same time it could be doing so much better, and we need to maintain that we are the number one economic power in the world. The way to do that is to keep our jobs by keeping our energy and our energy sources and our energy costs at a reasonable level so that we can, in fact, compete with the low-wage countries of the world. We don't want the low wages, but to do so, to make sure that we can still compete, we have to keep our energy affordable.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I want to comment a little bit on the all-of-the-above strategy that you were talking about.

I'm an advocate for an all-of-the-above strategy. We've heard the President mention that, but we here in the House have been advocating for that. I have since I got here. That includes alternate energy sources, renewable energy sources, biodiesel, wind, solar. I'm for those things. But I'm also for the traditional energy sources and, in addition, nuclear. We have a clean, safe nuclear energy plant, power plant in Arkansas that we count on to provide safe, affordable energy. We also have coal plants, other sorts of energy sources.

In my district, we make the windmill blades that go on these massive windmills. We also have Welspun Tubular in my district, in the Second Congressional District of Arkansas, and

they've recently been in the news because there has been a lot of uncertainty about their future as a result of the President killing the Keystone pipeline, or denying the permit. The happy news that I have to report is that Welspun is doing some diversifying. They did have to lay some people off after the Keystone pipeline was delayed, but they're doing some diversifying so they can make some other sorts of pipe, and they're actually going to expand. I believe we will ultimately win the battle on the Keystone pipeline; and once we get the Keystone pipeline in full swing, the construction in full swing, then that will further help Welspun.

So I'm for all-of-the-above, but I know that in my lifetime we are still going to be using a lot of these traditional energy sources. It's not an either/or. We can continue to pursue wind and continue to pursue solar and continue to pursue biodiesel and alternate energies, renewable energy sources, but at the same time pursue the traditional sources, particularly, natural gas.

Natural gas is abundant and, best of all, it's American—and, in my case, it's Arkansan. We've got a lot of natural gas in my district and other districts in Arkansas. It is abundant and it is cheap. Where ethanol can increase the wear on a traditional car engine, natural gas can extend the life of that engine.

I want to turn the conversation over to my friend from the Third District of Arkansas, Congressman STEVE WOMACK. He's got a lot of natural gas in his district as well.

Before I do, I just want to recap. We have jobs as our main goal. And there are pillars under that goal of jobs, and those pillars are: tax reform, regulatory reform, further energy exploration, and getting our spending under control so that we deal with our debt and we live within our means. Those are four pillars. They're not separate from job creation. They are a critical part of encouraging private sector job creation and giving certainty to job creators.

Now I'd like to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman, and I do appreciate his leadership in this discussion about job creation in America.

I've said many, many times that if there is an elixir out there to fix the problems, the challenges facing our country today, it's job creation.

What the gentleman from Arkansas has been articulating in the last several minutes has been a very good discussion about the four things, and I couldn't agree more, the four things that are part and parcel to our country creating jobs and putting itself on a different fiscal path.

He's talked about overregulation. I'll come back to that in a moment. He's talked about the threat of higher taxes and the need for comprehensive tax reform in our Nation; he's talked about

the need for a solid energy policy that allows our country to access its own resources, American energy resources to solve America's energy challenges; and, of course, he's talked about the deficits and the debt.

□ 1930

Now, if you look at the plight that we're in today insofar as job creation—one greater than 8 percent unemployment, sustained unemployment of over 8 percent—and when you look at the fact that people are out here scrambling to find work—meaningful jobs as they want to be productive and want to contribute to American exceptionalism—then the way you do that is not by taking a welfare check; it's by having a paycheck. If you're looking at this plight today like you would an impending storm, it's a dark, dark cloud of uncertainty that hangs over the job creators.

I submit to you that the reason so many people are sitting on trillions of dollars of cash, those who would like to get into the game and create jobs and expand the American economy, is that they have a difficult time computing their input costs. They don't know how energy is going to affect their ability to create jobs. They don't know how the next regulation, the next rule that is going to come down from Washington, is going to impact their ability to earn a profit. As evidenced by the downgrade that we had last year by the S&P, they're not confident that Congress, these people who gather in this Chamber every day, is capable of making the decisions, of having the courage to make the decisions to put America on a different fiscal path. It's a dark, dark cloud of uncertainty. I don't blame them for sitting on the sidelines right now, but there is a lot of cash ready to get in the game if we'll just do some of the right things.

The gentlemen who have spoken tonight talked about regulation, but that's not why I came to the floor tonight, and that's not what I wanted to talk about primarily. I came from a meeting right before votes today that talked about an issue totally unrelated to my district and unrelated to most of America. It's out in California.

Later this week, we're going to vote on H.R. 1837, the San Joaquin Valley Water Reliability Act. I heard my colleague from California talking passionately about this issue, as he has done a number of times from the well of this House, in that, back in 2009, Federal regulations to protect a 3-inch fish, the delta smelt, led to the deliberate diversion of over 300 billion gallons of water away from the San Joaquin Valley and its farmers. It cost thousands of farm workers their jobs; it inflicted up to 40 percent unemployment in certain communities; and it fallowed hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile farmland.

Those were real people.

Those were real jobs.

Because of Federal regulations and this desire on the part of this Con-

gress—of this Federal Government, I should say—to protect a 3-inch fish, we turned our backs on American workers. In so doing, we affected millions of people nationwide because, when you affect the fertile farmlands of California the way we have by diverting this water, you have, indeed, taken a step toward increasing the price of food.

The bill that we will consider later this week is a comprehensive solution that would restore water deliveries that have been cut off through the Federal regulations and environmental lawsuits and through a plethora of things facing the California farmers.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I hear what the gentleman is saying. I agree wholeheartedly. Correct me if I'm wrong, but what you're saying is that the issue is not regulation. The issue is excessive regulation. The issue is overregulation.

