United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2011 No. 22

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, February 14, 2011, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2011

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Lord God, our fortress and source of freedom, You are always attentive to our pleas. We need to be more attentive to Your response and Your commands. Or we are left to ourselves.

You are loving with those who love You. With those sincere, You show Yourself to be sincere. With the cunning, You can undo their cunning.

So shed Your light upon the House of Representatives; that step by step, in a unified effort, we may build a society where stability and creativity will flourish and we may even glimpse Your glory, both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ALTMIRE 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, when future generations look back at the 112th Congress, they should be able to remember us as the Congress that made the tough decisions that got our economy back on track and restored America to greatness. That's why I fully support the commitment to cut at least $100 billion from the President's budget. We're a country that is over $14 trillion in debt, which is placing every American, regardless of political party, at serious and increasing risk.

We're borrowing more than 40 percent of what we're spending, and my 2-year-old grandson is already $45,000 in debt. And to say that our spending is simply unsustainable, that doesn't quite capture in my mind the gravity of our situation.

To meet the deep obligation that we have to pass on to the future generations the blessings of liberty and freedom, we must act now and act decisively. That's why I'm here this morning to emphatically ask that this Congress, in this session, works together to find our way to $100 billion in cuts.

PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, the new Republican proposal to eliminate all funding for the many services provided by organizations such as Planned Parenthood are not merely anti-choice, they are also anti-health, anti-woman, and anti-poor.

The Republican proposal would eliminate the title X family planning which gives millions of American women access to primary and preventive health care. These budget cuts would deny crucial health services and cancer screening just to women. Their proposal would set up insurmountable cost barriers to family planning, just for the poor.

Their vision of smaller government would expand the government's power

Printed on recycled paper.

over a women's choices. It is wrong, it is shortsighted, and it is unjust.

Let's turn to the business of creating jobs and economic opportunity and away from the business of ruling other people's lives.

MILITARY TRIBUNALS FOR TERRORISTS ACT

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, I recently introduced legislation that ensures that foreign terrorists are tried in military courts instead of civilian courts like common criminals. Attorney General Holder originally wanted some terrorists, including the mastermind of 9/11, to be tried in a New York City courtroom. This proposal was soundly rejected on a bipartisan basis. My bill solves this problem.

The Military Tribunals for Terrorists Act requires terrorists to be prosecuted and sentenced before military courts. This is the appropriate judicial review for terrorists who kill innocent men, women, and children. Classified intelligence may be made public if terrorists are given access to trial in public courtrooms.

I urge all my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

CONGRATULATING THE GREEN BAY PACKERS ON WINNING SUPER BOWL XLV

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to fulfill my side of a friendly wager with my good friends in the Wisconsin delegation to commemorate the Green Bay Packers on winning Super Bowl XLV.

Quarterback Aaron Rodgers was flawless, throwing for more than 300 yards and three touchdowns without an interception to earn Super Bowl MVP honors. And despite playing much of the game without injured stars Charles Woodson and Donald Driver, the Packers never trailed, and ended their season by winning the trophy named after the franchise's most storied coach, Vince Lombardi.

In winning Super Bowl XLV, current Packer coach Mike McCarthy, a Pittsburgh native, led Green Bay to its 10th NFL championship, the most of any NFL franchise since the league first initiated a playoff system in 1933. Again, I offer my congratulations to the Green Bay Packers.

THE FEDERAL POLAR EXPRESS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the President announced to this Congress that he would freeze all domestic spending. But this week we heard the administration say it wants to spend billions of dollars for more high-speed rail. And that's not all. The administration wants to give wireless to everyone in the country at taxpayer expense.

It sure would be nice for all Americans to ride on fast choo choos throughout the fruited plane while reading the news on their wireless iPads, but the country's out of money. Our national debt has risen over $1.7 trillion since last year.

We need to focus on getting ourselves out of this crisis by cutting spending, not more spending. Ask the 44 million people living under the poverty level if they want their taxes to go to the administration's Federal Polar Express.

We need to cut spending, cut borrowing, cut the taxes, and cut the size of government. We are long overdue to stop subsidizing the government's special projects for its special people with money that does not exist.

And that's just the way it is.

REMEMBERING VICTIMS OF THE KLEEN ENERGY SYSTEMS EXPLOSION

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, this past Monday marked the 1-year anniversary of the disaster at the Kleen Energy Systems power plant in Middletown, Connecticut. That blast claimed six lives and injured dozens of others last February. It could have been prevented. Unsafe pipe cleaning procedures and poor ventilation helped ignite a basketball arena's worth of natural gas in an explosion that could be heard across a 30-mile radius in central Connecticut.

One of the six plant construction workers who lost their lives that day hailed from Thomaston, Connecticut, in my district, Peter Chepulis. And as we look back at the terrible events of February 7 last year, it's up to us to honor Peter's memory and those who died alongside him by ensuring that disasters like this never happen again. The cost of powering our homes and businesses should never be measured in lives. Industry and government alike failed Peter that cold winter morning, and we have much work ahead of us to right that wrong. While those who lost loved ones in Middletown a year ago will never be made whole again, we owe them our diligence and our best work to make sure that it never happens again.

□ 0910

REPUBLICAN BUDGET CUTS

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, last year we passed a 2-year $850 billion tax cut bill with the benefits skewed toward millionaires; $24 billion of that was a bonus reduction in taxes on estates of multimillionaires over and above the generous reduction that most had expected. When the bill passed, many of us asked how we were going to pay for it. Well, now we know.

This week, the Republican majority released a list of spending cuts, and look how we are going to pay for it: cuts in heating assistance for low income families, job training programs, National Institute for Health, NASA research, community health centers, and women, infant and children's nutrition programs.

Madam Speaker, the worst part is that the savings from the 70 programs slated to be cut only total $23 billion, less than the cost of the bonus estate tax changes for dead multimillionaires, a long way from the $100 billion demanded by the tea party, nowhere close to paying the $850 billion tax cut bill, and it doesn't fix the long-term structural imbalance in the Federal budget. Madam Speaker, that's not right.

