



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2012

No. 35

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 5, 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.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

PRESIDENT PUTIN

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend congratulations to Vladimir Putin for his election to become President of Russia. We saw the reports yesterday. There were nearly 100,000 Web cams that followed the voting stations all across Russia, and even though there have been reports from the Organization For Security and Cooperation in Europe of voting violations, we are where we are. Vladimir Putin is going to be the next President of Russia.

I believe that, in light of that fact, it's important for President Putin to recognize that, contrary to what he said in his acceptance speech last night, we do not want to destroy Russia. I believe that it is very important that we take every step that we can to encourage a strong, vibrant, growing, independent, democratic Russia. I'm not going to, as President Putin said last night, dictate from the West what he should do, but I do think that those of us, like the United States of America, a country that has had a 223-year history of democracy, could provide a little bit of advice to a country that is just now beginning to enter its third decade of democracy and obviously has had more than a few challenges.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that if we look at some of the recommendations, the economists last week pointed to some very positive steps that could allow President Putin to, rather than repressing the opposition that he faces, embrace it. Now, what could he do?

First, he could announce that this 6-year term will be his last term, that he will not run again as President of Russia.

Second, it would be very important in light of all of the controversy that took place following last December's parliamentary elections for him to call new parliamentary elections so we could have a greater degree of transparency and accountability.

Third, as we look at the prospect of provincial elections, what are tantamount to governorships, having those elections being free and fair would be a very positive thing.

Additionally, I was very glad to hear the news this morning from current President Dmitry Medvedev about the prospect of releasing my friend who sat with me on numerous occasions here in the Capitol, Mikhail Khodorkovsky, who was the head of Yukos Oil, one of the great energy companies in the world, and was a great philanthropist

in the country, and was guilty of one thing and one thing only, that being opposing Vladimir Putin. The prospect of his release would be a very welcome sign.

I also think, Mr. Speaker, that as we look at the prospect of the appointment of a new prime minister, there are names that have been thrown out there. Alexei Kudrin, who formerly served as finance minister, would be someone who would be very welcome in light of the fact that he has actually engaged the protesters.

So, Mr. Speaker, I throw these proposals out simply because I believe that we need to have a strong, vibrant, growing Russia. We need to recognize that those countries that are formerly part of the Soviet Union should also have an opportunity to be strong, vibrant, democratic, and independent without facing repression.

I do also believe, Mr. Speaker, that as we look at the debate that we're going to face here, that bringing Russia into a rules-based trading system by seeing them join the World Trade Organization would be a very positive thing as we pursue our shared goals.

So, again, as we look forward to the important relationship between Russia and the United States of America, I wish President-elect Putin hearty congratulations.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

□ 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.

H1137

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

At the beginning of a new workweek, we use this moment to be reminded of Your presence and to tap the resources needed by the Members of this people's House to do their work as well as it can be done.

May they be led by Your Spirit in the decisions they make. May they possess Your power as they steady themselves amid the pressures of persistent problems. May their faith in You deliver them from tensions that tear the House apart and from worries that might wear them out.

All this day and through the week, may they do their best to find solutions to pressing issues facing our Nation. Please hasten the day when justice and love shall dwell in the hearts of all peoples and rule the affairs of the nations of Earth.

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.

EXCITEMENT ABOUT SMALL MODULAR REACTORS AT THE SAVANNAH RIVER SITE

(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 Friday, the Department of Energy announced its decision to bring small modular nuclear reactor technology to the Savannah River Site in Aiken and Barnwell, South Carolina. SRS plays a vital role not only in the Aiken-Barnwell community, but also on a national level, as it enables the United States to honor its international nuclear nonproliferation commitments.

At a time when gas prices are at an all-time high and American families are increasingly facing tough choices, commonsense measures such as using existing government facilities and

technical expertise for developing SMRs are welcome.

I would like to congratulate Dwayne Wilson at the Savannah River Nuclear Solutions and Dr. Terry Michalske at the Savannah River National Laboratory. I'm also very proud of Dr. Dave Moody's efforts in creating such a fitting environment to host this technological advancement at no new cost to the taxpayer. Congratulations to Chief Engineer Gordon Simmons and Dr. Benjamin Cross for their article on Ameresco Biomass and small modular reactors in this month's *The Military Engineer* magazine.

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

ADVERTISERS PLAY A ROLE IN POLITICS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, last night, I rested very well on my Sleep Number bed knowing that the company had pulled its ads from Rush Limbaugh's show.

In light of Limbaugh's recent misogynistic attack on Georgetown student Sandra Fluke's fight to obtain affordable, legal birth control for women, I have been drawn to the important part that advertisers play in politics.

The use of airwaves to spread hatred of women is wrong. Those advertisers who support broadcasters who do so are nothing less than accessories to the crime. Advertisers' money keeps these vitriolic and hateful shows and hosts on the air.

Talk radio has gone too far, and it's long past time that advertisers take the initiative and recognize that shows they support often spread lies and hateful speech. I commend those advertisers who pulled their ads from this show, and I await those who follow. Companies like Sleep Number will keep my business, and my next order of flowers will come from ProFlowers.

But this isn't just about Mr. Limbaugh's recent, as he called it, "insulting word choices" as his substandard apology stated; it's about every advertiser who chooses to endorse the spread of hateful words and misinformation on America's airwaves.

INTERCONNECTED: THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE AND INSURANCE REFORMS

(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, health care continues to be an important topic in this country. A lot of people ask me, What keeps you awake at night? I'll tell you.

Right now, the Supreme Court is going to hear this law. They could find

the individual mandate is unconstitutional, and I hope they do. But what if they leave the rest of the law intact? Then we will have a real problem, and this House needs to be prepared to deal with that problem and lead on this issue.

In recent filings by the administration, it's apparent that they even acknowledge the difficulties inherent in throwing out the individual mandate but keeping things like guarantee issue and community rating; and, in fact, they asked that these two codependent policies be severed under the law.

States' attempts in the past to constitute guarantee issue and community rating have resulted in insurance costs becoming inexorably higher, the number of people who purchase insurance irrevocably lower, and, as a consequence, the entire system is at risk of completely imploding.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be prepared for this. The Supreme Court is going to hear the case next month. They'll rule by the end of June, and this House needs to be ready to lead.

COMMENDING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S PROPOSALS REGARDING HIGHER EDUCATION

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, President Obama stated recently that "no issue will have a bigger impact on the future performance of our economy than education." I commend President Obama for backing up this statement with key proposals that will make higher education more affordable for college students throughout our great Nation.

President Obama's proposal would increase Federal investment in the Perkins loan program from \$1 billion to \$8 billion, while rewarding colleges and universities that lower tuition costs and provide value to especially low-income students. President Obama also wants to increase the Pell Grant program for millions of college students.

President Obama has also proposed a "Pay As You Earn" plan to allow students to put a cap on their monthly payments and allow debt forgiveness balances after 20 years of payments.

Like the GI education bill that helped provide college education for millions of our veterans after World War II, these programs are critical to giving our young generation of college students a greater chance to complete their college education. As a Vietnam veteran, even I would not have completed my education if it had not been for the GI Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I commend President Obama for his leadership and initiative to provide good quality education for all our young generation of Americans.

□ 1410

STAND BY ISRAEL

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we're glad that the President took time out of his schedule from apologizing to people who apparently want others to pay for their contraceptives so that he could see Prime Minister Netanyahu today. He reiterated again what he said last May at AIPAC when he said—in the middle of a lot of other comments—that Israel must be able to defend itself by itself. He reiterated that again yesterday and today. The problem is for Israel to defend itself means they're defending us. We've been described as the Great Satan, the United States, and Israel the Little Satan.

It's time for this President to quit trying to suppress our friend Israel and stand with Israel; but if this President will not stand with Israel, then don't make threats to them about what we're going to do if they defend themselves without our okay. They've already been given the okay by the President, saying they must defend themselves by themselves. I hope and pray we will stand by Israel as they defend themselves—and us.

AIR CAPITAL AMBUCS

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend the Air Capital Chapter of AMBUCS.

AMBUCS provides mobility and transportation for people with disabilities. They provide therapeutic tricycles and bicycles to children and veterans with disabilities, and they give along with that the sense of freedom and hope that comes with being able to be transported.

Last year, my local chapter—appropriately named the Air Capital Chapter of AMBUCS—provided Marine Sergeant Jonathan Blank of Augusta with an AmTryke bike. It allowed him to regain some of his mobility. Sergeant Blank, having lost both legs in an explosion last year in Afghanistan, has been in physical therapy to learn to use his prosthetic legs. The AMBUCS-provided bike has allowed him to get exercise and stay healthy—strengthening his body and helping him walk with prosthetics sooner.

Air Capital AMBUCS has now provided over 30 specialty bikes since they were first chartered just 1½ years ago and are now one of the top five organizations all across the country—quite an impressive accomplishment. I would like to thank the Air Capital AMBUCS all-volunteer staff for the amazing work they do and their dedication to this very noble cause.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 2, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 2, 2012 at 10:18 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 35.
That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 36.
With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 2, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 2, 2012, at 11:23 a.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he notifies the Congress he has extended the national emergency with respect to Zimbabwe.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-92)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the na-

tional emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2012.

The crisis constituted by the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions has not been resolved. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue this national emergency and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

The United States welcomes the opportunity to modify the targeted sanctions regime when blocked persons demonstrate a clear commitment to respect the rule of law, democracy, and human rights. The United States has committed to continue its review of the targeted sanctions list for Zimbabwe to ensure it remains current and addresses the concerns for which it was created. We hope that events on the ground will allow us to take additional action to recognize progress in Zimbabwe in the future. The goal of a peaceful, democratic Zimbabwe remains foremost in our consideration of any action.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 2012.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

ROY SCHALLERN ROOD POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3637) to designate the facility

of the United States Postal Service located at 401 Old Dixie Highway in Jupiter, Florida, as the "Roy Schallern Rood Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3637

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

SECTION 1. ROY SCHALLERN ROOD POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 Old Dixie Highway in Jupiter, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Roy Schallern Rood Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Roy Schallern Rood Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. H.R. 3637, introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 Old Dixie Highway in Jupiter, Florida, as the Roy Schallern Rood Post Office Building.

The bill was favorably reported by the committee on Oversight and Government Reform on February 7 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting and proper that we name this post office in Jupiter, Florida, for Roy Rood, a servant to his local community and a veteran who served in World War II.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I had the tremendous honor of awarding a World War II veteran in my own district that I represent, Sergeant Arthur Nowakowski, his Silver Star for heroics he displayed over 60 years ago.

To Sergeant Nowakowski and Roy Rood and all of those who risked their lives and fought for the freedoms we hold dear today, thank you. Whether we present commendation medals or name post offices to honor our courageous veterans, these are small thanks and the very least that we can do for those who have sacrificed so much for our Nation.