I've got a 2-year-old and a 4-year-old. I love them dearly and hate to get on that plane when I have to come up here from Arkansas and have to leave them back at the house. I want them to have clean air and clean water, and I don't know anyone—the folks here tonight included—who are against all regulation. Regulation when used properly protects us, the kids, et cetera.

This is not about whether to regulate or not. This is about excessive regulation, overregulation, the regulatory process that does not consider cost-benefit, that does not consider the impact on jobs, that does not employ common sense, Washington regulators who don't speak with folks impacted on the ground, well-intentioned though they may be, who don't look at the impact and at the potential impact of their overregulation. That's what I hear from my colleagues.

I agree wholeheartedly, and I think that is a critical distinction to point out because we always hear folks saying, You just want no regulation.

That's a false choice. That's a straw man. That's not anyone's argument that I've heard. The issue is one of overregulation, of excessive regulation.

Mr. WOMACK. Let me take it a step further because I can relate to what the gentleman is talking about and can relate it back to my home district.

I think the gentleman would agree that, over the last several years in Arkansas, there has been a phenomenal rate of growth in the northwest part of our State, the area that I happen to represent, which is the great Third District of Arkansas. It's known for its incredible growth over the last several years. Now, it is home to some pretty well-known companies, companies like Wal-Mart and J.B. Hunt trucking and Tyson Foods.

If you look at northwest Arkansas, there is really no compelling reason why prior to the establishment of those major companies that northwest Arkansas would be an area where you would have this unprecedented growth. But for the entrepreneurial spirit and drive of guys like Sam Walton and Don

Tyson and J.B. Hunt—and I could go down another list of people who have provided jobs and who have created and expanded businesses and who have made a meaningful impact on the greater mid-South and the entire Nation—northwest Arkansas would be kind of an average area with no great infrastructure, until recently there, and with no real compelling reason why it would be anything special.

Yet we're fighting an issue in the greater northwest Arkansas area that could, indeed, impact our ability to continue to grow. I'm talking about EPA's desire, insatiable appetite, to put a total maximum daily load, a TMDL, if you would, on phosphorus loading in the Illinois River watershed, which flows into Oklahoma, because of a loading standard imposed on northwest Arkansas by our neighboring State, a standard that many say is not even achievable.

So all of the great development and job creation and the elevated quality of life is in jeopardy. The future is in jeopardy as a result of a Federal agency imposing on the region a standard that may or may not even be able to be achieved.

I bring that up for this reason: back when I was a mayor of a city in northwest Arkansas, I challenged EPA to give us the science, to show us exactly how they can calculate that this standard has been impacted by the farmers and ranchers of northwest Arkansas and those who manage the point sources of pollution, the municipalities. I happened to be the mayor who presided over one of those. As I understand it, the science was a collection of data from about 20 streams somewhere in America, streams not known to us. They took, I think, the 75th percentile of the average phosphorus loading into those streams. I doubt seriously that they used streams and rivers that were similar to what we were dealing with in northwest Arkansas.

I bring up this subject only because we're talking about job creation tonight, and our ability to continue to expand the economy in northwest Arkansas is dependent on our ability to have a good, clean water supply and to be able to treat our wastewater and to be able to discharge it properly and sufficiently in order to be able to create growth.

Yet I'm afraid, one day, we're going to look up, and because of these standards imposed on us by the Federal bureaucracy, this overregulation that we've talked about, that we're not going to have an opportunity to grow because we're going to be into moratoria on growth and development in our area as a result of these unfair standards. But that's a whole other story.

I really came tonight to talk with my colleague about tax reform because, as we've indicated, the threat of higher taxes, or the tax structure as we now know it, is, in my strongest opinion, one of the great barriers to job creation.

□ 1940

You know, just the other day, in this very Chamber, the President of the United States stood on the dais and he talked to this Congress about the need for comprehensive tax reform. In his proposal to reform the corporate tax code, I was pleased to see the President showing some leadership in that regard, and I look forward to working with the administration and my colleagues in the House and Senate to do something that in my strong opinion is long overdue.

I, along with many of my colleagues, agree on the need for corporate tax reform. The U.S. has one of the highest corporate tax structures in the world, second only to Japan. This discourages job growth and job creation in the United States.

It's time to broaden the base, time to get the government out of the business of picking winners and losers, time to eliminate special interest loopholes, and it's time to lower the corporate tax rate once and for all. But corporate tax reform is not the only piece of the puzzle. There are many other pieces. If we are going to grow the economy and give our job creators the certainty they need to invest, we also should look at the individual rates—not just the corporate rates, but the individual structure as well.

There's an opportunity to simplify the individual tax code. In December of 2010, according to the Compendium of Tax Expenditures prepared by the Congressional Research Service that we all use, there were more than 300 tax expenditures in the form of special exclusions, exemptions, deductions, credits, rates, and deferrals. We need to re-evaluate every single one of these expenditures.

There are many other benefits of comprehensive tax reform. For example more than 90 percent of the Treasury's budget goes to the IRS. If we simplify the Tax Code and make it easier to follow and enforce, the IRS doesn't need the resources it currently needs.

What's more, IRS reported, and I think these numbers were back in 2006, hundreds of billions—I think some were just short of \$400 billion—of what we call a tax gap. Again, simplification of the Tax Code makes it easier to follow and enforce, and we can significantly narrow that gap.

I thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who are looking forward to working on comprehensive tax reform. I believe in my heart that it is, as my colleague from Arkansas has indicated, one of four things, four basic things, four basic issues facing America today that can help put our job creators back into the business of doing what they do best. And that is having ideas, incubating those ideas, making those ideas come to reality, taking the necessary risks, having access to the capital to help support those businesses, to expand those businesses by hiring people, by growing things, by making things.