LOOK BEFORE YOU LEAP

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

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise with serious concerns with the lack of debate in this House.

I was taught growing up that there is a right way and a wrong way to do things. The right way is to look before you leap. We are not today looking at the consequences of our actions. Reckless cuts are as dangerous as reckless spending.

While the Democrats talk about creating more jobs, the other side talks about the race to the bottom in fiscal cuts. Think about it. You can't create jobs by removing the foundation that creates an educated workforce. Cutting access to education won't create more jobs. Cutting job training won't create a more competitive workforce. Cutting social safety nets won't save lives.

Not having hearings on the impacts of our cuts is not a smart thing to do. That's why my granddaughter reminds me we should stop, look, and listen before we cross the street. But not the new Congress, which embraces a race to the bottom rather than informed reductions. We should look before we leap. It might save jobs and lives.

DIRECTING COMMITTEES TO REVIEW REGULATIONS FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, proceedings will now resume on the resolution (H. Res. 72) directing certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government,

particularly with respect to their effect on jobs and economic growth.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When consideration was postponed on Thursday, February 10, 2011, 4 hours of debate remained on the resolution, with 3 hours equally divided and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on the Judiciary, Agriculture, and Oversight and Government Reform, and 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the majority leader and minority leader or their designees.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Madam Speaker, 2 years ago, and 2 years into the current administration, Washington policies have not rescued our economy from crisis. In fact, they have entrenched the crisis. American workers and American companies pay the price as Washington regulations stifle job creation and slow economic recovery.

The Judiciary Committee doesn't have jurisdiction over sweeping economic regulations, but it does have jurisdiction over something that sweeps with just as much force. That is the administrative law that governs how agencies must respond to Congress and what agencies must consider before they regulate at all.

The REINS Act enables us to reassert Congress' authority over the most burdensome regulations that our agencies churn out. These are major regulations—those that impose a burden of $100 million or more on our economy.

The REINS Act requires Congress, not an unelected agency head, to decide whether regulations with massive costs become the law of the land. The Judiciary Committee has already begun hearings on the REINS Act and intends to move quickly to mark up this legislation.

Small businesses are the heart of job creation. Rather than bend to small business' needs, Washington too often rigidly demands that small businesses bend to Washington.

Overbearing one-size-fits-all Federal regulations have long been the order of the day. Small businesses cannot bear their weight. Since small businesses are the engine of job creation, it is clear what suffers—that is, jobs.

This week, I introduced the Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2011 to force Federal agencies to accommodate the needs of small businesses. Yesterday, the Judiciary Committee held a hearing on the bill, and it intends to mark up that bill soon.

Let's reform the Administrative Procedure Act, the fundamental charter for all agency rulemaking. While it is not time to retire the APA, it is past time to strengthen it with common-sense reforms. We should make permanent cost benefit analysis requirements that Presidents have developed through Executive orders. Practice has proved that cost benefit analysis improves regulatory effectiveness and lowers regulatory cost. But an Executive order, no matter how wise, can be revoked by the next resident of the White House.

Other vital reforms also must take place. Agencies' favorite and almost universal course under the APA is informal notice-and-comment rulemaking. This procedure is certainly convenient and it does have its place, but under its shelter, it has long been too easy for Big Government to impose hard-hitting rules without sufficiently vetting them. This should change. We should consider tougher requirements that agencies must demonstrate a need for regulations.

Congress and the courts provide daily proof that evidence tested with witnesses at hearings produces the best judgments. Why shouldn't agencies use formal rulemaking hearings to evaluate the need for major regulations that cost hundreds of millions of dollars?

We also should make sure the public has earlier opportunities to comment on potential agency action. Public input should come well before agency positions harden into settled, but often underinformed, judgments. Under traditional one-time notice-and-comment procedures, agency decisions are too often made before public comment even happens.

President Obama has embraced a number of these principles with both spoken and written words. So I hope we will have bipartisan support for our efforts to pass meaningful legislation that will help create jobs.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am curious about the reference and surprised that my friend, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, would come to the floor in this discussion and lift up the REINS Act as a way that we may prevent the regulations for inhibiting jobs.

□ 0920

Dear friends, under the REINS Act we would be violating the separation of powers doctrine that I am sure that Members of the Judiciary Committee, particularly my friend the chairman and ranking member for many years, would be familiar with.

The REINS Act, which we have under consideration in our committee, would be the last thing we would want to enact in this Congress to create more jobs—the last thing. I am surprised that the separations of powers doctrine is now required for me to explain on the House floor, about a 1988 case entitled Morrison v. Olson, 487 U.S. 654, that the REINS Act would be constitutionally infirm and that the REINS Act would be a terrible thing for us to do if you are serious about jobs.

Supporters of the REINS Act argue that Congress, and the chairman has said this, that Congress has delegated too much authority over the years to what they call ''unelected bureaucrats'' in the executive branch—of course, they are appointed—creating thereby a lack of accountability among Federal agencies and resulting in burdensome regulations.

The REINS Act does not address even the problem that they are arguing about. Some might argue that there is a need to strike a balance between protecting the safety and health of all Americans and fostering economic growth and job creation. But the President of the United States has already anticipated this need with his issuance just days ago of the executive order improving regulation and regulatory review. I intend to put this in the RECORD at the appropriate time. This directs agencies to consider these concerns in promulgating rules.

But the bill that the chairman of the committee refers to would not achieve this balance. Rather, it will distort the rulemaking process and will hamper implementation of every single law on the books by changing the presumption in the Congressional Review Act and requiring affirmative congressional approval for all major rules. This act will serve as a chokehold and stifle regulatory review, which may in fact be the real intent of REINS legislation.

So I must respectfully hope that all of the Members of this House will carefully review the REINS Act, which will be coming up for a vote in the committee. We have had the hearings. I would like you to all weigh in on this, because nothing could be more seriously destructive to trying to create jobs than doing what is proposed in that bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), who is chairman of the Administrative Law Subcommittee.

Mr. COBLE. I thank the distinguished chairman from Texas for yielding.