I would now like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the legislation designating the United States Postal Service located in my district at 401 Old Dixie Highway in Jupiter, Florida, as the Roy Rood Post Office Building.

located in my district at 401 Old Dixie Highway in Jupiter, Florida, as the Roy Rood Post Office Building.

Roy was a longtime resident and a founding father of my hometown of Tequesta, Florida. Roy was born in 1918 on a farm in Jupiter, Florida, one of 11 children. Roy's childhood was spent working on his family's dairy farm where he learned the value of a hard day's work and fostered his love of the outdoors. The Rood farm was also home to Tequesta's first post office.

Rood joined the U.S. Navy in 1941, following the attack on Pearl Harbor. He served with dignity and honor as a trained instructor and aviation mechanic throughout World War II. Rood was stationed on the USS *Hollandia C-97*, a jeep aircraft carrier that was part of the fleet that participated in the Battle of Guam. By the end of the war, Roy had risen to the rank of aviation mate first class and was an acting chief petty officer.

Following the war, Roy returned home to Florida where he started a landscaping business that continues today. Before his death in October of last year, Roy Rood helped found American Legion Post 271, of which I'm a member; the local Kiwanis Club; the First Bank of Jupiter; and Jupiter Christian School.

Tequesta has seen many changes over the last 60 years and has grown due to the hard work and dedicated lives of people like Roy Rood. He was a fixture in my own hometown of Tequesta and in the many philanthropic organizations along the Treasure Coast, and they are directly attributed to his efforts. The residents of Tequesta are lucky to call Roy Rood our town's founding father. It would be a fitting tribute to Roy Rood's legacy and service to name the post office in Jupiter in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, over the last several years, I got to know Mr. Rood and his wife personally. I can honestly say there is no better, gentler, and kinder man than Mr. Rood. He will truly be missed.

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

On behalf of the minority of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I rise in support of the consideration of H.R. 3637, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 Old Dixie Highway in Jupiter, Florida, as the Roy Schallern Rood Post Office Building.

The measure before us was introduced by my good friend, Representative TOM ROONEY, on December 12 of last year in accordance with committee requirements. H.R. 3637 is co-sponsored by all Members of the Florida delegation and was favorably reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee by unanimous consent on February 7, 2012.

H.R. 3637 honors the life and legacy of Roy Rood, a Navy chief petty officer and business pioneer from Tequesta, Florida.

Shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Mr. Rood elected to join the fight for freedom by enlisting in the U.S. Navy in 1941. During his tour of duty with the U.S. Navy in World War II, Mr. Rood served with dignity and honor as a trained instructor and aviation mechanic. Mr. Rood was stationed on the USS *Hollandia C-97*, which was part of the fleet that participated in the Second Battle of Guam in 1944.

After his service in World War II, Mr. Rood returned to his home in south Florida where he started a successful landscaping business that actually continues to operate and thrive to this day. As the founder of the town of Tequesta, Florida, Mr. Rood has been a philanthropic and valuable member of that community.

That said, Mr. Speaker, let us honor the service and life of this fine American citizen by renaming the Old Dixie Highway Post Office in Jupiter, Florida, as the Roy Schallern Rood Post Office Building.

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, we can never do enough for our veterans, men like Roy Rood who have sacrificed and risked it all in the name of freedom.

While it has been over 60 years since World War II, we must never forget the sacrifices made by these people and so many others during that time. To those who have fought and served, to those who protect and defend our great country each and every day, thank you. Remember, Mr. Speaker, freedom is not free.

I urge all Members to join me in strong support of this bill, H.R. 3637, and 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. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3637.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. 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.

PRIVATE ISAAC T. CORTES POST OFFICE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3413) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1449 West Avenue in Bronx, New York, as the "Private Isaac T. Cortes Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3413

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

SECTION 1. PRIVATE ISAAC T. CORTES POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1449 West Avenue in Bronx, New York, shall be known and designated as the “Private Isaac T. Cortes Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Private Isaac T. Cortes Post Office”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1710

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3413, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1449 West Avenue in Bronx, New York, as the Private Isaac T. Cortes Post Office. H.R. 3413 was reported favorably by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on February 7 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, Private Isaac T. Cortes was born and raised in the Bronx and joined the Army in November of 2006. While at one time Private Cortes had aspirations of becoming a police officer with the New York City Police Department, his desire to serve and protect his country as a soldier soon won out. According to his brother, Private Cortes was “proud doing what he did.” He wanted to continue serving in the Army and serve to fight against terrorism.

In September of 2007, Private Cortes deployed to Iraq to support Operation Iraqi Freedom and served as an infantry squad leader in the 10th Mountain Division based out of Fort Drum, New York.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, less than 3 months later, on November 27, 2007, Private Cortes died when the vehicle that he was riding in was struck by an improvised explosive device. He was just 26 years old.

For his bravery and courage, Mr. Speaker, Private Cortes was awarded the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting and proper that we name this post office in honor of Private Cortes. This man made the ultimate sacrifice fighting to protect the country that he

loved. He put his own life in harm’s way so that we can remain the land of the free.

For that, Mr. Speaker, I’m truly grateful. The least we can do, Mr. Speaker, is to honor him and his brave service to our Nation by naming this post office after him. I urge all Members to join me in support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3413, a bill I authored to rename the United States Postal Service facility at 1449 West Avenue in the Bronx, New York, in honor of Private Isaac T. Cortes, who tragically lost his life outside Amerli, Iraq, on November 27, 2007.

Private Cortes lived his life by a simple motto, “Go big or go home,” which can also be used to describe Isaac’s decision to join the Army. Certainly there can be no more fitting instance of following the words he lived by than his decision to serve his country at a time when our country was fighting, not one, but two wars.

Isaac joined the Army in part because he felt that it would help him achieve his dream of one day becoming a member of the New York City Police Department, but quickly discovered that the Army was his true calling. Private Cortes loved the Army and loved the feeling of pride for country and community he felt when he wore the U.S. Army uniform, a pride so strong that Private Cortes intended to make a career in the Army, a career in the service of his country. Unfortunately, that dream was cut short on November 27, 2007, when Private Cortes, his Humvee, was hit by an IED, killing him instantly.

While Private Cortes did not get the chance to come home, his memory and spirit lives on through the love of his family, friends, country, and community.

The Army has recognized Private Cortes’ exceptional service by awarding him the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, the National Defense Service Medal, the Iraq Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the Army Service Ribbon.

Known for a big heart and his loving ways, his family honors his memory by hosting blood, clothing, food, and toy drives. And today, we have the opportunity to do our part to contribute to his legacy by passing this legislation, which will ensure his courage, integrity, and sacrifice will live on to inspire future generations to live up to his example.

There is nothing the government can do that will ever live up to Isaac’s “go big” moment or erase the burden felt by his family, especially his mother, Emily Toro, who I know is watching the proceedings now; but, by passing this bill, at least this Congress can do something to help ensure that his memory survives.

I think it only appropriate that prior to passing this bill we honor the serv-

ice of a World War II veteran, really showing the link between that great war to preserve democracy and freedom throughout the world and the sacrifices that have been made and continue to be made in a part of the world in the Middle East, in Iraq and Afghanistan, to preserve those same freedoms that we hold dear, that Private Cortes held dear, and as the people of the Bronx hold dear.

Just a note, Mr. Speaker, my colleague was talking about Bronx, New York. There are only three parts of the world that begin with “the”: the Vatican, The Hague, and the Bronx, sometimes said “da” Bronx.

But the Bronx is very proud of its sons and daughters, many of whom have paid the ultimate sacrifice in wartime; and this wartime is not unlike any other, continues to sacrifice, as do the sons and daughters of New York City and New York itself.

So, Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Private Isaac T. Cortes’ commitment to the Bronx, to New York City, to New York State, and to his beloved country, I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating the life of this brave soldier by supporting the passage of H.R. 3413.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and once again wish Emily Toro and the entire Cortes family our regards.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 3413, honoring the service in memory of Private Isaac Cortes and the sacrifices of his family, including Mrs. Toro, his service to this country and to the Bronx, by naming this post office in his honor.

With that, 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. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3413.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1720

JAMES M. FITZGERALD UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1710) to designate the United States courthouse located at 222 West 7th Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska, as the James M. Fitzgerald United States Courthouse.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1710

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

SECTION 1. JAMES M. FITZGERALD UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse located at 222 West 7th Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska, shall be known and designated as the “James M. Fitzgerald United States Courthouse”.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1710.

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

There was no objection.

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

Senate bill 1710 would designate the United States courthouse located at 222 West Seventh Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska, as the James M. Fitzgerald United States Courthouse.

Just last week, the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, which I chair, marked up the House companion bill introduced by Congressman DON YOUNG of Alaska, and I want to thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Judge James M. Fitzgerald had 47 years of experience as a judge, both in the State of Alaska and on the Federal bench. He was one of the first judges appointed to the Superior Court in Alaska when Alaska became a State in 1959 and was later appointed to the Alaska Supreme Court in 1972.

In 1974, President Ford appointed Judge Fitzgerald to the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska, where he remained until his retirement in 2006. I think it is more than fitting that a Federal courthouse in Anchorage bear his name. I support passage of this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1710 and am pleased to speak in support of the bill that names the United States courthouse located at 222 West Seventh Avenue in Anchorage, Alaska, as the James M. Fitzgerald United States Courthouse.

Judge James Martin Fitzgerald is considered one of the founding fathers of law in the State of Alaska. He dedicated his life to public service and was well respected throughout the Alaskan

legal community. Judge Fitzgerald was a World War II veteran, serving in both the U.S. Army and the U.S. Marines. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and an Air Medal for his military service and was honorably discharged in December 1946.

After his military service, Judge Fitzgerald earned his LL.B. and B.A. simultaneously from Willamette University and graduated in 1951. Soon after graduation, Judge Fitzgerald was appointed as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in Ketchikan, Alaska, and Anchorage, Alaska, earning a reputation as a prosecutor willing to take on corruption in law enforcement. In 1959, he was appointed by the governor of Alaska as the legal counsel for the State, and shortly thereafter was appointed as the State's first commissioner of public safety. Judge Fitzgerald was later appointed as a Superior Court judge in 1959 and in 1972 to the Alaska Supreme Court.

In 1975, President Gerald Ford appointed Judge Fitzgerald as the first district judge for the District of Alaska. Nine years later, Judge Fitzgerald was appointed chief judge for the District of Alaska, where he served until he assumed senior status in 1989. Judge Fitzgerald continued to serve as a judge in Alaska and on the Ninth Circuit until his death on April 3, 2011. In total, Judge Fitzgerald spent 53 years on the bench. Because Judge Fitzgerald took on his first judicial appointment the same year as Alaska achieved statehood, he had a unique role in shaping all Alaskan jurisprudence.