And as my friend from Virginia said a moment ago, we have proven that the American worker is the most productive worker in the world. And that's what we need to do: Corporate tax reform; ending this excessive over-regulatory environment that we're in; to access American energy solutions to solve America's energy challenges; and once and for all doing something about the extraordinary deficits—four straight trillion-plus-dollar deficits—facing America, and nearly trillion-dollar deficits as far as the eye can see, based on the current glide path; to do those things necessary to get our deficit under control, to begin to whittle down that debt and save future generations of the burdens that we have in an almost immoral way put on their shoulders.

With that, I thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank my friend from the Third District of Arkansas and appreciate his comments here tonight.

I'd like to continue a little bit tonight talking about tax reform since Representative WOMACK was talking about some aspects of the President's proposal. I think most of us around here are certainly excited that the President has even started discussing fundamental tax reform. Unfortunately, I think that the President's proposal has a lot of aspects that would be burdensome to the businesses and the job creators that he purports to be trying to help, and so I don't think that it has much chance in the House or the Senate, and I think he knew that when he proposed it. But at least he is having that conversation. That's a start, that's a start.

As we talked about, whether you are talking about tax reform, energy exploration, regulatory reform, our commonsense budgeting, making the Federal Government live within its means, all of those relate to jobs. They all are directly related to encouraging private sector job creation.

We've been working on a highway bill recently. Infrastructure is a critical part of this equation. That's part of the spending our money wisely under the budgeting side of things because we need a strong infrastructure so that we can compete with other countries, continue to have economic development in this country. So that's a critical part of it.

But with regard to the President's tax plan, it raises taxes at least a dollar for every dollar in tax cuts that he provides to simplify the corporate tax code. It creates a whole new category of taxes for our companies that do business overseas.

And most glaringly, it doesn't do anything to address individual tax rates, the tax rates that you pay at home, I pay. And why is that important for job creation? Well, for a number of reasons. First of all, the code we have now is complex. It doesn't always reward hard work. In fact, sometimes it punishes it.

But one of the real specific reasons why we must deal with the individual tax rates to grow jobs is because many businesses pay their taxes, particularly LLCs, sole proprietorships, partnerships, mom and pop businesses all around the country in Arkansas and in my district, they pay their taxes using the individual income tax brackets. So you can't just address corporate tax code, although the President's corporate tax "reform" has got a lot of tax hikes in it that will make our businesses, our job creators in this country, less competitive.

But you can't just reform the Tax Code by dealing with corporate tax reform. You've got to look at individual tax reform, corporate tax reform across the board. You have to make it simpler, fairer, and flatter. Some of the terms that we've talked about, we've certainly advocated for that in our budget last year, and we are going to do it again this year.

It's critical, not only for job creation by larger businesses but by small business, mom and pop businesses. So tax reform is a critical part of what we need to do to get jobs going.

As I've talked about earlier, some of my colleagues talked about, there are a number of reforms that we have been pursuing for over a year now that relate directly to private sector job creation.

□ 1950

As I indicated earlier, it's tax reform. It's regulatory reform. It's more energy development. It's living within our means. Individually, these issues may not have jobs in the title, but they are the columns, the supports, that hold up the private sector job building, if you will.

I want to say a couple of things about the regulatory issue because I've just introduced a bill, H.R. 4078, Regulatory Freeze for Jobs Act. Again, as a lot of us said, I'm not antiregulation. I don't know anyone that's against regulations across the board. What I'm against is the Federal Government failing to apply common sense when regulating. What I'm against are excessive regulations, overly burdensome regulations.

I'll give you an example. I had a jobs conference down in my district in Little Rock at the Clinton Presidential Library. We had a jobs conference. We invited a number of job creators. It seems to me if you want to know what to do to create private sector jobs or encourage private sector job creation, you'd ask someone who had actually created them, folks from the private sector, experts on this issue. We invited them in and said, Hey, what's the biggest obstacle to job creation? We had Democrats and Republicans both. And we asked them just point blank, and the number one answer was regulatory uncertainty.

What does that mean? Well, it means that folks have money that they might want to invest, but they hold on tight

to that money because they're not quite sure what's going to happen. They're not sure whether we're going to get our debt under control or not. They're not sure how much ObamaCare, the President's health care law, is going to cost them. They're not sure whether the regulations that they've heard proposed by the EPA as potentially being proposed, they're not sure whether those are going to be implemented or not. It's just uncertainty everywhere. And I had someone say to me the other night, Well, there's always uncertainty.

Yes, there is always uncertainty. If you're a farmer, there's uncertainty whether there will be enough rain for the crops that year. There will always be some uncertainty in life because we don't have crystal balls. I get that. But what we don't want is a Federal Government that needlessly creates additional uncertainty.

You know, sometimes we say, I had enough problems before this came along. Well, that's what we're talking about. You have enough to deal with naturally. You have enough uncertainty as it is. You don't need the Federal Government creating more uncertainty.

If you talk to community banks who have been impacted by the President's Dodd-Frank law, they've got a lot of uncertainty. They're having to hire new folks to comply with the law. What are the new regulations going to be? We don't know yet, just know they're coming. Don't know what they're going to be yet, just know they're coming and they're going to be burdensome. The same with the health care law.

Here's a quote from, actually, a well-known Democrat businessman, commissioner on the Arkansas Highway Commission appointed by our Democrat Governor in Arkansas, former chairman of the Arkansas Economic Development Commission, John Burkhalter. He said at my jobs conference:

Every project I look at now, I've got to wonder if I'm going to get to build it because, are the regulations going to stop me? I've got to admit that I pass on over 50 percent of the projects that I would like to do because of the burden, the hurdle of the regulations.