I rise in strong support, Madam Speaker, of this resolution. It has been far too long since the Congress conducted a comprehensive review of our regulatory policies and procedures. I am not here today to be a demagogue or accuser, but it appears that many of our regulations have simply become another cost of doing business in America.

My district is no different than many others. We are suffering from the recession; and while we once claimed many manufacturing and producing distinctions, a significant number of directly related jobs have either disappeared or gone elsewhere. This situation has grown so dire that the general feeling in many places in America is that if

the government wants to hold you in violation, the chances are trouble is imminent.

I support public safety, public health, safe work conditions, and other areas covered by Federal regulations; but I simply do not agree with those who feel that the only problem with our regulations is that there are not enough. This mentality, Madam Speaker, is exactly what has gone wrong with many of our regulations.

I have no doubt that if we clean up our regulatory system, new business and investment will be forthcoming in America, and I believe we can do this in such a way as to reinforce good, sound regulations. The Judiciary Committee, Madam Speaker, has jurisdiction over the Administrative Procedures Act and many other areas of the Commercial Code which can be improved without compromising consumer interests.

A lot is at stake here. And this is not a fight between businesses and their regulators. It is a fight, Madam Speaker, for the American Dream, that a business, an entrepreneur or innovator can have an idea, perhaps a dream, and then fully pursue it.

I am not implying that the sky is falling, but the reality is disappointing indeed. Our country is becoming less conducive for economic growth; and a major contributing factor, in my opinion, is the failure of our regulatory system. I hope we can change this very soon, Madam Speaker.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Courts and Administration.

Mr. COHEN. I want to thank the ranking member for the time.

Madam Speaker, my subcommittee, Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law, has had hearings on these bills, the REINS Act, as well as the regulatory reform bills that have been proposed. The REINS Act would require all measures that have a cost of $100 million or more, before their regulations go into effect, within 70 days of the promulgation of those regulations, they would have to be approved by a positive vote of this House and our equal House, the Senate, and signed by the President before they go into effect.

The reality, Madam Speaker, is this would stifle government and stifle growth, because, as we have seen, the Senate has difficulty doing much of anything within 70 days. In fact, it had difficulty doing much in 2 years. And to ask the Senate, where any one Senator can put down a slip on a judicial nomination or hold up legislation if they so choose unless they get what they desire and want, the last vestige in reality that we have in this county of ''don't ask, don't tell''—don't ask the Senator what they want and don't tell what they got—all of these regulations would be at the whim and caprice of any one individual Senator.

That is not what the American public wants. The American public wants the government to work. They want the House and Senate to work. They don't want the system in the Senate where one Senator can kill almost anything, to where ''Senator No'' can stop the government from actively promoting the general health, welfare, and safety of the American public.

Now, the REINS Act wasn't needed, apparently, during the time that George Bush was President, and yet there were more regulations and rules during that time than there have been during President Obama's time as President. It is interesting to note that my colleagues on the other side understood the separation of powers doctrine and the fact that article II allows the executive to carry out and administer the laws, and they should be able to do so.

□ 0930

But once President Obama came into office and there was financial services reform—the financial services reform we needed, because without regulations the financial services sector almost took this country into another Great Depression. They did take us into a Great Recession, costing us jobs and jobs and jobs and jobs.

The high unemployment rate is the result of the lack of regulation in the housing industry, in the financial service industry, where those two worked together to almost bring down this Nation's economy and the world's economy to where we had a day when President Bush brought us the TARP to save our economy. And in a bipartisan fashion we passed the TARP that Secretary Paulson told us we had to pass because we were on the brink, as President Bush also said, of financial collapse. Yes, financial collapse because of the lack of regulation. And yet in this Congress, the 112th, we're being asked to say that no regulations would take effect unless the House, and the Senate—that body known not for its alacrity but for its ''deliberateness''—would have to act and possibly pass something within 70 days.

Health care legislation; regulations couldn't go into effect to keep young people on their parents' insurance until they're 26 unless the Senate acted within 70 days. Preexisting conditions would continue to be an impediment for children to get insurance and to be treated. Lifetime caps would continue to exist because we couldn't get regulations approved within 70 days.

The fact is, it's the executive's responsibility to carry out the laws that the Congress passes, that Congress is not the Executive. And because Barack Obama is President is no reason to change what the Founding Fathers set up as a great document, with three separate and equal branches of government being challenged now. The REINS Act would go back to what the Founding Fathers wanted. It would go back on the Constitution, which we spent time reading on this floor—the entire Constitution—that included article II, the powers of the executive, an equal branch of government to the legislature. And the REINS Act would say that the Constitution doesn't matter; that the Congress, the legislative branch that is supposed to pass the laws, will also be a part of executing the laws.

I hold the Constitution in high regard and don't believe we should shred it because we want to have an opportunity to slow up financial regulations passed as part of the Dodd-Frank bill and health care for the American public. The whole idea of this review of regulations that we've gotten and this discussion on this floor of the House has taken this House to a place where the American public doesn't watch the Congress make laws and make improvements to create jobs and to improve the welfare of the American public, but it makes it a debating society, because we already have the power to review rules, and we do it in the Judiciary Committee and we do it in all committees. But now we're going to have reality television; and C–SPAN, instead of watching us pass laws, is going to watch us discuss what we already have been doing, always do, and are supposed to do, which is review regulations and have oversight but not veto over the executive.

So, Madam Speaker, it is with great regret that I participate in this debate because this debate is not a part of a law and an action and a bill to improve the American public but simply a political show. And with all due respect to the chairman of the committee and the members who have brought this legislation, it violates the Constitution, which we read. That shouldn't have been a show. That should have been something we held deeply to our hearts. This violates the Constitution and the powers of article II.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Speaker, I just want to point out to my friends on the other side of the aisle and to those who are watching this debate that both Supreme Court Justice Breyer and well-known and well-regarded Professor Larry Tribe have written supporting the constitutional basis of the REINS Act. It is clearly constitutional. It is clearly going to create jobs. By the way, that's as opposed to the new health care bill, which the CBO said yesterday was actually going to cost 800,000 jobs.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Nation is overregulated. You talk to any business owner, small or big, one of the first things they will talk to you about is the massive amount of Federal regulations that are imposed on them, many of them making no sense but costing

them money. Of course, that cost is always transferred down to the consumer, the American citizen.

