United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 2010 No. 81

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 26, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JESSE L. JACKSON, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

''Rejoice in the Lord always, again I say rejoice.''

Here is another day of creation; another opportunity to serve God's people in this land of freedom.

By the Spirit, may the Lord lift us in prayer renewing our faith. Knowing that lasting goodness is discovered in the Lord alone; and human freedom is a gift given to all the children of God; may Congress give the Lord glory by accomplishing great deeds in His Holy Name.

In the process, may we encourage one another and live in harmony and peace both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 5128. An act to designate the United States Department of the Interior Building in Washington, District of Columbia, as the ''Stewart Lee Udall Department of the Interior Building''.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 211. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the East Bay Regional Park District in California, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

F–35 JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER

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

Mr. ARCURI. Congress has supported a competitive acquisition for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter engine for the last 14 years for good reason. The total program is expected to cost more than $100 billion over the next 30 to 40 years. The Government Accounting Office has concluded that competition between engine suppliers could provide a life-cycle cost savings of over 20 percent.

A competitive F–35 engine program would also reap other benefits such as increased reliability, improved contractor responsiveness, a more robust industrial base, and less chance to ground the entire fleet to fix a problem.

Chairman ANDREWS and Ranking Member CONAWAY of the bipartisan House Defense Acquisition Reform Panel have stated that annual engine competition will make both engines better and save taxpayers money—up to $21 billion based on the F–16 experience.

The development of the alternative engine is now nearly 75 percent complete. To pull the plug on this program would forfeit $3 billion in taxpayer funds that have already been spent.

Competition saves taxpayers money. It's been proven to on the other fighter engine program. Why would we write a blank check to a single supplier for 40 years?

REPUBLICAN INTERACTIVE INITIATIVES

(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, Republicans are leading the charge on creative interactive initiatives that give the American people a seat in Congress. Hardworking taxpayers are rightfully frustrated by business as usual in Washington, particularly when it comes to liberals dragging their feet on job creation bills while continuing to rack up government spending.

AmericaSpeakingOut.com, launched yesterday by Chief Deputy Whip KEVIN MCCARTHY, will provide a forum for concerned Americans to make their

Printed on recycled paper.

voices heard and share policy concepts. I believe that this online forum will have more job creation proposals and more concepts on how to cut spending in just 1 day than the Washington liberals have presented all year.

I encourage South Carolina residents and Americans across the country to go to AmericaSpeakingOut.com to amplify your proposals on fiscal accountability, national security, American jobs, and values. It is time for you to speak out and speak up.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

NATURE'S GOD IS IN ALL OF US

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

Mr. KUCINICH. The theologian Thomas Barry wrote that the great work of our lives is to reconcile with nature, to come to establish a communion with every living species on the planet—with all humans, all animals and plants, with the land, the air, and the water. As children of a common Creator, we are part of every living thing. This requires reverence for the natural world.

When we look at the oil disaster in the Gulf of Mexico, we learn how far we must journey to reconcile with nature. The false doctrine of subduing the natural world puts us in danger of extinction because it ultimately attacks the precondition of human existence and because it separates us from an understanding of the essential interconnectedness of all life.

So we're lulled into distancing ourselves from the oil disaster, from its effects on the natural world, from its effects on future generations. Nature's God is not just up there, but it's in all of us. And only when we truly understand the deep significance of the Deepwater Horizon disaster will we be prepared to take a new direction not only with our energy policies but with our way of life.

GOVERNMENT MAKING IT HARDER

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is going to consider another so-called jobs bill, but what is really in this bill? Certainly not many private sector jobs or real help to America's small businesses.

Extending unemployment compensation is necessary, but it's not creating jobs. A delayed fix to the Medicare reimbursement rate isn't creating new jobs. Billions of dollars to bail out State Medicaid programs isn't jobs. Welfare payments aren't jobs. We're about to spend $200 billion on a so-called jobs bill without creating any private sector jobs.

Just a few months ago, I polled 16,000 of my constituents. Only 12 percent of them believe that government policies are making it easier to create jobs. Is it any wonder that Americans have this opinion?

The so-called jobs bill this week permanently raises taxes in order to pay for 1-year tax extensions. Unemployment is near 10 percent. Millions more Americans have just given up looking for a job. It's far past time that we stopped making it harder for businesses to hire and started providing real help through regulatory relief and targeted tax breaks. That would be a real jobs bill.

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, Memorial Day, folks across America will come together to pay tribute to our greatest heroes—those who fought and died to keep this Nation safe and free. We owe them and all of our men and women in uniform an eternal debt of gratitude.

Sadly, Washington has not always done enough to pay their debt. Even now, many Native American veterans are struggling to keep a roof over their heads because of their service. They are being denied housing assistance because they are receiving benefits that they have earned with their sacrifices.

I introduced the Indian Veterans Housing Opportunity Act to right this wrong. This commonsense bill makes sure that veterans disability and survivor benefits are not counted as income under a critical Native American Housing Act. This program will bring housing to our veterans who have already paid the price.

This House approved the bill unanimously last month, and Native veterans should not have to wait any longer for justice. I call on the Senate to observe this Memorial Day by passing this important measure.

REPEAL AND REPLACE GOVERNMENT-RUN HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a new poll shows that 63 percent of the American public wants to repeal the expensive government-run health spending law. Sixty-three percent represents the largest opposition to the law since its enactment. It's no surprise, as the law forces people to hand over their hard-earned tax dollars to a private company to buy health insurance or else.

As a constitutional conservative, I have to agree with the 63 percent of American voters who want this expensive, irresponsible, overreaching law repealed and replaced.

Democrats were wrong on the bill's cost, wrong on the effect on jobs, and wrong on the issue of taxpayer funding of abortions. We must stand in favor of repealing and replacing the government health spending bill with real reforms that lower health care costs without subjecting us to any nationalized health plan. America does not want, need, or deserve government-controlled health care.

IRAN'S CONCESSIONS UPDATE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the U.N. Security Council to reject Iran's attempt to continue down the path of nuclear proliferation.

Iran would have us believe that the nuclear deal it reached with Brazil and Turkey was of the same caliber as the offer Tehran rejected in October. The truth is, it's not even close. This agreement would allow Iran to pursue richer-grade uranium, keep more of its nuclear materials, and maintain access to the dangerous supplies it would send to Turkey.

The Security Council must recognize the severity of this threat posed by a nuclear Iran. It must choose a deal based on substance over convenience. But most of all, it must remember the safety and security of the State of Israel and the Israeli people.

In the face of Iran's latest diplomatic diversion, it is more important than ever that we levy real sanctions against a nation bent on destroying a friend. The future of Israel—our most important ally—depends on it.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS LAUNCH NEW WEB SITE

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

Mr. PENCE. After years of being shut out of the debates here on Capitol Hill, seeing runaway Federal spending, bailouts, and takeovers built behind closed doors, the American people finally have a way in—an unambiguous seat at the table. It's called AmericaSpeakingOut.com.

Since the outset of this Congress, Republicans have been offering positive solutions to the challenges facing this country. In building a governing agenda for this Congress, Republicans have been listening to the American people, and AmericaSpeakingOut.com is a continuation of that process.

Now let me say, this is not a listening tour. House Republicans are not a party in search of our principles. We know what we believe. We're committed to the principles of economic growth, fiscal discipline, a strong defense, and traditional American values. But we simply believe that the best ideas in America come from the American people. That's why we launched AmericaSpeakingOut.com.

So I urge all Hoosiers and, frankly, all my countrymen, whatever your politics, whatever your philosophy, join us

for the conversation at AmericaSpeakingOut.com. House Republicans are listening.

□ 1015

WHAT PEOPLE GAVE FOR THEIR COUNTRY

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday it was my birthday, and it didn't quite go as planned. One of the things I did is I went to Arlington Cemetery and spent 4 hours looking at the graves and thinking about American history and the people who wished they had a birthday, and what they gave for their country. Some gave their lives, some gave part of their lives.

I visited the Kennedy graves and let the word go forth. I visited Robert Kennedy's grave and the tiny ripples of hope that can wipe down the mightiest walls of oppression. But I found Earl Warren's grave, along with John Foster Dulles and Arthur Goldberg together.

I would like to read from Earl Warren's tombstone. I think it is something we should reflect on.

''Where there is injustice, we should correct it. Where there is poverty, we should eliminate it. Where there is corruption, we should stamp it out. Where there is violence, we should punish it. Where there is neglect, we should provide care. Where there is war, we should restore peace. And wherever corrections are achieved, we should add them permanently to our storehouse of treasures.''

This from the vice presidential candidate of the Grand Old Party in 1948, the nominee for the Supreme Court and the Chief Justice, nominated by Dwight Eisenhower when Republicans were Republicans. Thank God for Earl Warren.

God bless the United States, and may God save the Gulf of Mexico because it doesn't look like anybody else is going to.

LACK OF COMMITMENT ENFORCING NATIONAL IMMIGRATION LAWS

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am troubled by this administration's commitment, this lack of commitment of enforcing our national immigration laws.

Just last week, John Morton, Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, said that ''his agency will not necessarily process illegal immigrants referred to them by Arizona officials,'' in light of their new State law.

My district contains two permanent ICE offices, and I am seriously concerned that one of the top officials in the Obama administration in charge of enforcing our Nation's immigration laws is refusing to do his job. Regardless of his personal feelings on the Arizona immigration law, Assistant Secretary Morton has an obligation to enforce the rule of law and protect U.S. citizens and legal residents.

Arizona is under siege with both human and drug smuggling, and it is on the front lines dealing with Mexico's drug violence that is spilling over into the United States.

On behalf of my constituents and millions of Americans, I urge President Obama and Immigration and Customs Enforcement Secretary Morton to enforce our immigration laws.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TAM NGOC TRAN

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember an extraordinary young woman, a scholar, a student activist, Ms. Tam Ngoc Tran of Garden Grove, California, who was recently killed in a head-on collision with her close friend, Cinthya Perez.

Tam was the daughter of a refugee couple who fled Vietnam over two decades ago after escaping from a communist reeducation camp.

She graduated from Santiago High School, attended Santa Ana College, transferred to UCLA, earned a bachelor's degree in American literature and culture and was a doctoral student at Brown University.

Tam was also a courageous leader who inspired many through her personal story of immigration. In 2007, the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency raided the Tran home and subsequently arrested Tam and many of her family members.

Representatives LOFGREN, SMITH, and I then wrote a letter to then-Secretary Rice urging her to uphold the U.S. policy regarding the return of refugees to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. That allowed them to remain in the United States.

CONTINUE HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE OF CHILDREN UNTIL AGE 26

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 United Technologies Corporation, the largest private employer in the State of Connecticut, announced that they were going to take advantage of the health care reform law and extend age 26 coverage to all their employees' families. A few days later, Mohegan Sun Casino, which employs 10,000 in the State of Connecticut, made the same decision.

Prior to health care reform, during graduation time, graduating students get a diploma in one hand and a notice from their parents' insurer that they are being kicked off their parents' insurance coverage. Because of health care reform, 1.2 million up to age 26 Americans will now be able to use their parents' health insurance.

For the voices who call for repeal, I challenge them to tell those families that we should repeal that provision and kick their kids off health insurance.

In a few days, we are going to pass a Defense authorization bill which will extend age 26 coverage for TRICARE so that military families will also be able to insure their kids up to age 26. That's why health care reform was needed in this country. We are going to provide 14 million young adults with health insurance coverage by 2014. It is because we took that step that we are going to provide access to that population.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, our immigration system is broken and yet there are those that refuse to do anything about it. The misguided Arizona law S.B. 1070 has made it so difficult for families that some have started to leave the State.

The general atmosphere in Arizona is one of distrust and fear, not just for Hispanic families, but for all communities of color. In the media, blatant attacks, hate speeches, negative images of Latinos only adds to the fuel and fire.

Immigration reform is about people, all of us. It's about families, our neighbors, our fellow parishioners, our classmates, our children. Make no mistake, our immigration problem will not go away by just attacking those without a voice.

I urge my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, to roll up their sleeves and pass comprehensive immigration reform that will reinforce strong security at our borders, strong sanctions against employers who hire the undocumented workers, and unite our families.

We need comprehensive immigration reform now.

STRAIGHT FROM BP'S WEB SITE

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, here is an excerpt straight from BP's Web site. ''Code of conduct is the cornerstone of their commitment to integrity.'' You can't make this stuff up.

It goes on to say ''Great companies are built on trust. Trust is earned through the achievement of consistently high standards of behavior and care.''

Wait, but it gets better. The document also says that among the ''basic rules you must follow'' at BP is always to ''make sure you know what to do if an emergency occurs at your place of work.'' Straight from BP's Web site.

Well, 40 days into one of the worst ecological disasters of our time, BP has yet to meet its own commitment in its Web site to its own integrity. If the code of conduct is consistently violated, causing massive destruction and loss of life, then that employee or contractor would be terminated. The American people should demand no less.

Today I plan to introduce an amendment to the Department of Defense authorization bill to begin the process of terminating BP's business with the American people. Please join me in supporting my amendment to ensure that BP is permanently banned from profiting off the American taxpayer.

HONORING MELISSA BEYRUTI OF UNION CITY, NEW JERSEY

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the achievements of an inspiring student athlete, Melissa Beyruti of Kean University.

Melissa, an All-American senior basketball guard from Union City, New Jersey, finished her career this past March to become the NCAA Division III leader in all-time games played with 128. She also became Kean's all-time leading scorer, closing out her career with 1,974 points, and she holds the NCAA all-division record for career three pointers with 397.

In addition to being chosen for the 2010 NCAA Division III State Farm Coaches' All-American Team, Melissa has been named as both the Eastern College Athletic Conference Division III Metro Region Player of the Year and the New Jersey Athletic Player of the Year. Highlights of her career have been featured in The New York Times and Sports Illustrated.

Melissa has served as both an exemplar student athlete and role model for young girls and women, making her family, university, and the community of Union City very proud. She is an inspiration to many, and I want to congratulate her and her family. I look forward to her many future successes on and off the court.

SENATE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT ON THE EPA

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee released a report that outlines the economic impact of the EPA's holding up perfectly valid mining permits. This report brings to light yet another example of the EPA's war on coal that threatens our country's economic energy and security.

The report found that 190 coal mining operations are being held up. These mines are expected to produce over 2 billion tons of coal, and 81 small businesses rely on these permits to keep their doors open. The EPA is jeopardizing 1 out of every 4 coal mining jobs and over 162,000 indirect jobs in Appalachia.

Enough is enough. With nearly double-digit unemployment throughout the Appalachian region, the Obama administration should tell its EPA to stop its political attacks on coal. Now is the time to put politics aside so thousands of citizens in Appalachia can return to work.

AMERICAN JOBS AND CLOSING TAX LOOPHOLES

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about H.R. 4213 and the impact it will have on an economy that may be improving but has not gone far enough yet. This important bill will put the folks in Maine back to work by increasing investment in our communities and businesses and by closing tax loopholes.

Because of this bill, small businesses that are the backbone of our economic recovery will have increased access to credit. The Build America's Bonds program will continue to allow towns to invest in improving their infrastructure and provide good-paying construction jobs for many Americans. In my home State of Maine, extending the research and development tax credit helps important businesses like IDEXX in Westbrook to grow and develop innovative new products.

I am proud to say this bill also cracks down on tax loopholes that allow hedge fund managers to avoid paying income tax on much of their salaries, and the bill makes sure that multinational corporations don't avoid paying taxes by shifting their profits to offshore tax havens.

Closing tax loopholes generates billions of dollars to pay for the provisions that create jobs in our communities. I look forward to voting ''yes'' on this important bill.

BUSINESS ECONOMIC HISTORY THAT MIGHT MAKE PINOCCHIO BLUSH

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard some business economic history that might make even Pinocchio blush.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle sometimes want the public to forget we inherited an economy in free fall last January. GDP had plummeted 5.4 percent and 741,000 Americans lost their jobs that month. This Congress took decisive action to halt that downward spiral known as the Great Recession.

Those efforts are yielding results today, fostering 290,000 jobs last month, 600,000 jobs so far this year, on a track to create more jobs this year than in the previous 8 years under their rule. In my Virginia district alone we created 4,000 jobs last month and saw the unemployment rate drop.

The national economy has posted positive growth in each of the last three-quarters, jumping 5.6 percent alone in the first quarter. Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues continue to advocate for the bankrupt policies that previously drove our Nation into the economic ditch. We have chosen a new path, and it's those actions and investments that are putting Americans back to work today.

ASIAN-PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month and the remarkable contributions the Asian and Pacific Islander community have made to our Nation. I am a proud member of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and my district includes some of the most robust and active Filipino and Chinese communities in America.

For centuries our Nation has been strengthened by the enormous courage, sacrifice, and dedication of immigrants from across the globe, and the Asian American Pacific Islander community is no exception. As the daughter and granddaughter of immigrants, I know firsthand how weaving values and principles from our cultures into our national fabric is a part of what makes our country great.

The heroes of the AAPI community represent the very best aspects of American life, and their contributions have been invaluable to my district, the State of California, and to our country.

PUT LIMITS ON CORPORATIONS' ABILITY TO INFLUENCE AMERICAN ELECTIONS

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, when the Supreme Court handed down a decision in the Citizens United case, which allowed corporations, including foreign corporations, to spend money to advocate candidates in American elections, many people might have thought this

was an abstract threat. But the events of the last month probably should convince them otherwise.

Last year, BP Oil made $14 billion in profit. If they took one-tenth of that profit, $1.4 billion, they could spend $3 million in every congressional district for every election. It might be less expensive for them to buy Congress than it would be to pay the damages that they have done to this country.

You know, in Kentucky, we have a candidate, Rand Paul, who is running for the Senate. He said President Obama was being un-American when he said he wanted to keep his foot on the throat of BP Oil. Do you think Rand Paul might be getting some campaign expenditures from BP this year?

The damage that BP Oil has done to our country is not nearly as great as the damage which the Citizens United case could do to our democracy. We need to pass the DISCLOSE Act and put limits on corporations' ability to influence American elections.

□ 1030

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 later.

HONORING WORKERS WHO PERISHED IN DEEPWATER HORIZON ACCIDENT

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1347) honoring the workers who perished on the Deepwater Horizon offshore oil platform in the Gulf of Mexico off the coast of Louisiana, extending condolences to their families, and recognizing the valiant efforts of emergency response workers at the disaster site.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1347

Whereas 11 workers tragically died on the Deepwater Horizon offshore oil platform following an explosion on April 20, 2010;

Whereas the Nation is greatly indebted to offshore workers for the strenuous work they perform to provide the energy that drives our Nation every day;

Whereas the Nation has long recognized the importance of safety protections for offshore workers who labor in difficult and uncertain conditions;

Whereas these men were loving husbands, sons and brothers;

Whereas these workers should be remembered for their valor and contribution to our communities;

Whereas Coast Guard and local rescue crews worked tirelessly night and day in courageous rescue and recovery missions;

Whereas the families of the lost workers have endured a great loss; and

Whereas residents of the Gulf Coast and the Nation came together to support these families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the untimely and tragic loss of the 11 workers from the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas who died on the Deepwater Horizon offshore oil platform in the Gulf of Mexico off the coast of Louisiana;

(2) extends the deepest condolences of the Nation to the families of these men;

(3) recognizes all employees on the Deepwater Horizon for their hard work and sacrifice;

(4) commends the rescue crews for their valiant efforts to rescue these workers and others on the platform; and

(5) honors the many volunteers who provided support and comfort for the families of these people during this difficult time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I present H. Res. 1347 for consideration. This resolution honors the 11 workers who perished on the Deepwater Horizon offshore oil platform following an explosion on April 20 of this year. We mourn their loss and extend our prayers and condolences to their families.

H. Res. 1347 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative CHARLIE MELANCON, on May 11, 2010. The measure was reported to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which waived consideration of the measure to expedite its consideration on the floor today. The resolution has the support of over 50 Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the deaths of the 11 workers on the Deepwater Horizon offshore oil platform last month were a tragic reminder of the severe hazards that offshore workers face every day. As we mourn the loss of these men, let us take a moment to reaffirm our commitment to the safety of our offshore oil workers and all Americans who perform such dangerous and necessary work every day. Let us also take a moment to commend our Coast Guard and the local rescue crews for their tireless efforts responding to this catastrophe. Their jobs are also incredibly difficult and dangerous, and we thank them for their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, the Deepwater Horizon explosion and the ongoing crisis of the oil spill it produced will have significant political and policy ramifications. We will debate those here on the House floor, but that is not what we are here to do today. As we are joined today by the family of one of the victims of the explosion, let us put aside all differences and offer our united, heartfelt, and profound sympathies to the families and friends of these 11 workers.

I would now like to place into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of these hardworking Americans who lost their lives in this tragedy: Dale Burkeen, Donald Clark, Roy Wyatt Kemp, Jason Anderson, Stephen Curtis, Gordon Jones, Karl Kleppinger, Blair Manuel, Dewey Revette, Shane Roshto, and Adam Weise.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for introducing it, and I also thank the chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Congressman TOWNS of New York, as well as the ranking member, Representative ISSA of California, for their support.

[From Times Online, Apr. 30, 2010]

THE MISSING MEN OF DEEPWATER HORIZON OIL RIG

(By Joanna Sugden)

Eleven men were missing presumed dead after the Deepwater Horizon oil rig exploded last week.

Dale Burkeen, 37 was a crane operator on the platform and was trained to lower crew members to boats in an emergency.

He had returned to the rig from Neshoba, near Philadelphia, about a week before the explosion. He and wife, Rhonda, have two children, Aryn, 14 and Timothy, 6.

Donald Clark, 49 of Newellton, Louisiana, was expected to leave the rig the day after the explosion for a three-week break. He was an assistant driller.

Roy Wyatt Kemp, 27, has two children, Kaylee, 3, and 3-month-old Maddison, with his wife, Courtney.

He loved fishing and the outdoors and attended a Baptist church in Jonesville, Louisiana, where a memorial service for him will be held today.

Jason Anderson, was a father of two from Bay City, Texas.

Stephen Curtis was an assistant driller on the rig from Georgetown, Louisiana.

Gordon Jones, 28, of Louisiana, was expecting to become a father to a second son with his wife, Michelle.

Karl Kleppinger, 38, of Natchez, Mississippi was a Desert Storm veteran who spent more than ten years working on oil rigs. He was a floorman who made about $75,000 a year working off the Louisiana coast.

Blair Manuel, 56, resident of Gonzales, Louisiana, was a chemical engineer on the rig.

Dewey Revette, 48, from State Line, Mississippi, was a father who had worked for the company as an oil driller for 29 years.

Shane Roshto, 22, was from Franklin County, Mississippi. His family were named on law suits filed by Louisiana's fisheries industry, accusing BP and Transocean, the rig operator, of negligence.

Adam Weise, 24, of Yorktown, Texas, came straight from high school work on the rig in 2005. He loved to hunt and fish and play football. He was the youngest of four children.

[From the Houston Chronicle, May 24, 2010]

RELATIVES REMEMBER THE 11 LOST IN OIL RIG BLAST

(By Dane Schiller)

YORKTOWN.—The hand-scrawled note on the cover of the steno pad is as simple as it is startling.

''April 20, 2010 . . . Start of Hell,'' wrote Texas mother Arleen Weise.

At ''6:00 AM'' the next morning, Weise noted, she got word of the explosion on the Deepwater Horizon, the massive oil rig where her youngest son, Adam, was working in the Gulf of Mexico when he was killed.

''I knew in my heart,'' she said of her son's fate as she stood beside his jumbo-size pickup parked outside his home in this tiny town near Victoria. didn't say it to anyone; I just knew.''

With the pad, she has kept a record of people she has spoken with since that first phone call: Coast Guard officers discussing the search for her son. Oil company officials talking about benefits. A preacher framing a eulogy. Craftsmen chiseling a black marble headstone.

The notepad will travel with her today as she and the families of all 11 workers killed in the accident gather for the first time for a memorial service to be held behind closed doors at a convention center in Jackson, Miss.

Twenty-one of Adam Weise's closest friends and family will be flown on a charter flight paid for by Transocean, the company for which he worked.

He was one of two Texans killed.

The other was Jason Anderson of Midfield, who left behind a wife and two young children.

Anderson's funeral was held Saturday at a packed church in Bay City. One of his spare blue safety helmets and an XXL work shirt, complete with an embroidery of the drilling rig on the right breast pocket, were on a stage filled with flowers.

On one side of the church, where Anderson married his wife, Shelley, sat his family; on the other, fellow rig workers.

''We definitely do not understand why Jason is gone and the other 10 members of his rig,'' said Pastor Clyde Grier. ''We cannot let the things we don't understand dismiss what we do.''

He spoke of the burly man who played high school football, loved to hunt and was known for his Texas two-step.

Anderson, like Weise, knew of the dangers of working on a rig. But along with the physically demanding work and sweat came paychecks that could easily surpass $50,000 annually.

LEFT TO WONDER

Arleen Weise said she doesn't know what to expect today, whether other families will be angry and confrontational or comforting. She does understand, though, that none of them will ever know what happened in those final moments, no matter what her steno notepad says.

She knows her son was in the pump room. A surviving co-worker told her so.

And she knows how many rescue flights were flown and miles covered before the search was abandoned. There were 28 flights covering 6,600 nautical miles, she said.

She has imagined her 24-year-old son—the youngest of four—plunging into the nighttime sea and flailing to untie his heavy work boots and slip out of his jumpsuit.

She decided that the explosion was so massive he never even knew what hit him.

It is comforting—no pain, no suffering,'' she said. ''He's on the bottom of the Gulf with the Deepwater Horizon.''

She and three other women—Adam's girlfriend, sister and grandmother—agreed to talk with the Houston Chronicle in hopes that more people will know not just how Adam died but also how he lived.

Adam's older sister, Gwendolyn Weise, said that somewhere deep she still holds a glimmer of hope he'll be found.

''I just can't get over not having anything . . . him, by himself,'' she said.

Adam Weise loved playing football for the Yorktown Wildcats, but he wasn't the best of students in high school.

He worked on a ranch and then headed for the oil fields. He didn't like the filth but could handle the details in a world where even a dropped wrench could tumble for a mile through pipeline.

He made enough not only for his truck, which was nicknamed ''Big Nasty,'' but the neat two-bedroom home he shared with a cat. A red Transocean jumpsuit still hangs beside camouflage shirts and jackets for hunting.

When he was back on land at home, he was a prankster.

His mother said he once used a bullhorn to make her think the police had surrounded the beauty shop where she worked.

''This is the police,'' she recalls hearing over the bullhorn. ''Arleen Weise, come out with your hands up.'' She fell for it.

Remembering him makes her laugh as well as cry. She said she has had so much to do since his death that only now are some things really taking hold.

''These last few days it has hit me that my son is never coming back to me. I'm not holding it together,'' she said. ''Now, I keep seeming to be more of a mess.''

'WELL FROM HELL'

Adam Weise and his friend Caleb Holloway, of Liberty, were nearing the end of their last shift and at the end of their three-week rotation before heading home when a supervisor needed one of them to go to the pump room.

Weise took the job and told Holloway he'd see him later. Holloway survived.

If Weise had made it, he never would have been able to live with the guilt over those who died, his family said. ''We'd have never had our Adam back,'' said his grandmother, Nelda Winslette.

Added his mother: ''There is not enough counseling in the world to have brought him back.''

His girlfriend, Cindy Shelton, said he had been calling her before and after every shift—unusual for him. She says he was frustrated with problems on the project.

''Everything that could go wrong was going wrong,'' she said. ''Every time he'd call me, he'd say, 'This is a well from hell.' ''

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1347. This resolution honors the workers who perished on the Deepwater Horizon offshore oil platform off the coast of Louisiana and extends our sincerest condolences to those families. It also recognizes the valiant efforts of emergency response workers and volunteers at the disaster site.

I commend my colleague and friend, Congressman MELANCON, for bringing this important piece of legislation before the House, and I extend my appreciation to him and to the rest of our colleagues in the Louisiana congressional delegation for working together to address this disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I have come to the House floor a number of times since April 20 speaking of the ongoing impact of this tragedy on the gulf coast. Today, though, I wish to focus this body's entire attention on those whose lives were lost on that day and those who continue to respond to the crisis.

As I listen to my colleagues speak in support of this resolution, my heart is heavy. As with their families and friends, I mourn the loss of those who died aboard the oil platform. On that tragic day, the 11 men—Jason, Aaron, Donald, Stephen, Roy, Karl, Gordon, Blair, Dewey, Shane, and Adam—were on the rig doing what they knew best. The demands of working the rigs, as anyone who lives along the gulf coast knows, are great. It is physically demanding work, and it takes loved ones away from their families for long stretches at a time.