Now, the President recently said in his State of the Union Address that he has approved fewer regulations in the first 3 years of his Presidency than his Republican predecessor did in his. Well, the President said that, sitting right here on the floor of the House during the State of the Union this year, so I think it deserves some attention.

Well, is that true? If you just look at the numbers, it's true, if you just look at the number of regulations. But if you look at the number of what are called major regulations and the burden that it puts, the cost of the regulations, what this President has done far exceeds what we've seen before.

The previous administration issued an average of 63 major regulations per

year. This administration has issued an average of 88, an increase of 40 percent. Under President Bush, the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs reviewed an average of 77 economically significant regulations biennially. These are the ones that really impact business. I'm not talking about a minor regulation here or there. We're talking about the ones that really impact job creators. Under President Bush, his Office of Regulatory Affairs reviewed about 77 every 2 years. Under this President, it's 125. Not quite doubled, but not far from it. If the administration maintains its current pace, it would add nearly \$150 billion annually in new regulatory costs over 8 years.

I'm going to yield to my friend from Virginia, but before I do, I just want to mention that I have proposed the Regulatory Freeze for Jobs Act, H.R. 4078. What it would do, it would basically freeze the introduction and progression of major regulations, those having an impact of \$100 billion or more. It would freeze those with exceptions for emergencies, health issues, what have you. There are exceptions in the bill. But it would freeze them until our unemployment rate gets down to 6 percent to show that we're getting our footing, because what the regulatory environment is doing to our job creators is stifling their ability to create jobs.

I'm going to yield now to my colleague from Virginia.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I thank you so much.

I stuck around just because I wanted to hear more about your Regulatory Freeze for Jobs Act. I think that is a great concept. I look forward to reading it. It is the way and the direction that we ought to be going, because I'm willing to bet that those regulations that have been approved are probably, if you looked at the inches of the regulations, it might only be one reg, but I would be willing to bet that this administration beats the Bush administration on inches of regulation by a mile.

That being said, I have to also say that I go out and talk to not only the Rotary Clubs and other civic organizations, but I like talking to high school students, because what we do here in Washington will be a far greater impact on their lives than what we do on our own lives. It's our children.

You indicated you have young children. I have an 11-year-old, a 6-year-old, and a 4-year-old, and I'm concerned about them.

But the high school students get it. When I start talking about the regulations and I talk about what would you do if you were a factory that was faced with having to pay big fines because you couldn't comply—couldn't comply, not didn't want to—couldn't physically and timewise comply with an EPA regulation, what happens to those jobs? You know what they say? I don't have to teach them this. They already know it. Those jobs go somewhere else, usually to China.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Sure.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. And they know, and we talk about the money issue. You talked about that, and you're absolutely right. They know that if we create a regulatory environment that's conducive to creation of jobs—not no regulations, but conducive to creating jobs—that we end up with more jobs. If you end up with more jobs, you have more taxpayers. If you have more taxpayers, you have more taxes. And guess what. Just like in our households, if you have more money coming in, it's a whole lot easier to pay your bills going out.

And so when we talk about living within our means, we can live within our means at a higher level if we just have the ability for the American entrepreneurial spirit and the American entrepreneur to go out and take the normal risks that are associated with any business enterprise and create the jobs, the jobs that over the last centuries we, as Americans, have worked hard to create, and in a mere 200 years created the greatest economic system, the greatest economic country ever seen on this planet.

I have to say, it comes back, and you talked about Dodd-Frank and banks, community banks in particular, and I come from a very rural district compared to a lot of the others, and the community banks are the heart and soul of those communities; and yet they are afraid to lend money to people they know are going to stay there and fight to keep those jobs and to fight for their communities, but they are hesitant to lend the money because they don't know what the regulatory scheme is going to be.

□ 2000

Not only do you have the entrepreneur who doesn't know, but the banker doesn't know, so he doesn't know if he can lend money even to that entrepreneur.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I have heard story after story from small-town bankers, community bankers, who say that not only are they deciding not to loan to folks based on character and based on relationship, but they're being told they can't. They're being told they can't. They are community banks, the sources of credit. The source of money for small-town America are being told who they can and cannot lend to. Their judgment is being taken away from them, and they're saying, Look, you don't have to decide. We're going to regulate that. We'll tell you who you can loan to and who you can't loan to, never mind the fact that you've known them for 20, 30, 40 years, generation after generation. We're going to control this from Washington.

This President talks about his financial reform bill going after Wall Street. Actually, the folks on Wall Street backed it. What it ended up doing is hurting the folks that had nothing to do with the financial collapse in the first place. Small-town community

banks got the brunt of a lot of this because the big banks can afford the extra regulation and compliance. The small banks cannot. So, what the President's bill did is it ignored Fannie and it ignored Freddie—the problems—and then it went after banks. It made Wall Street happy in many ways. Many of them got on board and endorsed it. And then who took the brunt of the burden, the regulatory burden? Small-town banks. Small-town banks.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. You said that Wall Street backed it, but I can guarantee you, Main Street didn't back it. Main Street had problems with it. I feel personal about this because as a young lawyer right out of law school, I took some risks. I had to go to the bank. The bank that I had been dealing with wouldn't work with me on buying a building. But one of my community banks stepped up to the plate, and they said, do you know what? We know that as long as you're alive, you'll pay this loan. Even if business isn't good, we count on you because we have known you since you were a kid, and we know exactly that you're going to be there, and you're going to do things.