I have tried to find out in the last few days how many regulations there are. Nobody knows. We can't find anybody in Washington that can give us an exact number of how many. One person that I trust said that there are over 300,000 Federal regulations that have punitive fines for failure to abide by that regulation. That's a lot of regulations.

It seems to me—and this is just my opinion—that down the street where the bureaucrats work in those offices—and we don't know who those people are—they get up every morning; they go into a room; they sit around a big conference table, drink coffee, and they say, ''Who can we regulate today?'' And they write out another regulation and pass it down to the fruited plain and make the American citizen comply with that regulation.

Some regulations are probably pretty good. Some probably are not so good. And it's our duty as representatives of the people to control and regulate the regulators. That is our job. I believe that is our constitutional requirement since we allow these agencies to exist in the administration.

It seems to me the Federal Government should help business, not get in the way of business. And we should start our job of doing away with burdensome regulations that don't help the country.

This law allows Congress to review, by means of an expedited legislative process, Federal regulations issued by the government agencies and by passage of a joint resolution to overrule a regulation. We should have oversight over those regulations.

The health care bill is probably a pretty good example of this overregulation. Regardless of where we are on that issue, it brings about new massive, expensive regulations. Section 906 of H.R. 3590 will require business owners to submit a separate 1099 form for every single business transaction that they have with another business that totals more than $600 a year. What that means, you've got a business and they deal with other businesses. If they deal with them more than $600 a year, which many businesses do, they've got to file a 1099 form.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. It's expensive regulation that makes no sense. Why should all this paperwork be sent up to Washington so bureaucrats can review it? I don't understand the logic. It makes no sense. It costs money.

But the bill also requires 16,000 new IRS agents to oversee the individual mandate requirement that every person must comply with. I think that mandate is unconstitutional. The Supreme Court will eventually decide. But why do we need 16,000 new IRS regulation agents under the health care bill? I think that's overregulation. And, in fact, the Congressional Budget Office, as my friend, the chairman from Texas, said, Director Elmendorf yesterday testified that the health care bill will cost 800,000 jobs for Americans. He said that yesterday. So the bill is not going to help the economy. It's not going to help get jobs. It's going to cost us 800,000 jobs.

These are some reasons why I think Congress has the obligation to review the regulatory process and to get our house in order and probably eliminate a few of those 300,000 expensive regulations that are imposed upon businesses and on citizens.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 0940

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

In the time allotted to the Judiciary Committee, Judge POE, if he is still here, has raised two specific grievances about overregulation diminishing job opportunity. One was on the 1099 form, which I am going to examine more carefully; and the other was about the fact that the Health Care Reform Act frequently, derogatorily, is referred to as the ObamaCare Act, but which I call the ObamaCare Act because I think it's going to go down in history as a major accomplishment of the President's within the first 2 years of his office.

He said it would cost 800,000 jobs. I would like to ask him or anyone in the House for any evidence that there is an 800,000 jobs expense. The health care bill that both sides refer to as ObamaCare now creates jobs because we're adding many more people to the health care system, which, ladies and gentlemen, is going to require more doctors, more nurses, more clinics, more hospitals.

How on Earth can we expand the provisions of health care, which incidentally should apply to every American in this country, and then say that it's going to reduce the number of jobs?

I think that logic defies explanation, but I would yield to anybody who would like to explain it to me.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank my friend, the ranking member, for yielding.

The source of the information that I have used and that Judge POE has used in saying that the health care bill is going to cost 800,000 jobs is from a report released yesterday by the Congressional Budget Office, saying that the health care bill would cost 800,000 jobs.

The CBO, as we all know, is an independent, credible, outside agency upon whom we rely for information on a regular basis. For them to come out and say that the health care bill is going to cost 800,000 jobs is, quite frankly, believable and the reason, I think, we can cite them as a credible source.

Mr. CONYERS. Reclaiming my time, I frequently cite them as a credible source myself; but would the chairman of the committee explain how we insure millions more people and then have fewer and fewer jobs?

Did the CBO explain anything about this job loss and about how the health care system would be considerably expanded but would at the same time lose jobs and would do it with fewer people? Would the chairman of the committee assist me in understanding that apparent disconnect?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I can't explain the disconnect because I don't think there is a disconnect.

We can certainly supply you with the testimony that was offered by the CBO yesterday in which they said it would cost 800,000 jobs. We'll look for a copy of that testimony, or the other Judiciary staff members might be able to supply us with a copy of that as well.

I don't think there is a disconnect. I believe the CBO. I do believe that the health care bill is going to cost 800,000 jobs.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlelady from Houston, Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, a senior member of the committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank Mr. CONYERS for yielding as I think it is important that we explain to our colleagues what we're doing here.

Madam Speaker, this is part of a 7- or 9-hour marathon for committees of jurisdiction to come to the floor to respond to how important it is to, in essence, clog up the government. It sounds pretty, and it sounds attractive to be able to suggest that we have not been exercising due diligence as relates to the regulatory process of the executive branch.

My colleague from Tennessee was right: when we cite the Constitution, what we are saying is that the Founding Fathers recognized the importance of three distinct branches:

The legislative writes legislation. It has the right to oversight, and those who are part of this body are elected to represent certain perspectives.

The executive is elected by all of the people, electing the President of the United States.

The third branch, the judiciary, has oversight.

So what we have taken to the floor to do is to spend 9 hours in redundancy, talking about what this body should be doing anyhow. We have the responsibility of oversight. We have the ability to question regulations in regular order; but what we will be doing is ignoring the people's business of creating jobs and, frankly, putting ourselves in the role of a clogged toilet, meaning

that we are doing nothing, that we are stuffed up.

I would make the argument that the REINS Act, maybe through good intentions, is a dilatory tactic that keeps us from doing our work. As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, let me give you a few examples.

One of the subcommittees I have the privilege of sitting on—and I thank Chairman SMITH for designing this committee again—is a committee dealing with competitiveness. What could be more important than assessing whether or not this country is losing its competitiveness to countries around the world or that corporations are doing noncompetitive acts that cause us to lose jobs?