Our coastline is a working coastline because we are blessed with an abundance of natural resources in the Gulf of Mexico. From fishermen to those working the rigs, each day you can find thousands on the waters laboring to produce these resources and to contribute to the industry and economy of this Nation.

On April 20, the 11 men were working to provide the energy that has driven this Nation for centuries and that continues to be a force in the economy of my home State of Louisiana. This is dangerous work, and it is our responsibility to ensure that safety precautions are taken and that procedures are strictly followed.

The explosion is being investigated by various parties, including congressional committees, and it is our responsibility to ensure the findings are swiftly addressed with new policies to strengthen safety procedures for those working in dangerous and uncertain conditions. You have my word this will be done.

In times of tragedy, this Nation has come together as one, and this is especially the case for those along the gulf coast. I wish to recognize the extraordinary work of the thousands of volunteers and emergency personnel, from the Red Cross to the U.S. Coast Guard, whose unhesitating response to the call of need thus represents the compassion and dedication of this great Nation.

To the families of the 11 who perished, I realize that nothing my colleagues nor I here today can say will return your sons, husbands, and brothers to you, but it is my hope that the gratitude and respect we express on behalf of the citizens of this great Nation will provide some comfort to you while you grieve your loss.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1347.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman, a great leader, from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON),.

Mr. MELANCON. Thank you, Representative SPEIER. Thank you all very much.

I rise today with a heavy heart to remember the 11 men that died on the offshore rig Deepwater Horizon. Those men and thousands of them like them, women included, travel out to offshore rigs every day to work hard and provide opportunities for the rest of us to make a living.

As the crisis in the Gulf of Mexico continues to grow, we see shorelines, fisheries, and other economies threatened. This unprecedented event has the entire gulf coast and country watching to see how soon we can end this.

Setting aside the present crisis for a moment, I am proud to stand with Members of this Congress to remember those men who represent a very human face to this tragedy.

I would also like to take a moment to recognize the families of those 11 people. Those men were doing what so many other men and women do in Louisiana every day. They were working to provide a better life for their families while braving difficult and sometimes dangerous conditions to provide domestic energy needed to drive our Nation and our economy. Our thoughts are with these families, and I pray that their grief is not forgotten by the rest of us.

And we should also recognize the courageous work of the emergency responders who fought the blaze and saved lives that night. The loss of those 11 workers is a high cost to their families, and so I ask everyone to please remember the personal side to this tragedy as we move forward. Please keep them in your thoughts and, particularly, keep them in your prayers.

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague and friend from Louisiana (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

All along the gulf coast, there are many communities hundreds of miles from the edge of the water, communities that are filled with families that, for generation after generation, have produced the workers that are required to produce gas and oil in the gulf region. Some of those workers leave home for periods of 7 days, 14 days, perhaps 21 days before coming home. Sadly, some never return home. Families can't be prepared for losing those loved ones, and for that, our hearts and prayers go out in this resolution.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Orleans for yielding.

This is a sad time for those of us from south Louisiana. It's a sad time especially as we look at what's happening every day as more oil gushes into our marshland, our valuable, fragile ecosystem. But if there is anything that eclipses the sadness we're experiencing on the coast, it's the loss of those 11 lives, the 11 brave men who died on that Horizon rig, and the families that they left behind. So many of those young men left behind young children and wives who now have to cope with the loss and somehow find a way to move on.

So our prayers go out to those who lost their lives, and their families who are continuing to experience the tragedy that we're all so sorry for experiencing on the gulf coast. So it's a sad time for all of us on the gulf coast, but we want to give a special pause for those who lost their lives and the young children and spouses that they leave behind.

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1347, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1347.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1045

SUPPORTING RV CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION MONTH

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1073) supporting the goals and ideals of RV Centennial Celebration Month to recognize and honor 100 years of the enjoyment of recreational vehicles in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1073

Whereas 1910 marks the first year of mass-produced, manufactured, motorized campers and camping trailers;

Whereas 1 in 12 households in the United States owns a recreational vehicle, and over 30,000,000 recreational vehicle enthusiasts take part in this affordable and environmentally friendly form of vacationing;

Whereas recreational vehicle vacations allow families in the United States to build stronger relationships, explore the great outdoors, and take part in healthy activities;

Whereas this homegrown industry, including recreational vehicle manufacturers, suppliers, dealers, and campgrounds, employs hundreds of thousands of people in the Nation in good-paying jobs across all 50 States;

Whereas recreational vehicles offer the freedom, comfort, and flexibility to see all parts of the United States, from historic landmarks and national parks to local campgrounds and sporting events; and

Whereas the 100th anniversary of the introduction of the recreational vehicle into the United States marketplace will be celebrated June 7, 2010, at the RV/MH Hall of Fame and Museum in Elkhart, Indiana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of RV Centennial Celebration Month to recognize and honor 100 years of enjoyment of recreational vehicles in the United States; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to celebrate this anniversary by taking part in recreational vehicle vacations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1073, a measure supporting the goals and ideals of RV Centennial Celebration Month.

This measure was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Representative JOE DONNELLY, on February 4 of this year. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which waived consideration of the measure to expedite its consideration on the House floor today. The measure enjoys the support of over 50 Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, RVing is one of the great American traditions in travel. The 30 million Americans who regularly vacation via their recreational vehicles get to travel far and wide around our country, exploring our majestic landscapes, our national and State parks, and taking part in a healthy, outdoor activity. RVs help them do so at a price affordable to families. There are destinations for RVing across our 50 States, and we can all agree that we'd love for more Americans to visit the places we are most proud of in our communities.

For instance, I'd like for the RVing community to come and set their eyes on the Golden Gate Bridge, on the cable cars, on the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, or on the San Francisco Bay Estuary.

RVs make exploring our great country a practical option for many families. The first RVs came into mass production 100 years ago this June. Let us now take time to mark that significant moment in American history by supporting this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1073, supporting the goals and ideals of RV Centennial Celebration Month, to recognize and honor 100 years of enjoyment of recreational vehicles in the United States.

Since 1910, when the first mass-produced, manufactured, motorized campers appeared, people in recreational vehicles still set out to see the country and to enjoy the life of the open road. RVs have steadily gained popularity over the past 100 years. Today, over 30 million recreational vehicle enthusiasts enjoy this pleasant way to vacation. Recreational vehicles offer a way for families to experience all kinds of outdoor activities, especially in our national parks, lakes and oceans. Hundreds of thousands of Americans benefit from this industry, including recreational vehicle manufacturers, dealers and RV campground employees across the United States.

It is the freedom to share the excitement of exploring historical landmarks, of attending sporting events, and of engaging in family camping that explains the appeal of an RV for so many of our citizens.

On June 7, 2010, we will have the opportunity to celebrate the introduction of the recreational vehicle in the United States in Elkhart, Indiana, where the RV/MH Hall of Fame resides. This centennial is found to be a nostalgic celebration of the freedom and enjoyment that RVs have brought to so many Americans in the last 100 years. I support the passage of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY).

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of House Resolution 1073, a bipartisan resolution recognizing and supporting the goals of RV Centennial Celebration Month in June 2010.

The first mass-produced, manufactured, motorized campers and camping trailers appeared in the American marketplace for commercial sale in 1910. This resolution seeks to honor and commemorate America's 100 years of enjoyment of RVs. It also offers an opportunity to recognize the workers who make RVs, the entrepreneurs who started these companies and whose passion has created jobs and opportunity for so many people and to recognize the homegrown industry that has developed to support this great American pastime and to provide good-paying jobs for thousands of families.

I have the privilege of representing a large portion of the RV industry. It is crucial to northern Indiana's economy. RV manufacturing has long been a major economic driver in places like Elkhart by directly employing thousands of people in the RV plants and thousands more in suppliers' factories, not to mention its contributions to the local municipal tax base.

The economic importance of RVs and camping extends well beyond my district, of course—to the entire United States. RV manufacturing is big business in Oregon, Iowa and elsewhere. Camping and RV tourism pump millions into our parks and vacation destinations each and every year. For a century, through war and peace, booms and busts and technological fads, RVs have been a mainstay of American highways, campgrounds, sporting events, and driveways.

The RV lifestyle is still going strong. Today, one in 12 American households owns an RV, and over 30 million RVers take part in this affordable and environmentally friendly form of vacationing each year. We all represent families who own RVs and who enjoy the freedom of travel and of the family adventure they provide. Despite the economic ups and downs, RVs allow families an affordable way to travel and to explore this country's amazing natural resources.

This year, the RVing community will celebrate their centennial with a series of events which will culminate a 100th anniversary party hosted on June 7 at the RV Hall of Fame in Elkhart, Indiana. This resolution to recognize June 2010 as RV Centennial Celebration Month provides a fitting endorsement of the 100-year journey of a uniquely American product. This resolution enjoys the support of over 50 bipartisan cosponsors.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and pass House Resolution 1073.

Mr. CAO. I just want to let the gentleman from Indiana know that I grew up in Goshen, Indiana, which is about 20 miles from Elkhart; so I know how important the RV industry is to that area.

Mr. Speaker, with that being said, I would like to ask that all RV owners please spend some time and drive down to Louisiana, especially to New Orleans. We have the best restaurants in the world, the best seafood, and our culture is unequaled.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to urge my colleagues to support this measure honoring the 100 years that RVs have been in production, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1073.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING ISRAEL ON OECD MEMBERSHIP

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1391) congratulating Israel for its accession to membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1391

Whereas Israel first sent an observer delegation to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 1994, and first began actively seeking to join the OECD in 2000, when it met the OECD's membership requirements relating to industrial and per-capita product criteria;

Whereas in May 2006, the OECD adopted in full the Report by the Working Party on the Implications of Future Enlargement on OECD Governance, stating that expanding membership is vital to the organization;

Whereas Israel has been the most active nonmember country in the OECD, is a member, observer, or ad hoc observer in dozens of working bodies, is party to various OECD declarations, and is already in compliance with multiple OECD standards;

Whereas Israel's tax burden, encompassing income and property taxes, customs duties, value-added taxes, and national insurance, is much lower than in most OECD member states;

Whereas the World Bank ranks Israel among the 30 countries in which it is easiest to do business, and ranks Israel as tied for fourth in ease of getting credit and tied for fifth in protection of investors;

Whereas in 2010, the World Economic Forum ranked Israel 27th out of 133 countries in its Growth Competitiveness Index, and in particular ranked Israel third in quality of scientific research institutions, fourth in utility patents, fifth in strength of investor protection, fifth in the Forum's legal rights index, seventh in life expectancy, ninth in innovation, 15th in financial market sophistication, 15th in availability of the latest technologies, and 15th in judicial independence;

Whereas the World Economic Forum ranked Israel 28th out of 133 countries in its 2009–2010 Networked Readiness Index and 29th out of 121 in its 2009 Enabling Trade Index;

Whereas Israel has carried out far-reaching economic reforms in recent years with respect to taxes, labor, competition, capital markets, pension funds, energy, infrastructures, communications, transport, housing, and other fields, growing its private sector and streamlining its public sector;

Whereas Israel is a world leader in science and technology and is home to the most high-technology start-up companies, scientific publications, and research and development spending per capita;

Whereas membership in the OECD will likely strengthen the position of Israel in the global economy and within international financial institutions, solidify Israel's transition from an emerging market to an advanced economy, and encourage increased foreign direct investment in Israel;

Whereas Israel's accession to membership in the OECD will strengthen the OECD because of Israel's high living standards, free and stable markets, and commitment to democracy, human rights, and freedom;

Whereas Israel's economic and technological standing will likely benefit OECD member states in innovation, in research and development, and in the science and technology, including high-technology, sectors;

Whereas Israel is a strong ally and friend of the United States and supports the United

States in international organizations more consistently than any other country;

Whereas, on November 8, 2005, the House of Representatives unanimously adopted H. Res. 38, and on May 3, 2007, the Senate by unanimous consent adopted S. Res. 188, in support of Israel's accession to membership in the OECD;

Whereas in May 2007, during the annual meeting of the OECD's ministerial council, OECD member states invited Israel to open talks for accession to membership in that organization;

Whereas the Secretary-General of the OECD, Angel Gurria, has supported Israel's candidacy for accession to OECD membership and worked to ensure that Israel's candidacy was not politicized, and was judged by objective economic and democratic standards;

Whereas the United States has supported Israel's candidacy for accession to OECD membership;

Whereas, on May 10, 2010, the 31 OECD member states unanimously agreed to invite Israel to become a member of that organization, with the OECD noting in a statement that ''Israel's scientific and technological policies have produced outstanding outcomes on a world scale.'';

Whereas, on May 10, 2010, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu noted regarding Israel's accession to OECD membership that ''Israel's accession to the OECD has strategic importance for the process of positioning Israel's economy as a developed and advanced economy, as well as in attracting international investments . . . There is still work to be done. We have done a great deal. We are doing a great deal; and we will do a great deal . . . so that we can be on the list of leading countries, among the 15 most advanced countries in the world. This goal is possible and it won't take us too many years to accomplish.'';

Whereas Israel will be welcomed into the OECD during the annual meeting of that organization's ministerial council on May 27, 2010, and will fully accede to membership once it passes the requisite enacting legislation, a process that is likely to be completed within months; and

Whereas Israel continues to pursue further opportunities to accede to membership or enhance its participation, as the case may be, in international forums: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates Israel for its accession to membership in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD);

(2) commends the 31 nations of the OECD, as well as OECD Secretary-General Angel Gurria, for recognizing Israel's economic success as well as its commitment to the principles of democratic government and market economy by unanimously electing Israel to OECD membership;

(3) recognizes the importance of the strong role played by the United States in Israel's successful bid for accession to membership in the OECD; and

(4) calls on responsible nations to support efforts by Israel to accede to membership or enhance its participation, as the case may be, in international forums.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Ms. BERKLEY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. Israel's accession to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, a prestigious group of the world's most advanced economies, is a monumental achievement and is testimony to Israel's remarkable economic success and diplomatic acumen.

The unanimous decision by the 31 member states of the OECD to accept Israel is a recognition of Israel's economic strength as well as of its democracy and of its ability to contribute to the organization and to the world's economy.

Israel was one of the few economies in the world to have positive economic growth in the midst of last year's global economic crisis, and it is expected to grow at least 3.5 percent in 2010. As a member of the OECD, Israel will be in an even better position to advance key economic sectors of its economy, including technology, medicine and agriculture. This will prove beneficial, not only to the State of Israel but, as the record of Israeli entrepreneurial creativity attests, to the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, Israel's accession to the OECD is an important achievement for the State of Israel, and it also demonstrates the importance of U.S. engagement in multilateral organizations. Without the emphatic support of the Obama administration's delegation to the OECD, Israel almost certainly would still be waiting at the organization's door, knocking to come in.

I would like to congratulate and thank our OECD mission in Paris for their hard work. This strong team of diplomats worked tirelessly to support Israel's OECD candidacy, and it dutifully ensured that Israel's candidacy was not politicized and that it was judged by objective economic and democratic standards.

Mr. Speaker, the lesson from this victory is clear: U.S. engagement works. Without a strong presence at this international organization, we risk leaving our ally Israel to battle alone against its many biased critics. It is important to remember that maintaining a strong U.S. voice in international organizations isn't important just for America's interest but for Israel's interest as well.

I want to thank the Obama administration for their strong support for Israel at the OECD, and I look forward to working with them to ensure that there is the same support going forward at the OECD, at the U.N., and at other multilateral organizations.

The unanimous vote by OECD members to admit Israel not only highlights Israel's growing global economic importance, which it certainly does and is, but it also represents an important sign that the U.S., when properly engaged, can help to defeat the unrelenting efforts of Israel's detractors and, may I say, haters.

I would like to thank my dear friend, Ranking Member ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for introducing this important resolution and for making Israel's accession to the OECD possible.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank my good friend, the lovely lady from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), for those kinds words.

Mr. Speaker, we have got a good, strong partnership when it comes to promoting the ideals of freedom, democracy and the rule of law; and in that category, Israel will always stand out.

I am proud, obviously, to support this resolution, which I authored and sponsored, House Resolution 1391, which congratulates Israel on being approved for membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The OECD brings together governments committed to democracy and a market economy in advancing freedom and in advancing prosperity. The recent unanimous support of OECD member states for Israel's membership is a well-deserved seal of approval for Israel, one that can reinforce its progress and that will benefit both Israel and the members of the OECD.

Mr. Speaker, the history of Israel's pursuit of membership in the OECD speaks volumes about the nature of Israel, also, lamentably, of the Palestinian leadership and of the U.S. engagement in international organizations. Israel, the free, democratic country that it is, pursued OECD membership, not with a sense of entitlement but with patience and eagerness to demonstrate its eligibility and its competence in improving herself in the process.

Israel first sent an observer delegation to the OECD in 1994. In the 16 years since that time, Israel has carried out far-reaching economic reforms with respect to taxes, labor, competition, capital markets, pension funds, energy, communications, transport, and housing. Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on.

□ 1100

It has grown its now-booming private sector and streamlined its overgrown public sector. Its tax burden is much lower than that of most OECD member states.

Israel is now a world leader in science, technology, and entrepreneurship, home to the most high technology startup companies, scientific publications, and research and development spending per capita. And it has

been the most active nonmember country in the OECD, becoming a member or an observer in dozens of working bodies, a party to numerous OECD declarations, and coming into compliance with multiple OECD standards.

Israel also continues to uphold the democratic values of its founding with a vibrant political system, a robust and autonomous judiciary, and a commitment to human rights. In short, Israel's democracy, its prosperity, and its freedom are a model for many nations and many people. Israel has clearly made its case for OECD membership.

The Palestinian leadership, in contrast, has spent the last 16 years demonstrating time after time that it never misses an opportunity to miss an opportunity. It has rejected every offer of peace from Israel. It has refused to recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state. It has failed to crack down on violent extremism and anti-Israel incitement. Indeed, it has even tolerated and encouraged such behavior.

It has supported boycotts of Israeli goods, and the Palestinian Authority's prime minister, whom some consider a moderate, even participated in a mass burning of such goods. And it has consistently tried to use international organizations, from the U.N. General Assembly to the Human Rights Council, with its infamous Goldstone Report, to the International Criminal Court, to demonize and delegitimize Israel.

The Palestinian Authority tried hard to block Israel's candidacy for membership in the OECD, with the same Palestinian Authority prime minister personally lobbying foreign governments to oppose Israel's membership.

Is this a partner for peace, Mr. Speaker?

But it gets worse. A former Palestinian Authority foreign minister and senior associate of Abu Mazen announced just last week that the Palestinian Authority was intensifying its diplomatic and economic offensive against Israel. He said the Palestinian Authority needed ''to increase our efforts in the international arena to isolate and punish Israel, prevent it from deepening its relations with the European Union, and attempt to expel it from the United Nations.'' He continues, ''We must pursue Israel in all international bodies and institutions.'' And Palestinian leaders keep threatening violence to extract concessions.

Instead of focusing on building a better future for its people, the Palestinian leaders are focusing on tearing down that future for Israel and her citizens. This Congress should not reward such behavior by providing yet another $400 million bailout to the West Bank and Gaza, including another $150 million in cash directly to the Palestinian Authority.

Finally, Israel's candidacy for OECD membership teaches us a lesson about when and how the U.S. should participate in international forums, and when and how it should not. The OECD is what the U.N. was intended to be, a group of free, Democratic countries cooperating to advance their values and shared interests. It has rigorous membership standards and new members must be approved by all existing members.

Its Secretary General has demonstrated commitment to ensuring that Israel's candidacy and other issues are determined on the merits and are not politicized. That is why the U.S. should and does participate in the OECD, including by actively supporting Israel's candidacy for membership.

In contrast, the UN's misnamed ''Human Rights Council'' has no meaningful standards for membership, other than the ability to gain the support of a mere majority of the U.N. General Assembly, which itself includes scores of countries that are not free democracies.

In the most recent so-called ''elections,'' using the term loosely, to the Human Rights Council earlier this month, every single candidate, no matter how oppressive the government, ran unopposed on previously agreed upon regional slates. That is not democracy. It's what happens in the Castro brothers' Cuba. So it is no surprise that the Cuban regime is a longstanding member of the rogue's gallery that is the Human Rights Council, as are China, Saudi Arabia, and now Qaddafi's Libyan regime.

None of these countries ever are condemned by the Human Rights Council for their rampant human rights violations, nor is Iran, nor is Syria. But the Council has devoted 80 percent of its resolutions and about half of its special sessions to bashing the democratic Jewish State of Israel, and it has passed numerous other anti-freedom measures.

The administration's decision to join the Council, and the last year of the U.S. membership on that Council, have not changed these grim facts, lamentably. When the deck is stacked, when the fix is in against freedom and against democracy, the answer should be not to participate and instead vote ''no.'' The answer is for the U.S. and other responsible nations to walk out and demand better.

Today, however, in this legitimate and distinguished House, I will proudly vote yes on this resolution. I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

I thank my good friend and colleague from New York, Mr. CROWLEY, for cosponsoring this resolution with me; I thank our wonderful chairman, Chairman BERMAN, for agreeing to move it so promptly for floor consideration; and I again thank my good friend from Nevada, Ms. BERKLEY, for also standing on the side of Israel, always standing on the side of freedom and democracy.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it is plain to see from the words of my esteemed colleague, it is plain to see Israel's extraordinary impact on the global economy. Its accession to the OECD will have a positive impact on our global economy at a time when our economy is suffering worldwide.

It would be my hope that the Palestinians, rather than to continue to refuse to make peace with Israel, to continue its terrorist attacks on innocent Israelis, its continuance to refuse face-to-face negotiations with the Israelis for peace, to actively incite anti-Semitism and hatred towards Israel, and to continue its attempts to delegitimize Israel's very right to exist, that perhaps instead it would be more worthwhile for the Palestinian people if its leaders would work with Israel to improve its own economic situation, to raise the Palestinian people from the misery, poverty, and squalor in which they live, and in which they continue to live, not because of the Israelis' success, but because of the lack of movement on the part of the Palestinian leadership that continues to use and abuse their own people and attempt to delegitimize Israel's very right to exist.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1391, congratulating Israel for its accession to membership in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

On May 10, 2010, 31 OECD member states unanimously agreed to invite Israel to become a member of that organization. The OECD noted in a statement that ''Israel's scientific and technological policies have produced outstanding outcomes on a world scale.'' Israel's finance minister, Yuval Steinitz, described Israel joining the OECD as ''a badge of honor'' for Israel, which was one of the few economies to show growth in 2009 during the world economic crisis.

It is critical to recognize the importance of Israel's involvement now and in the future in international organizations. I stand with my colleagues in commending President Obama and the administration for the integral role it played in Israel's successful bid for accession to membership in the OECD. This only furthers to strengthen the bonds between the United States and Israel.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1391, a resolution congratulating and commending Israel for its accession to membership in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD.

On May 10th, it was announced that OECD member states had unanimously voted to extend membership to Israel. This landmark vote recognizes Israel's economic strength, and it is a clear victory over efforts to marginalize and delegitimize the country. Israel's accession to the OECD will speed its economic integration into the global community and provide increased opportunities for foreign investment.

Despite living under the constant threat of terror and war, Israel has developed one of the world's most robust economies. Last year, Israel boasted one of few economies in the world to show growth during the economic crisis. OECD has predicted a 3.5 percent increase in Israel's economy in 2010.

I visited Israel in early April and saw a modern, vibrant economy driven by scientific and technological advancement. While international attention remains fixed on the politics of the region, the OECD vote is a critical recognition of Israel's robust economy and ongoing innovation.

Last week, I joined over 30 of my colleagues in signing a letter to President Obama, thanking him for his administration's strong support of Israel's bid, as well as a letter to OECD Secretary-General Angel Guria expressing appreciation for the OECD vote.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support Israel's accession to the OECD, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1391, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 10 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1745

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. RICHARDSON) at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Resolution 1347, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 1385, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 1316, de novo; and

House Resolution 1169, de novo.

Remaining postponed votes will be taken later in the week.

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

HONORING WORKERS WHO PERISHED IN DEEPWATER HORIZON ACCIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1347, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1347.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

YEAS—403

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Andrews
Barrett (SC)
Becerra
Boren
Brown, Corrine
Cassidy
Cole
Conyers
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Gohmert
Graves
Grijalva
Hirono
Hoekstra
Honda
Jackson Lee (TX)
Kilpatrick (MI)
Larson (CT)
Linder
Maloney
McClintock
Petri
Radanovich
Ryan (WI)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Woolsey

□ 1817

Mr. LOEBSACK changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 302, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 302 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 302, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING AND HONORING MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1385, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1385.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

YEAS—414

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews
Barrett (SC)
Becerra
Boren
Brown, Corrine
Conyers
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Graves
Hoekstra
Jackson Lee (TX)
Kilpatrick (MI)
Maloney
McClintock
Petri
Ryan (WI)
Tiahrt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1826

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 302 and 303, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on both votes.

CELEBRATING ASIAN/PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1316, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1316, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 408, noes 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

AYES—408

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords

Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Andrews
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Becerra
Bilbray
Boren
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Conyers
Cuellar
Davis (AL)
Flake
Graves
Gutierrez
Hoekstra
Jackson Lee (TX)
Kilpatrick (MI)
Maloney
McClintock
Petri
Price (GA)
Ryan (WI)
Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1834

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROLLINS COLLEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1169, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1169, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCHAUER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 371, noes 36, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

AYES—371

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—36

Akin
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Cao
Carter
Cassidy
Coffman (CO)
Emerson
Fleming
Gingrey (GA)
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
Kingston

Lamborn	Neugebauer	Schock
Lee (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Shadegg
Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher	Westmoreland
McHenry	Scalise	Wilson (SC)
Myrick	Schmidt	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—24

Andrews	Davis (AL)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Baird	Edwards (TX)	Maloney
Barrett (SC)	Ehlers	McClintock
Becerra	Frank (MA)	Petri
Boren	Graves	Rogers (AL)
Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	Ryan (WI)
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Hoekstra	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Jackson Lee (TX)	Towns

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1843

Mr. LAMBORN changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend to several votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of H. Res. 1347, "aye" on final passage of H. Res. 1385; "aye" on final passage of H. Res. 1316, and "aye" on final passage of H. Res. 1169.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, on May 26, 2010, I was called away on personal business. I regret that I was not present to vote for H. Res. 1347, H. Res. 1385, H. Res. 1316 and H. Res. 1169. Had I been present, I would have cast a "yea" on all of these votes.

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 5136, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to file a supplemental report on the bill, H.R. 5136.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1397

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

(1) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Mr. Critz (to rank immediately after Mr. Garamendi).

(2) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mr. Critz (to rank immediately after Mr. Nye).

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICANS DESERVE ACCESS TO PUBLIC LANDS

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, millions of acres across our Nation are owned by the Federal Government, including national parks, forests, monuments, wilderness areas, and other lands. These lands belong to the American people and should be accessible to the public to enjoy.

The Hanford Reach National Monument located in my hometown includes Rattlesnake Mountain. I've been to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain, and it provides unparalleled views of the Monument, Hanford, and the Columbia River, and everybody should have an opportunity to appreciate that.

I'm introducing legislation that would ensure public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain. My bill simply is about making sure that land owned by the American people is accessible to the entire Tri-Cities community—not something to be admired from afar and from behind a fence. Recognizing that people are allowed to go to the top of Mount Rainier, there is no reason why safe and regular access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain for the general public cannot and should not be provided.

ON THE PASSING OF JUDGE EDWARD DAVIS

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a giant in South Florida passed away. He was a dear friend of mine, Judge Edward Davis, and a dear friend of all in America that are in the constant quest for justice. I have not had an opportunity to speak with his wife Patricia, but I did mention briefly last night that I offer she and the family my most sincere condolences.

I intend at the appropriate time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to commemorate Ed—and we call him Ned—by referring to the awesome career that he had and the significant number of undertakings that he put forward either as a lawyer or as a judge or as a citizen in Miami, Dade County, and throughout Florida and this Nation on behalf of the Southern District of Florida.

He will be sorely missed. He was an extremely tall and giant of a man with as big a heart as was the fact that he was tall. I will sorely miss him. The Southern District of Florida and all of their judges; Judge James Lawrence King and he were good friends. Ned and I went on the bench together at the same time, and it hurts me and it hurts our community that he is gone.