Because of Judge Fitzgerald's service as a member of the U.S. military and his contribution to the Alaskan and the U.S. legal community, it is appropriate to designate the United States courthouse located in Anchorage, Alaska, as the James M. Fitzgerald United States Courthouse. I commend my colleague from Alaska who sponsored this bill for his recognition of the judge, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I do thank the gentleman for yielding.

S. 1710, this legislation, as has been mentioned by both speakers, will name the Federal courthouse in Anchorage after the late Judge James Martin Fitzgerald. James Fitzgerald served Alaska from 1959 to 2006 on the first Alaska Superior Court bench, on the Alaska Supreme Court, and on the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska.

Judge Fitzgerald was an honorable man and represents the best of Alaska in its earliest years as a State. As was mentioned, from his service to his country in the South Pacific during

World War II to the time he served on the State of Alaska's highest court, Judge Fitzgerald always put his country and State first. From 1959 until his retirement in 2006, he served with distinction as a State and Federal judge unanimously praised for his brilliance, his modest nature, and his sense of justice.

In addition to serving as a judge, Judge Fitzgerald was a decorated World War II Marine veteran, a prosecutor, Alaska's first commissioner of public safety, and the initiator of what would become the Alaska State Troopers and the Alaska Village Public Safety Officer Program.

I am proud to have helped championed this legislation to designate the United States courthouse in Anchorage as the James M. Fitzgerald United States Courthouse. He was a great man, and this will ensure his life and accomplishments are properly memorialized in my State. Again, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. DENHAM. 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 California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1710.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 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. 2842, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION SMALL CONDUIT HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND RURAL JOBS ACT OF 2011

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-408) on the resolution (H. Res. 570) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2842) to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ROY SCHALLERN ROOD POST OFFICE BUILDING

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 pass the bill (H.R. 3637) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 Old Dixie Highway in Jupiter, Florida, as the “Roy Schallern Rood Post Office Building,” 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. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 362, nays 2, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]
YEAS—362

Ackerman	Clyburn	Griffith (VA)
Adams	Coble	Grimm
Aderholt	Coffman (CO)	Guinta
Akin	Cohen	Guthrie
Alexander	Cole	Hahn
Altmire	Conaway	Hall
Amash	Connolly (VA)	Hanabusa
Amodi	Conyers	Hanna
Andrews	Cooper	Harper
Austria	Costa	Harris
Baca	Costello	Hartzler
Bachmann	Courtney	Hastings (FL)
Bachus	Crawford	Hastings (WA)
Baldwin	Crenshaw	Hayworth
Barletta	Critz	Heck
Barrow	Crowley	Heinrich
Bartlett	Cuellar	Hensarling
Barton (TX)	Culberson	Herger
Bass (CA)	Cummings	Herrera Beutler
Bass (NH)	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Becerra	Davis (KY)	Himes
Benishek	DeFazio	Hinche
Berg	DeGette	Hochul
Berkley	DeLauro	Holden
Berman	Denham	Holt
Biggert	Dent	Honda
Bilbray	DesJarlais	Hoyer
Billirakis	Diaz-Balart	Huelskamp
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Dold	Hultgren
Black	Dreier	Hunter
Blackburn	Duffy	Hurt
Blumenauer	Duncan (SC)	Israel
Bonamic	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Bono Mack	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Boren	Ellison	Jackson Lee
Boswell	Ellmers	(TX)
Boustany	Eshoo	Jenkins
Brady (PA)	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Brady (TX)	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Bralley (IA)	Fattah	Johnson, Sam
Brooks	Filner	Jones
Broun (GA)	Fincher	Keating
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Kelly
Bucshon	Flake	Kildee
Buerkle	Fleming	King (IA)
Burgess	Flores	King (NY)
Butterfield	Fortenberry	Kingston
Calvert	Fox	Kinzinger (IL)
Camp	Frank (MA)	Kissell
Canseco	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Cantor	Gallely	Lamborn
Capito	Garamendi	Lance
Capps	Gardner	Landry
Capuano	Garrett	Langevin
Carnahan	Gerlach	Lankford
Carney	Gibbs	Larsen (WA)
Carson (IN)	Gibson	Larson (CT)
Carter	Cassidy	Latham
Cassidy	Gingrey (GA)	Latham
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez	LaTourette
Chabot	Goodlatte	Latta
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Lee (CA)
Chandler	Granger	Levin
Chu	Graves (GA)	Lewis (CA)
Cicilline	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
Clarke (MI)	Green, Al	LoBiondo
Clay	Green, Gene	Loehsack
Cleaver	Griffin (AR)	Lofgren, Zoe

Long	Pelosi
Lucas	Pence
Luetkemeyer	Peters
Lujan	Peterson
Lummis	Petri
Lungren, Daniel	Pitts
E.	Platts
Mack	Poe (TX)
Maloney	Sires
Marchant	Polis
Marino	Pompeo
Markey	Posey
Matheson	Price (GA)
Matsui	Price (NC)
McCarthy (CA)	Quayle
McCarthy (NY)	Quigley
McCaul	Reed
McClintock	Rehberg
McCollum	Reichert
McDermott	Renacci
McGovern	Ribble
McHenry	Richardson
McIntyre	Rivera
McKeon	Roby
McKinley	Roe (TN)
McMorris	Rogers (AL)
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)
McNerney	Rogers (MI)
Meehan	Rohrabacher
Meeks	Rokita
Mica	Rooney
Michaud	Ros-Lehtinen
Miller (MI)	Roskam
Miller (NC)	Ross (FL)
Miller, Gary	Rothman (NJ)
Mulvaney	Roybal-Allard
Murphy (PA)	Ryunyan
Myrick	Rush
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)
Neal	Ryan (WI)
Neugebauer	Sanchez, Linda
Noem	T.
Nugent	Sarbanes
Nunes	Scalise
Nunnelee	Schakowsky
Olson	Schiff
Oliver	Schilling
Owens	Schmidt
Palazzo	Schock
Pallone	Schrader
Pascarell	Schwartz
Pastor (AZ)	Schweikert
Paulsen	Scott (SC)
Pearce	Scott (VA)
	Scott, Austin

NAYS—2

Cravaack

Rigell
NOT VOTING—69

Bishop (NY)	Hirono
Bonner	Inslee
Brown (FL)	Johnson (GA)
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)
Campbell	Jordan
Cardoza	Kaptur
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich
Davis (IL)	Labrador
Deutch	Lewis (GA)
Dicks	Lowe
Doggett	Lynch
Donnelly (IN)	Manzullo
Doyle	McCotter
Engel	Miller (FL)
Fleischmann	Miller, George
Forbes	Moore
Franks (AZ)	Moran
Flake	Murphy (CT)
Fudge	Nadler
Gohmert	Nadler
Gosar	Paul
Grijalva	Payne
Gutierrez	Perlmutter
Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)

□ 1857

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to a family emergency, I missed the following rollcall vote: No. 95 on March 5, 2012.

Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry

Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Turner (NY)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

If present, I would have voted: rollcall vote No. 95—H.R. 3637—To designate the “Roy Schallern Rood Post Office Building” in Jupiter, Florida, “yea.”

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed the vote on Monday, March 5, 2012. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 95, H.R. 3637, the “Roy Schallern Rood Post Office Building.”

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 5, 2012, I had a previously scheduled meeting with constituents in Champaign, Illinois. As a result, I am unable to attend votes this evening. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye,” on H.R. 3637, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 Old Dixie Highway in Jupiter, Florida, as the “Roy Schallern Rood Post Office Building.”

ESTABLISHING JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) to establish the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on January 21, 2013, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 35

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

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE.

There is established a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies (in this resolution referred to as the “joint committee”) consisting of 3 Senators and 3 Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively. The joint committee is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on January 21, 2013.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE.

The joint committee—

(1) is authorized to utilize appropriate equipment and the services of appropriate personnel of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, under arrangements between the joint committee and the heads of those departments and agencies, in connection with the inaugural proceedings and ceremonies; and

(2) may accept gifts and donations of goods and services to carry out its responsibilities.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF ROTUNDA AND EMANCIPATION HALL BY JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) to authorize the use of the rotunda and Emancipation Hall of the Capitol by the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies conducted for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 36

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

SECTION 1. USE OF THE ROTUNDA AND EMANCIPATION HALL OF THE CAPITOL.

The rotunda and Emancipation Hall of the United States Capitol are authorized to be used on January 21, 2013, by the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies conducted for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BORDER SHOOTOUT

(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, last week, border protectors were patrolling near Roma, Texas, when they spotted drug smugglers trying to move narcotics into the United States. The agents found themselves under attack from the Mexican side when narco-terrorists unleashed gunfire from the other side of the Rio Grande River. The agents returned fire in self-defense. This sounds like a scene out of a western movie, but unfortunately this is real life on the Texas border.

The legal ports of entry may seem safe, but in the hinterlands it's the Wild West. Law enforcement is outmanned, outgunned, and outfinanced. We have troops protecting the borders of other countries; why don't they protect ours? But Texas is defending itself. It has to.

On Thursday, Texas DPS unveiled the second in its fleet of six gunboats that will now patrol the Rio Grande. Why does Texas have to send its own navy to defend the border of the United States? Because the Federal Govern-

ment refuses to do its job, and someone has to protect the homeland.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1900

THE SLAUGHTER CONTINUES IN SYRIA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. The slaughter continues in Syria.

Mr. Speaker, last week I visited the head of Mission at the Syrian Embassy and delivered letters that indicated that Mr. Assad, President Assad must go and that there must be an establishment of safe houses or safe places for women and children and that, at that time, the bodies of those deceased journalists should come out and, as well, that the Red Cross and International Red Cross should be allowed in.

Then there was a protesting and suggesting it was the rebels that weren't allowing the Red Cross in. But we've now heard from a journalist that was able to get out that those journalists were actually murdered. And now, today, we're reading that the Syrian authorities Friday blocked an officially sanctioned Red Cross convoy laden with food and medical supplies from entering a devastated neighborhood in Homs 1 day after the Army overwhelmed the rebel stronghold here after a months-long siege. No rebels, just a Syrian despot, the people who want to kill their own people.

Mr. Assad needs to go. We need to get women and children safe. We need to be able to get justice for the dead journalists, and now the world needs to rise up. I look forward to the Syrian resolution passing, but something must be done.

Mr. Assad, you have to go.

CONGRATULATING THE EDEN PRAIRIE BOYS SWIMMING AND DIVING TEAM

(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 want to rise today to congratulate the Eden Prairie boys Eagles swimming team and diving team on winning the Minnesota State Championship recently. The Eden Prairie Eagles earned more than 100 points over their two closest competitors that tied for second place.

A key relay team of Aaron Greenberg, Maverick Hovey, Mike Solfelt and Bryce Boston also set a new State record in the 200-yard freestyle relay, and they also took home first place in the 400-yard freestyle relay.