Without that money, I daresay that I wouldn't have had a successful law practice for 28 years. A lot of times people don't think of lawyers as businessmen, but if you're a sole practitioner like I was for many, many years, you've got to make the payroll, you've got to pay your loans, and you've got to do the things that you have got to do. Well, guess what's happening? That loan wouldn't have been made to me today.

Another young man in a situation like I was in who wanted to go out and practice on his own and make his way in his hometown wouldn't be allowed to do that under the current regulatory scheme—and that's that job plus the jobs of all the people who I had working for me in that office as I went forward with my practice. So you're absolutely right in what you say.

Further, I have to get back to your Regulatory Freeze for Jobs Act. I have said for some time I wish I had introduced the bill. But I have said for some time that if we would put a freeze on new regulations and say to the American entrepreneur, the business people out there if you invest in the United States now, we will give you a window where you don't have to worry about any new regulations, we would turn this economy around like that, and we would see that unemployment rate not just drop by point one or point two, but we would see it drop down to your 6 percent that you've put in there, and I think we would even see it drop below that 6 percent if people knew that they could count on having, not no regulation, but reasonable regulations, and not have to worry about new regulations during this time of economic stress.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. I know we're running short on time, so I just

want to say to the folks listening out there, wherever you may be, these are not new ideas. Some of the ideas you've heard tonight on tax reform, regulatory reform, energy exploration and making the Federal Government live within its means and investing in infrastructure, these are not ideas that just came up this week. You may ask yourself, why haven't we passed these a long time ago? Why haven't we worked on this before? Why are we just talking about it now? We have been for over a year. For over a year we have been working on these issues.

Many of these ideas we've passed. Let's take tax reform. We talked about that in our budget over a year ago—it will be a year, I guess, in April. Regulatory reform, I can't count the number of bills—not including mine, I just introduced mine—but we have passed bill after bill after bill that deals with regulatory reform. What about energy exploration? I literally can't count the number of bills that we've passed that deal with energy exploration, particularly the Keystone pipeline, bill after bill after bill.

If there's any softening in the President's position on the Keystone XL pipeline, you can bet it's because we have been relentless in this House—relentless in this House—pushing the President to allow for the construction of that pipeline. We've got a long way to go, but we'll keep pushing.

On the issue of the budget and living within our means, we've been fighting this battle for over a year. So none of this is brand spanking new. A lot of these ideas we've been fighting for for over a year, and we'll continue to. But we've got to keep talking about them, keep talking about them.

So what's happened after we passed them? Well, a significant number, about 30 or so, have passed this House, and they go right down to the other side of the building, and they sit in the Senate. Many of us grew up in the 1970s and saw the little cartoon, "Schoolhouse Rock," the little bill sitting on the Capitol Hill steps out here somewhere. That little cartoon taught me the fundamentals of our democracy, how a bill becomes law. It passes this House, and then what happens? Well, it has to go down to the Senate.

Unfortunately, they haven't passed a budget out of the Senate in over a thousand days. So you can bet they haven't passed our bills, either. So we've addressed a lot of this stuff. And we're going to keep talking about it and keep pushing and keep pushing. But a lot of it is sitting right down there in the Senate waiting for action, going nowhere. So if you're wondering what's happened to these ideas, that's where they are. And we are continuing to work on them here, continuing to pressure the Senate and the President to try to work with us to get this stuff done, because these pillars—tax reform, regulatory reform, energy exploration, getting the Federal Government to live within its means and hav-

ing a commonsense budget, and as part of that, addressing our infrastructure issues, all those together, they all relate to jobs. So we'll keep fighting for jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2010

FREEDOM UNDER ASSAULT

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

These are the best of times and in some ways the worst of times. Our freedoms are under assault, and some people in places of leadership do not appreciate the threat to our freedoms and therefore are naively assisting those who would take them away.

We know that in recent days in Afghanistan we had some soldiers who were given the responsibility to burn Korans which were being used by prisoners to write messages of an incendiary nature to other prisoners. Well, it's my understanding of shari'a law that to write in such a Koran could be considered a desecration; yet there's been no protest, no outrage over prisoners using the Koran to pass inflammatory messages to other prisoners.

We've also seen the death of Americans as a result. Two officers, along with others, have been killed and injured. Our Commander in Chief has seen fit to apologize to those who house the killers of our two American officers.

When I think about the feelings of the family members of the two American officers who were serving, to have a commander not do as Lincoln and so many Commanders in Chief have done in the past wherein they sent those troubling letters to grieving families to thank them for their service and to truly grieve with the families, no, in this case, the Commander in Chief sent messages instead to the home of the killer.

Now, we're led to believe by some internationally that, gee, it just overwhelmed the killer of the two officers. But then we hear that he may have taken a silencer with him to work. Well, where I come from, courts that I've been in to prosecute, my court as a judge, my region as a chief justice, that would be considered evidence of premeditation, of first degree murder; and yet we apologize to those who think like the murderer.

I haven't heard a demand for an apology from Afghanistan and from the leaders of Afghanistan, who would not be in office but for the lives and sacrifice of American soldiers. They wouldn't be there but for American soldiers, yet no apology from Afghanistan. So I think we have to look a little deeper at what is really going on here.

We know that in the United States it's been deemed to be just fine to stick a cross that symbolizes the death and sacrifice of Jesus Christ in a beaker of urine. Now, some of us believe that anybody that would do such a thing without repenting before they leave this life will have a special price to pay by the Judge of all judges, by that same Creator which gave us our inalienable rights. But not only was that done; it was funded by the United States Government NEA funds.

We've been told repeatedly that there is nothing unconstitutional about burning an American flag, that flag for which so many millions of Americans have given the last full measure of devotion. We're told that it doesn't violate our Constitution to burn American Bibles, that that's just fine under our Constitution. Yet we even have great Americans who have risked their life for this country, who see the death and loss of lives, say you know what, maybe we ought to have a law that says you can't burn a Koran or you can't shoot at a Koran.