That said, Mr. Speaker, I will commemorate his memory more appropriately as time progresses.

NATIONAL MEDIA IGNORE PRESIDENT'S LOWEST-EVER APPROVAL RATING

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's approval rating hit a new low this week according to a Rasmussen public opinion poll. Just 42 percent of Americans approve of the President's job performance. By a margin of almost 2–1, more Americans strongly disapprove of the President rather than strongly approve and fewer than half of those in the President's own party strongly approve of his job performance.

Not surprisingly, the national media have mostly ignored these results. The New York Times, The Washington Post, The Los Angeles Times, and USA Today—among many others—failed to mention the Rasmussen poll. In contrast, during former President George W. Bush's administration, the national media frequently reported polls showing any falling approval rating.

The national media should report the facts, not practice double standards.

RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY EXPO AND FORUM

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the 13th annual Congressional Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Expo and Forum that is slated to take place tomorrow. The topic of this expo is especially timely. Last year, China invested $34.6 billion in clean energy while the United States invested $18.6 billion, a distant second. We have an energy problem, and we need to address it.

At this forum, there are over 50 businesses, clean energy trade associations, government agencies, and energy policy research organizations that will be

showcasing their technologies. On efficiency: We should drill and mine energy efficiency the way we are so gluttonously dependent on drilling for oil and mining for coal. On renewable energy: We should invest in sustainable energy and new technologies to build our energy independence and to once again create American manufacturing jobs.

I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming this year's participants at the expo and encourage my colleagues to stop by the Cannon Caucus Room to see the exhibits.

TIME TO MAKE A PERMANENT FIX TO THE MEDICARE PAYMENT FORMULA

(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, we find ourselves up against another deadline for the so-called ''doc fix,'' and this happens because this Congress lacks the courage to solve the problem. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the longer we put off doing a permanent fix, the more expensive it gets. If the problem had been fixed 5 years ago, it would have cost $49 billion.

Here is an ad that the AMA has been running in some of the papers here on Capitol Hill. The cost to fix the bill now is $210 billion, but if we wait 3 years, it almost doubles to $396 billion and then balloons to half a trillion dollars in 5 years.

But there is a better way. H.R. 3693 would make a permanent fix to the formula Medicare uses to determine payments to doctors, and it's critical for our patients because patients cannot get access to a Medicare physician because, consider this, Medicare physician payment rates are about where they were in 2001. Medical practice costs have increased more than 20 percent. What's worse, the current fee pays doctors less each year for performing the same procedures.

I urge the Congress to pass a reasonable Medicare physician fix. The time has come and gone.

FINANCIAL GAMES

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I'm astounded. I'm astounded with what I just heard. This is a problem that was actually created nearly a decade ago by the Republicans as they were playing financial games. And to stand here on the floor and say this has to be fixed now, yes, indeed it does, but indeed it is the Republican Party that has prevented us from fixing it. That's going on right now as the negotiations take place on the American Jobs Act and corporate tax loophole closing—closing the tax loopholes on corporations that are in fact shipping jobs offshore.

I would ask the Republicans in this House to stand with us and do a permanent fix. It can be done. But it's not going to be easy. We need to raise the tax revenue. A good place to raise it is from those corporations that are shifting jobs offshore.

NATIONAL GUARD SENT TO BORDER OR MAYBE NOT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the administration announced they're deploying 1,200 National Guard troops to the border. That sounds mighty good, but not so fast.

It appears troops aren't really going to the border. It seems they're sending the National Guard troops 20 miles behind the border to do computer support work. Well, we can hire a Geek Squad to do that. The National Guard troops need to be on the border and they need to be armed so they can defend themselves. And they need realistic rules of engagement.

One border patrol official said that sending unarmed National Guard troops to the border amounts to the border patrol guarding the National Guard. Our current border philosophy is to try to capture people when they cross the border. Once they've crossed, if we capture them, then we have to deal with the consequences—like deportations, prosecutions, drug gangs in our jails, et cetera. Why are we letting illegals cross in the first place?

It seems to me we need boots on the border, not 20 miles behind the border guarding computers.

And that's just the way it is.

BUY AMERICA

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, in the last year of the Bush administration, the Department of Defense, under President Bush, authorized a 450 percent increase in the number of waivers we grant to this Nation's Buy America law, allowing in just 1 year thousands of American jobs to be sent overseas using U.S. taxpayer dollars.

We have the defense reauthorization bill on the floor this week, and we have a chance to say no more, that one of the best ways to grow our domestic economy is to make sure that our own U.S. taxpayer dollars, 70 percent of which are used with respect to U.S. procurement on defense items, stay right here in this country.

The stimulus bill is working. It's creating American jobs. But without spending one dime more of American money, we can stop this trend of more and more waivers being granted to the Buy America laws and apply U.S. taxpayer dollars to create U.S. jobs.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

SENIORS' BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about an issue of concern to seniors in my district and around the country. I'm proud to support the Seniors' Bill of Rights crafted by the Democrats' Seniors Task Force, and am committed to its goals. These goals include helping seniors achieve financial security by staying in their homes, finding jobs, and receiving quality, affordable health care.

Our seniors made this country what it is today—fighting overseas for our freedom, serving as the backbone for an economic boom in the post-war years, and providing critical leadership in our communities.

Today, I want to address a fundamental flaw in the Social Security system that I want to correct in the coming weeks: Social Security disability fraud. We are all aware of the disability backlog and the steps Congress is taking to reduce it. Due to dedicated oversight and strong action since the Democrats took back the majority in Congress, the backlog is being reduced. What is less commonly known is that some disability insurers are purposely adding to this backlog.

□ 1900

They have forced policyholders to apply for Social Security disability benefits or else they withhold payments. They do this even when they know the person is ineligible for Social Security disability benefits.

Here is where the fraud comes in. Disability insurance pays out when you are hurt and unable to perform your job. Social Security is there when you are so hurt that you cannot perform any job.

If a neonatal nurse, for example, injures her shoulder in a car accident and can no longer pick up infants, she can no longer do her job and is eligible for temporary disability benefits from her insurer. Because this nurse is still capable of serving a full career as a nurse in a number of other settings, she is not eligible for Social Security disability.

This isn't a hypothetical situation. It is an actual case pulled from a lawsuit against one of the disability insurers that was defrauding Social Security.

The disability insurer forced the nurse to commit fraud by forcing her to apply for Social Security disability, even though they knew the full extent of her injuries still meant that she

could work as a nurse in other capacities.

These insurers have access to medical records and know full well when their customers are unable to perform any job. Yet they mandate that all of their customers, even those who are only temporarily injured, apply for Social Security disability. This adds to the backlog and costs taxpayers millions of dollars, all because insurers want to delay paying legitimate claims.

My legislation would require that insurers play by the same rules that they require of individuals. If an insurer is going to mandate a policyholder apply for Social Security disability, that insurer should have to certify to the government that the claim is a legitimate, permanent claim.

This legislation will root out this practice so that bad actors won't be able to clog the system with frivolous claims. When frivolous claims are weeded out, access for legitimate applicants increases and the time to process legitimate claims decreases.

This is just one of the issues I am working on to benefit California's seniors. I look forward to working with my colleagues and passing this bill into law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SMALL BUSINESS JOB CREATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my thoughts on a matter of deep concern to me, small business job creation.

We have seen a lot of progress this year. Our economy has created over 500,000 jobs in 2010 alone. Last month, 290,000 jobs were created, with 231,000 of them in the private sector, the largest number of new jobs created in the last 4 years. While these are great statistics, we still have a long, long way to go. It will take time to recover the 8 million jobs lost over the course of this recession.

One positive thing that Congress could do to support jobs is to do all that we can to support small businesses. With two out of every three new jobs created by small businesses, they are the driving force of our economy. Unfortunately, they have also been the hardest hit by the recession, having lost over 2.4 million jobs.

As President Obama indicated in his meeting with the small business leaders, this is the Nation where anyone with a good idea and the will to work hard can succeed, and I agree with President Obama.

New York City is no stranger to good ideas, hard work, or small businesses. The city is home to over 200,000 small businesses which create hundreds of thousands of jobs, provide valuable goods and services, and help drive our local economy.

While the government can't get small businesses through all of the tough times, it can remove barriers that prevent businesses from growing and being able to succeed. We must do all that we can to support the work of the countless entrepreneurs that sustain our economy.

I encourage my colleagues in the House and in the Senate to work together to enact policies that will support small business job creation. We must work to eliminate these barriers and to permit people to be able to expand their businesses and to be able to create jobs.

We need to make certain that folks have an opportunity to work. We have people that have gone to college and are coming out with degrees and still cannot find a job. I think the time has come when the Congress must come together and create jobs and job opportunities for these young people in particular that want to work but are being denied the opportunity because they lack a job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

YOUCUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last evening I spoke on the House floor about the newly devised YouCut program and how it undercuts our representational responsibilities as Members of Congress.

I would like to revisit this theme, which has become a recurring one, given the Republicans' most recent efforts.

I repeat, government by referendum is not representation. Just because 81,000 people voted for a program in a Republican ploy doesn't mean that it is the will of the American people or informed policy.

Let me make it very clear: Referenda have their place, but in this, the world's greatest deliberative body, we are not in the position of needing to have that kind of ploy put forward here in this body. Republicans seem to think that online gimmicks are an effective substitute for good government.

What they fail to understand is that national policy cannot be made in a matter of minutes or within a few clicks of a mouse. Instead of worrying about friend requests, Republicans should contribute to meaningful debate. If they did, then they would have known that according to the nonpartisan Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, cutting funding for the Temporary Aid to Needy Families Program, as they attempted to do, would have resulted in 100,000 people losing their jobs.

This Chamber isn't going to be fooled or bullied or be controlled by the misguided ideological intention or misleading rhetoric of the few. Republicans have called for voter input on programs of national significance in the name of civic participation. But spreading misinformation is not in the best interests of the American people.

To the contrary, it is only in the best interests of the Republicans and their agenda. Not only are the summaries provided on YouCut, which I have called CutYou, inaccurate, they are specifically written to elicit a specific response.

As I have said, I do not fault my friends on the other side of the aisle for taking their upcoming election campaigns into consideration and doing those technological undertakings that they deem necessary for themselves. What I do fault them for is wasting the time of this Chamber with their ulterior motives and legislative tricks. They are playing with short-term decisions that have long-term consequences.

YouCut provides no effective way to change policy, does little to reduce our Federal deficit, does nothing to allow for people to talk about saving themselves, and hurts everyday Americans, especially the poor and the elderly, who probably, some of them, cannot participate in their poll for the reason that they don't have BlackBerrys and computers.

Instead of continuing to be the Party of No, Republicans should say ''yes'' to the American people and help pass the legislation that this Nation needs and deserves.

I urge my Republican friends not to undercut with their CutYou YouCut representational democracy and not just substitute selective, push polling, robotexting, tooting and tweeting for the work of the greatest deliberative body in the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to recognize National Small

Business Week. This year marks the 47th annual Small Business Week, during which we honor the immense contributions of entrepreneurs, their companies, and their workforce to our country.

Our Nation's economic rebirth relies on the ability of our community businesses to innovate, develop, and market solutions that deliver measurable value to their clients. Their growth and success creates up to 80 percent of new jobs in our Nation, including 25,000 already this month.

As a former business owner, I recognize today's many challenges, including getting access to capital, lowering energy costs, funding R&D, workforce training, and improving efficiencies.

When I host Small Business Federal Resource Seminars in my district, I encourage community businesses to connect with Federal agencies whose resources and programs could be useful to their operations, including—I have the SBA come out and share information with our businesses about 504 and 7(a) and Express loan programs. We also talk about small business development tools from the SBDCs.

The IRS is available to provide information about small business tax incentives, which include 179 expense provisions and bonus depreciation, the NOL carryback that has already refunded $2.6 billion to small businesses that had been in the stimulus, so that as they had been profitable in previous years, they can get those dollars back at a time they need to cover payroll and operating expenses. There are also tax credits for health care, which the IRS elaborates on as well.

The Commerce Department talks about export programs, and the Department of Energy talks about Webinars and grants, tools, and incentives for energy development and energy efficiencies.

Small firms are the engine of our U.S. innovation and competitiveness, producing 13 times more patents for employees than those in larger firms. And they support our communities. In addition to goods, jobs, and services, small firms invest in local real estate. Their suppliers grow as they grow, and they contribute to charities and provide leadership and mentoring services to their neighbors.

To help small firms weather the recession and access the capital that is critical to their growth, Congress and the SBA have stepped up. The Recovery Act included $288 billion worth of tax cuts, not just to 95 percent of working Americans, our consumers, but business incentives as well, including bonus depreciation, 179 expensing, the NOL carryback, and capital gains exclusions for small business stock. The first-time home buyer tax credit helped bring 700,000 new buyers back into the market.

This broad-based stimulus went further with infrastructure investment in roads, bridges, energy, and water projects, and included investments in education, smart grid technology, and health IT.

We have seen a positive return. GDP growth has gone from negative 6 to positive 6 since the stimulus, and U.S. manufacturing is now growing at its fastest pace since 2006. While these signs of recovery are encouraging, more needs to be done.

Creditworthy businesses need to have access to working capital, and many need to restructure their debt in the months and years ahead. When businesses can't access financing, they delay contracts, hiring, equipment purchases, and other expansions.

The Recovery Act provided higher guarantees and reduced fees on SBA 7(a) and 504 loans. Since its passage SBA has driven over $27 billion in small business loans into the hands of our community businesses, yet many are still struggling to access affordable capital. Banks are operating under tightened lending standards and have greater risk aversion and greater exposure to the instability of the commercial real estate market.

□ 1915

Their strained balance sheets make it difficult to continue extending credit, where appropriate, to small businesses.

The experience of the Recovery Act has shown that the SBA guarantee can make a difference for an entrepreneur in need of capital. When it comes to Congress' approach to fostering recovery, every week must be Small Business Week.

My colleagues and I will continue to address the capital access gap with measures we move forward in the weeks ahead. Congresswoman DAHLKEMPER and I have a bipartisan measure to increase the maximum loan size and guarantee on the SBA express loan, a critical tool that provides working capital so firms can restock inventory and make new hires.

Today I introduced the Small Business Asset Investment and Modernization Act, which will enhance the SBA 504 loan program for commercial real estate, buildings, and heavy equipment.

Businesses are facing a collateral program as their loans mature and their equity is down in value. Many small business owners obtained loans during the bubble, getting loans at inflated appraised values on their property or with balloon payment structures. Banks are reluctant to restructure debt, particularly if the borrower is equity challenged or if the bank is capital challenged.

My bill will temporarily enable business owners to refinance their commercial real estate debt through the 504 program, addressing an acute near-term need in that sector. Over the next few weeks, I look forward to advancing these and other initiatives to help our growing businesses get the capital they need.

I urge my colleagues to join us in moving forward on further programs to support the work ethic and entrepreneurial spirit of our small businesses, the cornerstone of our economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OUT OF AFGHANISTAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, in the year 2005, I joined my colleagues and fellow Californians, MAXINE WATERS and BARBARA LEE, and other strong progressives in forming the Out of Iraq Caucus. That group was critical in galvanizing support for an end to the Iraq war and a return of our troops safely home.

Before we formed the Out of Iraq Caucus, Mr. Speaker, questioning the occupation of Iraq was considered a political death wish, but because we had the courage to speak out and to organize, ours became a firmly mainstream position. Without the work we did and the pressure we applied and the growth of our Out of Iraq Caucus, we would not be poised for redeployment out of Iraq later this year.

It's now time for those of us who oppose the war in Afghanistan—a bloc that's growing every single day—to do the same thing. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to join the new Out of Afghanistan Caucus, formally launched by my friend Mr. CONYERS from Michigan.

As Afghanistan becomes more bloody, more expensive, and, frankly, more hopeless, we must rally with the same sense of purpose and fearlessness as we did in 2005 in the debate over Iraq. Every day, it seems, brings more bad news out of Afghanistan. The United States death toll has topped 1,000. According to news reports, for the first time we now have more troops in Afghanistan than we do in Iraq, and the combined costs of both wars is fast approaching $1 trillion—that's trillion with a ''T,'' Mr. Speaker.

The American people are losing patience with this war, and who can blame them? For 8½ years, they have sent their finest men and women and their hard-earned taxpayer dollars halfway around the world only to find that the Taliban is resurgent, the terrorist threat remains strong, and Afghanistan remains mired in corruption, violence, and poverty. At just the moment when we need to draw down, we are doubling down. We're pouring thousands of troops into Kandahar for an all-eggs-in-one-basket offensive that no one seems confident will succeed.

With all that in mind, how can we, in the House of Representatives, not

speak with a louder and more unified voice against this war? But we in the Out of Afghanistan Caucus are not calling for an abandonment of the country. We just believe that a military occupation, which has had nearly a decade to work, can't achieve the objectives of stability and security for the Afghan people.

What we need is diplomacy. We need humanitarian aid, support for democracy building and civil society programs. What we need are more resources for agriculture, education, and infrastructure. These are the tools of a smart security strategy that can empower the Afghan people in a way that sheds no more blood.

Mr. Speaker, warfare has only led to more warfare, emboldening the very enemy we're trying to defeat. A peaceful civilian surge is actually the only answer.

I ask my colleagues to join me in becoming a part of the Out of Afghanistan Caucus and help bring our troops home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the people of Ukraine have been struggling to achieve a fair, independent, and strong democracy since the oppressive Soviet yoke was shed in 1991, but recent events in the southern Ukrainian city of Zaporozhia have raised alarm.

A seven-foot tall statue of Joseph Stalin, the World War II Communist tyrant of the Soviet Union who was responsible for the Holodomor famine genocide in which millions upon millions of people starved to death, as well as the deaths of millions of Ukrainians, Pols, Russians, and so many others inside that tyranny, has been built outside of the city in front of the Communist Party headquarters. Even worse, Zaporozhia authorities just denied opposition groups the right to assemble to object to the statue's public display.

Since World War II, the world has come to know that Joseph Stalin killed over 50 million people inside those borders, and the repressive legions that supported him were responsible for such agony for so many. The elevation of Joseph Stalin with a monument is an affront to those who have fought for freedom around the world. Just as a monument to Adolf Hitler in Germany would be unacceptable, freedom lovers simply cannot stand by silently while a monument to Stalin, the mass murderer of the 20th century, is erected in Ukraine.

The story of U.S. citizen Eugenia Sakevych-Dallas, a survivor of the famine genocide in Ukraine, can clearly express how Ukraine and her people were treated under the iron fist of Joseph Stalin. She describes herself as a survivor of the forced famine in Ukraine of 1932–1933. She recounts: It is with tears of joy for the future and salty tears of pain for the past that I write this account of my survival. It is the bone-chilling nightmare of every child to have their parents dragged away by force, never to see them again; siblings sent to prisons, parents sent to their deaths.

She was born in Mykolaiv Oblast and came from a happy family living off the land, but that happiness was stolen when, at the age of 5, they were forced to give away their home, their land was confiscated, and all their domestic animals were taken from them. Like many Ukrainians, they were left on the streets to starve. They were called ''Kulacs''—enemy of the people. Her father was arrested first. The Communists came and picked up her family one by one, leaving her an orphan, an orphan crying with unbearable psychological wounds, alone, afraid, and starving.

She remembers her beloved mother during that time trying to feed the children, doing what any mother would to care for her offspring. She found a few rotten potatoes in a field, and, for this, Stalin's lieutenants arrested her and she was sent to Siberia. The prisons during that time were overpopulated with people who had done nothing but try to survive.

Memories flood back to her, as do tears, and she remembers the long, long lines of men waiting for stale, molding half loaves of bread for hours upon hours. Etched in her mind is one man whom she did not even know that finally reached the end of the line and, with starvation in his eyes, grabbed the little loaf and started to bite into it, swallowing it as fast as he could and then dropping dead right in front of her.

Starvation is an odd thing, she writes. An empty stomach taking in bread is like swallowing cement. It does not absorb the nutrients. It hardens and kills the human body. I lost my dear sister to starvation, a forced death, legalized murder, or murder that the Communists, at Stalin's behest, decided was mercy killing.

They were constantly on the run while her family was being picked off one by one by the Communists. And as starvation took hold of the Ukrainian people, hatred filled their hearts for Soviet Moscow. Many faces still haunt her today—the trains of people, families, old, young, starving, sick, hauled off with standing room only in those box crates. She became one of the children of the street, one of the few survivors of that tragic time in history who ate grass, pinecones, and anything that was chewable in the shadows, afraid that they might be taken away. People were begging, starving, eating anything they could find—a dead horse if they were lucky. Thousands of people were falling over dead, millions upon millions of innocent people killed under the Communists.

It was a sad time in history where, during the height of the famine, Ukrainian villagers were dying at the rate of 17 per minute, 1,000 per hour, and 25,000 per day, leaving only a few survivors to keep the history alive. They were stacked up like logs.

The horror and panic of that time of tyranny is still with her. The hunger that plagued Russia and tortured the Ukrainian people in their scheme to slaughter and take over and annihilate the middle class, she says, Let us not forget. It is our duty to bring the memories and truth to the world. We must expose the hardships, the horrors, and the truths so that these atrocities never can happen again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BOOZMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SENIORS TASK FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Caucus feels very strongly that seniors in America count and, in so doing, created a Seniors Task Force cochaired ably by Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY of Illinois and Congresswoman MATSUI of California. And we thought it was fitting tonight, this being the month in which we honor seniors, to spend an hour talking about the seniors of America.

There are 45 million seniors in this country, and they have the right to ask us what have we done for them lately. And tonight, we're going to ask that question, and we're going to answer it.

First of all, I think we should focus in on Wall Street, and our message is

''When Wall Street gambles, she loses.'' So part of what we want to focus on tonight is the reforms on Wall Street that will protect seniors in America.

The biggest winners, we suggest, in the Wall Street reform are people over the age of 50, who hold 70 percent of the Nation's wealth. Oftentimes, seniors don't realize how big their assets really are or how valuable they are, and they become ripe for scam artists to take them on a wild ride that oftentimes means that they lose the very assets that they have held so dear. Seniors often have caregivers they share their financial data and information with and, oftentimes, can be exploited by those very caregivers.

So we have created a Senior Financial Bill of Rights, which I would like to share with you right now. And the Democrats believe that there are four simple principles that we espouse on behalf of seniors.

The first is the right to simple-to-understand and suitable financial products. Now, this would seem so very obvious, but I'm going to share with you a couple of stories that suggest seniors become the most vulnerable population in terms of being captured by an industry that has plagued us with all kinds of financial products that are not understandable.

I first want to talk about a 67-year-old retired widow living alone in a home she's had for 24 years. She recently got a part-time, minimum wage job as a kitchen helper that helps with her expenses. She's getting $500 a month for that. She gets $973 a month in her Social Security benefits. And the balance due on her home is $90,000.

□ 1930

Now, her husband died in 2003, and she was having a hard time making those mortgage payments, so she went to Wells Fargo and got them to offer her a reverse mortgage. In so doing, she was able to pay off her regular mortgage and did not have payments for as long as she continued to live in the home, which appeared to be a good result.

Yet, in 2007, agents working for World Savings in Orange County, California, found her 500 miles away in Yuba City, California. In a series of phone calls, they convinced her that Wells Fargo was demanding the repayment of her reverse mortgage because home values were declining to levels of less than the loan balance. They convinced her that Wells Fargo would foreclose if she did not refinance to pay off the reverse mortgage. She was confused and frightened, and she did not understand the reverse mortgage for which she had paid $11,000 in origination fees.

So, before long, she was into yet another mortgage with an adjustable rate mortgage and was paying $4,000 a month at one point. Even the lowest payment option constituted 68 percent of her Social Security income—an absolute nightmare. She made three payments out of savings and then gave up. The trustee sale was first set for January 2, 2009. A legal aid attorney came to her benefit and was able to postpone the sale of her home, and negotiations continue today.

This is a real story. She is a real person in California who was not given the right to a simple-to-understand and suitable financial product. That is, in part, what we are going to make sure happens as a result of the Wall Street reform, in part because we are creating a Consumer Financial Protection Agency so that this kind of activity can't continue to go on.

In another case, a 90-year-old California retiree was sold a $100,000 annuity in 2001. He would have to live to be 100 to have unfettered access to his money. Instead, he died at 91, and his heirs were hit with an $11,000 surrender charge.

In another example, an 83-year-old woman was sold a $125,000 annuity in 2002. According to her son, she suffered from dementia and believed she had access to her savings when she had to enter a nursing home. In fact, she would have to pay exit penalties of 25 percent if she withdrew more than 10 percent of her money in any year during the first 6 years of the contract. So, when she died in 2004, her son had to pay—now, are you ready for this?—a $50,000 surrender fee.

That's why we need a Consumer Financial Protection Agency in this country, because that kind of activity goes on and has gone on. While you may suggest that it's ''legal,'' it's totally unethical, and the CFPA will provide that kind of protection for seniors.

I am going to go to these other senior financial bill of rights later on in the hour. I would now like to yield to Congresswoman KILROY as much time as she may consume.

Ms. KILROY. Thank you very much, Congresswoman SPEIER. I appreciate what you had to say. My heart goes out to those seniors who have been abused by predatory lenders, by predatory practices, by scam artists, and by fraud. This is why we need to take action. As you say, the Wall Street Reform Act is going to help us to do just that—to protect seniors.

When I think about what seniors need, they need, of course, personal security. They need to live in safe and livable communities. They need access to health care. With our recent health care bill, we are working to give seniors greater access to health care, to strengthen Medicare, to give greater choices in preventative medicine, with co-pays, and to close the Medicare doughnut hole. That is part of their security.

Also, there is financial security so that they can live the rest of their lives secure that their money is going to be there, that their life savings aren't going to disappear because of the excesses and the risk-taking of Wall Street or that they will become victims of predatory lenders who convince them that they'll need reverse mortgages or that they'll need to take out loans on homes that are already paid for.

This happened to a widow in my community. She was told that she needed to take out this loan. She didn't ask. She got cold-called by the predator and found out that she was tangled up in a financial mess that put her home in jeopardy. She is not the only one who has been in this position. We heard from the consumer law agency and also from AARP that seniors are frequently the victims of predatory lenders in this kind of practice. That's why the Consumer Protection Agency's taking a special look in protecting older Americans is so necessary.

What did Wall Street and others do? What is their connection to these predatory lenders?

Well, they got into this game of getting more and more mortgages, so-called Alt A, subprime and other kinds of risky mortgages, of securitizing them and then selling them as investments. Some of them, like Goldman, would even bet against those investments in some of their practices. We found out that more and more Wall Street houses were using these subprime mortgages and the sales of those as securities to get more profits for themselves. It was profitable for Wall Street, and it was profitable for Wall Street executives. Compared to seniors, take a look at what the Wall Street CEOs are getting paid.

Lloyd Blankfein: $9 million a year, or $24,657 a day.

Ms. SPEIER. Would you repeat that?

Ms. KILROY. $24,657 a day.

Ms. SPEIER. Isn't that amazing.

Ms. KILROY. The senior, $47 a day—average income—based on the $17,300 average annual income.

Take a look at Jamie Dimon at JPMorgan Chase: $16 million salary, an astounding $43,835 a day. There is John Stumpf. You mentioned Wells Fargo and their practice with the senior in your community. He receives $21.3 million, or $58,356 a day.

That's incredible. That's more than some people make in a year. They were making this every single day and were putting seniors' life savings at risk.

Now, many people got hurt in the Wall Street downturn, but seniors have less time to be able to reinvest and to make up that difference and to recover from what Wall Street did to Main Street. We need to work hard to make sure that seniors are protected from other kinds of scams, and we need to make sure they know, when they get somebody calling them, offering them mortgages that they didn't ask for, that that's an alarm.

When they get somebody telling them that they have to act today, that's another danger sign. They need to be careful of balloon payments, of prepayment penalties and of other kinds of tricks and gimmicks that can make those loans very expensive, that can make it hard for them to get out of

or that can make their money out of reach for a long time.

That's why we need the Consumer Financial Protection Agency. That's why we need an office which will protect older Americans. It will make sure that those kinds of practices aren't happening and that, when seniors get financial information—and when all of us get financial information—that it will be clear and easy to understand, not with pages and pages of fine print.

I was so proud of the credit card bill that we passed in our Financial Services Committee, that this body passed and which was signed into law to make credit card practices much clearer. We need to continue to work to make sure that seniors' financial security is also protected.

Ms. SPEIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KILROY. Yes.