Mr. Speaker, these student athletes have absolutely seen that teamwork builds character, confidence, and self-worth. It also teaches our young people the importance of working together to

find common ground. Lessons such as playing competitively while also having respect for your opponent are lifelong and will make for absolutely strong, successful adults and future strong leaders.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the Eden Prairie boys swimming and diving team.

A CALL FOR COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. POLIS. I rise today to urge this body, the United States Congress, to join my constituents' call and meet my constituents' call for comprehensive immigration reform.

My constituents across the ideological spectrum, from those on the right, who decry the rule of law, the undermining of the state of law and the affront to our sovereignty, to those on the left, who decry the tearing apart of families and the injustices of the inhumane treatment of people in our immigration system, we are calling out to fix our broken immigration system and replace it with one that works.

There are upwards of 10 to 15 million people residing in this country illegally. We owe it to the citizens of our country, conservative, liberal, and everywhere in between, to make sure that there are close to zero people living in this country illegally and pass comprehensive immigration reform, as both President Bush and President Obama have called for on a bipartisan basis.

My constituents demand action now. I call upon Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF DANIEL J. MABIN

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Daniel J. Mabin, World War II veteran, Korean War-era veteran, passed away this afternoon in Pennsylvania. Dan was a father, grandfather, great-grandfather, and he was the loving husband of his wife, Sheelagh. He was preceded in death by his beloved son Sean.

Dan was a member of what has been called "the Greatest Generation any society has ever produced," and he certainly earned that distinction by defending this country through two conflicts.

Sheelagh was his English war bride, whom he brought to America and settled in Levittown, Pennsylvania. When he left the service, Dan worked hard to support his growing family, often working several jobs.

Dan was someone who loved his country and cared deeply about its future. During his life, he served his community and worked to better the lives of

those around him. He imparted these values to his children, who have gone on to contribute greatly to their communities as well.

I had the honor and the pleasure of knowing Dan. He's left a lasting impression on those he touched. May his soul rest in peace.

IN MEMORIAM OF WILLIAM J.
"BILL" RAGGIO

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

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, today, in Nevada, a funeral service is being held for William J. "Bill" Raggio.

When you think of Nevada public service in the modern era, Bill Raggio's name tops all lists. When you think of legislative leadership in the Silver State, Bill Raggio's name tops all lists. When you think of self-made individuals in Nevada, Bill Raggio's name, once again, tops all lists.

It is with sincere sorrow that I rise on the floor of the United States House of Representatives on this day to memorialize a native son of the State of Nevada, a husband, a dad, a community and statewide leader, a role model, and a friend with whom I had the honor and privilege of serving the people of Nevada for many years.

My condolences to Bill's daughters, Leslie and Tracy, and to his wife, Dale. God bless you, Bill.

WE WILL BE THERE TO DEFEND
ISRAEL

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, America has no better friend on the face of the Earth than the people of Israel. Israel is the only nation on Earth that can say they've stood by America 100 percent of the time for 100 percent of their existence. And it's so important today that America, that our President, that this Congress, stand behind the people of Israel at this moment of supreme peril.

When the Iranians are building a nuclear weapon as fast as they can, that the Iranians have said they're going to use it, America must stand by Israel. There should be no doubt in the mind of every Israeli, of every friend of Israel around the world that America will stand behind her best friend 100 percent of the time, just as they have stood beside us 100 percent of the time.

We will be there for Israel to defend her safety, her security, and her prosperity against any enemy, any time, anywhere.

CONFLICT BETWEEN IRAN AND
ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas). Under the

Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives in this world's great deliberative body. And taking it from the top, as I listened to the statements that were made tonight in the 1-minute, I think of the gentlelady from Texas and her statement about Syria.

Now I'm not here, Mr. Speaker, to defend President Assad and Syria. In fact, I think he needs to go. And I believe that all people of the world have a right to a self-determination, and they should not live under tyranny and they should not live under despotism.

I just think back to when some of us objected that the former Speaker of the House, Mr. Speaker, and that was NANCY PELOSI, as she took over the big gavel, she set up a diplomatic tour and mission, and one of those places was Syria. And I remember the President of the United States, whom, according to the Constitution, is in control of—and I'll say according to the interpretation of the Constitution, he's Commander-in-Chief but also controls the foreign policy. It's implicit, and it's more than a two-century practice that you have to have the President of the United States as conducting foreign policy.

The President of the United States was George W. Bush who asked the then-Speaker of the House, please, do not go to Syria. Do not seek to negotiate with President Assad. Do not upset the diplomacy that's taking place between the United States and Syria, or the lack of that diplomacy.

And I think about that time when NANCY PELOSI, as Speaker, crossed that line, even though it was requested by the President of the United States, the Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces, and the individual who was in command of all of our foreign policy, had asked her not to go.

Now we see what's going on in Syria. And I listened to the comments, and I just think that if the gentlelady from Texas had spoken up at that time when I did, it might be a little bit easier to hear tonight than this particularly was.

□ 1910

Mr. Speaker, there are many things in front of us in this Congress. Among them, of course, are economics and national defense, and our national security.

Right now, as I listened to the gentleman from Texas talk about the Israelis, and there's an event going on tonight that brings together about 12,000 people that are some Israelis, many people of Jewish origin here in the United States, and all who will be sitting there at the AIPAC dinner will be strongly supporting an independent Israel that is in control of defending themselves, the sovereignty of Israel.

I'm a strong supporter of Israel. I look at the country of Israel surrounded by its enemies, formed in 1948, and for most of my life, I've watched Israel develop and defend herself, and I've watched how they are the most stable and reliable democracy in the Middle East, and for a long time they were the only democracy in the Middle East. It would be the only place for a long time where an Arab could get a fair trial out of all of the Middle East.

Today, we're seeing the dialogue take place from Iran, not with Iran, and Israel is the stated target of Ahmadinejad. They've been working in Iran, as you know, Mr. Speaker, urgently and feverishly to develop a nuclear weapon and a means to deliver it.

When I came into this Congress and was sworn in in 2003, I sat down then with the ambassadors to the United States from Germany, France, and Great Britain, who were seeking to convince us here in the Congress that we should encourage our President to open up dialogue with the Iranians and perhaps be able to talk them out of their nuclear endeavor.

Now, that was in September of 2003 that that meeting took place over in the Rayburn building, Mr. Speaker. As I sat in on that meeting and weighed in on that meeting, I kept hearing the message come back about "open up dialogue." They wanted to open up dialogue.

So when it came around to the opportunity where I had the floor, I asked those three ambassadors from each nation, the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, What is your long-term agenda here? What do you propose to do? They said, We want to open up dialogue. My answer was, If we open up dialogue with Iran, what is the next step? They said, We're only here to talk about opening up dialogue.

But if you open up dialogue with Iran, there are other steps along the way. If we just talk with them, and they refuse then to shut down their nuclear development within Iran, what are you prepared to do?"

I watched these diplomats start to get nervous. When you talk to diplomats about action, they start to get nervous. So what are you prepared to do? What do you mean? We all, I think, knew what was coming.

Well, are you prepared to go to the United Nations with us and ask for a resolution rejecting Iran's nuclear endeavor? Are you prepared to bring about sanctions? If the sanctions don't work, are you prepared to bring about a blockade? If the blockade doesn't work and there's a line in the sand that says if you violate the blockade, and if you continue on your nuclear endeavor, are you prepared then to go to the desert and enforce the very things that are being started in this dialogue here?

Of course they weren't prepared to do that. They weren't even prepared to talk about that.

Mr. Speaker, when you start down the path of diplomacy and you think

that the only tool you have is diplomacy, there is nobody out here operating as a sovereign nation in the world that's just kind of dumb or duped that doesn't understand that there has to be a force, there has to be some kind of threat, there has to be a consequence and an "or what," or otherwise we would go to the Iranians with our hat in our hand and say, Why don't you be some nice guys for a change and shut down your nuclear development, your nuclear endeavor? What kind of luck will we have with that?

If they believe, as they seem to, that they're called upon by the entity that they worship to annihilate Israel, the miniature Satan, and then turn around and annihilate the Great Satan, the United States of America, that's their stated purpose, Mr. Speaker. And their stated purpose is target one, Tel Aviv, because it's the city that was created after the origins of Israel, and its predominantly of Jewish population. So they would target Tel Aviv.

Now, any nation that would take that position, we would think that somehow we would say to them, Even though your goals are to annihilate Israel and to annihilate the Great Satan, the United States, would you just please be a nice guy and stop developing your nuclear weapons? I mean, how naive could we be to go to Ahmadinejad and make that kind of a request under the guise of dialogue and think somehow that that's going to get the job done?

We should have known then—I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I knew then—that dialogue was not going to solve the problem. You never win on dialogue alone. You always have to have a leverage point, so they will look at that, they'll look you in the eye and decide, they mean what they say. It isn't worth it any longer. The juice is not worth the squeeze. I'm going to back off and stop developing the nuclear. But of course that didn't happen. The three countries that were here asking us to engage in dialogue, good people and good friends, very respectable ambassadors each. I have personal admiration and respect for them. But when you start down the path of dialogue, you must also understand there has to be a consequence at the other end. That consequence, in sequence, was to go to the United Nations for a resolution of rejection and disapproval, make it clear in the international world that the Iranians were violating the nuclear nonproliferation agreements that were established, make it clear that there would be sanctions, and if that's the case, there would be then an embargo and there would be a blockade, and on the other side of that, that there would be action to take out their nuclear capability.

Now, our current President has said that he takes nothing off the table. But when you say you take nothing off the table, that doesn't mean that everything is on the table. It's a little bit of that language that we've learned we

have to look at pretty carefully and understand that there's a loophole in that. If you didn't put it on the table in the first place and you take nothing off the table, he may have already in his own mind taken military action off the table, and we don't know.

Mr. Speaker, I was watching the news on Friday morning, and on "Fox and Friends," I heard Gretchen Carlson release the story that Israel and the United States, and that would be President Obama and President Netanyahu, had reached an agreement that Israel would not strike Iran's nuclear capability before the election.

Now, I'm a little amazed that that isn't all over the newspapers and all over the floor of Congress, Mr. Speaker. I'm a little amazed that that story has not been picked up and pasted throughout the blogs and Americans up in arms, Israelis up in arms. I'm a little amazed that that's not going to be the central discussion taking place in the AIPAC dinner with 12,000 people there tonight, and I'm amazed that the President of the United States can give his address to AIPAC, as he did last night, to such a great applause and support, as was reported in the news. I'm amazed.

First of all, was the Fox story true? My experience has been you don't see news come out of there that's unbased or unfounded. It's based on something. It's founded upon something. I haven't chased it down to look at the original sources that are there, but I know what I heard. It disappeared from the media.

But if the President of the United States is even thinking in terms that he would play nuclear showdown with Iran by calculating an election date as part of that equation, it is an appalling concept to think that it could even be reported in the news as fact that the President of the United States would conduct his negotiations and manipulate his foreign policy, especially when it comes down to an Armageddon-type of a policy based upon an election date for his reelection.