Some may recall that on May 22, 2008, there was a U.S. soldier that shot at a Koran. That sparked unrest, and there were two civilians and a Lithuanian that were killed as a result of that. Some people may remember last year when a pastor in Florida burned a Koran; it sparked rioting and 11 were killed, including seven U.N. workers.

What's really going on here? Well, I think it's important to look back to the Organization of Islamic—what used to be Islamic Conference—now it's been changed to Islamic Cooperation—and we can find some things. I've got a chart here to show.

This is from the Third Extraordinary Session of the Islamic Summit. It outlines the 10-year Program of Action to Meet the Challenges Facing the Muslim Ummah in the 21st Century. This is the Islamic Summit Conference results. It's important to note that the term "Islamophobia" was invented for just such occasions to try to demonize Americans—or so-called "Westerners"—who might try to say there's such a thing as freedom of speech, freedom of religion, who would seek to subjugate our First Amendment rights to the Islamic Conference, their rules and shari'a law.

The plan, the 10-year plan from December 2005, the plan is, here at number two:

Affirm the need to counter Islamophobia through the establishment of an observatory at the OIC General Secretariat to monitor all forms of Islamophobia, issue an annual report thereon, and ensure cooperation with the relevant governmental and non-governmental organizations, NGOs, in order to counter Islamophobia.

Endeavor to have the United Nations adopt an international resolution to counter Islamophobia, and call upon all States to enact laws to counter it, including deterrent punishments.

That's right. This is in compliance with the 10-year plan from 2005 to subjugate Americans' First Amendment

rights under our Constitution to shari'a law.

□ 2020

It's not a terribly complicated effort, but it is brutal. It has cost so many lives, all in an effort to not only show disdain for actions of Westerners regarding the Koran, but also to push to get the U.N. and all states such as the United States to adopt laws to punish what shari'a would consider any inappropriate use or abuse of a Koran.

I happen to think as a Christian it's terribly inappropriate to abuse a Koran. I would encourage people not to do so. I would likewise say that it is a terrible thing to abuse a Bible and to abuse a flag. It shouldn't be done. As a servicemember, prosecutor, judge, chief justice, I took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and that means all rights under our Constitution.

Just so people don't forget, I think it is appropriate to remember what is in the First Amendment:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

We're supposed to have the right to freedom of speech. The Supreme Court has said that means you can burn a flag, you can burn a Bible, you can burn a Koran. But there is a movement in all 57 states—that's right, 57 states of the OIC—to get the U.N. and all countries to subjugate their freedoms to shari'a law. Sure it's okay to burn a Bible, burn a flag, but not a Koran. It's wrong to do so, but it's not illegal.

We're told as of today that the Taliban says the airport blast in Afghanistan was revenge for Koran burnings. This article today points out that 40 people have been killed in protests and related attacks since the incident became known this past Tuesday, including four U.S. soldiers. NATO, France, Britain, and the U.S. have pulled their advisers from Afghan ministries out of concern that the anti-foreigner anger might erupt again. After all we've done, it's not over. These people feel they still must subjugate our First Amendment rights to shari'a law.

The First Amendment should be pretty clear. It should be noted that until the 1950s when Lyndon Johnson basically got tired of churches yapping at him over what they deemed as moral issues, he shut them up by adding an additional provision added to the tax laws that basically forbade any church or such organization from getting involved in politics. My children were surprised, based on what they had been taught in public school, that for most of this country's history, churches were the bedrock, churches were involved in every great movement that occurred, both in the Revolution, in the civil rights movement that resulted in the abolition of slavery, in

the civil rights movement of the 1950s and '60s. Lest we forget, Martin Luther King, Jr., was an ordained Christian minister. He knew and espoused the true way, truth and light.

The Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam was established in 1990. When we hear about the cause for human rights under shari'a law, it is important to understand what that means. This is from the Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam from August of 1990. Article 24 says:

All the rights and freedoms stipulated in this Declaration are subject to the Islamic shari'a.

Article 25:

Islamic shari'a is the only source of reference for the explanation or clarification of any of the articles of this Declaration.

That's what we're talking about. When the term "human rights" is utilized, it's important for people to understand that under this declaration of human rights that is still being forwarded today and thrust at us, it's important to note that those are considered human rights only under the definition of shari'a.

When we're told about the OIC believing and pushing human rights, that means no one has the right to desecrate a Koran in any way, although they can burn Bibles and American flags all day long. It means no one has the freedom of speech to draw a cartoon about Mohammed because if they do, they have the human right to be executed.

If someone is a Muslim and they pronounce that Jesus Christ has become their Lord, then they have the human right to be executed. If someone is a woman testifying under the laws of shari'a, she has the right to have her testimony only count as half that of a man. Under these terms, if a woman inherits from a male, she has the human right to receive just one-half of the inheritance that a man would. Under shari'a, as to those women on whose part you fear disloyalty and ill conduct, admonish them first, next refuse to share their beds, and, last, beat them. If a husband is displeased with his wife, the woman has the human right to be beaten.

This goes on and on. I'm surprised that the women's rights movement has not been more assertive in pointing out the inequalities that occur in countries that espouse shari'a and the threat that it imposes to women's rights all over the world and in America.

Under shari'a, to bring a claim of rape, a Muslim woman must present four male Muslim witnesses in good standing. Islam places the burden of avoiding illicit sexual encounters entirely on the woman. In fact, under shari'a, women who bring a claim of rape without being able to produce four male Muslim witnesses, admitting to having had illicit sex, if she or the man is married, this amounts to an admission of adultery and she should be punished. Some believe she should be stoned to death and at a minimum

flogged if she is raped and can't produce four men of Muslim good standing on her behalf.