I am not happy with the United-Continental merger. We've just lost jobs in Houston—500 of them. I would prefer our continuing to have oversight over whether these large-type mergers cause us to lose jobs. There are any number of merging industries that believe that's the best way to go, and therefore I would welcome that opportunity.

Mr. CONYERS, I understand that the mayor of New York is suggesting that Germany should take over Wall Street. I'm offended. I'm hurt. Not that I have anything against Germany, but I know that there is a type of intellectual property that is possessed: if nothing else, the pride of Wall Street as it relates to the body politic of finance in this country and around the world. I would like to have a hearing as to whether or not that is detrimental to the loss of jobs or whether, in fact, it diminishes the competitiveness of this Nation. That is what the Judiciary Committee has powers to do.

If you put this bill in place—and I don't mind conceding that something is going to pass—I hope that there is a thought process that recognizes that staff has indicated to us that last year, under this rule, there were 94 major regulations that this body would have to attend to. So we would have had to eliminate our work on food safety; we would have had to eliminate our work on Wall Street reform; we would have had to eliminate our work on ensuring that Americans get good health care, all in order to stop the work of this body to address a regulation that we would have every right in an oversight process to handle.

Then, as a member of the Crime Subcommittee, I want you to be aware of the fact that I've been told by representatives of the Federal Bureau of Prison that our Federal prisons now house more convicted international and domestic terrorists than Guantanamo Bay. Yet we are at a hiring freeze. We don't have enough Federal Bureau of Prisons corrections officers. As the rising inmate population—nothing that I'm proud of—continues to grow, the ratio of Federal prisons correction officers diminishes.

□ 0950

You can see it in a tragedy in Washington State: Not enough officers in a State prison, and a prison officer is killed. We need to have hearings on how we can address the crisis in the Federal Bureau of Prisons. I might say, they would add jobs. We need more individuals there to protect those who are serving their country as being part of the Federal Bureau of Prisons system, creating jobs. Why are we not attending to that?

When you have to address major regulation and stop the business of this House to either hold a hearing in committee or in 15 days discharge to the floor, we have to debate it on the floor, that's what we will be doing, rather than engaging in the legislative process. We write the laws, and I might say that I have a great deal of respect for the CBO, but I also know that they are not without vulnerabilities, and they are not without imperfection. If there's 800,000 jobs being lost, are they being lost throughout industry because of certain requirements and then, on the other hand, some 3 million-plus jobs may be created because of the access to health care and the increase in resources for more doctors and nurses, health technicians, providing scholarship dollars, more community health clinics that will employ people—it doesn't make sense. It's an oxymoron to suggest that you're going to have a finite loss of 800,000 but you're not going to be able to increase.

Let me add, I'm on Judiciary, and this is what we're here for. I've already cited to that I'd like the Competition Subcommittee to be addressing the questions of whether mergers are still good for America and the working people; whether or not our intellectual property that is being hacked and stolen is diminishing the ability for American workers to work; whether or not even entertaining selling Wall Street is a rational approach to take.

And then let me get on a more controversial subject. Someone would make the argument now this couldn't be a job creator, but we have been frustrated by the immigration system for now the lifetime of my tenure in Congress. We have had the pros and cons, or we have been mad at the 1996 reform and the 1980s reform. Some of us have continued to press one refrain: That we must do security, border security, and also a comprehensive approach to immigration. Some would argue that that absolutely cannot create jobs, but I will tell you, why are we not fully addressing the broken immigration system in this Nation? If we pull at the heartstrings of many Members of Congress, who will proudly speak of their German heritage, their Irish heritage, their Hispanic, Latino heritage, African American heritage, Asian heritage, heritage from all around the world, they will point to the fact that they came from somewhere.

We understand that if we can regularize this broken immigration system, not only do we have individuals legitimately investing in America through Social Security and taxes, but immigrants, new immigrants also create jobs for others, and it builds an economy. The agricultural economy, for example, that is playing hide and seek with workers who they have to hire—hide and seek, because they don't have a regularized system. Our agricultural industry, one of the greatest in the world, in fact the greatest—we can feed the world. I applaud our family farmers and the industry that has grown. I've always admired being able to do something with the land.

We could be addressing an immigration reform system that puts people to work, that allows the agricultural industry to grow and thrive and build jobs. In fact, I was listening to a colleague from the other side of the aisle who indicated he had come out of the agricultural industry, has a farm or land that is doing agricultural work, and he said that we have not been hampered by the economy; we are thriving, we could grow. So if we put an immigration system in place, the work of the Judiciary Committee, we create jobs. Isn't that what we're supposed to be doing?

So I ask my colleagues, as my ranking member has said, to thoughtfully think of this particular resolution, the REINS Act. It is truly that. I would add that it will strangle with the reins the work of this body and the work of the Judiciary Committee, and it will not create any jobs. We will be stifled, dead in our tracks, working with one regulation after another.

What I'd like to say: If you have got a bad regulation, send it to the Judiciary Committee. We can handle it, but I don't want to see corporations getting away with criminal activity, which we could address in the Subcommittee on Crime. I don't want to see us getting away with food safety problems because we're not addressing it.

Madam Speaker, let me just say, this is a lot of great intentions, and I have a great respect for my colleagues. This institution is one that I love, but I frankly believe we can do better in this House, and the President of the United States and the administration don't deserve this. What we do deserve is a hard fight to reduce the deficit and to build on jobs and to serve the people back home who are struggling with their own problems and need this government to respond to the needs of education, health care and science, and many other issues.

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

Madam Speaker, I just want to say to my Texas colleague who just spoke that I know and appreciate how strongly she feels about saving jobs in Houston, creating jobs in Houston, as I do, too, but we heard yesterday from the CBO that this new health care bill is going to cost America 800,000 jobs. And it just so happens if you prorate that out, that would mean that the new health care bill will cost Houston, Texas, around 600 jobs, and of course, it

will cost other communities around the country jobs as well. So the best way to try to save jobs in Houston, the best way to try to prevent jobs from being lost in Houston, would be to vote to repeal the health care bill.