Ms. SPEIER. When you were referring to credit cards, I was reminded that, in 1980, a credit card application was one page long, about 700 words. Today, a credit card application—and, indeed, a contract—is closer to 30 pages. Imagine if senior citizens were trying to wend their way through 30 pages of legalese and knew precisely what they were getting.

Isn't it true that the Consumer Financial Protection Agency is going to simplify that process for seniors and for all Americans?

Ms. KILROY. That is one of the very important things it will do. It will take a look at all of the confusing documents.

One of the charges that was made against one of the financial institutions in this country was that they were pushing some of their predatory lending products by having closing documents that were about as thick as a telephone book. Then they were pushing people, stating they didn't have time during the closings to actually read them: No. You've got to keep moving. You've got to keep moving. People were not really understanding what they were signing in these lengthy documents and in the fine print.

This is an important financial transaction. For many people, buying a home is the biggest financial transaction they're going to make. It has to be a clear and fair document so that it's good for both parties in the transaction, so that it's a good deal for the mortgager, and so that it's a good deal for the person who is taking out that mortgage. That can only happen if it is a contract that is fair and reasonable in its terms so that people can understand what it is they're signing. It is very important for our seniors.

Again, citing AARP and consumer law organizations, we know that seniors are most often the targets of that kind of predatory behavior, and that's what we have to be very careful of. Stand up with our senior bill of rights for financial security for older Americans.

I yield back.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlewoman for her outstanding comments in protecting the seniors of America.

I now yield to my good friend and colleague from the great State of California (Ms. RICHARDSON) as much time as she will use.

Ms. RICHARDSON. First of all, I would like to acknowledge the co-chairs of our senior task force—Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. MATSUI. The work that we have been able to do in such a short period of time is amazing.

Of course, to Ms. SPEIER from California, my neighboring home State, I thank her for organizing this hour that we have today.

You know, seniors are the fastest growing segment of our population. Every year, as more and more of the baby boomer generation retires, the number of seniors in our country grows considerably. Currently, one in every eight people in the United States is an older American. Over the next decade, the number of older Americans will increase by 36 percent. That's 5.5 million people. In my district alone, there are over 52,000 seniors. Older Americans are living longer and more active lives. Yet with older ages and longer lives, there come new challenges for us in Congress and in State and local governments to meet. Regardless of our ages or our generations, we have a responsibility to look out for our senior Americans just as our children and grandchildren will hopefully do for us one day.

Last week, I had the pleasure of hosting a 37th Congressional District annual senior briefing. We had over 1,032 seniors. It was pretty amazing to be there and to see everyone coming in, excited to be there. Well, what I want to say is that it was really interesting to me: two-thirds of those individuals drove. Two-thirds of those individuals had computers.

So, when we talk about seniors, it's not the end of the road. In fact, for many—and thankfully so—there are many, many good quality years ahead. What we have the ability to do on this task force is to ensure that they can have good quality lives and will not just simply stay at home, not really able to be productive.

When we had our senior briefing, the seniors were excited, and they were in great spirits. We had a full agenda; and the biggest thing that we talked about, which we spent half of our time on, was understanding the health care bill that this Congress just recently passed and how it benefits them.

The other things, though, that were unfortunate that I learned in that meeting were some of the troubles that some of my seniors were having—trouble staying financially secure in the midst of this recession. Ms. SPEIER talked about what has happened with the actions of Wall Street. Number two, obtaining jobs. Number three, finding affordable housing. For many seniors, they are downsizing and moving into other situations. For the amount of money that they have coming in, it cannot meet the cost of housing today. Finally, we talked about their getting quality health care.

A 2009 study revealed that in California, the State that I come from, over 500,000 seniors are living single and are having a difficult time making ends meet, let alone enjoying their quality of life.

As we move forward to continue addressing the needs of senior citizens, I am proud to be a member of this newly established seniors' task force. We are committed to preserving the rights, as has been talked about so far this evening, and in promoting the interests of America's senior citizens. The seniors' task force will be an excellent vehicle to ensure that the government is working for our seniors and for some of us, if we are so blessed to be, who will be coming forward as well.

At the task force opening press conference last week, we unveiled the senior bill of rights as has been shown. This resolution is an expression of what seniors who have worked most of their lives to make this country a better place deserve in return. There are just a few things:

One, financial security and stability. Two, quality and affordable health and long-term care. Three, protection from abuse, scams, and exploitation. We heard some examples of those this evening. Four, a stronger economy now and for future generations. Five, for a safe, livable community with safe transportation options.

□ 1945

This Congress has recognized the needs of seniors, and we have taken it on straight, without hesitation, that swift and bold action is needed.

In the very first days that Congress was in session for this particular 111th Congress, we passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, also known as the Recovery Act, and many seniors included in that received $250 that was to go towards helping to cover the costs, the rising costs, that many of our seniors are facing.

But then we took another action just about a month or so ago, and that was concerning health care reform. This Congress, this Democratic Congress, took the leadership, without much other assistance except by our help from the administration, to make sure that we could pass health care reforms that would dramatically increase the quality and the affordability of care that our seniors would face.

The health care reform that we did over the next few years will help close the Medicare doughnut hole that keeps many seniors from getting the prescription drugs that they desperately need. The average senior will save $250 in 2010, $750 in 2011, and over $3,000 in 2020 on prescription drugs.

However, one need that we know is also being overlooked and I have been trying to take some leadership on is

the fact that many of our seniors are still working; some because they want to, because they have the ability to and there is much left to contribute, but others because they have to.

These economic woes that our seniors are facing are based upon many factors. Over 40 percent of the seniors in my district rely upon Social Security as their only source of income. I know many seniors who are pinching pennies simply to eat. This isn't acceptable. In fact, it is not even American. There are many seniors in my district who need to continue to work in jobs in order to maintain financial security.

The ongoing economic downturn, which Wall Street greatly, in fact, caused, that national economy that has now adversely affected millions of workers in various age groups has disproportionately burdened workers over the age of 55. Older Americans are experiencing difficult times, and only 55 percent of the jobless older workers have been there long enough to be able to have an extended tenure beyond January of 2008, compared to 72.6 percent of those in the age group of 25–54. A larger share of jobless older workers were paid lower wages in their new full-time jobs, compared to people who are in the age group of 25–54.

We have a responsibility. We have a duty to provide employment opportunities to senior citizens, who still have much to contribute. So I brought forward a bill to add to the great Senior Bill of Rights that we have brought forward, which is H.R. 4819, Expanding the Opportunities for Older Americans Act of 2010.

This bill responds to the need of senior citizen employment opportunities. It will expand senior employment programs for older Americans and create 40,000 new jobs. This bill will also lower the eligibility age for participating members of our society, and it will also eliminate some of the requirements that work against seniors. For example if a senior happens to be married and their spouse is working, many of the current programs that other spouse is not able to take advantage of, and that is wrong.

We must ensure that seniors have financial security and that this economy works for them. We must uphold our end of the bargain to our seniors, who have sacrificed and dedicated so much to this country throughout their lives.

I urge all of my colleagues to join us in this Senior Task Force, not only tonight, when we have started the discussion, but as we move forward the Senior Bill of Rights and many other pieces of legislation that will make a difference.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlelady from California.

The numbers of seniors in our country is growing exponentially, in part because some of us who are baby boomers are growing older and reaching that age ever so quickly. But I note that while there are 40 million Americans who are now 65, in 10 years that number will more than double to 88.5 million Americans who will be over the age of 65. So making sure that seniors are protected is going to be a more and more significant responsibility for Congress to ensure.

You mentioned the doughnut hole. For seniors who are on Medicare, health care reform has been somewhat challenging, because they didn't know what was in it for them. Part of what we are talking about is what have you done for seniors lately.

The health care reform measure has huge benefits for seniors that are important to underscore, one being that if you do find yourself in the doughnut hole by this fall, you will receive a check for $250. If you are in the doughnut hole come the first of January, you are going to be able to buy your prescription drugs at 50 percent of what the retail costs of them are. And the greatest news of all, and this is a benefit for senior citizens as well as every one of us, and that is for preventative care, there will no longer be a copay.

That kind of gets lost in translation from time to time. But I just had, and I am proud to admit it because I think we all should have colonoscopies after age 50, but I just had a colonoscopy. I got the bill, and we all kind of experience sticker shock when we see those health care bills arrive at our home, and, thank God, we have health insurance, but my bill was over $3,000 for that procedure. Now, a copay on that procedure is like $600.

But moving forward, whether it is a colonoscopy, a mammogram, any kind of screening for cancer, that will no longer carry with it a copay, because we want to incentivize seniors and younger people to actually take advantage of the preventative services that are out there, that really prevent people from getting sicker and requiring more health care and more hospitalization.

So lots of good things for seniors are in health care reform.

Ms. KILROY. That is absolutely correct. If the gentlelady will yield, I congratulate you for taking care of your health and getting those preventative measures taken care of. Even though we don't like to do them, they are good things to do.

Those kind of copays, when you think about what seniors need to pay, with the more frequent medical testing perhaps, or higher costs of prescriptions, maybe taking more prescriptions, therefore more copays on those, the senior cost of living could be higher than the cost of living index for maybe the general population. That is why it is important that they have the economic security that Representative RICHARDSON spoke of.

For seniors, it is sort of like a three-legged stool. One leg of the stool is Social Security; one leg of the stool is personal savings, which we should all be thinking about as we get older; and one leg is also maybe a private pension. Yet this economic downturn has hurt that stool in all of those areas.

With more people unemployed, fewer people are paying into the Social Security system, so that hurts the system as a whole. That is why it is so good that we are focused on jobs and working on jobs, to get more people doing what they want to do and need to do to support themselves, but also being part of the Social Security system.

We know that the Wall Street abuses have hurt in many cases pension funds who invested in risky products, who were sold these products by a company, say, like Lehman Brothers, who then disguised what was going on by these Repo-105 practices, just taking some of the downside that should be on their balance sheet and hiding it when the quarterly reports were due. That has hurt the pension funds that the State employees are involved in in the State of Ohio. It is making that fund take a large economic hit that somehow we have to make up for, or people will not have the same kind of pension benefits that they thought they might have.

Then there is also the personal savings aspect too. We have all seen the 401(k)s have become 201(k)s, as we all know, because of the risky behavior that Wall Street engaged in, and because maybe we don't have the kind of financial literacy we should have in this country.

Again, back to the Consumer Protection Agency and the agency that will protect older Americans that will focus on that, that will make sure the information is getting to people in clear terms, so that they know that when they are investing something, that the person they are investing with is looking out for their interests, for the client's interests, not just simply being selfish and selling them something that is not good for them. And it will help us by ending taxpayer-funded bailouts for Wall Street for any future damages like that.

We want to make sure that we are working hard to stay on top of this thing. But as much as Congress can do, we can't do it every day the same way that an independent office of consumer protection can do, that would have that as their charge and every day be taking a watchful eye on the practices of the investment industry to make sure that these kinds of abuses aren't going on anymore.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlelady from Ohio.

You know, it would be great for us to focus for just a minute on the prescription for Wall Street reform for the 40 million seniors in America and just kind of list out the protections that are in the Wall Street reform.

As you mentioned, the office of financial protection for older Americans, this is going to be a huge benefit for seniors, because they are going to be able to call this office and say, you know, I have just been offered X. Is this something that makes sense?

Let me give you an example. Sergio Del Toro, he has been banned from the

securities industry for defrauding a 90-year-old Minnesota nursing home resident of $511,000. Mr. Del Toro recommended that the elderly man put his entire net worth into the stock of a firm called Third Dimension, for which there was no market or publicly quoted pricing. Mr. Del Toro's alleged motivation? A 15 percent commission, equal to $76,000.

Now, as part of Wall Street reform, one of the standards that is going to have to be met is, is there a net tangible benefit to the client? Clearly, in this case there was no net tangible benefit. What happened was this nursing home resident lost his whole savings of $500,000, and Mr. Del Toro was the recipient of $76,000 in commissions. Mr. Del Toro is banned from the industry now, but this is another example of why having Wall Street reform is so necessary.

I now yield to one of our newest Members of the House, Mr. DEUTCH from Florida, to have him offer up his thoughts.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my Democratic colleagues to discuss the challenges facing seniors in America today. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California, Representative SPEIER, for her ongoing commitment to our Nation's seniors, as well as Representative SCHAKOWSKY and Representative MATSUI for their outstanding work as co-chairs of the Senior Task Force, an effort launched by the Democratic Caucus to protect the health and financial security of our Nation's eldest Americans.

Today I would like to focus on an issue of great importance to me and the many residents in the 19th District of Florida, and that is the issue of Social Security.

Social Security is a sacred trust that provides over 50 million Americans each year with a measure of financial security. In my district and across the country, Social Security guarantees seniors the ability to enjoy their golden years free from abject poverty or financial reliance on their children.

As the representative from Florida's 19th District, I have the privilege of serving so many seniors who fought in World War II and rebuilt this country after the Great Depression. These wonderful Americans have worked hard every day of their lives, and for them, Social Security does what it was designed to do—it provides them with a secure, basic source of income after a lifetime of hard work.

Seniors know they can count on Social Security to never be a day late or a dollar short, and they know that checks will never come back marked with ''insufficient funds.''

□ 2000

Many of my constituents saw their lifelong retirement savings vanish overnight due to the irresponsibility on Wall Street that led into this recession. And many of them lost all of their savings to predatory Ponzi schemes. However, for them, one thing is certain in this time of economic uncertainty: Social Security is still there, on time, every month. This critical program is working just as it should for millions of people.

Mr. Speaker, if President Bush and the Republican Congress had their way and had enacted a risky privatization scheme for Social Security, the savings of all America's seniors would have been gambled away on the stock market.

Today, I stand here with my Democratic colleagues to say that we will never let the private market gamble away the financial security of our Nation's seniors and our Nation's most vulnerable. Mr. Speaker, it's clear the stock market is no place for Social Security. It would take the security out of Social Security.

Just this year, the Republican alternative budget called for cuts in payments to seniors and a risky privatization of the overall system. Clearly, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle didn't run this idea by my constituents who saw what happened to their pensions invested in the private market.

The large, vibrant senior communities of south Florida share a common value: that a lifetime of hard work should be honored with a secure retirement. I stand with them when I say that Social Security must remain a reliable program, not just for this generation of seniors, but for generations of Americans to come.

To the opponents of this popular program, I say that we will tirelessly fight for the due benefits of our seniors who have spent a lifetime of earning. We will not yield. We will not back down. And for this generation of seniors and the next and the next after that, we will not let Social Security be privatized.

And while this social program keeps millions out of poverty, the work of improving how we care for our Nation's retirees has not ended. The current cost of living formula that ties seniors' COLA to the Consumer Price Index tracks inflation across the economy. Our Nation's economic downturn has prevented America's seniors from receiving an adequate cost of living adjustment, and that's not right.

The Consumer Price Index for wage earners tells us that goods and services are less expensive than they were in the third quarter of 2008, but the seniors in my district and across America know that their prices continue to go up. The fact is, our Social Security cost of living calculator is insufficient and just doesn't reflect the true cost of living for seniors. The measurement of determining seniors' cost of living should be indexed to, well, seniors' cost of living.

I have trouble explaining to my constituents that even though their part B premiums went up and their copay went up, and even though prescription drug prices are through the roof, they don't get a cost of living increase because the price of cell phones and supporting equipment went down.

In the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, seniors are losing their pensions, watching their home values drop. And, on top of all that, the agenda that the Republicans have put forth threatens to privatize this sacred trust.

And while this Congress has had to make the hard choices after inheriting an economy in shambles, the men and women serving our country on the commission, on the task force looking at the challenges facing our country fiscally, have the unenviable task of reducing our deficit and getting our national debt under control.

I would simply remind the distinguished members of the commission that before this great recession, Social Security has run a surplus every year since the 1980s and, in fact, today has $2.5 trillion in reserves.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of America's seniors, I would say to the members of the commission that a deficit commission should not undercut a program that contributes nothing to our deficit.

Just a month ago, the good people of Florida's 19th District sent me to Congress to fight for our seniors, our community, and our values. And I'm happy to tell them that, with my Democratic colleagues here today, this Congress is making these values a top priority.

And I'm pleased to reassure the seniors in Palm Beach and Broward Counties that, as a part of the Seniors Task Force, I'll be a tireless defender of Social Security and Medicare and a dedicated advocate for policies that protect the health and financial security of America's seniors.

I'm thrilled to stand here with my colleagues.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his passionate commitment to seniors.

I'd like to address this whole issue of mortgages. You know, so many Americans have seen their homes being foreclosed on over the last 2 to 3 years. The numbers are staggering. We're talking about, 7, 8, 9 million homes. And I think that there's a misconception that somehow those are all younger families, but the truth is many of these people are senior citizens.

One of the protections in the Wall Street reform is that we are going to deal with banning predatory mortgage lending, and I want to just share with you one example.

This is back in 2000, at the age of 57, Willie Howard, who, at long last, became a homeowner. He had this tiny house here in Washington, DC, of 963 square feet. Now, Willie never learned how to read, so he proved to be an easy touch for refinancing offers as the housing bubble inflated.

By May of 2005, his $108,000 loan had ballooned to $137,000 because he had been courted by mortgage brokers who wanted to suggest that he could, in fact, save more money.

By October of 2006, after four more refinancings, Mr. Howard's loan balance had ballooned to $238,000. Now, half of the increased debt came from $51,000 in points, fees, prepayment penalties, and negative amortization. So it really was all about the scam artists; in this case, a mortgage broker who wanted to churn. By getting him in and out of loans, he was able to make more money as a mortgage broker, and poor Mr. Howard, who could not read, went from having a $108,000 loan to a $238,000 loan. And as Mr. Howard said, the problem with the system is that the broker had no obligation to act on behalf of Mr. Howard's best interest.

So what does Wall Street reform do to help Mr. Howard and seniors across this country? Two things. It requires that they show a net tangible benefit to the client consumer and that that client consumer has the ability to pay. Now, those two tests couldn't possibly have been met for Mr. Howard by that mortgage broker.

So, as a result of Wall Street reform, seniors and Americans across this country are going to have recourse. And, in this case, Mr. Howard would be in a position to have that contract rescinded, have his costs, his consumer costs, be they attorney's fees or anything else, paid for, and have the opportunity to have that particular loan reworked in 90 days or less. That's the kind of benefit that accrues to seniors in the new reform.

The final area that I thought would be worth us spending a little time on is the other rights that benefit seniors, and that's the right to know that Wall Street bankers will not gamble away their retirement savings. Both Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. KILROY had spoken about the 401(k)s turning into 201(k)s. And as clever as that sounds, it's tragic when it happens, and it's happened to senior Americans across the country.

I'm going to talk to you about a senior citizen in my district. This is a real story of a senior citizen who spent his entire life as a doctor providing health care to those who did not have resources. He provided health care in a county hospital setting, and he made, you know, a good salary doing that. So he retired, had a comfortable home, had $1 million in retirement in his 401(k).

Now, he was using a financial adviser, one of the slick financial advisers that we've heard too much of over the last couple of years, much like the employees at Goldman Sachs who would sell a risky investment to someone but, on the other hand, would short it for their personal gain.

This particular constituent had the situation where his financial adviser was not looking out for his best interest. So, over the course of the financial meltdown, this constituent lost three-quarters, three-quarters of his 401(k). Now, that's just outrageous on so many scores, but particularly so when you're dealing with the 401(k)s of senior citizens who don't have the luxury of trying to find other ways of making up that money, don't have the ability to go back to work.

And our financial service reform is going to make sure that that particular activity of Wall Street gambling away retirement savings can no longer happen because we do have the standards put in place.

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

WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE DOING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADLER of New Jersey). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I'll be right with you as we get our charts adjusted here and get started for the evening.

It's a pleasure to be able to join you this evening and to talk, once again, about subjects that are on the list of attention for many Americans, the kind of questions people are paying attention to, things that make people concerned, and overall questions regarding jobs and our economy.

And if you step back a considerable distance and get way outside of Washington, D.C., one of the things that you can see if you look over a long period of time is that there's a big debate as to what the Federal Government should be doing—in fact, that is kind of the main political debate—and should the government be doing a whole lot of things or should it be doing a smaller, limited number of things.

We have just heard over the previous 40 or 50 minutes from the Democrat Party, and they were very excited about all the things the government was doing. The government was involved in all of these handouts to different people and the different ways of trying to show compassion, and so they were very interested in seeing that the Federal Government was involved in a whole lot of different things.

There's a different perspective on that, and that is that the Federal Government should be involved in a smaller number of things and that, in fact, the government should be limited, the Federal Government should be limited. We should leave a lot of things to the State government, and local governments also should be taking responsibility. The Federal Government should not be the big mother giving everybody whatever they want. And so this debate goes back and forth as to what should the Federal Government be doing.

Now, if we take a look, there are some things we could learn from history. We do recall that there was a very famous, well-known nation that you've heard of, read of many times, and they had the philosophy that it was the job of the government to provide these basic necessities to their citizens. They believed the government should provide food and a place for people to live. They believed that the government should provide education and that the government should provide health care to the citizens. After all, if you don't have health care, you'll get sick. And they also believed that the government should provide jobs for their citizens. And so that nation operated under that principle that the Federal Government should be providing food and clothing and a place to live, education, health care, and a job.

□ 2015

Yet we watched that nation. It was a big threat to America, and over a period of time, it totally collapsed. The wheels fell off of it. And the nation doesn't exist anymore. It used to be called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We in America in the meantime looked at their nation, and we said their economy is a mess. They don't know what they are doing. The Federal Government cannot afford to be giving all things to all people, and it is much better for the private sector to run the economy, for the Federal Government to be limited and just focus on the things that it can do well.

So this is sort of the source of the large debate today, What is it that the Federal Government should be doing? And of course the problem with the Federal Government doing too much is pretty soon you run out of money. That is what we are starting to see all over Europe and the governments in Europe, but as well in our own government, particularly over the last year and a half.

Now, we have just heard comments from the Democrat Party talking about the fact that the financial and economic crisis that we have experienced was the result of Wall Street. It was all Wall Street's fault. Unfortunately, their memories are selective. The fault lies more than anywhere else here in Congress. This was a government mistake. Republican and Democrat economists saw this thing coming, they saw it a long distance away, and politically we did not have the will to deal with it and solve the problem.

How did this all happen? Well, we came up with a nifty idea a good number of years ago that it would be a nice thing if people who were very bad investment risks had the opportunity to buy their own home. And so what we demanded was that banks had to make loans to people who were a poor credit risk. So we said you got to make a certain percentage of your loans like that. So the banks are going, boy, this doesn't seem like a very good idea. You are demanding that we make loans to people who probably can't pay back their loan.

I don't know how you could try to say that that's a compassionate thing to do. I don't think a family that has a loan that's too big for them to pay and that constantly is missing their mortgage deadlines and eventually gets evicted from their house, somehow that doesn't impress me as a picture of

compassion. But that was the desirable thing. And so we put that into the different regulations and the government mandates, and we created Freddie and Fannie, two quasi-public, but really private, firms which made a big business in home loans. They gave good prices to people, and through the years Americans had many of their loans put into Freddie and Fannie. But what happened was the very last year of the Clinton administration, they kicked up the percentage of loans that had to be made to people who were bad credit risks.

So we are starting to create a bit of a problem because what happens when all the bad credit risks don't work? Who is going to pay? Well, the implied payer was, you guessed it, the poor old taxpayer. And so we see Freddie and Fannie moving along, and through a series of other circumstances, particularly Greenspan's keeping the interest rates low, the liquidity high, we see this big bubble in real estate bubbling right on up. From when I first came to Congress in 2001, the housing prices almost doubled in about 5 years. And you thought, boy, was I silly not to have bought a house, because if I would have bought a house it would have doubled in price. And then ker-pow, the bubble pops. When that happens, now all of this mischief that was created by Freddie and Fannie making bad loans starts to come due.

Was this something that people understood? Yeah, there were people smart enough to see it coming. In fact, President Bush saw Freddie and Fannie, saw that they were in serious financial trouble, saw it was going to be a tremendous hit on our economy and asked the U.S. Congress for authority in the very smallest ways to regulate Freddie and Fannie. And that you can find documented in that great conservative oracle The New York Times. Take a look at September 11, 2003. This is 5 years at least before the big collapse of the economy.

He is requesting permission from Congress to regulate Freddie and Fannie to take care of this problem that the liberal Democrats created, that is, making loans to people who couldn't afford to pay them. Now, they were assisted in this mischief also by different ratings firms like Standard & Poor's, who rated these different instruments that were created with these loans as AAA rated, which of course is a scam: they weren't. And the idea that Wall Street had was that if we would take one bad loan and we put it together with a thousand other bad loans that we have enough diversity that all these bad loans will not be bad loans, which was of course a bad assumption. Anyway, you know the story.

The Republicans passed the bill to get more control of Freddie and Fannie. It went to the Senate. The Republicans, while they were in the majority, never had 60 votes, and the bill died over in the Senate because the Democrats refused to support it. In the meantime, the gentleman who is now in charge of fixing some of these economic problems was saying there is nothing wrong with Freddie and Fannie. And Freddie and Fannie had a great lobbying team, ran around the Hill here in Congress giving away hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars in PAC contributions.

So first of all, let's not say that it was Wall Street that created this economic crisis. Let's go back to the fact that it was ACORN, that it was loans that were made to people who couldn't afford to make those loans, it was loans that were put into Freddie and Fannie and ended up the tab now being picked up by, you have got it, your grandchildren and your children. So that's where we are.

Now, the big question is if we are going to give all this money away to different people the way that we have been doing for the last year and a half, how are we going to pay for it? Somebody once said the trouble with socialism is that sooner or later you run out of other people's money. Well, so what've we been doing? Well, the last year and a half, boy, we've been doing some spending. But one of the things that anybody who runs a business knows is you got to have some kind of a budget. You have to have a plan as to where you are going so that you can somehow balance how much money you are spending with what's coming in. You have to have some sort of a sense of where you are going. You don't want to just float from month to month not knowing what you are doing.

And so if you are going to have any kind of decent management in a business, you need to have a budget. Now, some families run without a budget, but to some degree what they do is they just take the money that's coming in, put it in the bank, and then they can take the money out until they run out, then they know they got to stop spending until the next month. But there has to be some kind of a plan of how you are going to proceed economically for any kind of a good management.

I don't think there is hardly anybody that has stocks and bonds or whatever, or traded on Wall Street, that doesn't have a budget. And of course the Congress needs to have a budget too. In fact, the Democrat whip, STENY HOYER, made this statement: he said that enacting the budget was the most basic responsibility of governing. The most basic responsibility, according to STENY HOYER, was that we have a plan. Now, I agree with STENY. I do think having a budget is very, very important. You have got to have that.

He was joined by Congressman SPRATT, who is the House Budget Committee chairman. And he was even more specific: If you can't budget, you can't govern. He said that in 2006. So the Democrats, like the Republicans, are recognizing that you have got to have a budget. You have got to have some kind of a plan. If you don't, you are going to start really getting off the track economically.

So, we then find this rather surprising article in The Hill newspaper just April 14, 2010: ''Skipping a budget resolution this year would be unprecedented.'' Wait a minute: ''Skipping a budget resolution this year would be unprecedented.'' In other words, we don't have a budget? You got it right. We don't have a budget this year. We don't have a budget. Any other business has to have a budget. Do we have a budget? No. ''Skipping a budget resolution would be unprecedented. The House has never failed to pass an annual budget resolution since the current budget rules were put into place in 1974.''

We have never not had a budget resolution since 1974. So we are setting a record this year. We have got no budget. No budget. First time that's happened since 1974, according to a Congressional Research Service report. That's the research branch that works for everybody in Congress.

So we have just marched off the edge of the economic world. We have decided rules don't apply to us. We have good intentions. We are going to have the Federal Government be all things to all people. Let's spend some money. Let's take care of everybody we want to take care of. And, hey, about this deal about having a budget, let's not have a budget because, you know, somebody could really beat you up if you had a budget.

I am joined by a good friend of mine, Congresswoman LUMMIS. I don't know if you would like to take a minute or two to make a comment. I would be delighted to have you join us.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the Representative from Missouri and look forward to the opportunity to join you this evening. I am a member of the Budget Committee. And last year we had a lengthy budget debate in the committee, it was very robust, to discuss possible amendments to the budget. And even though the majority of the Republican amendments to the budget were not passed, we did pass a budget. It was over the ''no'' votes of the Republicans. However it fulfilled a duty of this body to pass a budget.