□ 2030

She has the human right to be flogged or in some eyes to be stoned to death.

There are those who are saying we should get out of Afghanistan now. Actually, we could have done that a long time ago if a different course had been pursued. It is not inappropriate to note that in so many circumstances the enemy of our enemy should be considered our friend.

Along with DANA ROHRBACHER and STEVE KING, we met twice with Northern Alliance leaders, and although these brave leaders and their soldiers, their horse soldiers, did what some intelligence and special ops individuals have indicated, performed acts of heroism and gallantry such as they'd never seen before on their behalf and on behalf of America.

The Taliban was initially defeated, people forget, when we had initially less than 200, at no point more than 1,500, American special ops and intelligence just embedded with the Northern Alliance, assisting them as the enemy of the Taliban.

Our friends, the Northern Alliance, they're Muslim. They're our Muslim friends. But they did not want the intolerance of the Taliban and were willing to pay any price, just as the Founders were, to prevent having the Taliban take them over and, as they had done before, burn films, burn books, burn art, dictate to the women, prevent their freedoms. The Northern Alliance helped us by basically being the people who defeated the Taliban. We provided them the arms to do it, we provided them the aerial support, and they did it.

We disarmed them, told them they had nothing to worry about. We added over 100,000 troops and became occupiers. We tried to nation build. We gave them a constitution that provides for shari'a law.

Where is the apology to Afghan Christians for us getting them a constitution that does not permit public churches? The last Christian church in Afghanistan has closed. At last account, I'd seen there was one acknowledged Jewish person living in Afghanistan.

Now there's intolerance. We have a \$12.5 billion government in Afghanistan. That's their budget, and they provide about \$1.5 billion of their own. You know what happens to that government when we pull out? That's why the Taliban is telling people, even on Afghan television, We're going to be in charge as soon as the U.S. pulls out.

There are ways to deal with this issue. If you just look at the map, you get a good idea what we're talking about.

During a recent trip to Afghanistan and meeting with Baluch people—let's first look at the map itself.

Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran, India. Now, before 1948, this area in here was Baluchistan. In 1948, the arbitrary lines

that were drawn put Baluchistan in with Pakistan. This used to be a Baluch area. As a recent Pakistan Daily News editorial pointed out, most of Pakistan's natural resources come from this area. As people have advised us in Afghanistan when I was over there recently, the Taliban are being supported by supplies, arms. They're getting their support from southern Pakistan into southern Afghanistan. They're coming through the Baluch area.

The Baluch don't want that. They're Muslim. They're our friends. They want to be our friends. They would be wonderful friends. They have been terrorized by the Pakistani Government for decades, and we've stood by and didn't seem to care, the world has.

Well, perhaps it is time to recognize an independent Baluchistan, where we'd have a friend who would not keep supplying the enemy of America, those people that helped train and prepare for 9/11 to kill as many thousands of Americans as they could.

We don't want to leave Afghanistan in the hands of the Taliban and all of the American life and treasure be for nothing. But there is an easy answer. We leave, but we empower the enemy of our enemy, the Northern Alliance and the Baluch people. Let them take care of their own area. Let them prevent the Taliban from taking over. Let them prevent Pakistan from becoming such a focused enemy as they have unabated. Let them worry.

India wants to be our friend.

If we look at the area of Pakistan, well, this shows the different major ethnic groups. Pink here is the Baluch people; green is the Pashtun. And, of course, only a tiny percentage of the Pashtun people make up the Taliban, but virtually all of the Taliban is made up of Pashtun. They do come over here into Pakistan. Then we have brown as the Punjabi and the yellow as the Sindi.

Northern Alliance is up here. You've got a number of different groups up there, including Uzbeks. But these are people who do not want the Taliban to ever take over. They're the enemy of our enemy, and that's where we can do some real good. It's time to stop the support of those who would take away our First Amendment rights.

There's an article, this is from CNN, May 20, 2009:

Military personnel threw away, and ultimately burned, confiscated Bibles that were printed in the two most common Afghan languages amid concerns that they would be used to try to convert Afghans, a Defense Department spokesman said Tuesday.

The unsolicited Bibles sent by a church in the United States were confiscated about a year ago at Bagram Air Base in Afghanistan because military rules forbid troops of any religion from proselytizing while deployed there.

Such religious outreach can endanger American troops and civilians in the devoutly Muslim nation.

Why would it endanger civilians if they have the rights that Americans say we're fighting for? Why? We're burning Bibles, the American military did, back in 2009?

I was given this Bible by my aunt, told that it was provided during World War II to my uncle, says, "May the Lord be with you." It's a New Testament, and inside the front cover it says:

As Commander in Chief, I take pleasure in commending the reading of the Bible to all who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. Throughout the centuries, men of many faiths and diverse origins have found in the sacred book words of wisdom, counsel, and inspiration. It is a fountain of strength, and now, as always, an aid in attaining the highest aspirations of the human soul.

Signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

That wasn't signed by President Obama. It was signed by Franklin Roosevelt, and it was given to our soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me just say, if the President takes more action to demean the American rights and to eliminate our own rights, then it's time for the President to apologize, not to Afghanistan but to the American people.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. BILBRAY (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a family medical issue.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 2012, 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:

5095. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral Robert F. Willard, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5096. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John D. Gardner, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5097. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final

rule — Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Single Family Lender Insurance Process: Eligibility, Indemnification, and Termination [Docket No.: FR-5156-F-02] (RIN: 2502-A158) received February 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5098. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Equal Access to Housing in HUD Programs Regardless of Sexual Orientation or Gender Identity [Docket No.: FR 5359-F-02] (RIN: 2501-AD49) received February 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5099. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Group Health Plans and Health Insurance Issuers Relating to Coverage of Preventive Services Under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (RIN: 1210-AB44) received February 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5100. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary — Templates, Instructions, and Related Materials; and Guidance for Compliance received February 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5101. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary (RIN: 1210-AB52) received February 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5102. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 11-54, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5103. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 1-12 informing of an intent to sign a Project Agreement with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5104. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a message from the Speaker of the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5105. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5106. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5107. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Guidelines for Determining Probability of

Causation under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000; Revision of Guidelines on Non-Radiogenic Cancers [Docket Number: NIOSH-209] (RIN: 0920-AA39) received February 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5108. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Wage Methodology for the Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment H-2B Program; Delay of Effective Date (RIN: 1205-AB61) received February 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5109. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Little League Baseball, transmitting the Annual Report of Little League Baseball, Incorporated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1084(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5110. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting Sabine-Neches Waterway Channel Improvement Project Southeast Texas and Southwest Louisiana Final Environmental Impact Statement and Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Sites Final Environmental Impact Statement; (H. Doc. No. 112—90); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

5111. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule for Rating Disabilities; AL Amyloidosis (Primary Amyloidosis) (RIN: 2900-AN75) received February 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

5112. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Foreign Tax Credit Splitting Events [TD 9577] (RIN: 1545-BK50) received February 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5113. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary [TD 9575] (RIN: 1545-BJ94) received February 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5114. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Medicare Ombudsman report to Congress for the year 2010; 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. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 665. A bill to establish a pilot program for the expedited disposal of Federal real property; with an amendment (Rept. 112-402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1837. A bill to address certain water-related concerns on the San Joaquin River, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 563. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2117) to prohibit the Department of Education from overreaching into academic affairs and program eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Rept. 112-404). 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. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BOREN, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 4089. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4090. A bill to reauthorize the National Dam Safety Program Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 4091. A bill to assist low-income individuals in obtaining medically recommended dental care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 4092. A bill to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 to provide clarification of the relationship of certain constitutional rights to provisions of law relating to the military detention of certain covered person; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SEWELL (for herself and Mrs. ROBY):

H. Res. 562. A resolution directing the Office of the Historian to compile oral histories from current and former Members of the House of Representatives involved in the historic and annual Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, marches, as well as the civil rights movement in general, for the purposes of expanding or augmenting the historic record and for public dissemination and education; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BACA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WELCH):

H. Res. 564. A resolution recognizing the critical importance of the supplemental nutrition assistance program (SNAP), formerly called the food stamp program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEST (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr.

HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. MILLER of Florida);

H. Res. 565. A resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Palm City Community in Martin County, Florida; 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. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 4089.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 ; Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4090.

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

Article I, Section 1. "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 4091.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 4092.

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

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 10, 11, 14, and 18), which grants Congress the power to define and punish offenses against the law of nations, to make rules concerning captures on land and water; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 12: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 23: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 32: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 104: Mr. LANGEVIN and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 205: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 207: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 218: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 329: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 385: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 409: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 452: Mr. KLINE and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 459: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 481: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 511: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 631: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 640: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 757: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 777: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 799: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WEST, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 807: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 812: Mr. SCHILLING.

H.R. 876: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 892: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 930: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 931: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 1004: Mr. BERG.

H.R. 1114: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1164: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1167: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 1206: Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1330: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1332: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1340: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 1342: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1370: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 1386: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1404: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1418: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1505: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 1558: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1581: Mr. CRAVAACK.

H.R. 1588: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1672: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 1681: Ms. BASS of California.

H.R. 1738: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1895: Mr. MORAN, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1912: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2071: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2085: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2131: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 2168: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

H.R. 2179: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 2245: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2267: Mr. FORBES, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 2288: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 2328: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2353: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2404: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2437: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 2446: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. McCOTTER.

H.R. 2499: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2513: Mr. MORAN and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2529: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 2634: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2657: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2738: Mr. FARR and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2896: Mr. LANCE, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 2955: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 2969: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3014: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 3059: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3066: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 3083: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 3086: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. VISCSLOSKY.

H.R. 3207: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3269: Mr. TONKO, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. KIND, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 3275: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 3324: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3353: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3356: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WEST, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 3364: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. LOESACK.

H.R. 3373: Ms. MOORE, Ms. CHU, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. SPIER.

H.R. 3462: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3464: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3476: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 3485: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 3496: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 3506: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3523: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 3526: Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3528: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 3566: Ms. BASS of California.

H.R. 3612: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 3626: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 3627: Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 3643: Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 3676: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 3679: Mr. GRJALVA.

H.R. 3702: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 3704: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 3723: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 3767: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. WEST.

H.R. 3770: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 3783: Mr. CRAVAACK and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 3805: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 3821: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3827: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 3828: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 3831: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 3855: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 3860: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3863: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 3877: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 3893: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 3895: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 3914: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 3974: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3981: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3984: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3989: Mr. KELLY.

H.R. 3990: Mr. KELLY.

H.R. 3991: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 3992: Mr. PENCE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 3994: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 4010: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 4038: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 4045: Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 4046: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 4061: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 4065: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 4078: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 4080: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 4082: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.J. Res. 103: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Mr. FINCHER.

H. Res. 111: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. MORAN.

H. Res. 130: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 262: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 351: Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 484: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 542: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H. Res. 555: Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 556: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. KELLY, Mr.

DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H. Res. 560: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

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:

The amendment to be offered by Representative RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, or a designee to H.R. 2117 the Protecting Academic Freedom in Higher Education Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.