Now, the gentlewoman from Texas also raised the subject of immigration. I wasn't aware that that was connected to this bill, but I'm also happy to reply to her comments about that subject as well. Today in America, there are roughly 7 million people who are working illegally in this country. They are taking jobs that should go to the 26 million Americans who are either unemployed or underemployed. So, once again, if we want to create jobs for Americans in this country, one way to do so would be to make sure that only legal workers are employed in this country, and we have ways to accomplish that end.

Madam Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY), who is the vice chairman of the Administrative Law Subcommittee.

Mr. GOWDY. I rise in support of H. Res. 72, but I also want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) for not only his leadership on this issue but also the judicious way in which he leads our Committee on the Judiciary.

The Constitution gives Congress limited but critical functions. The very same Constitution that we all swore an allegiance to when we took the oath, the very same Constitution that we read when we started the 112th Congress, gives important, limited, critical functions to Congress, and one of those functions is to pass laws that are easily understood and reasonably enforced. It is not the function of this body to merely pass broad ideas and leave it up to someone else, an unelected official in the executive branch, to fill in the details.

And make no mistake, I do not blame those in the executive branch. I blame the Congress of the United States for abdicating its responsibility. Nature abhors a vacuum, and one look at our code of Federal regulations—and I encourage anyone, anyone who challenges this or doubts it, go to your local library and look at the code of Federal regulations, and you will see that that vacuum created by this body has been more than filled by the executive branch.

The labyrinth that has become this Nation's regulatory scheme has exported jobs, imported litigation, all the while eroding the very limited amount of public trust that is left in the institutions of government.

We had a witness, Madam Speaker, in Judiciary yesterday, and I asked him a very simple question: When you get a call from a member of the executive branch who works with a regulatory agency, is your first impression that he or she is there to help or to accuse? And this representative of middle America, a businessman from Kentucky, without hesitation said, They are there to accuse. It is an adversarial relationship between the regulators and our business creators.

□ 1000

We do not and should not leave it to the FBI to decide what is bank robbery. We do not and should not leave it to the Drug Enforcement Administration to decide which controlled substances under title 21 should be criminalized or not. That is a function of this body. The executive branch does not write laws, at least not yet, in this Republic. Yet we let other regulatory agencies decide the very details that either create or destroy the environment that is conducive to creating jobs.

While other Congresses may have delegated and abdicated, we must reclaim the responsibility to govern and legislate, and the accountability that is attendant thereto. H. Res. 72 does exactly that, and I am pleased to rise in its support.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the ranking member, and I thank the chairman as well.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and I have worked together on the immigration issue. And I would beg to differ. It is well documented that regularized individuals in certain industries would, in fact, create jobs and create investment into this country as well. But as you have one person working, that person generates the opportunity for another. In construction jobs, for example, when you are involved in construction and have the right trained person, it creates expanded jobs.

But I also want to make mention that as it may have been cited, the 600 jobs lost because, allegedly, of a CBO report, I know that 500 jobs have been lost because of a merger between two major giants in the aviation industry. And, frankly, I am hopeful that we could focus on whether that is one of the diminishing aspects of mergers, that individuals do lose jobs.

But I will also say to you that we have documentation here that 1.1 million private sector jobs have been created since the enactment of health care reform. I mentioned 3 million jobs in my statement; 1.1 million private sector jobs have already been created; 207,000 jobs in the health care industry have been created since the enactment of the health care reform.

Under the past administration, President Bush, 673,000 private sector jobs were lost, and this was the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The claim that the health care reform law would cost 800,000 jobs, or has, is misconstrued because last year's debate showed that the health care bill will save taxpayers billions of dollars and give consumers more better access to health care. In fact, private sector job growth has been strong since the enactment of health care. Again, 1.1 million jobs have been created.

So we will have a constant debate about numbers, but I think there is a vigorous debate on how these jobs could be lost. The real issue is, this is the Judiciary Committee, to protect the rights of the American people. And I have cited, and the ranking member has cited, and Mr. COHEN has cited ways that we can be constructive to create jobs in America, to protect the consumer, and to ensure that competition is fair and healthy. And I would, Madam Speaker, simply ask my colleagues to engage in that kind of work as opposed to work that will take up the time of this body and delay us from doing the people's work and providing justice for all.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. ROSS of Florida. I thank the chairman for this opportunity.

Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong support of House Resolution 72. Now more than ever, regulatory reform is needed. Agencies have expanded their authority to levels far beyond what was ever intended, in circumvention of the legislative process.

At a time of record unemployment, the last thing businesses, and in particular, our small businesses, need are burdensome regulations and added compliance costs. Why would we make it harder for our job creators to expand and grow? Shouldn't we create an environment that fosters prosperity, innovation, and global marketplace competitiveness?

For example, in my home State of Florida, we have what's known as Numeric Nutrient Water Criteria that is being thrust upon us by EPA, a regulatory law that is supported by nothing but junk science, not accepted principles of science. And yet what it's going to do is cost my citrus industry $325 million in initial compliance costs. It is going to cost my agricultural industry anywhere from $855 million to $3 billion in initial costs, with an annual impact of $1.1 billion to Florida's overall economy and over 14,000 jobs lost. Those jobs, lost in an economy like this. In Florida, water is our livelihood. We can regulate our own control of water. We believe in clean water. But we need to have a voice in what is happening to us with these regulatory controls.

Is it fair for an unelected regulatory agency like the EPA to have unchecked rulemaking authority and prevent Florida's job creators from employing hardworking citizens in need of jobs? We are regulating jobs out of existence. Would those who promote more regulatory control not be satisfied until we have choked the last breath out of our American economy and our American job market because of too much regulatory control?

Massive oversight is needed, and I applaud congressional efforts to reform the current out-of-control regulatory process. The REINS Act, the Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act, and the Administrative Procedure Act reforms are necessary. They will provide transparency to a rulemaking process and give businesses, large and small, proper due process in agency decisions that greatly affect them. They are the important first steps that will allow businesses the ability to grow, our citizens to work, and our economy to flourish.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes of the time that I have remaining to the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SMITH. I appreciate that very much.