I can understand the motive, Mr. Speaker. But to think in terms of if something bad happens between Israel and Iran that might risk the President's reelection, that at least it's reported in the news that he would have had the incentive to negotiate with Israel to say, Do not mount a military strike to knock out Iran's nuclear capability before the election.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we have that much time. I think we count this time in weeks, perhaps 2 or 3 months. But I don't think we count this time until after the November election.

□ 1920

Furthermore, when you get to the point where you have these kinds of crises coming forward and when we have the President, who has announced that the Iraq war is going to be finished on such and such a date and that the Afghanistan war is going to be fin-

ished in 2014 and that by the way, oh, time out, Iran, on your nuclear endeavor here until after my reelection because then it will be a lot more comfortable time to deal with this crisis as I take nothing off the table, I don't remember the President saying he has put military strikes on the table. I just remember him saying, I take nothing off the table.

So here is what needs to be done, and I don't know that the credibility exists at this point in the White House for this to be done; but a President who was a credible individual could look at the camera and look across the ocean into the eyes, through video, of Ahmadinejad and the mullahs and say:

I have put an X on the calendar, and that marks the date beyond which you will not be allowed to continue your nuclear endeavor. I know that date, but you do not. I will work with you so that you can save face in Iran, Mr. Ahmadinejad and the mullahs. I'll work with you to accelerate the demolition of your nuclear capability to the satisfaction of American inspectors, and we'll do all of that so you look as good as you can and can save as much face as possible, but you will never know what that date is on the calendar unless you push it too far.

By the way, if you're one day from having it all demolished and you're not done, sorry. The date is the date. You'll not be able to develop your nuclear endeavor beyond that date on the calendar, which you don't know and I do.

That's how you negotiate with terrorists, with cold-eyed people who believe that the United States is the Great Satan; that they're somehow called by the entity they worship to annihilate Israel, to annihilate the United States and to negotiate with them—to think that you can open up dialogue and go through all of the resolutions and sanctions and embargoes and knock the blockade and let some of the rest of the world violate those agreements, by the way, and profit from it.

We saw it happen in Iraq. It didn't work. We're watching it happen in Iran. It's not working. Now we're dangerously walking very close to that line of Iran having the capability of having developed a nuclear weapon and a means to deliver it.

By the way, when I say "a means to deliver it," Mr. Speaker, it isn't just a nuclear-tipped missile that can strike Tel Aviv from Iran at 750-or-so miles from the sovereign territory of Iran to Tel Aviv, itself. It is the ability to put that anywhere in a suitcase. It could be delivered aboard ship; it could be delivered aboard a little boat; it could come about any way over land. Once they have that capability and it's proliferated, there is no stopping the proliferation. We must end their capability before they have that capability—not after. After is too late. That nuclear horse is out of the barn as soon as they are able to produce that

weapon; and when it is, they will terrorize the world. We don't know where it is.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of the American people in the United States Congress for the autonomy, the sovereignty, and the self-protection of Israel. Should Israel decide that they need to take out Iran's nuclear capability tonight, tomorrow, at any moment, I stand prepared to stand with Israel. Even though this administration might send the message that military support and global political support would no longer be forthcoming from this administration, I believe we have a new administration around the corner.

If we can tell the Iranians to wait with their nuclear development and if we can tell the Israelis to wait with a military strike to take out the nuclear capability that's growing now in Iran, then I can say that the American people look forward to an administration that will treat Israel right, an administration that will support and encourage that Israel defend herself, and a United States of America that will step up and protect and defend Israel as we are pledged to do both philosophically and spiritually and by the obligation that we have from history.

That is just what comes to mind, Mr. Speaker.

Then, as I listened to the speakers here tonight, Syria is a very dangerous place. I am for a regime change, and I don't think that we should have negotiated with nor sent a delegation to President Assad. He is slaughtering and murdering his own people. So to that extent, I agree with the gentlemanly from Texas.

But I came here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to address a number of subject matters. On this subject matter, I'm looking out at tomorrow as Super Tuesday, Super Tuesday with 10 States having primary elections. Perhaps out of that comes a direction, the likelihood that there will be one Presidential candidate who will emerge and become the likely nominee, the apparent nominee. I think the odds are a little less than even that that can happen, but it's close.

What we have is a longer, drawn-out nomination process than was anticipated, which started back in Iowa more than a year ago as we worked with the Presidential candidates through that time. Some of them were just putting their toes in the water. They were looking. They came to Iowa and decided they didn't really want to do it, and they stepped back out again. Others hadn't quite emerged. Rick Perry came on a little bit later in August of last year and made a credible run. For a while, he was at the top of the polls. In piece after piece of this race, we've watched as some candidates took a look and stepped out while other candidates stepped in and stepped out.

Now we're at this point where there are four Republican candidates for President who are in the race, and

we're watching as the polls are starting to separate. I don't want to make this prediction, Mr. Speaker, but I'll say this: if I look across the platforms of the Republican likely nominees, potential nominees for the Presidency, I begin to say: we don't have a Republican agenda that's a national agenda. We don't have a consensus on that national agenda.

This Congress has been moving pieces of legislation, almost all of them tied to jobs, jobs, jobs. It seems to me I can think back about 4 years, and I can hear our current Speaker ask the previous Speaker: Madam Speaker, where are the jobs? Jobs, jobs, jobs. Well, I've heard "jobs, jobs, jobs" for a long time. It's nice that we're about jobs. I haven't heard a lot about profit, profit, profit, which is required to pay for the payroll to create jobs, jobs, jobs. Yet profit isn't something that comes from a government job, Mr. Speaker. That would be something I hope the President would have overheard. Profit is not something that comes from a government job. Government jobs consume the profits of the private sector.

There are two sectors in the economy here, the public and the private. The public sector is the regulatory sector, but not exclusively. When the public sector provides law enforcement, for example, that gives us security so that the private sector can operate—so you can open up your shop and do business, so you can open up your factory and do business. You have to have some security. You have to be able to have a judicial branch of government, more limited than the one we have, I might say, so that you can enforce the laws. You need some functions of government. You need people to build the roads, and you need people to sometimes reach out and do for the people that which they cannot do for themselves. Leave us otherwise alone, I would say, Mr. Speaker.

But the drain on the private sector, on the productive sector of the economy, comes from the public sector. The public sector generally consumes the energy and the resources and the product of the private sector. The private sector invests capital; it produces goods and services that have a marketable value both here and abroad; and the economy dynamically grows. The Federal Government reaches in and takes out 22, 23, 24 percent of the gross domestic product, most of which needs to be on the private sector side because they're the only ones generating wealth; they're the only ones taking capital and reinvesting capital.

Historically, for the last 40 to 50 years, the Federal Government has consumed about 18 percent of GDP. Now that has grown up, roughly, to the neighborhood of 23 percent of our gross domestic product; but it saps the vitality of an economy to have a government that grows and consumes more, and it saps the vitality to tax and spend it on the government entity side. The endeavor of the President's eco-

nomics plan should be to roll people out of public employment and into the private sector because the private sector is producing goods and services with a marketable value both here and abroad.

I don't see that coming out of this White House today. I pray it comes out of the White House in less than a year from now when a new President, Mr. Speaker, is elected who understands the principles of free market economics. I can go deeply into that, but I'm hopeful that I can express to you tonight the need for this Congress to move on a series of issues that are very important to the American people.

□ 1930

It is unclear who the apparent nominee, and in the end the nominee, for President is. So, therefore, we can't go to that individual and say will you please write up for me the platform that you are going to run on when you are nominated as President of the United States. That's unclear.

To me what is clear is there are a series of issues that are universal across the contending Presidential candidates. These are the issues that we should move through this Congress, planks in the platform of the next President of the United States. We are in a perfect opportunity to do this.

We are here with a not particularly intense legislative agenda. It's kind of hard to have a lot of things to do when you send them down there and stack them up like cord wood on the desk of HARRY REID. Let's send some things down there that the American people can see are the planks in the platform of the next President.

We know what this President will do. He gave us ObamaCare. He tried to give us cap-and-tax. He gave us Dodd-Frank. Those are the big egregious pieces. He gave us TARP; he gave us the economic stimulus plan, all of that out of President Obama. He blocked the Keystone XL pipeline because apparently he had concluded that it wasn't a national security issue and he needed a little more time to study. I'll come back to that in a little bit, Mr. Speaker. That's the agenda of the current President of the United States.

The next President of the United States needs to have a clear platform to run for office on. They have been articulating that, but the American people don't know what it is because they don't know who the apparent nominee will be.

Well, I can help out with that, Mr. Speaker, because I have sorted through the platforms of each of the viable Presidential candidates and come down with a list of those issues that would be universal across the campaigns of the likely or potential nominees of the Republican Party for President of the United States. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the leadership in this Congress move the legislation that's universal to any of the potential nominees so that we can lay out that

platform for the next President. The planks are there. If it's something that's popular with the American people, and it's in the agenda of each of the Presidential candidates, bring it to the floor of this Congress.

Bring it through committee first. Let's go through regular order. Let's mark it up in committee, bring it to the floor, and let's have a debate and a vote on it and send it over to HARRY REID and see how well he does rejecting the agenda that the American people support.

Let me start off the list, and this is off of a bit of a research list that I put together about 2 weeks ago. It comes this way: every Presidential candidate that is a viable candidate and with a reasonable potential to be nominated for President of the United States on a Republican ticket supports a fence.

I have stood on this floor over and over again and said go down to the southern border, those 2,000 miles, build a fence, a wall, and a fence. We can't just think that four strands of barbed wire is good enough or that a vehicle barrier is good enough or that a single fence, where the other day they showed a video of the panels in the fence where they went in with a post jack, is what I call it, and jacked the panel up. Then the drug smugglers and the illegals poured underneath that, and then they dropped the panel back down again and walked away with their jack kind of laughing or whatever the south of the border version is for high fives was taking place.

Now, we need to build a fence, a wall, and a fence, Mr. Speaker. I have stood here on this floor and demonstrated how you do that. We need to go down to the border and build first the barrier fence that defines our border, and that says don't come across this, it's U.S. territory, you can only come here legally.

Next, we need to come north of there, a reasonable span, 40 to 50 feet, perhaps, and put in another fence. I would make that out of concrete, precast panels with a slip form trench foundation in it, and I would drop those panels in and affix that in such a way that it would be a strong barrier so that humanity is not pouring through across the border.

I would come again further up another 50 feet or so and build another fence. That can be steel, that can be chain link, it needs to be tall so that you end up with a fence, a wall, and a fence, two zones of no-man's land that it can be enforced. Yes, we need to use all the virtual that we can, all of the cameras and the sensory devices that technology will provide, so that we know to deploy our Border Patrol to the place where there has been a breach or a violation in that fence and enforce that 100 percent.