At $3.6 trillion, it was the largest budget in the history of the United States. President Obama this year proposed a $3.8 trillion budget. At a time of recession, he proposed a budget that was $200 billion larger than the budget the year before. And the budget the year before included some astronomical increases, such as a 39 percent increase in the budget for the Environmental Protection Agency.

Well, as you can see from a full day of hearings that were held today in the House Natural Resources Committee, that additional 39 percent increase in one agency's budget in 1 year, as now applied in the Gulf of Mexico to the oil spill, has not yielded the kind of efficiency that we expect from government.

The United States is in charge of this cleanup. The President of the United

States is in charge of this cleanup. And on occasion he has dispatched members of his Cabinet, members of the Coast Guard, members of other agencies to involve themselves in the cleanup. But the fact that they increased their budget 39 percent in 1 year has not contributed to the coordination efforts of Federal agencies in cleaning up the gulf.

Mr. AKIN. I would like to reclaim my time for just a minute. I really wanted to inquire of you about some of these numbers that you just said, because I am not on the Budget Committee. And I was kind of shocked in a way. We haven't not had a budget since back in the 70s, and that was just since we put this current budgeting process. And we've always had a budget, and yet this year we don't have a budget, and we are spending money at a tremendous pace.

Is the rapid rate of spending, is that part of the reason we don't have a budget, because we are just so embarrassed we are spending so much? Is it because by putting a budget down it acknowledges the complete fiscal irresponsibility that we have started down that path? Do you think that's what it is? Or is it just we can't figure it out? Why don't we have a budget?

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman for the question. His question is very relevant because Republicans are asking the same question. Our chairman of the Budget Committee, JOHN SPRATT, is an honorable man, and we have pursued with him frequent efforts to encourage him to convene the Budget Committee for purposes of passing a budget.

Normally, the Budget Committee passes a budget by April 15. That's part of the traditional process of this House. And that budget sets the ceilings or the parameters by which the Appropriations Committee will act during its efforts to vet the line items within the budget, meaning really going through the budget carefully, deciding what to spend money on, what the priorities of Congress are this year.

So it is unprecedented, as Mr. AKIN pointed out, for this Congress not to consider a budget. And here we are at the end of May, fully 45 days into the period of time during which we normally have a budget for the Appropriations Committee to work with; and, Mr. AKIN, we do not have a budget. And it is becoming more and more apparent every day that the Budget Committee will not be convened.

□ 2030

I am certain that JOHN SPRATT, who is the chairman of the Budget Committee, finds this painful. But I am also of the impression that the leadership within his party has encouraged him not to convene the Budget Committee out of concern that passing a $3.8 trillion budget, the budget as proposed by the President, would set a tone for this election year that Democrats don't want to face up to. They don't seem to want to face up to the fact that we are at over $12.9 trillion in debt.

Mr. AKIN. Let me just stop you for a minute here, please, because I would like to try and get these numbers figured out a little bit. Of all of the different complaints I heard about President Bush, the one that I think I heard the most was that he was spending too much money. I think the people didn't like the fact we were at war in Iraq very much, but I think particularly they were worried that he was spending too much money.

And so I guess his last year in was 2008, and that was when the Pelosi Congress was here. And that was his worst amount of deficit spending that he did, which was about a $470 billion deficit that year in his spending. Now, that wasn't good; that was about 3.1 percent of gross domestic product, and that was his worst spending, and he was spending too much, and some of us said, yes, he was, and we didn't vote for some of the spending.

He was followed by President Obama the next year, which is 2009, and the amount of deficit there was $1.6 trillion, that is three times more than Bush's worst year. And, boy, were we doing some spending. Then we went from 3.1 percent of GDP all the way up to 9.9 percent GDP, and so we just rocked into this. I will tell you, President Obama made George Bush look like Ebenezer Scrooge.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Yes. Recall that President Obama, since he took office, will double the debt in 5 years, triple it in 10 years. This is absolutely unsustainable.

When the Budget Committee met with Mr. Orszag, who is the director of the OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, we asked him if this budget was sustainable. In other words, if there are adequate revenues being collected to pay for the budget that we have passed. And Mr. Orszag acknowledged that there are not.

We cannot do that. Yet we do it year after year after year.

Mr. AKIN. The thing that has, I think, other Americans, and myself included, concerned about, is you keep going out into this uncharted territory where we are spending more and more and more money that we don't have, and America is banking on our good credit. We have nations like China who buy our Treasury bills because the Chinese are very good at saving money, and they are taking their savings and buying our Treasury bills.

You wonder how long can we keep spending money on all kinds of pension and welfare programs and feel-good programs and reward-people-for-not-working programs and food stamp programs, and all kinds of other things that may be nice? How long can we continue to borrow other people's money to do that before it comes time to pay the fiddler?

When we do, what is that going to look like? That is kind of a scary thing. This is a chart of some of these absolutely amazing items of spending. This is the Wall Street bailout at $700 billion. You have got the economic stimulus bill—I think it's closer to $800 billion, finally, which wasn't a stimulus bill at all; it was just paying various States that had exceeded their budgets so they could keep paying generous pensions that they can't possibly afford to sustain.

Then you have got the appropriations, Obama appropriations and the IMF bailout, and now you have got the big health care thing. They are claiming that's a trillion. I think we will be lucky to get away with it only been being a trillion.

You put all of this stupendous spending together, and the bottom line is they don't want to have a budget because they don't want people to see that we are really pushing the edges on things.

I have a chart here that I think is a little bit spooky. I don't know if you can see it from where you are standing, but this is debt and deficit as a percent of gross domestic product.

What I have got here, this is deficit as a percent of gross domestic product. The deficit that we have in the United States, as a percentage of GDP, is 10.3 percent. You take a look at Greece here and their percentage as a deficit of GDP is about 9.4 percent. Now Greece is about to crash the European Union because of their crazy financial situation, their socialized medicine and all. They can't make it work.

And so deficit as a percentage of GDP is 9.4, and here we are at 10.3. That doesn't make me feel comfortable that we are worse off than Greece is. Then coming across on the chart, debt as a percent of GDP, our debt is 90.9 percent of GDP. Greece is worse at 130, but Greece and Italy are the only two nations of Europe that are worse off than America is.

So these numbers don't give us cause to be very comfortable with our economic situation. I am wondering whether that's not the reason why the Democrats don't want to put a budget in front of people, because they are going to realize somebody is going to get wise that we are just blowing the lid off of any kind of economic sanity by our excessive spending.

Mrs. LUMMIS. It was not 3 weeks ago that the United States had a sale of the U.S. Treasuries that was undersubscribed, which means there were not enough purchasers of our debt for that particular bond issue of U.S. Treasuries that day, which is to say that in order to attract buyers of our debt, we are going to have to pay a higher interest rate to the people who are willing to lend us the money, which is to say that our interest rate payments are going to go up, which means a larger portion of the annual Federal budget will have to go towards paying the interest on our national debt, which is to say that it is a potential trigger for inflation.

Inflation is a job killer. We have asked the Japanese, who had a period

of time in the 1990s called the forgotten decade, how we can avoid, in the United States, having a forgotten decade? They have told us, don't raise taxes during a recession.

So we are in a conundrum. If we raise taxes, we will increase the length of the recession, potentially. If we don't raise taxes, the deficit will grow, potentially leaving us, in my opinion, with one good choice. The good choice is to cut spending. How does this Congress cut spending? This Congress has never cut spending.

I am delighted to be a Member of Congress at a time of economic turmoil because I come from the State of Wyoming.

Wyoming is a State where we have had boom and bust cycles because of our dependence on the economies of oil, gas, and coal. As commodities go, the State of Wyoming goes. When I was a Wyoming legislator, I experienced both a boom and a bust cycle, and what we had to do was reduce spending.

Recently, the Wyoming Legislature reduced spending to the tune of over 10 percent. In Wyoming, it is customary to adjust to these types of belt-tightening, and expenditures during times of largesse.

So when we have money, we have invested in the University of Wyoming, invested in the bricks and mortar of our K–12 system, invested in our technology, in our economy. Yet, when we have to tighten our belts, we do it across the board. You know, it's not the best way to budget. We in Wyoming acknowledge it's not the best way to budget.

But I do believe that if we could cut spending across the board, domestic spending, that is, we would have an opportunity to reduce those expenditures. But I would also acknowledge that without addressing the entitlement situation we can never get a handle on our budget concerns.

That is why I commend, to the attention of everyone within earshot, a plan that was developed by PAUL RYAN, the ranking Republican member of the Budget Committee. It can be reviewed at www.americanroadmap.org. It provides the path, the glide path, towards our economic recovery without raising taxes. It takes a long time, it's not without pain. There are, as PAUL always likes to say, sharp knives in the drawer.

But, nevertheless, it does it in a responsible fashion, without raising taxes, and addresses, long term, the consequences of overspending and of our potential of becoming a European-style social democracy and a culture of dependency.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I very much appreciate the expertise that you bring from Wyoming. The idea of cutting spending here, that's got to be the closest thing to a swear word you can say in Washington, D.C., the idea of cutting spending.

Yet I just heard less than an hour ago the Democrats just raving about the wonders of Social Security and their Medicare and Medicaid programs, the three major entitlements, all of which a Democratic economist, a Republican economist, all agree that they are on a train-wreck path in a fairly short period of time. Because these entitlements are just like starting a robot, some machine that gets going. You create the law, the law gives out money to people, and it just runs. If you don't touch it, it just keeps giving out money.

And the trouble is, it's giving out more money than we have. What's going to happen is you are not going to have anything to spend any money on for Defense or any other program because Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, will eat the entire budget up.

What you are saying is correct. We need some of that common sense that says, wait a minute, we just can't keep running more and more and more government giveaways.

It gets back to the question, do we really want to follow the model of the Soviet Union down the primrose path into just economic collapse, because we know it didn't work. It's not working well for Europe, and we know what the models are that make for a prosperous and healthy and good economy.

And it's what you are saying; one of the main things you have to do is to cut taxes. The interesting thing is that the Democrat, JFK, figured that out. He cut taxes because we were in a recession. He cut taxes and found out a very fascinating thing: That the recession stopped, the economy got stronger, and he actually collected more tax revenues with a lower tax rate. It seems like it's like making water run uphill, but it's not.

What happens is you have more economic activity. Because of that there are more taxes that are generated because there are more transactions and, therefore, the government actually raises more money by cutting taxes. JFK figured it out. Ronald Reagan did the same thing, and it worked like a champ for him, and George Bush did the same thing. He did some serious tax cuts and moved us from recession to recovery.

Because he understood this basic principle: There are certain things that are job killers, and one of the worst ones is excessive taxation. Why is that true? Well, because, the people who make jobs are businesses, and the business people have to have some of their own money to plow back into the business to put a new wing on a building, to buy a new machine tool, to start a new process, and to get a new plant going somewhere.

They have to have some money. If you tax it all away from them, then they are not going to have money and they can't make jobs. FDR found that out the very hard way. They kept driving and driving and driving the taxation of business owners. Instead of just creating, business owners that were hiding and hunkered down inside their businesses—they closed them down. The businesses closed, and all the employees were laid off.

Mrs. LUMMIS. One of the great ironies of being a freshman in Congress is you see who people quote. It is so ironic that we Republicans, as Mr. AKIN and I are, frequently quote JFK. JFK never disavowed American exceptionalism.

□ 2045

He acknowledged American exceptionalism and he harnessed American exceptionalism. And it is fascinating that we find ourselves frequently returning to his speeches, as Republicans, to review the importance of American exceptionalism in stimulating the economy and growing the economy and acknowledging what Ronald Reagan acknowledged, that we are a shining city on a hill and that we are to be emulated, but only to be emulated when we deserve to be emulated.

And it is at this time in our country's history when we need to review those great leaders and our great Constitution and the Declaration of Independence and our founding principles in a manner which provides the roadmap to our future. And, indeed, it does.

When we return to our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence, we are reminded that we were endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights, not by our government, by our Creator, and that we chose and consented to be governed and that we chose and consented to be governed pursuant to a Constitution that provided limited obligations to the Federal Government and reserved the remainder of the rights to the States and to the people. If we in Congress would vet bills pursuant to that model, we would return to that shining city on a hill and we could turn over to our children and grandchildren the Nation that we inherited from our parents.

It is stunning—and Mr. AKIN has seen these numbers—that people in America today, when you ask them, Do you have a higher standard of living than your parents, acknowledge that indeed we do. And then you ask those same baby boomers, Do you believe your children will enjoy a higher standard of living than we do? They say no. They're concerned. They see a path, a pattern, a culture of dependency forming.

But I'm convinced that this year being another election year and another opportunity for government of the people to rise up, to take control, and to consent to being governed in the way they wish to be governed, that we will see an opportunity next year to return to government of the people and to our founding principles.

Now, Mr. AKIN and I both know that that will all be for naught unless those who are in a position to govern next year take seriously the messages of the people of this country. And I can assure you, based on what I have heard as a freshman Member of Congress, that

we will indeed take seriously the messages of the people in this country and that we will restore for the American people our first principles and that we are going to be able to be a strong, vibrant country and proud to hand the reins to our children and grandchildren.

I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I very much appreciate the little history lesson and also the shot of inspiration that you have shared with us, the idea of the shining city on a hill.

I think that there are a lot of people that can be quoted. I'm thinking of good old Alexis de Tocqueville, a Frenchman who traveled around America, took a look at our system and said he looked for the secret of America's greatness. And he had a great quote along those lines, but one of the things he said was: You have a weakness in America, and that is, if the public realizes that they can vote themselves largesse out of the public treasury, you're really going to be in trouble.

There's another name for that. It's called socialism; the idea that voters can demand the Federal Government to keep giving them more and more stuff. The problem with that system is that eventually you run out of other people's money. That was one of the great weaknesses that Alexis de Tocqueville saw with our system, that because we are a self-governing people, because people have the right to vote, they can also make irresponsible votes and they can perpetuate a socialistic system.

A lot of Americans don't really know what socialism means anymore. They don't understand that the concept of American law was that people are all equal before the law, that Lady Justice is not supposed to give a special deal to a rich person or a poor person or anybody else, that people are all equal before the law.

The Pilgrims experimented with socialism. It was demanded of them by the agreement that they made with the loan sharks of London that financed the expedition to send the Pilgrims to America. So it was forced on them and they agreed to it, to have everybody take all of their corn that they grew and everything they produced over at the new colony in Plymouth and divide it equally and then send the shares back to London.

Well, that lasted less than about a year or so. And Governor Bradford saw everybody starving to death, and they pitched socialism, and he wrote in ''The History of Plymouth Plantation,'' he said: As though men were wiser than God. And he said: This is an experiment that's been tried among godly, hardworking people, and everybody can take a look at our example and see that this isn't going to work.

So the Pilgrims understood it. Unfortunately, our Congress today doesn't seem to understand it, and that's why you see these kinds of things.

Here's the Federal Government employment numbers. We're trying to create employment. Well, that's one way to do it; go hire everybody. What's the trouble with this theory? Well, every time you hire somebody in the government, you lose two jobs in the private sector. So now after we've passed this wonderful stimulus bill—which we were told if we didn't pass it, unemployment might get to 8 percent. We're now close to 10 percent unemployment, and we continue to do the very things which kill jobs, particularly worst of which is taxation.

But this is an alarming trend as well, government employment going up. And I think a recent study just indicated that the average government employee makes twice as much money as the average civilian employee in America. That is not a good trend, because pretty soon everybody is going to be working for the government—that's not very hard to break that equation—and then who's going to be paying?

I see my good friend, Congressman GOHMERT from Texas, coming to bring us a little bit of Texas wisdom, perhaps.

LOU, would you join us, please.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you for yielding.

Actually, I was going to bring a bit of John Adams' wisdom because, to follow up on my colleague's wonderful quotes and references to history, John Adams, toward the end of his life, said: The longer I've lived, the more I've come to understand that one worthless man is a shame, two is a law firm, and three is a Congress.

I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. Hey, let's do that one again. One worthless man is a shame, two is a law firm, and three is a Congress. Congress was smaller in those days, I suppose.

Well, thank you for that bit of Texas wisdom.

Here's another chart that runs along with it. This is private sector employment, government employment. You can see what's happened here. We're doing some employment, all right. It's the government that's doing the employment. But you take a look at the blue line—this is the private sector employment—you see jobs going down like a submarine. And that isn't just a statistic, that isn't just a fact, that is suffering—suffering in our economy, suffering with lots of people who don't have jobs, a lot of younger people moving back with their parents. The house is full of people because we're having trouble with not having the jobs.

Now, what kills the jobs?

Well, first of all, excessive taxation is a big deal. Insufficient liquidity is another problem. Our banking regulators are so tough that it makes it very, very hard for businesses to get loans. A third big job killer is economic uncertainty. Boy, oh, boy, do we have some of that. Who knows what we're going to do next.

We just passed this socialized medicine bill, and everybody who has employees is going to get whacked for having employees. There's a huge incentive we've created to get rid of any excessive employees on your budget because you're going to get taxed heavily for socialized medicine.

And then, of course, the old standby. If you can't get them with too much taxes, no liquidity, and uncertainty, then you hit them with red tape and government mandates.

You put this together, and you've got a great formula to destroy jobs in America, and we have been doing this in a massive kind of way.

Here's kind of a list of some of the Obama plan taxes:

Cap-and-tax. That's that tax on energy. Do you remember how the President said, I'm not going to tax anybody who makes less than $250,000? And then he comes up with this deal, that you get taxed when you flip your light switch. I don't know how in the world you can keep those two things separate, that you're going to only tax people making $250,000, and then nail them with a tax when you flip your light switch.

Did you want to make a comment? I would be happy if you want to jump in, Congresswoman.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you, Mr. AKIN.

Would you be so kind as to pull the chart up that you have behind you, the one that displays what has happened to private sector employment versus public sector employment?

As you can see from the chart, private sector employment is an upside down U, in that in the year since the majority party has switched hands and Democratic control of Congress has been in place, we have seen private sector employment decline dramatically. At the same time, we have seen public sector employment increase to the tune of about 188,000 public sector workers increase. At the same time, we've lost about 12 million private sector employees.

Now, I have a bill that I believe will begin to address this serious problem that we see with regard to employment. It is the Workforce Reduction Act, but it does it without firing anyone. It does it through attrition. The bill provides that for every employee who vacates a position due to retirement or moving on, that that position would be moved into a position pool. In fact, for every 100 retirements that occurs in the Federal Government, 50 positions would be moved into a position pool, the other 50 positions, vacant, would be eliminated. And then agencies would need to apply for reinstatement of a position based on necessity.

Those agencies who critically need employees, such as possibly the Minerals Management Service, in its enforcement functions in the Gulf of Mexico, would be likely recipients of employees in order to meet the obligations of the Federal Government to protect our borders with regard to the encroachment of oil that is seeping into the Gulf of Mexico. For other positions which are less mission-critical, those agencies would downsize.

Now, this is not going to be dramatically harmful to Federal agencies because, as I said, since the Obama administration took office, 188,000 new Federal employees have been added, and this excludes people that were hired pursuant to the decennial census. Consequently, we know that somehow we survived without these employees prior to President Obama taking office.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, all of these things are really indicators that we've got a Federal Government that is out of control. We're hiring too many Federal employees, spending too much money. We don't even have a budget for the first time since the seventies. This is not a good picture.

Congressman GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I appreciate you yielding, and I appreciate the gentlelady mentioning the Minerals Management Service. I know she was present for hearings today that the Director of the MMS was testifying. We had the Secretary of the Interior for a while testifying and his Deputy Secretary testifying. We had a Coast Guard admiral testifying. But I'll tell you what, after hearing the testimony about MMS, I'm very concerned that adding more jobs there is just creating more problems. There is so much mismanagement, so much impropriety, it sounds like, that that would be a disastrous mistake to add to the MMS.

But let me point out, as the Director of the MMS testified, they have decided that the MMS would be better nonexistent, so now they're dividing it into three different groups. And you talk about Texas, back home, if you have a pond that has become stagnant and it has begun to stink and become rancid, it doesn't matter how many ways you divide that pond, it still stinks. And they're not going to address the management problems. They're not going to address the fact that—and get this, the only entity within the Minerals Management Service that is unionized—and if we were out somewhere else I might expect a drumroll—but it is the offshore inspectors, the only entity within MMS that's unionized.

And we come to find out that as critical as those offshore inspectors were to protecting our country, to protecting our environment, to protecting all of those thousands and thousands and thousands of livings that were gained off of the coast area, the protection was an appropriate offshore inspector. And yet when I asked the Director of MMS was there a good way to have a check or balance so that somebody ensured the offshore inspector was adequately doing their job and making sure that when they finally bothered to go out and watch a blowout preventer be tested that somebody made sure they were really doing their job because, as I'm sure you all know, there's an investigation currently going on about some of the gifts and perks and things that were provided by peopl being inspected to those doing the inspection.

□ 2100

Well, how do you guard against improprieties?

The director said, Well, we had a system that fixed that. We had two offshore inspectors who would go out at the same time to an offshore rig. That way, they could kind of watch over each other's shoulders and make sure they were doing the right thing.

So my question was then, Would it have been a good idea that the last inspectors that you sent out—a union team that went out to the Deepwater Horizon rig, who were ordered to watch each other and to carefully make sure that they did their jobs—were a father and son union team?

She was not able to comment because that was under investigation.

Folks, we've unionized people, which means there are going to be restrictions on how much travel they can do and on how many hours they can spend, and that's normally part of the union contract. There are some areas in the country where we need unions to make sure that things are done fairly; but we're talking about the government, our United States Government that is supposed to protect us. I mean, these guys out there are protecting our lands, our livelihoods. It's almost like the military. They're on a mission.

Can you imagine if the military were unionized and if they said, We'll only work so many hours a day, and we're going to restrict the amount of travel we're going to be able to do. What kind of union contract would you get for the military? The offshore inspectors and the MMS are supposed to be protecting us and our country.

I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. I'd just like to jump in if I could, gentleman.

I'm detecting a certain level of skepticism on your part whether or not this government agency was really very effective in protecting us and in preventing a massive environmental mess. I guess the question I have is—you're suggesting that maybe a government agency isn't that reliable. Yet we just trusted the government with all of America's health care. Does that make you feel comfortable now that you see how the government is working in the MMS area?

Mr. GOHMERT. Actually, I'm not just skeptical of the MMS. I'm telling you it's a disaster. It was a disaster with MMS, and it was a disaster that their performance was allowed to happen.

We're going to find out there is somebody responsible—maybe one, maybe many—at British Petroleum, but we know for sure—and it came up in the hearing today as well—that the President had previously mentioned that he wanted to end the coziness between inspectors, or people with the government, who were supposed to manage the oil companies and make sure they were doing the right things, the Big Oil companies.

So that inspired some double-checking. We had hearings before about the 2 years, 1998 and 1999, during which the Clinton administration had employees who pulled the price control adjustment language out of the offshore leases. Originally, I was thinking it cost millions. It cost hundreds of millions, and now there are billions of dollars that have gone to Big Oil that should have gone into the Federal Treasury.

When we had a hearing a couple of years ago about that, I asked the Inspector General—and this was a Clinton——

Mr. AKIN. Appointee.

Mr. GOHMERT. Appointee. Originally, he was the Inspector General. He is now in another capacity.

I asked him, Did you not interview these two people who had the most knowledge about why that language was pulled out?

He said, Well, they left the government. They're not with the government, so I can't do anything about it.

He could call them. He could see if they wanted to talk. He didn't even bother to do that.

So, after the President's comment about the coziness, I had to go back and check. Whatever happened to those two people the Inspector General couldn't talk to?

Well, one of them, when she left the Clinton administration, went to work for a company called British Petroleum. Perhaps you've heard of them. She had three major officer/director positions with British Petroleum, but as of June of last year, Secretary Salazar and this administration hired her to come to work for the Minerals Management folks, so she is now——

Mr. AKIN. So, when we're talking about a cozy relationship here, it's very cozy.

Mr. GOHMERT. It's very cozy.

Mr. AKIN. So Obama's person in charge, Salazar, who is in charge of this thing, basically hired somebody out to basically do this oversight?

Mr. GOHMERT. Who had been working for 9 years for British Petroleum—that's correct—in high capacities. So it's interesting to hear about that cozy relationship.

Mr. AKIN. What was her name, gentleman?

Mr. GOHMERT. Her name is Sylvia Baca, B-A-C-A.

It was interesting, though, to learn—and I didn't really realize this—but nobody with the Minerals Management Service goes through a confirmation process in the Senate. This is completely an extension of the White House. Whatever the administration is, the Minerals Management Service is part of the administration. The Congress has no authority to confirm, to say ''yes'' or ''no'' to somebody who is appointed. This is an extension of the President's own hand, his running the Minerals Management Service; and we have absolutely got to clean house. The trouble is it's not our house. It's the President's house and that of the Minerals Management Service.

Mr. AKIN. As to my understanding, doesn't the law require that the President in a major environmental disaster like this—I've been told that the Federal law requires that the President take charge of the situation.

Has he been down there basically running it and calling the shots?

Mr. GOHMERT. I understand he has been there, but as some of our friends from Louisiana have pointed out—and Governor Jindal has been fighting the President through the MMS and through his responders—they gave full authority to British Petroleum to make all the calls. So the Louisiana folks, the people along the gulf, who are wanting to mitigate and who are trying to get protection and protect themselves, had to get permission from British Petroleum, which was not giving it.

We heard in the hearing today that there were people in Louisiana, along the gulf, who wanted to build barriers to this oil coming in. Yet all we heard from the administration's representatives was, Well, we're still discussing those to see—we're worried that could end up creating more problems than it solves because when they build the little barriers to the oil coming into those marshes, it might actually pull more oil in.

They're discussing it. The oil is in the marshes. It's killing animals and killing wildlife right now, and we heard today in the hearing that they're just discussing it, and they're trying to figure out if they may do more good than harm or if they may do more harm than good. It's outrageous what's going on.

The President does need to take charge. It is a disaster of massive proportion. British Petroleum is at the helm, but the White House should not have given them the authority to just make all the calls. It's unbelievable the disaster that occurred and now the disaster that is being created by the failure to respond.

I asked the admiral in charge of the Coast Guard, you know, How many ships have you moved into the area in the last 37 days? They've moved four major boats into the area. That's it. That's it. We could have moved the Navy. We could have had all kinds of response. The President has all kinds of resources, and he is just basically letting all this happen.

Now, British Petroleum needs to be made to pay, and it shouldn't be limited to $75 million—absolutely not—but we've got to have a better response. People are losing their livelihoods. They've already lost their lives. It has got to come to an end.

I yield to my friend.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN. I do yield, lady.

Mrs. LUMMIS. It is the power of the purse that this Congress holds that allows us to gain control of situations like this, and that is why this discussion is so important. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for including us. I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. I thank you, lady.

We've been talking about a broad range of different topics today; but in general, it is the condition of our economy.

The thing I would like to be sure that we don't do is to leave with the impression that there aren't solutions to these problems, but the solutions include, one, we're going to have to back off our just giving away money to everybody. We're going to have to reduce Federal spending. What we're going to have to also do is to use the power of reducing taxes to increase government revenues. So we have to reduce taxes in order to get the economy back and going and to start creating jobs.

Now, if we want to continue the formula of destroying jobs the way we have been, what's going to happen is that it's going to be harder and harder to get the economy back on track, but there is a solution. It's not complicated. It involves doing tax cuts selectively to allow those small businesses to start creating jobs again, and we have to get off their backs with regulations and red tape. We have to increase their ability to get liquidity, but we also have to stop taxing and taxing and taxing. All of the talk about concern about jobs is just a bunch of lip service because every one of these things is a job killer:

Cap-and-Tax. They're going to tax energy.

Health care taxes, a massive effect of destroying jobs. There are all kinds of businesses now that are asking, How can I get my employees under 50 so I don't have to get involved in this?

The death tax. Taxes on inheritances. This is another thing that is going to tie up money that could be invested in business and that could create jobs.

The capital gains tax. This is one of the big things that helped create jobs before. This is going to expire next year. So there are solutions to these problems, but the solutions require some grown-up leadership in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence this evening. I yield back.

JEWISH AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to proudly commemorate the fifth annual Jewish American Heritage Month, which takes place in communities across the country each May.

Jewish American Heritage Month promotes awareness of the contributions American Jews have made to the fabric of American life—from technology and literature, to entertainment, politics and to medicine.