I wanted to suggest that the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, raised the criticism about the new 1099 rule being a job-killer. And apparently, he and the President are in agreement on the rule expanding reporting requirements to include transactions of $600 or more. President Obama has stated that he is open to reconsidering these rules in light of the burden that it brings on small business. So I would like to suggest that there is at least one point of accord. There may be others between the members of the Judiciary Committee in the consideration of the matter before us.

Now I return to the assertion that the health care bill, proudly referred to by some on this side of the aisle as ObamaCare, that this bill will cost 800,000 jobs. And I would like to suggest that this misleading figure has been floating around since last summer. This is why The Hill article on the CBO today said, ''GOP jumps on old job numbers.'' What CBO said last summer was that if health insurance is affordable, a person who is working a bad job just to keep health care might be able to leave the job.

Surely we wouldn't want a person who is suffering from a preexisting disability, who would be covered under this expanded health care law, to keep on working when the only reason he was working in the first place was to get the health care that was otherwise, until now, unavailable.

□ 1010

If people can get health insurance despite preexisting conditions, then such folks might be able to leave their work. I'm sure that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle wouldn't have any objection to that. Yes, it might reduce the number of people working, but it would save lives. That's what health care is about. A person who is not eligible for Medicare because he or she was under 65 might choose to retire and get private insurance instead of staying on the job until Medicare becomes available. Others who needed to work a second job just to afford health care may not now need to do it because we have made health care more affordable.

For goodness sake, I can't imagine that anybody under the example that I have used would be opposed to a person leaving a job under that circumstance. That does not mean that that is costing jobs in America. It's saving lives.

[From the Healthwatch—The Hill's Healthcare Blog, Feb. 10, 2011]

GOP JUMPS ON OLD CBO JOB NUMBERS

(By Jason Millman)

Eager to exploit an opening to attack the healthcare reform law, Republicans on Thursday touted testimony by Congress' budget scorekeeper that the law would result in 800,000 fewer people working.

Congressional Budget Office Director Doug Elmendorf first made the projection last summer, but it didn't stop Republicans from circulating his Thursday comments during a House Budget Committee hearing as fresh proof that the reform law ''destroys'' jobs.

''The Verdict Is In: CBO Confirms New Health Care Law Will Cost Jobs,'' was the title of a Senate Republican Conference press release.

''CBO: ObamaCare Will Destroy 800,000 Jobs,'' was the headline from the National Republican Congressional Committee.

However, the CBO prediction is a little more nuanced. Last summer's CBO report said the projected labor reduction is ''largely'' the result of more people voluntarily staying out of the workforce because the healthcare reform law gives them better healthcare options through an expansion of Medicaid and new state-run health insurance exchanges.

From the report:

''The expansion of Medicaid and the availability of subsidies through the exchanges will effectively increase beneficiaries' financial resources. Those additional resources will encourage some people to work fewer hours or to withdraw from the labor market.''

Further, a ban on discriminating against preexisting conditions will likely ''increase the appeal'' of health insurance plans offered outside the workplace for older workers.

''As a result,'' CBO said, ''some older workers will choose to retire earlier than they otherwise would.''

Rep. Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.), the ranking member on the Budget Committee asked Elmendorf to explain the report on Thursday.

''One of the impacts you said was that there will be some individuals who, because they can get their health care through the exchange . . . would now have the freedom to choose to not get a job simply because they needed the health care,'' Van Hollen said, according to a transcript from CQ. ''Isn't that correct?''

''Yes, that's right,'' Elmendorf replied.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just want to point out that the figure we have been using that the health care bill is going to cost 800,000 jobs is not necessarily an old figure. Or maybe I should concede it's a day old, because that figure came from yesterday's testimony by the Budget Director in front of the Budget Committee. I said Budget Director. Let me read the statement:

''Testifying today before the House Budget Committee, Congressional Budget Office Director Doug Elmendorf confirmed that ObamaCare is expected to reduce the number of jobs in the labor market by an estimated 800,000 people.''

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

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

Here are excerpts from the exchange. In response to a couple of questions by Members of Congress, the last question was from Representative JOHN CAMPBELL of California, the Director of the CBO said in response to a question, ''Is it going to cost 800,000 jobs?'' his one-word answer was ''yes.''

So those are fresh figures, they are accurate figures, and I think we need to be very acutely aware of just how many jobs the new health care plan is going to cost.

Madam Speaker, I would now like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN), who is also a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 72 because I believe that a number of regulations issued by Federal agencies are stifling job creation. And, from the sound of it, President Obama agrees. On January 18 of this year, President Obama issued an executive order stating that, quote, our regulatory system must promote economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation. I agree with the President on all those points.

Some regulations are critical to protect our health and provide a safe place to live and work, but there are a number of regulations affecting job creators, including small businesses and community banks. These regulations are overly burdensome, repetitive, and just plain don't make sense. Not a day goes by without one of my constituents complaining over the EPA's overreaching policies. The administration is trying to do through regulations what it couldn't get passed into law. As a result, job creators spend their money complying with these burdensome regulations—money that should be used to create jobs, money that should be used to invest in research, in capital improvements, and money that should be used to spur innovation. For example, job creators are spending money planning for more burdensome EPA regulations on boilers; boilers used every day to heat schools and businesses. And now the EPA wants to apply the oil spill law to force dairy farmers to spend millions of dollars preparing for spilled milk, because of the amount of fat in it. What if it's skim milk? If it wasn't so troubling, it might be funny.

On top of this, regulations yet to be written inject uncertainty into the economy, further stifling job creation. Uncertainty over renewable tax credits, for example, is forcing a Little Rock company back home in my district to stop building wind turbines because they don't know if they can sell them.

I've heard concerns back home over the lack of transparency from unelected Federal workers that have never met the folks in Arkansas and they've never held a town hall. They don't hold town halls before they write these regulations, yet they pass the equivalent of laws every day.