We can't just let people come into the United States, shrug our shoulders and say, well, we'll catch somebody later on or somebody tomorrow. We have to ensure that if you're going to

sneak into America, we're going to catch you, and we're going to enforce the law. In the end, if you violate that law, we are going to need to punish you and put you back into the condition you were in before you broke the law.

Now, I don't understand why that somehow seems to be cruel and unusual punishment to encounter someone who is unlawfully in the United States, who has violated our laws if they crept into the United States across the border and entered into the United States illegally. That is a crime, Mr. Speaker. It's not a civil violation. It's not. It is a crime. That makes the people who sneak into the United States illegally, people who commit crimes, by definition, are criminals.

I suggest that we build a fence, a wall, and a fence. Some will say we can't build 2,000 miles. My answer is, have you ever seen the Great Wall of China? The Great Wall of China is 5,500 miles long and armies marched on top of that.

The first emperor of China, Qin Shi Huang, back in 245 BC connected the existing sections of the Great Wall of China so that it is one continuous 5,500-mile long wall. They did that, not with huge machines and excavators and cement plants; they did it with stoop labor, putting it together piece by piece by piece. If the Chinese could build a 5,500-mile long great wall, and it's one of the wonders of the world, it would be a wonder to me why we have such difficulty building something that approaches 2,000 miles in length, a simple solution to a complex problem.

Our little old construction company could get tooled up to build a mile a day. I'm not suggesting that our people go do that; but if our little company has that capabilities, think what the big companies have for a capability.

By the way, I'm not suggesting that we build 2,000 miles of fence. I just say this, build it according to the Secure Fence Act. That's the law we passed. That's what Duncan Hunter was for; that's what I was for. Let's just build a fence, a wall, and a fence, and just build it till they stop going around the end. It doesn't have to be 2,000 miles long if they stop going around the end sooner than that. They leave tracks, by the way.

You go out there and you take a look. Well, okay, they went around the end of this fence. Well, let's add another 20 miles, and now I'll see how that works, and we'll just keep building fence until they either quit crossing the line or we have 2,000 miles of it.

The math on that, Mr. Speaker, is not that hard to figure out, although the question doesn't get asked often enough. So we did the math on this a little while back, and I have got to adjust it by a mental calculation to get it into contemporary, and now it's probably even a year old.

We're spending about \$12 billion enforcing our southern border, \$12 billion a year. Now if I take 12 billion, divide it by 2,000, that's \$6 million a mile. If

you are spending \$6 million a mile to defend the border, the Border Patrol comes before the Judiciary Committee, the immigration committee, under oath and testifies we think we interdict about 25 percent of those who attempt to cross the border.

I go down to the border and I ask those enforcing it, so you're stopping about one in four? They laugh at me. Oh, no, we're not stopping one in four, maybe 10 percent. Some say 2 to 3 percent, but the most consistent answer I get from the enforcers on the border is 10 percent. But I'm willing to go back to the 25 percent number and use that, even though I think it's probably high.

I do the calculation. I think, let me see, if Janet Napolitano, Secretary of Homeland Security, came to me and said, Congressman, I want to hire you to guard the west mile from your house across rural Iowa, that mile gravel road for that mile. For that mile I'm going to pay you the same amount that we're paying to protect our southern border, \$6 million a year—oh, and by the way, if that's not enough incentive, it's a 10-year contract. She would lay, in theory under this formula, \$60 million on my kitchen table, and my job is to guard that mile of road and see to it that no more than 75 percent of those that try get across?

□ 1940

I'm going to snap that up, Mr. Speaker. And I'll tell you, I'm not going to go out there and hire myself a multitude of people that are boots on the ground. I'm going to hire some, but I'm going to be very well aware that you have a benefits package that goes along with it, health insurance, retirement benefits and all of the pieces that have to do with supporting an officer, including a vehicle for him to drive, multiple vehicles in some cases. I'm going to recognize that. And I'm going to look at the capital investment for the long term all of the way through retirement of hiring boots on the ground. And, yes, we need them; and those that are there do a good job, and they want to do a good job.

But I'm going to look at it and think: I could invest some of this \$60 million in this contract a little more effectively. I think I'll just build a fence, a wall, and a fence. Then I'll have myself a few Border Patrol officers there to rotate the shifts and monitor the sensors and watch the cameras, and maybe man a guard tower here and there. And we'd make sure that no one would get across that.

And, by the way, as I brought up Israel a little bit earlier, they built a fence. They designed that fence so that it would be as reliable and as tight as possible. It has some wire there. It has got towers and they monitor it, and it has been 99-point-something percent effective. So we can learn something from the Israelis. Why do they build fences if fences don't work?

We look at the Mexicans. They have barriers down there between Mexico and Guatemala.

There's a fence that was being built between Saudi Arabia and Iraq so they could interdict the refugees that they anticipated would be coming into Saudi Arabia, to keep them out.

There is a fence that's being built right now in that bankrupt country of Greece, between Greece and Turkey, to keep the illegals that are pouring into Greece from Turkey out of Greece. Even though the Greeks can't afford it, they are building the fence to keep the illegal Turks from pouring into Greece.

Now, some will say there is something inherently immoral about a fence—a fence, a wall, and a fence, in my case, Mr. Speaker—and I would argue there's a difference between that, those who would say, Haven't you ever heard the Berlin Wall? Well, of course I have heard of the Berlin Wall. I've walked almost every foot of the Berlin Wall. I have a piece of the Berlin Wall in my office over at 1131 Longworth, and it's framed. It is framed with a wood frame and it has a red cloth behind it and a piece of the Berlin Wall about that big. It was chopped out on September 12, 1990. It represents the single-most significant historical event in my lifetime, the end of the Cold War when the Iron Curtain, the Berlin Wall itself, literally the Iron Curtain came crashing down.

But the Berlin Wall was designed to do something entirely different than all of the fences that I've described, Mr. Speaker, and that is it was designed to keep people in, not out. And that's the difference. A wall that's designed to keep people in because you don't want them to achieve and access freedom and liberty and our God-given liberty rights, that's what the Berlin Wall did. It trapped people; it fenced them in.

The other fences that I've talked about are designed to keep people out who are trying to come into the United States, and other places, in violation of existing law.

And others will say—and some are clergy that will say: Well, you were a stranger. You were an alien in a foreign land, and I took care of you.

There are a lot of quotes in the Bible that remind people that we should reach out to the less fortunate among us. But I happen to have stood on Mars Hill in Athens where St. Paul gave his famous speech, his famous sermon in Act 17, when he said: And the Lord made all nations on Earth, and he decided when and where each nation would be.

That was St. Paul's statement on Mars Hill in his famous sermon in Act 17. Each nation has its sovereignty. The Lord decided each nation on Earth and when and where those nations would be, and we should not shrink from that responsibility, that sovereign responsibility, to protect our borders and to protect the rule of law.

And the borders of the United States are what define the sovereignty of the United States. If we should accept the idea that there aren't borders, that

people have always migrated and somehow it is immoral for us to define those borders or tell people you can't come across, then I would ask those who advocate a policy like that, and I believe it is an illogical policy, but those who advocate for such a policy, I would say to them, then: How many people do you believe should be allowed to live in the United States? What should the population of the United States of America be? Six billion people on the planet. We're the third largest population country on the planet, 300-plus million of us. How many should live here?

If you asked the rest of the world: Would you like to live in the United States of America and we'll buy you a plane ticket to go and we'll give you an unlimited supply—well, how about the current access of welfare benefits that are there? Seventy-two different means-tested Federal welfare programs; and, by the way, refundable tax credits for illegals working in America under an employer ID number, a 42-dash number instead of a Social Security number.

I congratulate Congressman SAM JOHNSON of Texas for bringing his legislation that prohibits any tax credits from going to, any refunds from going to those who are filing their taxes without a Social Security number.

But they could tap into all of these benefits, 72 different means-tested welfare programs and the refundable tax credits that are there, and we'd say to them: You can live by an implied guarantee in the United States of America at a middle-income level, middle class without working, and we're going to see to it that it's all available to you. Come to America and we'll give that to you. I would predict, Mr. Speaker, that more than half of the 6 billion people on the planet would opt to come to the United States.

So how many people do those who advocate for open borders, what do they think the population of the United States should be? Should it be 3 billion? Am I right on that? Should it be 2 billion? Should it be 4 billion? I'll suggest it would surpass 3 billion under that kind of an offer, except many of those on the tail end of that great transshipment of humanity would realize that our system here would collapse long before you could ever load 3 billion people into America, or 2 billion, or maybe even 1 billion.

So what is the number? What is it that those who advocate for open borders and suspending the rule of law, what is it that they believe should be the future population of the United States of America? How many would they let in?

And I constantly hear the lamentation that it takes too long to come into the United States legally. It takes too long. Well, I suppose if we just opened it up and we accelerated the process and everybody that was in line, if we let them in right away, inside of a year, maybe that's not too long. I'm

constantly hearing candidates, Presidential candidates even, some in the past, not so much now, argue that we need to speed up our immigration process and that those who are here in the United States illegally need to get right with the law and that they need to go to the back of the line.

So if they need to go to the back of the line, do they really understand that the lines don't start in the United States? The lines for legal immigration into the United States start in foreign countries where people have an aspiration to come here, and they apply for a visa and eventually a green card to come here; and that line, those lines, when you add up all of the lines of the various visas that are out there—H-1Bs, H-2Bs, the visa lottery program, the list goes on and on—you add up all of that, the lines to get in, waiting to come into the United States legally are 50 million long—50 million. Fifty million people are waiting in foreign countries to come to the United States legally, and I hear constantly the wait's too long. We need to accelerate coming into the United States.

So we bring 1.2 million people into this country legally, kind of on average each year, 1.2 million. We're the most generous country on Earth by far. And some data shows that we bring more people legally into the United States than all other countries combined. I can't anchor that in a data point, so I want to put that caveat in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker. But it's in that category, someplace pretty close, 1.2 million legals coming into America, drawing from a pool of about 50 million that are waiting in line. And in all of that, we only have about 7 to 11 percent of those legal immigrants that we even score their ability to contribute to the United States. The rest of it is all about how they can benefit from the taxpayers and the workers here, how they can benefit.

□ 1950

No nation other than the United States would allow for the, what should I call it, the evolution of an immigration policy that just simply grants this to people because they want to be here and gives them the authority to accelerate the legal immigration of the family reunification plan so that beyond that first individual they can start bringing in people outside that extended family tree.

We sat down and did a spreadsheet calculation and wondered how many people could one individual bring in to the United States under family reunification. We built it on a spreadsheet. We got out to 357 individuals brought in by one single individual, and then we ran out of room on the spreadsheet and realized you really can't calculate it. But you can calculate the visas, the means by which we are legalizing people in America.