It is a concept that was brought to me by leaders in the south Florida Jewish community 5 years ago when I was first elected to serve in this body. It was an idea born of the concern that, although there have been 355 years of Jewish life in America, there is still a tremendous lack of understanding about Jewish culture in that Jews are both a religion and a heritage in terms of our traditions and our community. Because we are less than 2 percent of the population in America, most people in America have either never met a Jewish person or have rarely, if ever, interacted with a Jewish person, so our traditions are often a foreign concept.

It was felt by the leaders in my Jewish community that, in having a month dedicated to cultural and educational programming, particularly in non-Jewish communities, it would raise awareness, foster understanding and deal with some of the concerns over the fact that, of the bias incidents that have been documented by the FBI and by the Anti-Defamation League, literally 65 percent of those bias incidents in recent years have been anti-Jewish bias. If we can use Jewish American Heritage Month, now in its 5th year, to foster understanding and tolerance, then hopefully we can reduce anti-Semitism and bigotry in this country.

As we are well aware, the foundation of our country is built upon the strengths of our unique cultures and backgrounds. Yet, while our diversity is America's strength, ignorance and intolerance about the culture and about the traditions and accomplishments of the Jewish people are, unfortunately, still really prevalent.

Again, Jews make up only 2 percent of our Nation's population, and as a result, we need to make sure that people in America understand that there have been so many different things and that so much of American history has been touched by a significant contribution of American Jews.

Tonight, my colleagues who are joining me on the floor to acknowledge and to mark the 5th annual Jewish American Heritage Month are going to talk about some of the impacts that the Jewish community has had throughout American history.

It is my privilege to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, JARED POLIS.

□ 2115

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady from Florida.

I am here tonight to talk about the Jewish history in the West and in Colorado. Colorado was still an untamed wilderness when gold was discovered near Pike's Peak in 1858. The 59ers, fortune hunters from across the country, came to our State, growing the population and building a diverse economy. Jews, too, were part of that quest.

Over the millennia, our Jewish people have suffered many exiles, often wandering and migrating from one country to another, frequently meeting

with hostility and hardship. It was in that spirit that Jews immigrated to the American West, where we established viable communities and maintained the Jewish heritage, despite great obstacles.

The unpredictability of gold mining and a growing demand for supplies encouraged many of the Jewish 59ers to establish small business in new towns and mining camps throughout Colorado. Over the next two decades, Jews settled in Leadville, Cripple Creek, Aspen, Trinidad, Colorado Springs, Pueblo, Central City, and Denver.

One of the first Jewish pioneers was Fred Zadek Salomon, who arrived in Auraria in June of 1859. He founded and became manager of the first general mercantile company in Colorado. The two were later joined by a third brother, Adolph Salomon, who became the first Jewish elected official in Colorado as a trustee of Greeley, Colorado.

Another one of our famous early Jewish Coloradans was Frances Wisebart Jacobs, who was born in 1843 and died in 1892. She was born in Kentucky to Bavarian immigrants, but she moved to Denver when she was young. She helped organize and was president of the Hebrew Ladies' Benevolent Society, and she joined with the city's Congregationalist ministers and Catholic Archdiocese to create a multifaith charity organization.

She also left her mark on tuberculosis relief, which Denver later became known for, as one of the first people to conceive of a free hospital for the medically indigent tuberculosis victims, for which Denver later became known.

Frances Jacobs is memorialized as one of 16 Colorado pioneers and the only woman and the only Jew in a stained glass window in the Colorado state capital rotunda. In 1994, she was inducted into the National Women's Hall of Fame, and in 2000 she was awarded the Denver Mayor's Millennium Award.

From its humble beginnings, the Colorado Jewish population has grown; in our generation, with immigrants from the east coast, as my parents from Brooklyn and Peekskill, New York, moved to Colorado in the 1970s, along with many of their fellow Jews, and more recently immigrants from California, Jews finding a new home in my hometown of Boulder, which when I was young and growing up, had one synagogue. It now has six synagogues.

The town of Denver, with a longer and more established Jewish community, also continues to thrive with the Jewish cultural and religious life across the region.

I rise to proudly recognize the role of Jews in the development of Colorado and the Rocky Mountain West.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much, Mr. POLIS. Your comments are such a perfect example of the unique contributions that American Jews have made in our history, and you specifically highlighted examples that most people would not have been familiar with. I would bet that Coloradans are not familiar with that history. So thank you very much for coming down and sharing that with us this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share a story that was an experience that I lived through. For me as a young Jewish woman growing up in a predominantly Jewish community in New York, on Long Island, growing up, and then moving to south Florida and spending my adult life in a significant, large Jewish community, one would think that I had spent most of my life without experiencing anti-Semitism, and I have not experienced much in the way of overt anti-Semitism.

But I want to share a story with my colleagues from when I was in college at the University of Florida. I was standing in the hallway of my dorm the first week of school and talking to another young woman who I had just met, and she saw my last name on the door, because there are signs on the doors with your names on them at the beginning of each semester in most college dorms.

Somehow the subject of religion came up. I shared with her that I was Jewish, and her response, she was from a tiny town in north Florida, and it was evident after her comments that she had never met a Jewish person before, because she said to me, ''You're Jewish? I have seen pictures, but I have never seen a real one.''

You know, growing up on Long Island, and that being my first exposure to someone who had not met a Jewish person, I had heard that there were people in America who thought that Jews had horns, and we were somehow not human. But, fortunately, I realized at the time that that was simply a reflection of the fact that she had not had experience with Jews or the Jewish community. And as we got to know each other, we lived on the hall together all throughout our freshman year, we got to be very good friends, and she realized that I was human and that I didn't have horns.

But it is really important, and that story and that experience helped me understand why we had a need for Jewish American Heritage Month, just like the experience of Black History Month and the years and years of success of that cultural celebration that we have in February, and Asian Pacific Islander Month, and Hispanic Heritage Month. It is important that we celebrate the diversity in this country and that all Americans learn about the success and contributions that all different cultures have weaved together to make America the strong, vibrant Nation that we are today.

Again, I am really pleased to be joined by my colleagues who are here with me on the floor tonight.

With that, I yield to my good friend and next door neighbor, a gentleman who has been doing a fantastic job representing his constituents in south Florida and someone who has spent many, many years as a leader in the organized Jewish community, Congressman RON KLEIN from the great State of Florida.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the gentlelady, and I thank the gentlelady for bringing this forward as an important part of our American fabric, as she talked about Jewish American Heritage Month as just one of many that make up the fabric of the United States, the people of the United States; the fact in many ways we are an immigrant population, but we are very diverse, both in religion, background, ethnicity, and it is a way of celebration that we are celebrating Jewish American Heritage Month, and we will have the opportunity to do that tomorrow and for weeks to come.

Being from Cleveland originally, Cleveland, Ohio, I grew up in a family that had roots. My family came to the United States in the twenties from Europe, from a persecuted background in countries where they weren't welcome as Jews. Of course, we know the history of what happened during the Holocaust.

But they came to the United States and did what most immigrant families did: They congregated among themselves initially, went to small towns, figured it was important to get an education, started little businesses and things like that.

My dad had a variety store, which is, for those of you who remember what that is, sort of like a Woolworth's, but a small, independent store started by my grandfather during the Great Depression, and then it was a family business all the way through. My dad taught me all about what it was to be part of that American fabric.

Being Jewish was unique where I came from, but not totally unique. There was a Jewish community in Cleveland. I eventually, with my wife, moved to Florida. Obviously, in Florida there was a larger Jewish community where I moved to. But it was only one generation before that that in that same community where I grew up, there were restrictions on where people could live. There were restrictions in deeds where you could purchase a home or a condominium, and they didn't allow various minorities, not just Jews, but African Americans and various others, to go into those communities and buy properties. It was only one generation before I moved there.

So it is really sort of in our own lifetime that all these things have changed. Of course, we know as Americans there is still more work to be done with various forms of discrimination.

But I do want to mention a couple of names and sort of have some fun tonight. First of all, the first Jewish Member of Congress was from Florida. In 1841, David Levy Yulee became the first Jew to serve in Congress. It was obviously even before the Civil War. He eventually went on to serve in the United States Senate. Then it was a

long, long time after that before another Jewish resident from the State of Florida came back to represent the community in Congress.

But I am going to mention a few entertainment people, because I think those are some of the fun people. Many of you remember Sandy Koufax. Now, this is not entertainment, this is sports, but one of the great, truly great pitchers of all time, Los Angeles Dodgers. I think many of you remember him.

He refused to pitch on Yom Kippur, which is the most significant holiday of the year for the Jewish community. It was the World Series. He made a conscious choice and sort of sent reverberations throughout the sports community. How could he make this decision? But he became a folk hero for many people to say he stood up for himself. He stood up for his religion, he stood up for his family, and although he wasn't a religious man, he did something that was quite unique at that time.

Steven Spielberg. How many of you know Steven Spielberg and the touch he has had on all of our lives, with the movies and so many important cultural things that he has been a contributor to? He obviously for many reasons, not only as a great film director and producer, he has also taken it upon himself to set up the Shoa Foundation and has funded it with others as a way of taking the written testimony of people who survived the Holocaust, to preserve it forever. That, to me, is a great contribution.

Groucho Marx, we all know Groucho Marx. I won't do the imitation because I see my colleague from Denver, from Colorado, over there is going to make fun of me if I do that. But Groucho Marx is truly one of the greats. And, of course, it was all the Marx brothers. They just left such a mark in that time. They came from that background of that early vaudeville era and sort of expressed that great sense of humor.

So there are so many, and I know my colleagues are going to mention one after the other here. But I am just happy to be here tonight to celebrate this important milestone, to celebrate it every year as part of this community, to talk about it, to learn about it, and to get our community to talk about it and teach others as well.

I thank the gentlelady for bringing us all together tonight.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and for taking us through an important aspect of Jewish life in America.

Now it is my pleasure to yield to another colleague from the West, and a leader on the House Rules Committee who has a Rules Committee meeting that is imminent that he needs to get to, and a leader in the Jewish community as well, Congressman ED PERLMUTTER from the State of Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friends from Florida.

I wanted to follow Mr. POLIS and just talk about the Rocky Mountain West, which really did receive Jewish immigrants with open arms. Sometimes there was discrimination, but generally it was open arms. In New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, ranching, farming, mining, construction, you name it, the Jewish community was involved in it. Merchants, oil and gas, the Manhattan Project down in Los Alamos in New Mexico.

So, my family, a great-great-great uncle immigrated from the Ukraine in the late 1800s, was part of a mining commune above a little town called Center, Colorado, remained in that mining commune for about 3 years, realized he didn't like being at about 11,000 feet in the mountains of Colorado, moved to the Denver area, where he had a small store, and that uncle then attracted the others who immigrated from the Ukraine. So the youngest brother came first, then the next brother, the next brother, and the next brother. My grandfather was the oldest. He was the last to arrive from the old country.

But the Denver area in Colorado really did allow people a chance to really show what they were made of, and the Jewish community in Colorado, in the Denver area, has flourished over the years. It has been very much a part of the fabric of the community in charitable efforts, as well as education and those kinds of things. And the heritage that we are talking about tonight, really at least in the Rocky Mountain West, the Jewish community and the Rocky Mountain West are inseparable.

I just thank my friend for organizing our Special Order hour, and I yield back to her.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much, Mr. PERLMUTTER. We appreciate your contribution to our effort to raise awareness and celebrate the contributions of Jewish Americans to American history.

It is now my pleasure to yield to one of our newest Members, who as of just yesterday is no longer the most junior Member of the House of Representatives. He held that title for, oh, about a month. He is the neighbor to the other side of my congressional district, and did a fantastic job as a State senator, was another leader in the organized Jewish community in south Florida, someone who has been a staunch advocate for Israel and for issues that are important to the Jewish community, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. DEUTCH.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the American Jewish community's many contributions to our Nation's society and culture. I would like to thank my dear friend and colleague, Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for her outstanding dedication to preserving Jewish history and culture in America.

Jewish American Heritage Month gives all Americans the opportunity to recognize Jewish Americans as leaders in every facet of America's life, from athletics, entertainment, the arts and academia, to business, government, and our Armed Forces.

□ 2130

Florida's 19th District is home to the largest, one of the largest Jewish American populations in this country.

I'm privileged to represent many first generation Americans whose parents arrived on our shores seeking a better life. Many of these Jewish Americans are members of the Greatest Generation. They stepped up to serve in World War II and rebuilt this Nation after the Great Depression. In fact, over half a million Jewish Americans fought for the United States in World War II, and 11,000 of them perished fighting for our country.

For those who arrived in Europe as the Holocaust raged on, this war became very personal. As a quote from a Jewish Air Force officer reads, As a Jew, it was Hitler and me. That is the way I picture the war.

While the contributions of Jewish American soldiers during World War II cannot be understated, the truth is that Jewish American soldiers have been fighting for this country since the Revolutionary War.

Colonel Isaac Franks and Major Benjamin Nones were aides de camp to General George Washington. Commodore Uriah Phillips Levy, who served in the War of 1812, was court-martialed six times due to his defiance of anti-Semitism. And by the time the Civil War broke out, there were 150,000 Jews in the United States, with 7,000 fighting for the North and 3,000 fighting for the South. Senator Judah Benjamin even served as Secretary of State for the Confederacy. And although Jews only made up 2 percent of the population during World War I, they made up 6 percent of the United States Armed Forces.

Jewish Americans have served in Korea and Vietnam. They've served in Operation Desert Storm and in countless operations around the globe. They're among the brave young men and women who served after September 11 in the war on terror and who are serving bravely and valiantly in Iraq and Afghanistan, even as we speak.

And as we approach Memorial Day, I recognize those Jewish war veterans who made the ultimate sacrifice for freedom, like Major Stuart Wolfer, a Jewish American major from my district, a loving father of three daughters who was killed by rocket fire in Baghdad 2 years ago.

Since the Congressional Medal of Honor, Jewish Americans have been awarded this high honor for their dedicated service to this Nation since it was created. Six Jewish Americans received the award in the Civil War, two in the Indian wars in the late 1800s, three in World War I, two in World War II, one in the Vietnam conflict.

I am proud to also note that Florida's 19th District is home to one of the

largest chapters of the Jewish War Veterans of America. These brave men and women embody true patriotism, and their dedication to this great country is captured in their mission statement, which reads:

We, citizens of the United States of America of the Jewish faith who served in the wars of the United States of America, in order that we may be of greater service to our country and to one another, associate ourselves together for the following purposes:

To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America;

To foster and perpetuate true Americanism;

To combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions;

To uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his or her battles wherever unjustly assailed;

To encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men and women;

To combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; and

To preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families.

The mission of this wonderful organization holds a special significance to me. I'm the proud son of a Jewish war veteran who volunteered as a teenager to serve our country and fought in the Battle of the Bulge, where he earned a Purple Heart.

My dad's no longer with us today, but with every veteran that I meet, I hear his voice and remember his love of country. It's a love of country that so many Jewish Americans hold in their hearts. Those who practice the Jewish faith hold in high regard a value for service, for justice and progress for all people.

These are values also embedded in the very fabric of this country. And it's for this reason today, on the fifth anniversary of Jewish American Heritage Month, that I am so proud to recognize the Jewish American men and women who, for centuries, not only have shaped our national culture, but have defended our people in times of great challenge.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for arranging this wonderful evening.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you very much, Mr. DEUTCH, and I'm really pleased that you chose to highlight in your remarks the contributions that our Jewish war veterans have made.

Last year, I think it was last year, Ms. SCHWARTZ, last year, we marked, the Jewish Members, a number of us and some non-Jewish Members, marked Jewish American Heritage Month by taking a trip to the Museum of Jewish Military History, which is based in Washington, D.C., and it was a museum that I was not familiar with, didn't know existed. And we had an opportunity, all the way back to the Revolutionary War, to see the contributions of Jews throughout our military history and how they proudly, so many of them, as you said, hundreds of thousands, proudly fought side by side with their fellow American citizens to defend the freedom that we continue to enjoy today.

So thank you so much for acknowledging that.

It's now my privilege to yield to my good friend, the gentlelady from Pennsylvania, who has been a leader, whom I've shared many a conversation with in the time we have served in the Congress together. We were elected in the same year and both served as State legislators, championing many of the same cases. She was a leader on health care in the Senate in Pennsylvania and has been a leader in the Jewish community in her own right, and I'm so glad you've joined us here tonight.

The gentlelady from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I thank the gentlewoman, and I'm very pleased to join you this evening. Thank you for organizing it, and thank you, of course, for your sponsorship of the resolution that created the Jewish American Heritage Month. And I am very pleased, as the only Jewish member of the Pennsylvania delegation, to be able to speak tonight a bit about the contributions of Pennsylvania's Jewish communities, in particular, Philadelphia's Jewish community and the contributions we made.

I would be remiss if I didn't also say that I appreciate our colleague's comments before about Jewish veterans. And as many of my colleagues know, my father was a veteran serving in the Korean War, and certainly those experiences have helped inform who I am.

But this evening, I did want to talk a bit about some other subjects, and, in particular, let me start by saying that William Penn, who founded Pennsylvania in 1682 as a colony, did so making sure that the colony was based on religious tolerance.

The Philadelphia Jewish community has been around for a very long time and really came really expecting and being honored to be able to experience that religious tolerance, particularly in Philadelphia, and has been a part of Jewish Philadelphia and the Philadelphia community for generations. As early as 1735, Nathan Levy established himself in the import/export trade with his cousin David Franks in the bustling Philadelphia port. Well, today the Philadelphia port is still bustling, and it is one of the busiest ports in the Nation.

Philadelphia Jews have contributed to our national fabric through sciences, public service and through the arts. Just to name a few—and it's always risky to just name a few, but I will—philanthropist Sam Guggenheim and Watergate counsel Samuel Dash, Science Nobel Prize recipient Howard Temin, and the comic Larry Fine all were graduates of Philadelphia's public magnet school, Central High School, where my sons went to school, and certainly proud Philadelphians, and they are among the members of Philadelphia's Jewish community. Philadelphia continues to proudly distinguish itself as an important epicenter of American Jewish life.

As a new Member of Congress, I was very honored and proud to support Temple Beth Shalom, which is located on Old York Road in Elkins Park, Montgomery County—I represent Montgomery County—becoming a national historic landmark. It is the only synagogue designed by the great American architect Frank Lloyd Wright, and it is a remarkable place to see. I would commend it to all of my colleagues.

And looking forward, on November 14, 2010, the National Museum of American Jewish History will open its spectacular new facility on Philadelphia's Independence Mall. This museum is the only museum in America dedicated exclusively to exploring and preserving the American Jewish experience. And again, I encourage all of my colleagues, Jews and non-Jews, to visit this remarkable institution and to learn the stories of Jewish Americans, their challenges, their hardships, and their successes as they became a part of the fabric of who we are as Americans.

For me, the significance of American Jewish Heritage Month is marked by a story of one young woman named Renee Perl. Over 60 years ago, Renee fled Austria on a Kindertransport. Some of the Jews may know what that means. It was a children's train. Parents sent their children on this train hoping they would be embraced by strangers and taken care of. She was, of course, fleeing the Holocaust. After almost 2 years, first in Holland and then in England, she arrived alone on the shores of America, a 16-year old without family or friends, but armed with a keen sense of hope and expectation. As with many refugees, she was anxious to put her difficult experiences behind her and embrace her new country, which she did with deep gratitude.

Renee Perl was my mother. She instilled in me a deep love for this country and its capacity to provide not only safe harbor but opportunity. My mother's search for security and freedom in America is part of who I am and why I do what I do. It is a deeply personal reminder of the importance of democracy, not only for American Jews, but for so many. Her story, her life, as for so many others, calls on us to meet the responsibility we have to respect the values of our great Nation, to build and protect the freedom and hope that it offers to so many citizens and newcomers.

It is with pride and gratitude that I mark the occasion of American Jewish Heritage Month, and I am pleased to participate in this evening's discussion.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much.

Ms. SCHWARTZ, I have to tell you that I've heard you share that story before, and I get a lump in my throat every time you tell it. It is so moving and meaningful for you to share that story in the Chamber of the U.S. House of Representatives, and it's one of the ways that we can help people understand why acknowledging the contributions of American Jews and the rich tapestry that we have weaved throughout American history is so important. So thank you again for sharing that story once again.

It's now my privilege to yield to one of the most significant Jewish leaders in our country, someone who has been a stalwart fighter for Israel, a stalwart fighter for the issues that matter to American Jews and to Jews across the globe, the gentlelady from Nevada, SHELLEY BERKLEY.

Ms. BERKLEY. Thank you very much, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We usually start our days together because we're next-door neighbors, and it's a pleasure to see you 14 hours later here on the floor of the House. But I want to thank you for spearheading this effort. I think it's very important. And I know this is near and dear to your heart, and you've done an extraordinary job year after year bringing the Jewish American story to our fellow citizens, and I appreciate it very much.

I can't help but agree with you about the beautiful story that our colleague, ALLYSON SCHWARTZ, spoke of. I leaned over to you and said, Is she talking about her grandmother? And you said, No, that's her mother. And I know how much that means. I also have heard her story many times, and it also puts a lump in my throat as well.

Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, my family story is very much an American Jewish story. And not unlike so many millions of other American Jews that came to our shores from other places, my mother's side of the family comes from Thessaloniki, Greece, where there was a very vibrant community, Jewish community prior to World War II. Half of the population of Thessaloniki, Greece were Jewish before World War II, but by the time the Nazis finished, there were only 1,000 Jews left in Salonika out of the 80,000 that existed and lived there and thrived there prior to World War II. I'm not presumptuous enough to think that my family would have been among those thousand chosen to live.

On my father's side of the family, from the Russia-Poland border, an entire culture, from 1,000 years of Jewish culture in that part of the world, was exterminated as a result of World War II. My family escaped both the Russia-Poland area and Thessaloniki, Greece in order to come to our Nation's shores. And I grew up hearing stories of what their lives were like where they came from and how thrilled and excited they were to come to the United States of America and truly felt this started as a haven. It was the very survival of my family. Had they stayed where they lived in Europe, we would have been exterminated in the Holocaust, but we did survive. We came to this remarkable country, where not only did we have an opportunity to survive, but we've had an opportunity to thrive.

I'm second-generation American. When my grandparents came here—and this is a story that is so common among American Jewish families—they couldn't speak English. They had no money. They had no skills.

□ 2145

The only thing they had was a dream, and that dream was that their children and their children's children would have a better life here in the United States than they had where they came from.

I often think of myself, and I hope this isn't too presumptuous, as my grandparents' American Dream. But I think even in their wildest dreams they never would have imagined that they would have a granddaughter that was serving in the United States House of Representatives. When I am doing this, I often think of my grandparents and realize that they went through so much in order to come to this country. And we have been able to share in the extraordinary success and largesse of this remarkable country.

We are very lucky as an American Jewish community to be very much a part of the fabric of this great country, to have full acceptance, to be able to access the highest levels of power, to actually be able to effectuate meaningful change in a very positive way by participating in the American political process.

My father, much like so many of the others that spoke today, is also a World War II veteran. He is 85. His name is George Levine. He is still working. But I think what demonstrates our commitment and our love of this country and our patriotism as American Jews is the fact that my father also joined the Navy when he wasn't quite old enough to do so. But he wanted to fight for his country. He wanted to stand up and do something positive for the United States of America to show that we belonged here and we were part of this great country.

There are 500,000 Jews that served in the American Armed Forces during World War II, including numerous Jews who rose to the rank of general, and several more were admirals. Now, my father was never an admiral in the Navy, but he served and he served his country proudly and well; and I continue to be very proud of him.

We have made more than a life for ourselves in the United States of America. We are very proud Americans, and we are very proud Jews. And we appreciate so much the fact that this country offered so many remarkable opportunities and gave us a chance not only for survival, but to become a part of something so much bigger than ourselves. I think it's incumbent, and I think most Jews feel this way, that given the rights that we have here in the United States also comes responsibilities.

Those responsibilities mean good citizenship and participating in the political process and voting and being knowledgeable and getting a good education so that you can not only be part of the foundation of this country, but to give back to a country that has given us so many opportunities. So I am very much a part of the American Jewish community, but it's a story that so many of us share with our fellow Americans.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I want to thank you very much for giving us the chance to thank this great country not only for taking us in, but for letting us be so much a part of not only the culture and the political life, but to be very much involved in the greatness of the United States of America. Thank you for giving me this chance.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much for your eloquence, Ms. BERKLEY, and for acknowledging that a lot of people think about the arrival of Jews in America as really being an infusion after World War I, an infusion after World War II; but we have 353 years of Jewish life in this country. And, unfortunately, much of our arrival followed persecution in other parts of the world: after the Spanish Inquisition, the pogroms in Russia—that's when my family came initially in the 1800s—and then in the early 1900s fleeing Poland for a better way of life here. And it's so incredibly important that we tell our story.

Jewish American Heritage Month allows us to do that now. President Bush proclaimed it 5 years ago. We had 250 cosponsors, of which you were one, of the original legislation that urged him to do that. And one of the things that I really think is important to acknowledge is there is so much partisanship here in the House of Representatives. I was the most proud at the time that we passed that resolution unanimously out of the House. With over 400 Members voting for it, we had 250 cosponsors, bipartisan cosponsors, and then we had a bipartisan effort across the Jewish community in this country to urge the President at the time to proclaim the first Jewish American Heritage Month. And they did so willingly, put aside party differences because they knew that it was incredibly important. And we have continued to be able to mark the occasion every year.

Ms. BERKLEY. Well, if it wasn't for your leadership we might not be here this evening doing this, so I thank you. Congresswoman, when you and I hear the beautiful song ''God Bless America,'' it means a great deal to us because I think every day God bless America, God bless this country.

But the interesting thing is Irving Berlin gained prominence as a composer of patriotic songs. As you know, Irving Berlin was a very famous composer, he was Jewish, and he wanted to

show his love of this country and use his talents in order to create these remarkably patriotic songs. And ''God Bless America'' is still among my favorites. And he received the Congressional Gold Medal of Honor in recognition of his service to this country in composing these patriotic songs. So whenever I hear that song I get a little patter in my heart, and it particularly makes me proud that an American Jew composed it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Me as well. And in that same vein, Emma Lazarus was by far at the time the leading Jewish literary figure in 19th-century America. And it's her sonnet which was called ''The New Colossus'' that is engraved on the base of the Statute of Liberty: ''Give me your tired, your poor, yearning to breathe free.'' And then the rest is history.

Ms. BERKLEY. History.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. The rest is history, exactly. There are so many contributions that this month allows us to highlight. And I really thank you for joining us tonight, to continue to be able to do that. And I know we look forward to the rest of the month and the celebrations across the country.

Ms. BERKLEY. Thank you very much.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much.

It is now my privilege to invite my colleague from the State of Florida, the gentleman from central Florida, who is a newly elected Member and who has done a fantastic job fighting for his constituents, fighting on behalf of the issues that are important to this country, and fighting to help particularly focus on job creation and turning our economy around, the gentleman and my friend from central Florida, ALAN GRAYSON.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you. It would be easy to spend this time that I have, and in fact this entire hour, talking about the contributions that Jewish people have made to American history and to American science and culture. If you look at the back of a dollar bill, you will find the seal of the United States. And you will find that the 13 original States are depicted in the form of a Star of David on the back of every dollar bill. And that's to reflect the support that Jews provided during the Revolutionary War for our freedom as a country.

It also would be easy to spend this time, and in fact the whole hour, talking about people who we know who have lived upstanding lives as Jews and reflected our values in ways that have caused America to appreciate what they have given us. I am thinking, for instance, of my father's mother, who came to America fleeing oppression in Europe 110 years ago. I am thinking of both of my mother's parents. My mother's parents told me that their finest hour was when they got to visit Jerusalem. And yet they came from Europe to North America in the hope of achieving freedom, and they did.

But I would like to try to do something that's in some respects a little more difficult, if I may, which is try to explain in some general way what Jews have meant in this country for our intellectual and moral life as a country. And I think it begins with the fact that we all lived as slaves. And we not only remember that time and remember what it meant for us to achieve freedom ourselves as a people, but we also make sure that each year we come together during a time that's important to all of us, to come together as families and remember the importance of that part of the Jewish experience. And that helps us to relate to other people who are oppressed in all sorts of ways.

We also, I think, are moved by the central concept, in my mind, of tikkun olam, healing the world. Now, this is a concept that dates in Jewish law all the way back to the Mishnah. And originally it was basically an injunction that you should not take advantage of other people. One of the original examples of tikkun olam, the principle of healing the world, was that for instance when the captives were taken, when people were held hostage in military battles, the tradition at that time was that they could be freed by a payment of money. We don't do that anymore, nobody does that anymore, but that was typical and ordinary in Biblical times.