It depends on whether you look at one study or another. There are competing studies, and that is between 89

and 93 percent of the legal immigration into the United States is not based on merit whatsoever. There's no merit quality there whatsoever. And then the balance of that, between 7 and 11 percent, does come from some measures of merit such as H-1Bs, having a skill.

I'm suggesting this, Mr. Speaker, that we develop an immigration policy here in the United States Congress, with the cooperation of our next President, that's designed to enhance the economic, the social and the cultural well-being of the United States of America. Any country worth its salt is going to have an immigration policy designed to benefit the country itself. We're not in the business of trying to alleviate—well, we'd like to, but we cannot be in the business of trying to alleviate all world poverty, all world hunger, and all world lack of liberty and freedom. It isn't just enough to bring people in here and let them understand and be inspired by American liberty—God-given American liberty; but we need to promote and inspire it in other countries in the world instead of going there to bow before foreign leaders and apologize for being Americans.

I'm astonished, Mr. Speaker, that we had a Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, who told the world that she wouldn't wear a lapel pin with an American flag in foreign countries because she was afraid it offended people. My attitude about that is, go find a country that's offended that's not accepting foreign aid. And what are they offended about? American liberty? The way we've led in the world? Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT of Texas has so well and famously said with regard to foreign aid that goes out to people who set themselves up as our enemies and that vote against us consistently in the United Nations, he says, You don't have to pay people to hate you. They'll hate you for free.

So I want to configure immigration policy that's designed to enhance the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the United States. We should be scoring the applicants for legal immigration into the United States. We should be scoring them by their ability to contribute to this society, this economy, this culture, and this civilization. And one of the ways that we can do that is we can look to our English-speaking allies for some guidance. Canada, United Kingdom, and Australia come to mind.

Each of them either has a policy or has been developing a policy to set up a point system, a scoring system, so that they can evaluate the applicants for immigration into their countries. And here are some of the criteria: education, job skills, earning capacity, and age—you want young people to come in so they can pay taxes long enough so that you can justify paying for their retirement—and English-speaking abilities, because the ability to speak, write and understand English is the strongest indicator we have of the abil-

ity to assimilate into the broader overall culture.

So there is nothing discriminatory about this other than if we're going to have a policy that's good for America, we have to do some discrimination in favor of those who can do the most to help our country. I'd like to bring in and continue to bring in bright, energetic people, especially young people. And if they are preeducated by the taxpayers of a foreign country, that's fine. I'm happy with that. Come on in here and help America's economy grow and raise your family, but embrace our American traditions, our American culture, and our American civilization. After all, that's why you came. And to the extent that you bring some of your culture along with you and there are certain traditions that you follow, that adds to the flavor and it adds to the zest of life here in America.

But, Mr. Speaker, when they come and reject American liberty and the American way of life, and they try to recreate in an enclave the life that they left instead of embrace the life that's offered to them here in America, I would ask, why are you here? Why would you come to America if you're going to reject Americanism and seek to recreate the place you left? Why didn't you just stay there? And that's some of the foundation of the immigration concept that we have, Mr. Speaker.

By the way, as I get to item number two on this long list of universal items that I think all Presidential candidates should embrace and this Congress should pass, I would add that we've got E-Verify legislation before this Congress, and I am not satisfied that it is written in a way that it will work in the way it's intended. I am very concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the preemption that's written into it that prohibits the political subdivisions from supporting and enforcing immigration laws that mirror those of the Federal Government.

Aside from that, I have proposed an offer that actually solves this problem without having to go there and preempt the States and the political subdivisions, and it is called the New IDEA Act. New IDEA stands for the new and the acronym is the New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act. The Illegal Deduction Elimination Act clarifies that wages and benefits paid to illegals are not tax deductible, and we know that. But the practice is to write off wages and benefits paid to illegals because they know that nobody is going to come along and enforce. And this has been a practice since the Amnesty Act of 1986.

Under the New IDEA Act, then, the IRS, coming in to do a normal audit of an employer's company, would run the Social Security number and other pertinent data through E-Verify. So let's just say I have 100 employees. The IRS would come in, the Internal Revenue Service would come in to do an audit of my company. They would look at my

receipts and my expenditures; they would look for anomalies in that calculation that might indicate that there would be money that was scooped out that tax wasn't paid on, or a tax avoidance. And in the process of doing that, they would run those Social Security numbers of the employees through E-Verify, the Internet-based system that can verify whether the data identifies someone who can legally work in the United States.

As they run those 100 Social Security numbers through E-Verify, then E-Verify would either come back and affirm that they could lawfully work in America; or if there's no answer, there's no response, then it's implied that they can't work legally in the United States. So therefore the IRS could deny that business deduction of the wages and benefits paid to that illegal.

And they would give a period of time for the employer and the employee to cure any data that is there and give the employer safe harbor if he uses E-Verify so that for another means of lack of verification, they can't come in and enforce against him for hiring illegals. Safe harbor for using E-Verify, not a mandate that they use E-Verify, the IRS would make the determination by using E-Verify and that result is this: if out of those 100 employees, let's just say I had 10 that were illegal, the IRS would say, I'm sorry, but you paid \$50,000 a year to each one of these employees, and that's no longer a business expense because they were unlawfully working in the United States and you had the tool to verify.

And so that \$50,000 times 10 is \$500,000. That \$500,000 that you wrote off of the gross receipts number—just say I grossed \$10 million and that 500,000 would be one of my expenses that's there—they would deny the expense of \$500,000, \$50,000 paid to 10 illegals, and that \$500,000 then goes out of my expense column on Schedule C, goes over into the gross receipts side and shows up down on the bottom line as net income, taxable net income. That means that your \$10-an-hour illegal, by the time you pay the interest, the penalty and the tax liability, becomes about a \$16-an-hour illegal.

So the employer can draw a choice. Does he really want to take a chance on being audited every year and seeing his expenses of his illegals move from \$10 an hour up to \$16 an hour, or would he maybe go offer an American a job at \$13 or \$14 an hour? I think that's what happens, Mr. Speaker. And it provides an incentive so an employer doesn't have to switch it all overnight. They can calculate the risk, and they can clean up their workforce incrementally if that's what it takes.

□ 2000

Furthermore, in my bill, the New IDEA Act, it requires that there be a cooperative team put together between the IRS, the Social Security Administration, and the Department of Homeland Security so the right hand, the

left hand, and the middle hand know what each other are doing. We get Social Security No-Match Letters that used to come out—they stopped sending them out a while back because nobody was doing anything with them. They would just send them out saying: We did our job; these Social Security numbers didn't match that you're sending in. A letter would go out; nobody shows up; that's the end of it.

You've got Homeland Security that is operating at the direction of the White House, that has decided they're going to provide administrative amnesty. Three hundred thousand illegals in the United States already adjudicated for deportation, and the President and Janet Napolitano and Eric Holder set up a policy—primarily Janet Napolitano—set up a policy to take staff time and scour through the 300,000 already adjudicated for deportation illegals that are there and see if they can find a means and a way to justify allowing them to stay in the United States. Administrative amnesty.

My bill, New IDEA, puts the three of them together so the IRS sends the information to Homeland Security and to the Social Security Administration; No-Match Letters from Social Security Administration go to the IRS and to Homeland Security, and it says: Put your heads together; figure out how to enforce America's immigration law.

That's what we need to be doing, Mr. Speaker.

By the way, the President of the United States, who has disrespected the rule of law, has a couple of family members who have received some type of administrative amnesty asylum—Auntie Onyango, whom I hope I don't have to spell that. But in any case, she has been in the United States for a long time illegally, since the 1990s—President Obama's aunt—living in public housing, reportedly, was finally adjudicated again for deportation. And the Obama administration declared her to be at too much of a risk if now, after all these years since the nineties, if she were sent back to Kenya. Because his aunt is now too high a profile public figure to be sent to Kenya, someone might kidnap her and hold her for ransom, and so it's a great risk; therefore, we should give her asylum in the United States where surely no one would kidnap her living in public housing and hold her for a ransom here. They just would do it in Kenya.

So, Homeland Security—I presume the State Department may have had a voice in this—granted, according to news reports, asylum for Barack Obama's aunt.

Now, if you can get asylum for the President's aunt, and you think in terms of the rule of law as applied the same to everyone, then who would it not apply to? Well, the rule of law surely didn't apply to Barack Obama's drunken Uncle Omar, who had also been processed and adjudicated for deportation and also didn't honor the court order to be deported. So drunken

Uncle Omar nearly ran into a police car, found himself afoul with the law with a blood alcohol content of nearly twice the legal limit—it was 1.4—nearly twice the legal limit, and drunken Uncle Omar disappeared from the scene. And I'm confident that he went the way of Barack Obama's aunt, an administrative amnesty manufactured by the administration, not deported, not shipped off back to Kenya.

So if we won't deport the President's aunt, if we won't deport the President's uncle no matter what his blood alcohol content, and we've got 300,000 that are in the United States illegally who have already been adjudicated for deportation, and even though we're short-handed and we're having trouble processing all of this and the President has said—well, at least Janet Napolitano has said that we don't have the resources to enforce all of the laws, why are we using our staff resources to go try to give people an exemption from the law that's already been enforced? That's administrative amnesty. So they've been scouring the books to give people a pass on a rule of law.

I raised the issue, and I asked dozens of people across the spectrum in my district and around the country: What's the most important component of immigration law? Mr. Speaker, what I hear is the rule of law. The rule of law. Not the idea that some people are needy and it hurts our hearts to enforce a law—it does. But in the end, if we don't respect the rule of law, if we don't refurbish the rule of law, we have then desecrated one of the essential pillars of American exceptionalism.

We cannot be a great country if we don't have the rule of law. We must be a country, a sovereign nation. Sovereign nations must have borders. Borders must be defended. Those borders must be controlled in a way where we decide who comes in and decide when people go out, if they don't decide on their own. And we must preserve and protect and refurbish and enhance the rule of law.

That's what the New IDEA Act does. It has the support of all Presidential candidates—formally, not attested to yet by Governor Romney, but I believe philosophically he would tell you that he sees the logic in it. If we passed this off of the floor of the House of Representatives, I believe that Governor Mitt Romney would be supportive of such an initiative.

Then, if you go on down the line of the planks and the platforms that are universal among the Presidential candidates, you would see the desire to repeal Dodd-Frank there universally among Republicans. Dodd-Frank, that's set up such that the government would decide which lending institutions were too big to be allowed to fail. Then, once declared too big to fail, the three entities in the Federal Government would decide whether they were going bankrupt, and if they went into receivership, who and what entity would receive them.

It's a horrible scenario to think that the Federal Government will decide winners and losers by a statute written by the very people that contributed so much to the financial problem that we had, Chris Dodd and BARNEY FRANK, so I'm for a full 100 percent repeal of Dodd-Frank. If it has a couple of redeeming qualities—and I believe it does—let's restate them back into the law. Let's not make exceptions and leave pieces there.