And the rule of tikkun olam was applied to place a limit on how much you could take in order to give someone back their freedom. Why? Because that person was a prisoner, he or she could not defend himself or herself, and he or she wanted and deserved the freedom that every human being deserves. So under the idea of the concept of tikkun olam, we placed a limit on the price that you could pay on somebody's freedom, even if they were captured in the field of battle or otherwise taken hostage. And that's a concept that's broadened over time. It's a concept that I think is suffused through our life as a country in America today because it appeals to our better nature.

I saw something recently that summarized this in a way that I thought was particularly vivid. This is Rabbi Michael Lerner talking about the concept of tikkun olam and how it applies to modern life: ''We in the Tikkun community,'' he said, ''use the word 'spiritual' to include all those whose deepest values lead them to challenge the ethos of selfishness and materialism that has led people into a frantic search for money and power and away from a life that places love, kindness, generosity, peace, nonviolence, social justice, awe and wonder at the grandeur of creation, thanksgiving, humility and joy,'' especially joy I think, ''at the center of our lives.''

And what we strive for under Jewish law is a reflection of the future that we hope to bring about, the messianic age, the age when people live in peace, when their lives are filled with love and with joy. And our actions today are meant to point in that direction. I think that's a good summary of what we try to accomplish as legislators. I think it's a good summary of what America tries to accomplish when we appeal to our own better natures. And that's, I think, the greatest of all of our contributions to American life, the concept of tikkun olam, the concept that the way that we conduct ourselves is a way that can spread throughout the world. I appreciate the time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much, Mr. GRAYSON, for sharing your unique perspective. And, again, it's so incredibly important that we had this opportunity to acknowledge the contributions of Jewish Americans to American history.

And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that something that I am quite proud of is a contribution that I wasn't aware that I had made. Upon my election to the Congress in 2004, I learned that I was elected as the first Jewish woman to represent the State of Florida in Congress in history. And that's a source of great pride certainly to my parents, my Jewish parents, who were extremely proud and who kvelled, which is a Yiddish expression for a great bubbling of pride, so to speak. But it's something that has been a source of pride to me.

Mr. GRAYSON. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. GRAYSON. I am sure, and I know for a fact, that your parents must be very proud of you. But I will tell you that when I was elected, my mother's reaction was, I really wish you would become a doctor instead. I yield back.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. That's right. They wished for a doctor or a lawyer; they got a Member of Congress. What can you do? They had to settle.

Mr. Speaker, as I wrap up, and I am going to yield the last portion of our time to my good friend from Indiana, but I do want to talk about this year's Jewish American Heritage Month. And it's been packed with programs celebrating the contributions of American Jews to our country with movies, cultural exhibitions, speakers, and innovative educational curricula.

Right here in Washington, the United Jewish Communities and the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington will once again be hosting what has become their annual tradition, a reception for Members of Congress and members of the Jewish community right here on Capitol Hill.

J Street will also be hosting a reception to celebrate May as Jewish American Heritage Month with Members of Congress, their staff, and the Jewish community. But that's not all. The Library of Congress and the National Archives and Records Administration has been hosting lectures and exhibits and discussions about Jewish contributions to America.

In my home State of Florida, there will be a celebration of Jewish contributions to the civil rights movement. And the Marlins baseball team will host a Jewish Heritage Game. I can share with you that I had the privilege of throwing out the first pitch last year at the Jewish Heritage Game, which was really neat. But at that game they have kosher food and Jewish music in-between innings, and it's really an incredible experience.

Cincinnati, Ohio will be hosting lectures, including one on President Lincoln's solid relationship with Jewish Americans. And Wyoming of all places will host a festival celebrating Jewish food. And Lord knows that we Jews like food a whole lot.

□ 2200

Events are also scheduled to occur in New York, California, Texas and other States around the country, but I think the thing that we are all the most proud of is that tomorrow we will join President Barack Obama and the first lady, who will hold the first ever White House celebration and ceremony honoring Jewish American Heritage Month and the contributions of Jewish Americans throughout American history. It's our first opportunity to have that celebration in the White House during the month of May and Jewish American Heritage Month.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way in recent years to promote appreciation for the multicultural fabric of the United States. It's our responsibility to continue this education. If we as a Nation are to prepare our children for the challenges that lie ahead, then teaching diversity is a fundamental part of that promise. Together, we can help achieve this goal of understanding with the celebration of Jewish American Heritage Month.

I thank my colleagues for their support and call on all Americans to observe this special month by celebrating the many contributions of Jewish culture throughout our Nation's history.

With that, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) who hopefully will come up with a good segue from Jewish American Heritage Month to what he has come to share with us tonight about his constituents.

HONORING THREE SONS FROM SECOND DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana. Thank you very much. I want to thank my dear colleague from Florida and tell her what a vibrant and successful Jewish community we have in Indiana as well. We are very proud of our Jewish community there, and I want to thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, as we near Memorial Day, I rise today also to offer some words in commemoration of those who gave their lives in the Armed Forces of the United States, in particular, three sons from the Second District of Indiana. This weekend, Members of this body will return to our districts and participate in Memorial Day parades and events that are a tradition of American life. People will picnic with their families, barbecue and watch parades, and people will honor our veterans and pay respects to those servicemembers who died in the line of duty in places large and small, in places like South Bend, Plymouth and Westville, Indiana.

Specialist Paul E. Andersen, an Army Reservist from South Bend, Indiana, died in action on October 1, 2009, by indirect fire from enemy forces. A 24-year veteran of the Armed Forces, Paul was competing his second tour of duty in Iraq.

A 1979 graduate of Buchanan High School just across the line in Michigan, Paul enlisted in the Army Reserves in 1985. After serving his first tour in Iraq, Paul met his future wife, Linda, at the home of a friend. They shared a love of country music, old movies, and strawberry milkshakes. Paul proposed marriage within just a few months, and they were married 3 weeks later.

Linda knew what the Army meant to Paul from the very beginning. When he reenlisted for 6 more years of duty, though, it was only after first seeking her consent.

When he asked her how she would feel if he opted to redeploy, she said, go ahead. ''I knew I married an Army man, he's my world, my life, my friend.''

In November of 2008, Paul served with the 855th Quartermaster Company from South Bend. Paul's mission in Iraq was to provide both shower and laundry services, as well as operating a clothing repair shop supporting coalition forces based in 10 different locations throughout the Iraqi theater. Without these crucial services that helped make life bearable for those fighting far from home, our soldiers would not have been able to perform their duties as ably as they do.

Paul will be remembered as a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. As a civilian, Paul worked at a tube and bending company. He loved to tinker with machines and was notorious among family members and friends for going overboard on the Christmas lights every year.

He lived a life full of love and joy. Specialist Andersen is survived by his wife, by six children, and by nine grandchildren.

Army Staff Sergeant Justin DeCrow of Plymouth, Indiana, died in a the tragic shooting at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009. After 13 years of extraordinary service to his Nation, Justin was taken from his family, friends, and comrades, and he will be forever missed.

Justin always wanted to be a soldier. He graduated from Plymouth High School in 1996, and after marrying his high school sweetheart, that spring he enlisted in the United States Army. He answered the call to serve his country because of an unfailing love of America and also the opportunity to make a life for his family in a career like no other.

Early on, he performed light vehicle maintenance. In 2000, Justin and his family moved to Evans, Georgia, after he was assigned to nearby Fort Gordon, where he was trained as a satellite operator.

He would later go on to work in that capacity in South Korea. Last September, Justin was assigned to the 16th Signal Company at Fort Hood. He had hoped to soon return to Fort Gordon to be with his family.

While at Fort Hood, Justin distinguished himself by training new soldiers. He will be remembered by his fellow soldiers as a mentor with an undeniable charm and quick wit, and by friends and family as a loving and devoted father and husband.

Justin is survived by his wife of 14 years, Marikay, their 13-year-old daughter, Kylah, and two proud parents, Daniel DeCrow and Rhonda Thompson. He will be missed by them and by a grateful Nation forever in debt to a selfless man's kind heart and deep sense of service.

Marine Corps Lance Corporal Joshua Birchfield of Westville, Indiana, died in the Helmand Province of Afghanistan on February 19, 2010. After almost 2 years of accomplished service, Joshua was killed by small arms fire while on patrol during his first tour of duty in that country.

Josh graduated from Westville High School in 2004 and enlisted in the United States Marine Corps on April 18, 2008. He joined the marines after seeing a TV news segment focused on the hardships that military families endure when they are separated, especially during the holidays. Josh was deeply inspired by those who dedicated their lives in the service of others. He wanted to share that burden they were carrying on behalf of our Nation.

Lance Corporal Birchfield was stationed in Helmand Province as a rifleman with the Third Battalion, Fourth Marine Regiment, First Marine Expeditionary Force, based in Twentynine Palms, California.

For his service and support in Operation Enduring Freedom, Josh has been decorated many times, earning the Purple Heart, Combat Action Ribbon, National Defense Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Sea Service Deployment Ribbon, and the NATO Medal. Joshua was a baseball enthusiast, and this coming weekend, I am proud that I will be there as the baseball field in Westville will be renamed in Josh's honor, a living memorial that will remain a place of joy and remembrance for years to come. And we all hope that we can live up to the example that Josh has given to all of us.

Joshua was also an inspiring hero to many in the tight-knit Westville community, and he will be remembered as a selfless and compassionate man. He is survived by both parents and sisters, extended family, and many, many friends.

We are forever in debt to these three great Hoosiers, all patriots in every

sense of the word and all brave Americans who have laid down their lives so that we may be safe, so that others might live without fear, and so that our country can remain safe and secure and strong.

Let us also remember today those brave Americans who are serving their Nation now here at home and in harm's way in places all around the globe. By choosing to serve their Nation in uniform, these sons and daughters, mothers and fathers, are continuing hundreds of years of a tradition of selflessness, excellence, and courage in protecting the freedoms and values we are blessed to enjoy as citizens of this beloved country.

Mr. Speaker, may the House of Representatives always do right by these fine men and their families, and may we never forget the price of freedom and those who have laid their lives down in service to this great Nation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am really privileged to have been here to listen to the gentleman acknowledge the patriots that gave their lives and that have served our country so faithfully from his community, and I can tell you that the constituents of the district that he represents in Indiana have no greater friend, no greater advocate, than JOE DONNELLY.

With that, I yield back.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION AND THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as always it's an honor and privilege to be recognized by you here in the House to address you in the presence of the folks that are here in this Chamber.

I appreciate my colleagues in their presentation in the previous hour and their discussion about Jewish American Heritage Month. I want to say also to my friend, Mr. DONNELLY, the support for our troops and the grief that we have for those that we have lost goes deep for all of us, and I appreciate that sentiment as well.

I look at the democracy in the Middle East and the demonstration there that in 1948, a Nation that stood up and created a Nation, actually a people that stood up and created a Nation. I am very well identified with Israel, in particular because the generation of my life has almost mirrored the generation of the life of the Nation of Israel.

□ 2210

And so I would very much encourage the people in this administration to support Israel, support them in their self-defense in the Middle East, and understand that there have been some things that have taken place in this country that undermine the national defense of Israel and to send a message that might encourage their enemies.

I would like to send a message here tonight to encourage the nation of Israel, the Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, and all the people that stand up for liberty and freedom in that part of the world. It is one thing to defend your freedom and your liberty throughout the generations as we have through this country; it is another to be completely surrounded by enemies that would like to annihilate you as a people and as a country. We have no neighbors that draw maps of the world that erase the United States from that map—we do have some neighbors that would like to take some chunks out of the great Southwest of the United States and change the map of the United States of America.

We don't have any neighbors who seek to, when they educate their children, eradicate all of the United States of America. But that is the case with a number of the neighbors of the nation of Israel. And to be surrounded by those kind of people, people who raise their children and little girls to put suicide vests on at age 3 and walk them around to justify the homicide bombing activities that have taken place all over Israel over the years—and by the way, while I'm on the subject matter, many of those bombings have been reduced dramatically, significantly across Israel, and a lot of that has to do with the barrier they constructed between themselves and the West Bank. I've been there. I've seen that barrier and watched how effective it has been. And I've been a strong proponent of the construction of a barrier that would be that effective on our southern border in particular, where we have millions of illegal border crossers every year coming across our southern border into the United States. And there are those that will say that those that are coming across are just coming here to get a job. They just want to work. They just want to take care of their families. In fact, Mr. Speaker, many do, many do, but there are also many who do not.

Ninety percent of the illegal drugs consumed in the United States come from or through Mexico. And out of that huge human haystack of humanity that pours across our southern border every night, while the numbers are down a little bit—at least by the way we keep statistics, we can't be sure because we don't know—but the numbers, when I did have a reasonable measurement, there were 4 million illegal border crossings a year. I think if you take—and this is from memory, Mr. Speaker, so hopefully the accountants in the world won't hold me too accountable, but 4 million illegal border crossings a year divided by 365 days comes down to about 11,000 illegal crossers a night, on average, every night.

I have spent some time down there on those crossings at night at places like San Miguel's crossing to sit down there on the border. And some of the places along there, at its best, is three or four barbed wires that are stretched apart where illegals cross through, 11,000 a night, Mr. Speaker. And so you can take your historical measure by Santa Anna's army of someplace between 4,000 and 6,000 that surrounded and attacked the Alamo. It's 11,000 a night. So one might argue, and I think very effectively, that it is two to three times the size of Santa Anna's army that invaded Texas, every night, on average. And no, they don't all come with muskets and they're not in uniforms, but that is the magnitude of it every single night, on average.

And now I'm going to say, thankfully, the President of the United States has announced, I believe yesterday, that he was going to ask for $500 million and 1,200 National Guard troops to bolster the security at the border. Now, some of the people on my side of the aisle were immediately critical of it as being not enough, and I won't take issue with them on that part, it is not enough, but it is a good baby step. We have taken so many giant steps in the wrong direction, especially economically, in the effort to do so culturally and socially, that when I see a little baby step in the right direction, like 1,200 Guard troops going down to the southern border, that's a good thing. Little steps in the right direction are a lot better than giant steps in the wrong direction.

So 1,200 Guard troops at $500 million works out to be this, Mr. Speaker. That is an increase of border patrol personnel security of 6.5 percent, and it is an increase, from a budgetary perspective—$500 million divided by the roughly $12 billion we're spending on the southern border comes to about a 4.2 percent increase in the budget part of it.

Importantly, it sends the right message. And we need to emphasize and reinforce the message that's been sent, that this country, Democrats and Republicans—albeit in significantly different percentages within the parties, but it is a bipartisan position—that we need to stop the bleeding at the border, Mr. Speaker. All the rest of the things we might want to do don't account for much—as a matter of fact, they don't count for anything—if we don't stop the bleeding at the border.

I just came from a dinner where I sat down and listened to the narrative of an individual—whose wife actually told the greatest part of the narrative—who was kidnapped by the Mexicans in Mexico. One of the cartels that were the top-of-the-line human kidnappers had asked initially for $8 million in ransom and for 8 months kept this man in a box. He watched his weight go from 165 down to 80 pounds. And finally, finally after those 8 months and down to 80 pounds, he was released. That doesn't happen to all. Some aren't released. Some are killed in captivity. Many of them are brutalized. But when you see a person's weight shrink in half, you know that is brutalization. And this is what's going on in Mexico. There are

these kinds of activities that are threatening to throw out the politics of South America in countries like Brazil, for example, and Colombia would be another, and Peru would be another.

As I watch this unfold, it isn't a big surprise to us. When we see all the violence in the Southern Hemisphere and in Central America, it shouldn't be a big surprise to us when that violence spills over the border. And when Phoenix becomes the second highest kidnapping city in the world—and it would be first if it were not for Mexico City—I think it should be pretty clear to all of us here in the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, that the violence of the drug trafficking country of Mexico has spilled over into the United States, and the lawlessness that is a part of what goes on south of the border is now in greater numbers becoming the lawlessness that they are living with in Arizona and border States along the way. And when Arizona passed their immigration law, we heard, Mr. Speaker, what I would call a primal scream of desperation come up out of Arizona. And they passed the legislation that they could. They passed the legislation that they needed to protect and defend themselves.

Mr. Speaker, that is a long and deep subject which I intend to go into a little more deeply, but I recognize that the astute gentleman from east Texas, the ''Aggie'' himself, the judge, Mr. GOHMERT, is here with some actual facts and data that come off of a printed sheet rather than out of that globe of his that has so much knowledge in it.

And I would be so happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from east Texas (Mr. GOHMERT.)

□ 2220

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I do appreciate so much the comments of my friend from Iowa, and we do appreciate the comments of our colleagues in the hour previous to this, about the wonderful Jewish heritage in this country.

It is Jewish Heritage Month, and it does mean so much to this Nation when you look at the contributions of the Jewish immigrants into this country. This country has benefited so immeasurably from immigration, but it has to be legal, and there are a number of different aspects.

First of all, we've got, basically, a Third World immigration service. It needs to be cleaned out from top to bottom and from side to side. It needs to be streamlined and made more efficient, more effective. That has got to be done. It wasn't done effectively in the previous administration. It has got to be done. It is not being done now by this administration, and it has got to be done. It has grieved me much, in my 5½ years here, to hear people come down to the floor who talk about laws, who are spouting off things as facts, which are wrong, because they haven't read the bills.

My friend knows that, in our Republican Conferences, nobody had been more loud and emphatic than I in begging my colleagues, when we were going through the TARP bailout, to read the bill.

If you'll just read the bill, you'll see we don't do this in America. We don't give one person $700 billion.

We didn't have enough people read the bill. They didn't realize how much we were giving away the farm when the TARP bailout passed.

Likewise, we have people, including down Pennsylvania Avenue here, who have talked about this Arizona bill. I've got it here. It's 19 pages. That's with the amendments. It includes the amendments that were passed to make clear their position. I've gone through and, you know, I've highlighted different parts. It's what I do. I am not technically challenged. I love doing things on the Internet, finding things and doing good research on the Internet, but there is something about having a hard copy which I can go through and highlight, and that's what I've done here. This is not rocket science.

If you have read the law as it has come down from the Supreme Court and as passed by this Congress, you'll find out that this Arizona law is actually not as tough, as stringent as existing Federal law. You'll find out what this Arizona bill talks about in terms of what a law officer will do because it reads: For any lawful contact stop, detention or arrest made by a law enforcement official—well, a ''lawful contact stop'' means a law officer cannot stop you unless it is authorized under State or Federal law. In fact, if he were to violate someone's civil rights by unlawfully stopping someone, he has got a lawsuit. We've got a Federal law that allows you to go sue Arizona or the local law enforcement if they were to abuse their power. That's why the civil rights laws are there.

Any lawful contact.

There is a type of arrest that has been known since 1966 as a Terry Stop, and there is probably not a certified law officer in Iowa, in Texas, or in the country who has not had a class on what a lawful stop, a Terry Stop, is because under Terry vs. Ohio 1966, the Supreme Court discussed this. They said that you've got to have a reasonable suspicion that there has been some crime committed in order to have a detention stop. You can't just, you know, willy-nilly stop people.

Also, it could be a lawful stop if you see that somebody is violating the traffic laws. Sometimes officers will have a lawful stop, and they'll give you a warning. They could have given you a full ticket because they saw that you had violated a law or that maybe you had a taillight out or something, but it's a lawful stop. They stop you and wonder, perhaps, you know, are you carrying illegal drugs or something. Well, they're authorized to stop you for violating the traffic laws, and they're not bound to put on blinders when they do in order to see if you've violated something else while you're there, but not unreasonably.

If they've lawfully stopped a person for some purpose other than immigration and if they have a reasonable suspicion that the person is an alien, that a person is not lawfully present in the country, then this law allows them to make, as it says here, a reasonable attempt, when practicable, to determine the immigration status of the person.

Now, what Terry vs. Ohio made clear is a ''reasonable suspicion'' means you can't just say, Well, I suspected something. That's not good enough. In law school, when we studied Terry vs. Ohio, there was some terminology I had to practice saying before I got to class so that I could say it without, you know, stumbling and looking more ignorant than I might otherwise already look. The word was ''articulable.'' It rolls off pretty easily nowadays, but you can't just suspect. Well, I just had this suspicion. That's not good enough. It has to be a reasonable suspicion based upon articulable facts. If you cannot articulate facts that justify your suspicion, it's not reasonable. It's an unlawful stop, and it's probably a civil rights violation that's going to get the community or the State of Arizona sued successfully.

The Federal law allows even further stopping just to check to see if somebody may be legally present in the country. Federal law officers have the ability to do that if they think it appropriate. Arizona is just trying to deal with the fact that they have so many criminals in Arizona.

My friend mentioned a kidnapping. It is intolerable that one of our 50 States of these United States would have a beautiful, wonderful city like Phoenix and that that United States' city, here in the continental United States, would be the second most prolific kidnapping capital in the world. This isn't a Third World country where we have coups d'etat constantly and governments constantly changing hands so that you don't know who is going to enforce the law. This is the United States of America. Arizona is not some Wild West territory. To have Phoenix have the second most kidnappings in the world is intolerable, and it is an embarrassment for which this Federal Government owes an apology to border States like Arizona for allowing this kind of thing to go unstopped, unchecked.

This law is very reasonable. You know, basically, there is just one page—if people would bother to go check. On page 5, it talks about lawfully stopping someone who is operating a vehicle if he has a reasonable suspicion to believe the person is in violation of any civil traffic law. I mean, this is not an unreasonable law, but it does say repeatedly that a law enforcement official or agency of this State, county, city, town or other political subdivision may not consider race, color, or national origin in the

enforcement of this section except to the extent permitted by the United States or Arizona Constitution. Well, the Arizona Constitution cannot allow it if it is forbidden by the United States Constitution. So this is not some horrific bill as the President and others, including our President, have made it sound.

That's why it is a little bit irritating to have the President of Mexico come into this body as an invited guest, as a guest in this House, and say: I strongly disagree with the recently adopted law in Arizona. It is a law that not only ignores a reality, that cannot be erased by decree but that also introduces a terrible idea, using racial profiling as a basis for law enforcement.

□ 2230

That is why I agree with President Obama, who said the new law ''carries a great amount of risk when core values that we all care about are breached.''

He comes in here as an invited guest and completely misrepresents the facts, and tells the world here in this body to our faces that the Arizona law ignores a reality that cannot be erased by decree, and introduces a terrible idea that racial profiling is a basis for law enforcement?

I am sure that he does not lie, but that statement is a lie; that is not true. He just needed to read the bill, and apparently no one, I don't know if the Attorney General has read it yet, he hadn't read it when he came before our Judiciary Committee. Secretary NAPOLITANO, she owed the State of Arizona better than she gave it, and she had not read the bill, and she is out there condemning it. And then to have our invited guest come in here and condemn a law that he clearly had not read—I would be glad to give him a copy. It is not hard to get. But to come in here, that is just so outrageous.

But then he comes in and says, ''Because of your global leadership, we will need your support,'' this is President Calderon, ''to make the meeting in Cancun next November a success.'' And that is because he has come in and touted global warming.

For those that can't understand the politicalese that is used in here, what that statement means, and what all these 100 and some countries around the world have said, when they said we have got to have the United States' global leadership come into this global warming conference, what they mean is, if the United States doesn't come in as the patsy who is willing to pay all these other countries out of some guilt complex, then nobody else in the world is going to come in and start redistributing the wealth from America into all those other countries.

I appreciate President Calderon saying that, but the trouble is we are distributing plenty of wealth to Mexico. He mentioned it himself. The Merida Initiative, as I recall. This body passed a bill to give them $500 million, as I recall, to use to buy law enforcement equipment to help enforce their laws. We are pouring plenty of money into Mexico, so he doesn't need to try to go to some global warming meeting and try to construct some method of extorting more money out of the United States. We are giving them plenty.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Texas. I wanted to go back through a couple of points the gentleman has made with regard to the Arizona law.

One of them would be, my recollection is that ''lawful contact'' was amended to say ''stop, detention, or arrest.'' I happen to have had a copy that has the amendment integrated into the overall bill, and I was able to sit down and read that on Saturday morning.

Mr. GOHMERT. If the gentleman would yield, yes, it does say any lawful contact, stop, detention or arrest.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Didn't they strike ''lawful contact'' and just put in ''stop, detention, or arrest?''

Mr. GOHMERT. This is supposed to be the updated law as amended.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Your copy doesn't reflect that. I recall mine did.

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman needs to understand that ''lawful contact stop'' means you can't stop them unless you have a reasonable suspicion.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Let me suggest that ''lawful contact'' would mean, among it, ''lawful contact'' would be ''stop, detention, or arrest,'' so specific within those individual subcategories of lawful contact. So I think I make a distinction without a difference in the language as I recall it, and that is carefully crafted language.

When we look at the reasonable suspicion component of this, Mr. Speaker, I think about this; that I wrote the reasonable suspicion law in Iowa as a State senator for the Workplace Drug Testing Act that we passed in 1998. It has been in law for all of 12 years, and in that period of time, in fact 12 years and 2 months, I happen to remember it was St. Patrick's day in 1998 that it was signed into law, Mr. Speaker.

But we provide for an employer or employer's designee to direct an employee to undergo a drug test, and generally that will be a urinalysis, based upon a representative of the employer declaring that the employee in question has a reasonable suspicion that they are using or abusing drugs. That might be any of the indicators that have to do with bloodshot eyes, or dilated pupils, or erratic work habits, or showing up late, or let me say agitated nature or nervous nature, something of that nature.

So the designee of the employer can point to an employee and say, I have a reasonable suspicion that you are using drugs. Go get a drug test right now.

That has been an Iowa law for 12 years. It is more draconian than the Arizona reasonable suspicion law with regard to requiring the law enforcement officer to draw their reasonable suspicion and make a determination when he has reasonable suspicion as to the lawful presence of the individual that he has had lawful contact with and had a stop, detention, or arrest.

A reasonable suspicion, I would add also to the gentleman from Texas, who went to law school down there, that if I remember correctly, it is a specific, articulable fact, so that it has to be specified as well as articulable. I have trouble practicing that word too. I am doing it here. So I didn't go to law school to learn that.

But the reasonable suspicion language that is there is well settled, and it has been completely utilized for decades in the United States, and for at least 12 years in Iowa. Maybe it is the janitor, or it is the nurse or the truck driver, or maybe it is the accountant or the keyboard operator that is the designee of the employer, that has received 2 hours worth of training to start out and one hour worth of training each year to refresh them, and they are the ones that get to point their finger at somebody and not say, let me see your papers; it is, we will send you into the clinic here, and you can fill this jar up, and we will check it out and see if you are using illegal drugs.

I would submit that it is a little bit more invasive in a person's privacy to require a urinalysis than it is to require that they show their papers. Yet we have people across this country that are demonstrating against Arizona's immigration law, when all it does is ask the local law enforcement officers to carry out the function of enforcing immigration law, Arizona immigration law, which mirrors Federal immigration law in that practice, and it has been a requirement for a long, long time, perhaps half a century, that those who are in this United States that are not natural born citizens or naturalized citizens have to carry their papers if they are 18 years old or older. That has been a common practice. There appears to be no offense taken about that practice.

But here, behind where I stand, Mr. Speaker, we had President Calderon take issue with Arizona's immigration law. He said he strongly disagrees with the Arizona law, that it is a terrible idea that could lead to racial profiling. That is pretty close to the quote, not exact. Mr. GOHMERT provided it exactly.

So if President Calderon is so offended by the law that Arizona has passed, I would take him back to the simplest lessons in deductive reasoning that were perfected by the Greeks 3,000 years ago, and it would be this: President Calderon, if you are not offended by the United States Federal immigration law that sets a standard that is more stringent than the Arizona immigration law, but you are offended by the Arizona immigration law, the only logical deductive reason that could remain is that he is offended that Arizona law enforcement will be enforcing Arizona immigration law. So that would tell me President Calderon is insulted or offended by Arizona's State

and political subdivision law enforcement officers.

And I will suggest that the former Member of Congress from Colorado and my friend, Tom Tancredo, got it right when he said you can understand what is going on by the objectors of the Arizona law; the higher the level of hysteria, the greater their fear that the law is going to be effective.

□ 2240

They don't want the law to be effective. That's why they're demonstrating. They don't believe, if they've ever read the bill, they don't necessarily believe that it's unconstitutional or it violates a Federal preemption standard or that there's case law out there that prohibits local law enforcement from enforcing Federal immigration law. That isn't all a matter of their issue. They're contriving arguments that help them arrive at a result that they want, which is open borders, full-bore amnesty, paths to citizenship, more voters, more people coming into the United States to cash into this giant ATM called America.