Dodd-Frank needs to be repealed. We need to pass the repeal of Dodd-Frank here on the floor of the House. MICHELE BACHMANN of Minnesota has been the lead on that. She drafted the legislation to repeal Dodd-Frank. She's been a strong and vocal advocate for repealing Dodd-Frank. So have all the other Presidential candidates. We should do this for the American people, for the next President, and we should do it to honor the effort of MICHELE BACHMANN, Mr. Speaker.

Next piece is official English. Almost every country in the world has an official language, at least one official language. It's been so recognized throughout the ages that the single most powerful unifying force known throughout all history and humanity is having a common language. If we can talk to each other, we have an instantaneous bond with each other. Here in America, we're so fortunate that English is that language, and yet there seems to be an open effort to try to encourage language enclaves in America where the second and even third generations of Americans don't learn English; they just live within the enclave. They're trapped in that economic and that cultural cycle of the enclave, the silo of an ethnic minority instead of assimilating into the broader society.

We need to establish English as the official language of government, not to disparage another language, but to unify the American people and hold us together as a people and strengthen our unity. The government does not need to be spending that kind of money on language.

Then repeal ObamaCare and a number of other things.

I appreciate your attention to this matter this evening, Mr. Speaker, and I would yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of New York (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel delays due to weather.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and March 8.

Ms. MOORE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and March 6 on account of a family medical emergency.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1134. An Act to authorize the St. Croix River Crossing Project with appropriate mitigation measures to promote river values.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on March 1, 2012 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 347. To correct and simplify the drafting of section 1752 (relating to restricted buildings or grounds) of title 18, United States Code.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 6, 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:

5166. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of User Fees for Filovirus Testing of Nonhuman Primate Liver Samples (RIN: 0920-AA47) [Docket No.: CDC-2012-0003] received February 9, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5167. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Services Surveys: Amendments to the BE-120, Benchmark Survey of Transactions in Selected Services and Intangible Assets With Foreign Persons [Docket No.: 110112021-1680-03] (RIN: 0691-AA76) received February 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5168. A letter from the Assistant Director for Policy, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cote d'Ivoire Sanctions Regulations; Darfur Sanctions Regulations; Democratic Republic of the Congo Sanctions Regulations received February 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5169. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; Reinstatement of Coverage Pertaining to Final Payment Under Construction and Building Service Contracts [GSAR Amendment 2012-01; GSAR Case 2010-G509 (Change 53) Docket 2011-0009; Sequence 1] (RIN: 3090-AJ13) received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5170. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/President, Resolution Funding Corpora-

tion, transmitting the Corporation's Statement on the System of Internal Controls and the 2011 Audited Financial Statements; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5171. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Texas Regulatory Program [SATS Nos. TX-061-FOR; TX-062-FOR; TX-063-FOR; Docket No. OSM-2011-0007] received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5172. A letter from the Chief of Staff, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Review and Approval of Existing Ordinances or Resolutions; Repeal (RIN: 3141-AA45) received February 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5173. A letter from the Comptroller, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Fees received February 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5174. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2012 Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Atka Mackerel Total Allowable Catch Amount [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA901) received February 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5175. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2011 and 2012 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 111220788-1785-02] (RIN: 0648-XA855) received February 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5176. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Generic Annual Catch Limits/Accountability Measures Amendment for the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 100217097-1757-02] (RIN: 0648-AY22) received February 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5177. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report on compliance within the time limitations established for deciding habeas corpus death penalty petitions under Title I of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5178. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's statement of actions with respect to the Government Accountability Office report entitled, "National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Acquisition Approach for Commercial Crew Transportation Includes Good Practices, but Faces Significant Challenges" (GAO-12-282), dated December 15, 2011; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

5179. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's statement of actions with respect to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report entitled, "International Space Station:

Approaches for Ensuring Utilization Through 2020 Are Reasonable But Should Be Revisited as NASA Gains More Knowledge of On-Orbit Performance" (GAO-12-162), dated December 15, 2011; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

5180. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Definition of a Taxpayer [TD 9576] (RIN: 1545-BF73) received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 940. A bill to establish standards for covered bond programs and a covered bond regulatory oversight program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-407, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 570. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2842) to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-408). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILLS

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following actions were taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of March 1, 2012]

H.R. 901. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than March 9, 2012.

H.R. 2309. Referral to the Committee on Rules extended for a period ending not later than March 30, 2012.

[The following action occurred on March 5, 2012]

H.R. 940. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than March 30, 2012.

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. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 4132. A bill to amend section 506 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to expedite approval of drugs for serious or life-threatening diseases or conditions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CANTOR (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 4133. A bill to express the sense of Congress regarding the United States-Israel strategic relationship, to direct the President to submit to Congress reports on United States actions to enhance this relationship and to assist in the defense of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 4134. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that any person who, for a commercial purpose, makes available for consumer use a machine capable of

producing tobacco products, is a manufacturer of tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 4135. A bill to permit United States companies to participate in the exploration for and the extraction of hydrocarbon resources from any portion of a foreign maritime exclusive economic zone that is contiguous to the exclusive economic zone of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia):

H.R. 4136. A bill to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in conjunction with a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 4137. A bill to make permanent the exclusion from gross income for employer-provided educational assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 4138. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to create a National Neuromyelitis Optica Consortium to provide grants and coordinate research with respect to the causes of, and risk factors associated with, neuromyelitis optica, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 4139. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend permanently the 100 percent exclusion of gain from the sale or exchange of qualified small business stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 4140. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the time limitation for use of eligibility and entitlement to educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. BASS of California):

H.R. 4141. A bill to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to take appropriate actions to improve the nutritional quality, quality control, and cost effectiveness of United States food assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 4142. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for annual cost-of-living adjustments to be made automatically by law each year in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for sur-

vivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 4143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the period during which transfers of excess pension assets may be made to retiree health accounts and to provide for the transfer of such assets to retiree group term life insurance accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

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. STEARNS:

H.R. 4132.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the power to regulate interstate activity.

By Mr. CANTOR:

H.R. 4133.

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

Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, the power to "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations" and pursuant to Article I, Section 8, clause 1, the power to "provide for the common Defence."

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 4134.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; whereby the Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Furthermore, this bill makes specific changes to existing law, in accordance with Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution; whereby the Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 4135.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations," and Clause 18, "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 4136.

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

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4137.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 4138.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 4139.

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

The amendment to the Internal Revenue Code to extend permanently the 100 percent exclusion of gain from the sale or exchange of qualified small business stock is authorized by Article I Section 8 to Lay and collect taxes.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 4140.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 4141.

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

The Commerce Clause, Article I Section 8 Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States, grants Congress the power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes".

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 4142.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 4143.

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

Article 1, Section 7 of the United States Constitution which provides that "All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 12: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 85: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

H.R. 178: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 303: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 409: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 436: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 451: Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 452: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 512: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 546: Mr. SCHILLING.

H.R. 605: Mr. MARINO and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 664: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 708: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 733: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 750: Mr. QUAYLE.

H.R. 854: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 860: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 890: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA.

H.R. 931: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 972: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 978: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 979: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 998: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1057: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1093: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 1106: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 1164: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 1332: Mr. HOLT and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1370: Mr. QUAYLE.
 H.R. 1397: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 1404: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1483: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 1488: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 1521: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WATT, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 1547: Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H.R. 1549: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HANNA, Mr. STIVERS, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 1558: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 1561: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 1581: Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 1639: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 1653: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. JORDAN.
 H.R. 1681: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 1687: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 1700: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 1744: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1755: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 1789: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 1811: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1842: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1873: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 1878: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1880: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 1895: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 1909: Mr. BARTLETT.
 H.R. 1997: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 2020: Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 2069: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 2071: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 2077: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 2088: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2179: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2182: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 2206: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
 H.R. 2288: Ms. DELAUNO.
 H.R. 2325: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 2505: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H.R. 2529: Mr. BARROW.
 H.R. 2569: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 2834: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 2866: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H.R. 2896: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 2906: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 2950: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 2952: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 3036: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 3059: Mr. HURT and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
 H.R. 3142: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 3187: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 3216: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. KISSELL.
 H.R. 3251: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 3307: Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KIND, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 3315: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 3381: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 3389: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 3393: Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H.R. 3399: Mr. SHULER.
 H.R. 3405: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 3409: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3417: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 3496: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 3506: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 3523: Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. HURT.

H.R. 3528: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H.R. 3542: Ms. NORTON and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 3572: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 3608: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H.R. 3612: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 3625: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 3627: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. LUJÁN.
 H.R. 3643: Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H.R. 3676: Mr. QUAYLE.
 H.R. 3704: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 3720: Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 3767: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. AUSTRIA.
 H.R. 3806: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 3814: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 3842: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 3849: Mr. DOLD.
 H.R. 3850: Mr. WEST and Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 3851: Mr. WEST and Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 3855: Ms. NORTON and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 3856: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 3893: Mr. WEST.
 H.R. 3895: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 3900: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 3911: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 3974: Ms. CHU and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 3980: Mr. WEST and Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 3981: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 3991: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
 H.R. 4010: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CARDOZA, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 4023: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 4030: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 4038: Mr. PETERS and Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 4040: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HECK, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WEST, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YODER, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H.R. 4046: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 4070: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 4078: Mr. FORBES and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 4080: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 4081: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 4082: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 4083: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 4089: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 4105: Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN

of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mrs. BONO MACK.
 H.R. 4118: Ms. CHU, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 4124: Ms. CHU, Mr. WEST, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 4128: Mr. HULTGREN and Mrs. ELLMERS.
 H.R. 4131: Mr. SERRANO.
 H.J. Res. 86: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
 H.J. Res. 103: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H. Con. Res. 87: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. BACA.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. HIMES, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
 H. Res. 130: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H. Res. 177: Mr. SIRES.
 H. Res. 271: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H. Res. 282: Mr. STARK.
 H. Res. 351: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H. Res. 454: Ms. HIRONO.
 H. Res. 460: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KIND, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H. Res. 484: Mr. FILNER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 490: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. OLSON.
 H. Res. 506: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. BERMAN.
 H. Res. 526: Mr. SIRES and Mr. LAMBORN.
 H. Res. 555: Mr. PALLONE.
 H. Res. 568: Mr. DOLD.

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 TIPTON, or a designee, to H.R. 2842, the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act of 2011, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2842

OFFERED BY: Mrs. NAPOLITANO

Amendment No. 1: Page 4, strike lines 12 through 15.

H.R. 2842

OFFERED BY: Mr. TIPTON

Amendment No. 2: In section 1, strike "2011" and insert "2012".

H.R. 2842

OFFERED BY: Mr. ELLISON

Amendment No. 3: At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. NO NET LOSS OF JOBS.

Section 2 and the amendments made by section 2 shall not take effect unless the Secretary finds that such section and amendments, if in effect, shall not result in a net loss of jobs.