And there was a point that was raised this morning in a breakfast that I hosted for the Conservative Opportunity Society. I will put it this way, since it's a confidential discussion that takes place in there. It was raised by one of the members from the upper Midwest, and I'll call it a rust belt State, who said he has watched as generations of Americans have arrived here from foreign lands, different countries other than the United States because they had a dream, because they had a passion. They wanted to build on that dream, and here they could have the freedom to do so. They have all the constitutional rights and protections that man has ever known, the right to property, the rule of law, in a nation that was founded on Judeo-Christian principles, which means we need less law enforcement than anybody else in the world. And people came here to build on that, and that vitality is a great core of the American experience and the American civilization.

But he raised the point that, when you start bringing in tens of millions of people who come here for a different reason, a different reason rather than to build, that people coming here believing that they can cash in on the welfare state, that there is somebody else that's going to do the work and there's going to be money that gets kicked out of this government machine—this giant ATM is the shorthand that I use for it—he worries about the future of our Nation because they and their children and their children's children would have a different view about what the work ethic is, for example; the responsibilities we have to stand up and support the rule of law and hold everyone accountable to the American Dream, which embodies a responsibility that we have to utilize this blessing that we have that's passed to us from the previous generations and to leave this world and this country in a better place than it was when we found it. That's an American Dream obligation. And if they come here for a different reason, this is a new phenomenon that hasn't taken place because we've only been a welfare state about a half a century.

When my grandmother came here a little over 100 years ago, she came into a society that was a meritocracy. And if people walked across the great hall at Ellis Island and they had a limp or a gimp or a bad eye or both eyes looked a little crazy or a little too pregnant, if something wasn't right, even though they'd been screened before they got on the boat, they put them back on the boat and shipped them back to the country that they came from. About 2 percent of those that arrived at Ellis Island were put back on the boat and sent back to the country they came from because the United States of America was filtering for good physical specimens, good mental specimens, generally, people who could sustain themselves in this growing country, a meritocracy. But today it's anything but.

Only 7 to 11 percent of the legal immigration in America is based on merit. The rest of it is completely out of our control, with family reunification and a whole lot of other plans under the sun, but not based on merit. And what kind of a country would not establish an immigration policy designed to enhance the economic, the social, and the cultural well-being of the United States of America?

That's one of my, I think, salient points, and I'd be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. And the point is quite salient. And it brings to a point something I think my friend from Iowa and I can agree with part of the quote from our President that was quoted by President Calderon. And to give you the exact quote again, President Calderon, in talking about the Arizona law said that ''it introduces a terrible idea using racial profiling as a basis for law enforcement.'' Now, that is just blatantly not true, absolutely not true. Using racial profiling as a basis for law enforcement. That is, it flies in the face of the facts and the facts of this bill.

But then he goes on, and here's the part where I believe my friend would agree with me in congratulating the President, not on the first part of the quote, because he's applying this to the Arizona law, but he says the new law ''carries a great amount of risk when core values that we all care about are breached.'' But the part that is in there is so important to us in the United States, and that is that there is ''a great amount of risk when core values that we all care about are breached.''

Now, I grew up with my mother and dad telling me if I ever have an emergency, if I'm ever in trouble, look for someone in uniform because I can trust them. That's the way I grew up in Mount Pleasant, Texas, and that's the way I have taught our three girls growing up their whole lives, growing up in Tyler, Texas, that if there's a problem, even if you're worried you might have done something wrong, you go to somebody in uniform. You can trust them. And I've taught them the same thing.

You know, if somebody were ever kidnapped, no matter what the note said or whatever, you call the FBI. You can trust them. And I know so many FBI agents, and I do trust them. They're some wonderful agents. And I know they would lay down their lives in a second.

But what about when we come to the point when the Federal law enforcement is told by their commander in the White House that enforcing the law is a bad idea? That's problematic. And then that spills over until you have somebody who is charged and his whole job is enforcing the immigration laws, and he says, if Arizona sends somebody that they have detained because they're illegally in the country, he may not even enforce the law. See, that flies in the face, just like the President's quote says. There's a great amount of risk when the core values that we've taught our children, that we all care about, are breached.

And I'm telling you, when you have someone in the Federal Government charged with enforcing the law and they're being taught, and it's coming top down, ignore the law, don't enforce it, they're violating all the core values that we've tried to instill in our children and the things that we grew up believing, and this country is not the country we hoped for, that we dreamed for. It becomes like the country that so many immigrants flee illegally, because they're not based, their country does not have the rule of law that's in force. Too much graft and corruption.

You come to this country, don't ask us to ignore the rule of law. Some of us, like 4 years I had in the Army, time as a prosecutor, as a judge, as a chief justice, 5½ years in Congress, taking that oath that was given by the Speaker to the new Congressman DJOU from Hawaii, I mean, we took an oath to follow the law and we're supposed to support and defend the Constitution. This flies in the face of all those oaths when you say ignore the law, it means nothing; we'll get around to enforcing it some day down the road. It means I've spent most of my adult life for nothing because the rule of law means nothing.

So I would implore people, do not come to this country and ask me to say that my adult life has been for nothing, because the rule of law means something. It means nothing to them. It does mean something. It's meant something to me, and it always will, because I know, and I know my friend from Iowa knows, I know the Speaker knows, if we don't have the rule of law that's applied across the board, and I think better in this country than in any country in the history of the world, then we devolve into the ashes

from which we rose, and we are just a historic memory and nothing more.

I yield back to my friend from Iowa.

□ 2250

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank my friend from Texas. I am standing here listening, thinking about what it means to be in a country that in the history of the world there has been no country that has more profound respect for the rule of law. And the thought that all this life in the law as a prosecutor, as a judge, as a Supreme Court Justice, all of that activity, to have someone declare that it's all for nothing, that it really didn't have any meaning, that behind it all it was a facade that was simply there to facilitate somebody's political agenda is what it would come down to.

And I think back throughout this course of history. And earlier I spoke of the Greeks, but I would take this law, this rule of law back to Rome, Roman law, Roman law that survived the Dark Ages and manifested itself as the foundation of old English common law, that came across to this country and arrived here, let me suggest, with the Mayflower 390 years ago, with the Pilgrims who came over here for religious liberty and religious freedom to get out from underneath the thumb of the King, and also to be able to worship as they pleased, and those traditions of old English common law that came here.

But the injustices that still came from English common law were the injustices that were corrected in a large way in the traditions and defined in the Declaration and corrected in the Constitution of the United States.

We are here and one of the reasons that we are a great Nation, one of the reasons that we are the unchallenged greatest Nation in the world is because one of the essential pillars of American exceptionalism is the rule of law, Mr. Speaker.

When we look at the difference between the country represented by President Calderon and the country represented by President Obama, our traditions are entirely different. As I listened to President Calderon's speech, he said we are founded on the same principles. He said they were founded 200 years ago on the same principles as the United States is my recollection from the speech. I don't have it in front of me.

It struck me that I would like to ask that question of him personally to explain that to me, how we are founded on the same principles, the right to life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Could that be in a Mexican Constitution somewhere that is 200 years old? I am not aware of that. I hope it is. I hope I just missed it, but I am not aware of that.

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, Mr. Speaker. This country was founded for religious liberty. It was founded on the rule of law. It was founded on the basic principles that our rights come from God, and that we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, and among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, Mr. Speaker.

And America was founded by a Nation who believed in freedom, a Nation of farmers and small shopkeepers, a Nation that rejected the aristocracy, a Nation that wrote in its Constitution that we are not going to confer any title or royalty on anybody in this country. We are going to shed those trappings of royalty, and we are going to be a Nation that is empowered from rights that come from God that come directly to the people, and the people bestow the responsibility on government. That's what America was founded upon.

And we believed for a long time that our voices mattered. We have been engaging in these debates well before the Declaration of Independence. Patrick Henry's speech was a manifestation of many decades of Americans seeking to rule themselves before they threw the yoke of King George off in 1776 and culminated with the ratification of the Constitution beginning in 1787 and finishing in 1789.

We are a different Nation. When I asked the Historian of Mexico in Mexico City a couple of years ago about the colonial experience of Mexico versus the colonial experience of the United States, his response was, well, about 7 percent of Mexico are the aristocracy, and they have run their country from the beginning. And 93 percent are the people who are being run. And they have no tradition of being able to have a voice that actually changed and shifted the government and directed the government. Not a government of the people, but a government of the aristocracy run for the aristocracy that managed and controls the people.

Now, I hope President Calderon is breaking that mold. I hope Vicente Fox started it along the way, and I hope President Calderon is breaking that mold. And I applaud him for the courageous approach that he has had in taking on the drug cartels. They have suffered thousands and thousands of casualties in the middle of this war against the drug cartels, but they have a very heavy lift down there. It isn't that Mexico mirrors that experience of the United States, in my view. I think it's a different history, it's a different experience, it's a different culture, and a different set of traditions.

And, yes, we can be friends, and we are trading partners, and we need to enhance those trades. And I want to be supportive of the effort to shut down the drug cartels. And we have, Mr. Speaker, a responsibility in this country to shut down illegal drug consumption so that we can turn down the magnet that draws so many illegal dollars out of the United States into Mexico and the violence that's committed there and points south, and there and points into the United States. All of that is part of the picture. We haven't addressed our side of this problem very well at all. And we point our finger at Mexico. I want them to do their job too.

But we can, by golly, shut off the bleeding at the border. That we can do. And there are $60 billion a year that are wired out of the United States into the Western Hemisphere, points south. About $30 billion of it goes into Mexico; about $30 billion goes into Central America, the Caribbean, and South America. And the Drug Enforcement Agency does not even have an estimate on what percentage of that $60 billion is laundered illegal drug money.

I would hang that point out there and yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. Some say, well, if you are a caring Nation then you ought to just welcome anybody that wants to come. The problem is because this Nation has been so richly blessed, and because we have been a Nation that believed in the rule of law and enforced it more fairly across the board than any nation in the history of the world, then opportunities have abounded here. And so it has been a draw.

And I know my friend from Iowa was chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee on which I was privileged to serve, and so I know he is aware of these statistics, but it's estimated that between out of the over 6 billion people in the world that 1 billion to 1.5 billion people in the world would like to come to America. And as most folks know, we have over 300 million in this country now.

But if we were to just say there are no borders, you want to come, come on, we are just giving up on our obligation to protect the economy and the people and the way of life in this country, so come on. One billion to 1.5 billion people would overwhelm this Nation. It could no longer be the greatest Nation in the world because you couldn't have an organized, sustained society with a government that functioned. It would be overwhelmed.

So in order to continue to be that light on the hill, that beacon that Reagan talked about, we have to make sure that we have managed immigration, that we continue to be a beacon so people want to come here, but that we control the immigration so it doesn't overwhelm the economy so that this becomes a matter of regret for those who have come here.

Now, I know, as my friend from Iowa has done, and I guess most of us, assist people who have immigration problems. And so we have some wonderful dear Hispanic friends, constituents whom we are helping to try to legally get in family because they want to abide by the law. They want to do the right thing because they know the law is important.

And some people that I love very dearly are Hispanic immigrants. And, you know, having been invited to come

to family functions and back when I was a judge, one of the great honors of my time as a judge was to marry a couple. And her parents were immigrants. And it was just so moving. It brought tears to my eyes. But I look around at this Hispanic group of family, and what comes to my mind when I am with them, when I see them is they believe in the things that made America great.

This family, these dear friends, they believe in God, they have a love of family that's unrivaled, and they have a hard-work ethic like virtually nobody else can even aspire to. It's a beautiful thing. And I have great hopes that those three things that you find generally so often in Hispanic communities are what's going to reinvigorate this country and get us back on track and get us back to the very things George Washington prayed for this country when he resigned as commander in chief of the Revolutionary military. Those are good things.

But we owe it to all of the people, those who have immigrated legally, those who have been here, grandchildren, great grandchildren of immigrants, people that are Native Americans, we owe it to all of them to keep this country strong so it continues to be a land of opportunity.

□ 2300

I come back to that prayer that George Washington had when he wrote, himself, that was at the end of his resignation, and of course, it was the only time in human history where someone led a revolutionary military, won the revolution, and then resigned and went home. Never happened before, never happened since.

At the end, Washington's words were these, I now make it my earnest prayer that God would have you in the state over which you preside in his holy protection.

I know my friend had people, as an employer, providing paychecks, you probably had people resign. You may not have had people put prayers like this on the end of their resignation, but Washington goes on that he, God, would incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and, get this, and obedience to government. To entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another, for their fellow citizens of the United States, and particularly for the brethren who have served in the field, and, finally, that he would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice.

That's part of the prayer. How can you do justice? You follow the law. You are just. To the rich and the poor you are just to everyone. Race, creed, color, nationality, religion, prayer, that was part of Washington's prayer.

Then he goes on to love mercy, you can't have mercy unless you have justice in the first place.

Washington goes on: And to demean ourselves with a charity, humility, and pacific timbre of mind which were the characteristics of the divine author of our blessed religion, and without an humble limitation of whose example in these things, we can never hope to be a happy Nation.

He signed it, I have the honor to be, with great respect and esteem, your Excellency's most obedient and very humble servant, George Washington.

Now, that's a resignation, that's a prayer.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Did he sign that in the year of our Lord?

Mr. GOHMERT. This resignation he did not, but, of course, we know that most things were signed in the year of our Lord, including our Constitution. So I find it remarkable when some people around here have said, well, it would be unconstitutional to sign things around here in the year of our Lord. I pointed out how can it be unconstitutional to sign things in the year of our Lord, whatever the year number is, when that is exactly how the Constitution itself is signed and dated.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I reflect back on talking about George Washington and the eloquence that he had and the love for his fellow man and for his country and how great it would have been if Fidel Castro would have stepped down about the time that he finished a term or two in Cuba and how much different this Western Hemisphere would be.

What if we didn't have people like Hugo Chavez down there that seek to be President for life and impose their version of Marxism, their version of emperor's law, which is one of the foundations of empire. If you look around and you look at empires, they are run by emperors. They are run by the law of the emperor, not the law that comes from God that sees justice blindly, and the level kind of justice for whomever it might be, rich or poor.

I am thinking about this Arizona law again and how it's been misrepresented across this country. I am not very forgiving for what has happened here. When you have the highest official and officials in the United States Government that either shoot from the hip or willfully misinform the American people, and it starts with the President of the United States himself.

When the Arizona law was passed he almost immediately said that a mother and her daughter could be going to get some ice cream, and they could be targeted because of how they looked and be required to produce their papers. That was a race card thrown into the middle of this debate based upon no fundamental facts, Mr. Speaker.

Then behind that we had Eric Holder the Attorney General, testifying before the Judiciary Committee a week and a half ago, if I recall correctly, about a week and a half ago with Eric Holder. As he was asked these series of questions, he had made the point that he thought that there was a potential for racial profiling that could take place. Then, Mr. Speaker, we found out, and I think Eric Holder may know by now, that he misunderstood the law, but he hadn't read the law.

We found out, when Congressman TED POE, also a former judge from Texas, asked him the question, have you read the bill? He said, no, he hadn't. He hadn't been briefed on the bill.

But he had a few things to say about it, and prior to the Judiciary Committee, about its lack of constitutionality. Well, that's the Attorney General, who also testified that he is a nonpartisan office, that he is simply going to enforce the law.

Then we have the Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, and she had remarks to make about how the bill could be used for racial profiling. It's obvious that she didn't read the bill. In fact, she confessed to Senator MCCAIN in a hearing that she didn't read the bill.

Then we had the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, who heads up ICE, John Morton, who made a statement, I believe it was to The Chicago Tribune newspaper, that he wasn't committed to necessarily picking up the individuals that would be incarcerated by Arizona law enforcement that had violated U.S. and Arizona immigration law.

The law enforcement officer, the chief law enforcement officer for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, sent a message, not yet to be retracted, that he wouldn't commit to picking up these individuals that had been picked up by Arizona law enforcement, because he disagreed with the law. Breathtaking.

What would George Washington have said to think that the top enforcer of American immigration law, the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security John Morton, would even intimate that he had any options about enforcing the law?

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it isn't his option. It's not the option of the President of the United States to decide whether to enforce the law. It's not the option of the Attorney General to decide whether to enforce a law, or, the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the Assistant Secretary of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement; none of them have the option. They are executive branch employees. Their oath is to uphold the Constitution to the best of their ability and to faithfully execute the laws. That's their job.

This Congress sets the legislation and sets its policy. The executive branch carries it out. They don't get to have discretion. I will submit to John Morton, Janet Napolitano, Eric Holder, or even President Obama. President Obama could do a John Adams.

Come back here, run for office, come to Congress. If you like to set policy, get in the legislative business. Don't be in the enforcement business.

I am not seeking to enforce a law myself. I am saying here is the law. The Federal Government has immigration law, and you have an obligation, if you are the President of the United States, or an executive branch officer

with that duty, to enforce that law. Our job is to set the policy and pass the laws.

You know, I will go even further. Michael Posner, Assistant Secretary of State, he said he brought it up early and often to the Chinese that we had a problem with a law in Arizona that could bring about racial profiling. These are the people, we have got 40,000 Chinese in the United States that have been adjudicated for deportation. The Chinese won't take them back. And we are sending them some 550-year-old bones from paleovertebrates, so they can keep their artifacts straight.

We need to send them the 40,000 Chinese that they won't take, deport them as well as the bones, Mr. Speaker. And, additionally, Felipe Calderon on top of this. The American people have been misinformed by the President, by the Attorney General, by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, by the Assistant Secretary of State Posner. Then the President of Mexico takes his talking points from the White House and comes to this floor and lectures and chastises us that we have a law here, that I will say is completely constitutional. I will make this further prediction, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the announcement came out today that the Justice Department under Eric Holder now has a legal brief that recommends that they bring suit against Arizona.

□ 2310

Here is my prediction: ACLU has written that legal brief for the Justice Department. That apolitical, nonpolitical Justice Department has a brief that one day we'll get our hands on, a draft brief. Release the draft is what needs to happen from the Attorney General. But in that draft we'll find the ACLU that has already sued Arizona with a 98-page case, there is the document that they're using to put their brief together in the Justice Department.

The President gave the order to the Attorney General to look into Arizona's law. And the Justice Department, under Attorney General Holder, looked at the lawsuit that's been brought by the ACLU and MALDEF and other organizations that are hardcore left wing, including SEIU, and they have lifted the language right out of that lawsuit, and that will be the draft, Mr. Speaker. That's my prediction. I put my marker down. When we get our hands on the draft from the Attorney General's office, I will take that draft and I will take the language and I will highlight the language right out of the ACLU's lawsuit. And I'll show you how the Justice Department lifted that language out of the lawsuit of the ACLU and MALDEF—the Mexican American Legal Defense Foundation—and put it right into their draft advisory. And the Federal Government will be conducting and carrying out the order of the President—in a nonpolitical office, supposedly, according to Holder's testimony—at the direction of the ACLU and MALDEF and LARASA and the other organizations, SEIU and many others that are hardcore, leftist organizations in this country.

If we're going to have the rule of law, it's got to be impartial. It's got to be objective. It's got to be constitutional. It's got to be statutory, and it's got to be consistent with case law. Arizona's law is all of those things, but this Justice Department's unjustified attack on Arizona is anything but.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I just want to say, the President said he would fundamentally transform America. And when the executive branch charged with enforcing the laws of the country won't read them, won't follow them, and won't enforce them, that's a fundamental transformation.

Our friend, CYNTHIA LUMMIS from Wyoming, prepared this chart. One final note on fundamental transformation: This chart, when you have the blue line, the private job sector hiring, shooting down like this and the red line, the public government hiring, shooting up like that, you have fundamentally transformed America.

With that, I yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time and, Mr. Speaker, yielding back the balance, should there be any.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4213, TAX EXTENDERS ACT OF 2009

Mr. PERLMUTTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–497) on the resolution (H. Res. 1403) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4213) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5136, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011.

Mr. PERLMUTTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–498) on the resolution (H. Res. 1404) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5136) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 2:30 p.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TOWNS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BEAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BOOZMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, May 27.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5139. An act to provide for the International Organizations Immunities Act to be extended to the Office of the High Representative in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the International Civilian Office in Kosovo.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 27, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7649. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyprodinil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0551; FRL-8818-8] received April 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7650. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Phosphate Ester, Tallowamine, Ethoxylated; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0165; FRL-8816-4] received April 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7651. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Spirodiclofen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0139; FRL-8820-4] received April 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7652. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the Critical Skills Retention Bonus (CSRB) program, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 355(h); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7653. A letter from the Acting Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's annual report on material violations or suspected material violations of regulations relating to Treasury auctions and other Treasury securities offerings during the period January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009, pursuant to Public Law 103-202, section 202; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7654. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's ''Major'' final rule — Lead; Amendment to the Opt-out and Recordkeeping Provisions in the Renovation, Repair, and Painting Program [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2005-0049; FRL-8823-7] (RIN: 2070-AJ55) received April 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7655. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases: Minor Harmonizing Changes to the General Provisions [EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0508; FRL-9143-5] (RIN: 2060-AQ15) received April 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7656. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revisions to Regulation Number 1 [EPA-R08-OAR-2009-0790; FRL-9114-3] received April 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7657. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the Discrete Emission Credit Banking and Trading Program [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0148; FRL-9151-6] received April 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7658. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the Emission Credit Banking and Trading Program [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0147; FRL-9151-5] received April 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7659. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Participation by Federal Candidates and Officeholders at Non-Federal Fundraising Events [Notice 2010-11] received May 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

7660. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ocean Dumping; Designation of Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Sites offshore of the Sinuslaw River, Oregon [EPA-R10-OW-2010-0086; FRL-9143-2] received April 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7661. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1882-DR for the District of Columbia; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Appropriations, and Homeland Security.

7662. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1886-DR for the State of South Dakota; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Appropriations, and Homeland Security.

7663. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1887-DR for the State of South Dakota; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Appropriations, and Homeland Security.

7664. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1885-DR for the State of Kansas; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Appropriations, and Homeland Security.

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. SKELTON: Committee on Armed Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 5136. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–491, Pt. 2).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5114. A bill to extend the authorization for the national flood insurance program, to identify priorities essential to reform and ongoing stable functioning of the program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111–495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California: Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Report of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (Rept. 111–496). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1403. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4213) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–497). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1404. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5136) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and for other purposes (Rept. 111–498). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5402. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide for equitable allotment of lands to Alaska Native veterans; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5403. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to temporarily adjust the reimbursement rates for TRICARE claims in Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5404. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize space-available travel on military aircraft for a member or former member of a reserve component who is eligible for retired pay but for age and for dependents of the member who accompany the retiree; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RADANOVICH:

H.R. 5405. A bill to provide for a visitor center for visitors to Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 5406. A bill to establish the Corporate Subsidy Reform Commission to review and identify inequitable Federal subsidies and make recommendations for termination, modification, or retention of such subsidies, and to state the sense of the Congress that the Congress should promptly consider legislation that would make the changes in law necessary to implement the recommendations; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5407. A bill to establish the Program Reform Commission to review and identify unnecessary Federal programs and make recommendations for termination, modification, or retention of such programs, and to express the sense of the Congress that the Congress should promptly consider legislation that would make the changes in law necessary to implement the recommendations; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 5408. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to change the state of mind requirement for certain identity theft offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BACA, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 5409. A bill to establish the Residential Construction Loan Guarantee Program to guarantee loans made to eligible home building companies for viable building projects; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5410. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit corporations which are subject to certain criminal or civil sanctions from engaging in campaign-related activity under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. KOSMAS:

H.R. 5411. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish an early-stage business investment and incubation grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial 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 Ms. BEAN (for herself, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BRIGHT, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. HILL, Mr. WELCH, and Mrs. HALVORSON):

H.R. 5412. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase maximum loan amounts under the program in title V of that Act, to provide temporary authority for debt refinancing of commercial real estate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOREN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. LUJÁN):

H.R. 5413. A bill to authorize the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 5414. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in the Francis Marion National Forest in South Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. TEAGUE):

H.R. 5415. A bill to designate the Memorial of Perpetual Tears, which honors victims of driving while impaired, as the official National DWI Victims Memorial; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HELLER:

H.R. 5416. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Elko County, Nevada, and to take land into trust for the Te-moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 5417. A bill to amend titles XIX and XVIII of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, with respect to payment of disproportionate share hospitals (DSH) under the Medicare and Medicaid programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCMAHON:

H.R. 5418. A bill to provide emergency operating funds for public transportation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NADLER of New York:

H.R. 5419. A bill to amend chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, relating to protective orders, sealing of cases, disclosures of discovery information in civil actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

H.R. 5420. A bill to provide a tax credit for job training by successful companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.J. Res. 87. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H. Con. Res. 281. Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2011, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2010, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2012 through 2020; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H. Res. 1397. A resolution electing a Member to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H. Res. 1398. A resolution recognizing the contributions of university and college immigrant assistance programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Res. 1399. A resolution honoring the lives, and mourning the loss, of Sergeant Brandon Paudert and Officer Bill Evans, members of the West Memphis Police Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H. Res. 1400. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Caribbean American HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 1401. A resolution expressing gratitude for the contributions that the air traffic controllers of the United States make to keep the traveling public safe and the airspace of the United States running efficiently, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. WELCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. REHBERG, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MAFFEI):

H. Res. 1402. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the National Council for International Visitors, and expressing support for designation of February 16, 2011, as ''Citizen Diplomacy Day''; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

299. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Kansas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1623 urging the United States Congress to require the Environmental Protection Agency to exclude air monitoring data from use in determinations for the area of Flint Hills; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

300. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 64 urging the Congress to amend the Tenth Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 147: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 272: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 413: Mr. SCHAUER.
H.R. 442: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 460: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 716: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1194: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1205: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. WU.
H.R. 1826: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1844: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1884: Mr. SHULER, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 1925: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 2000: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 2030: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2103: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2159: Mr. HONDA, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2163: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2164: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2243: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 2305: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H.R. 2378: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2381: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2555: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2733: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3077: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 3332: Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 3486: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 3502: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3786: Mr. SCHAUER.
H.R. 3924: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 4051: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 4072: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 4128: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4195: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4287: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4296: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 4376: Mr. FILNER, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 4400: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4494: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 4538: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4568: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 4598: Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 4684: Mr. OLSON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOREN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BRIGHT, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4751: Mr. HELLER.
H.R. 4796: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 4914: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 4947: Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 4959: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4993: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 5012: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5029: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 5032: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 5034: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 5079: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5092: Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DJOU, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. INSLEE, and MR. HEINRICH.
H.R. 5096: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5126: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 5137: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5142: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 5151: Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 5157: Mr. MURPHY of New York.
H.R. 5214: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 5236: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 5258: Mr. FLAKE and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 5260: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5263: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 5268: Mr. PERRIELLO.
H.R. 5289: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5294: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 5299: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 5306: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 5339: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 5340: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 5348: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 5351: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 5353: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5354: Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 5357: Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 5374: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 5382: Mr. PENCE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 5396: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 5400: Mr. FILNER, Mr. PERRIELLO, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.J. Res. 76: Mr. JONES and Mr. WALDEN.
H. Con. Res. 261: Mr. KINGSTON.
H. Con. Res. 265: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H. Con. Res. 266: Ms. FOXX, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. INGLIS, and Mr. CONYERS.
H. Con. Res. 267: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 273: Mr. PETERSON.
H. Con. Res. 274: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H. Res. 173: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H. Res. 536: Mr. DENT and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 989: Mr. KUCINICH.
H. Res. 1052: Mr. OWENS.
H. Res. 1138: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 1207: Mr. CAMP and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H. Res. 1209: Mr. DINGELL.
H. Res. 1217: Mr. BOREN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. TANNER.
H. Res. 1251: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. TEAGUE, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 1322: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. STARK, and Mr. FILNER.
H. Res. 1343: Mrs. MALONEY.
H. Res. 1347: Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. SPEIER.
H. Res. 1349: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H. Res. 1366: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H. Res. 1370: Mr. BACA.
H. Res. 1371: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H. Res. 1374: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H. Res. 1385: Mr. SCALISE.
H. Res. 1391: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HIMES, Mr. POLIS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 1396: Mr. HARE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

139. The SPEAKER presented a petition of City of Pembroke Pines, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 3262 supporting House Resolution 4812; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

140. Also, a petition of City of Lauderdale Lakes, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 2010-25 congratulating the President for passing the Health-Care Reform Legislation; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Appropriations, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, and Rules.