We can do better. Let's seek commonsense solutions to our problems and stop the Federal Government from killing jobs.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, the American people and American employers know what Washington has not learned: too many regulations impose too many costs and cost too many jobs. The Judiciary Committee is working hard on the reforms we need to tame Washington and unleash American businesses to create jobs. We should pass the REINS Act, pass the Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act, reform the Administrative Procedure Act and the practice of too many regulations with too many costs for too few benefits.

Madam Speaker, I think this debate really comes down to a very simple question. There are those who favor a government of regulations and there are those of us who feel that Congress should oversee and approve the most burdensome regulations. Any Member of Congress who feels that Congress should oversee and approve the most burdensome regulations, I believe, will support this bill.

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

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today's effort is driven by a simple goal: to ensure every area of the Federal Government is dedicated to job creation. If we are to get the Nation back to work, we all must work together to remove barriers to economic growth and prosperity.

Every job matters, and every effort to help create a new job matters. The American people have demonstrated a relentless determination to make the difficult choices necessary to get through these tough times. We should do no less.

Employers need certainty, flexibility, and freedom to expand their businesses and hire new workers. Red tape should not tie down economic growth, and onerous regulations should not be roadblocks to job creation. Congress can no longer accept sweeping changes that affect the lives of students and workers without first determining whether it is good for our long-term competitiveness, good for job creators, and good for our economy.

We were sent here to focus on getting the economy back on track and the American people back to work. Today we are moving forward with our commitment to do just that. In my conversations with constituents, I have seen the desperation that follows months of searching in vain for work. I also have witnessed the hope that is renewed at the prospect of future employment.

Everyone agrees you need rules of the road and commonsense protections; bad actors will always exist, and they must be held accountable for breaking the law. But we shouldn't accept lost wages, lost jobs, and lost opportunities as inevitable consequences to advancing fairness, accountability, and responsibility.

□ 1020

The Education and Workforce Committee oversees a broad range of policies that affect the Nation's workplaces and classrooms. A number of those policies will be discussed by other leaders of the committee in a few moments.

In the time remaining for myself, I would like to discuss one area in particular that deserves closer examination. Is the Federal Government using its authority fairly and on behalf of American workers, or is it pursuing a partisan agenda that makes our workplaces less competitive?

The National Labor Relations Board is an independent Federal agency created by Congress more than 75 years ago. The NLRB is charged with preventing and remedying unfair labor practices and establishing whether employees desire union representation. Its responsibility is to fairly protect the rights of workers against unlawful encroachments by employers and unions.

Unfortunately, the board has recently shown an eagerness to tilt the playing field in favor of powerful special interests. A culture of union favoritism has seized the board, with consequences that reach into virtually every workplace. Stripping workers of their right to a secret ballot through a backdoor card check scheme is just one looming threat. The board also has threatened legal action against States seeking to protect the secret ballot, and it has diminished safeguards for employers. We cannot allow the board to rewrite the rules of the game to circumvent the will of Congress in pursuit of its own job-destroying agenda.

This same culture of union favoritism has also swept across the administration, expanding protections for big labor at the expense of rank-and-file workers. Project labor agreements and high road contracting sound innocent enough, but they put small businesses and the vast majority of their workers at a disadvantage—at the expense of the taxpayers, I might add.

These are the kinds of policies that should be examined to determine whether they undermine economic growth. Our efforts will not be blinded by partisanship. If we learn of a rule or regulation that stands in the way of a strong workforce, regardless of the Congress or administration that put it in place, we will take a look at it. This is a critically important responsibility, and I look forward working with every Member of Congress to get it done.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, as we meet this morning, there are 15 million unemployed people in our country. And what I'm hearing from our constituents is they want us to work together to find ways to help the job generators of this country, small businesses and entrepreneurs, to put Americans back to work.

Here we are again, really, just having a political discussion that doesn't hire a person, help a company, or really go anywhere. Frankly, the majority has gone from ignoring the unemployment problem to worsening it in the last couple of days. In the 5 weeks that they've been in the majority, there has not been one bill, not one word, not 1 hour of debate on a bill that would create jobs in the American economy. Instead, what we've had is a series of political exercises that have ignored their promise to ''focus like a laser beam on job creation.''

Now, the problem has gotten worse this week, and it will get worse as the day goes on with the announcement of the majority's plan to finish out the budget year with massive cuts in the budget.

Now, let me say from the outset, we agree completely that sensible spending restraint is necessary to reverse our trend of deficit and debt and help the American people and the American economy, and we look forward to working with our friends in the Republican Party to make this a reality. But one of the areas that is being considered for up to a 30 percent cut is education.

Now, the Federal Government spends education money on essentially five things: We help the most disadvantaged children in the country learn how to read and do mathematics through Title I; we help children confronted with a learning disability, with Downs Syndrome or autism, get special education services through the IDEA; there are scholarships and student loans for people of all descriptions to get a higher education at a college or a tech school; there are programs for someone who's lost his job at an oil refinery or her job at a bank to be retrained for their next job; and there's a small but crucial amount of money that helps our teachers become better

instigators of science education or math education and instill in the next generations the hunger to learn and the power to achieve.

You need not listen to Members of Congress about the consequences of these kinds of cuts. Listen to the job generators of our country. Listen to Andrew Liveris, the leader of the Dow Chemical Company, who, as part of the business roundtable report in December, said the following, and I quote. ''I think if you had to go to the easy ones, education is a sweet spot for the government, for Congress and for all of us. If we don't get a well-educated workforce back in this country, if we don't invest in science, technology, engineering and math, if we don't pull it all together,'' he goes on to say, ''there will be trouble.'' And he further says, so what we've got to do is ''have a sustained investment, government and public companies together, private partnerships in education.''

This is not the Democratic leader of the House. This is not President Obama's administration. This is the leader of Dow Chemical Company saying that to grow jobs in America and win global economic competition, we need to invest in education.

The majority's taking us in exactly the wrong direction. Proposing cuts of up to 30 percent in education programs will be on the floor next week. So, sadly, they've moved from ignoring the jobs problem to worsening it.

We want to work together with the Republican Party and with Independents to find ways to empower small businesses and entrepreneurs to put our country back to work. We've spent 9½ hours in this debate talking about something else. Let's get on with this debate, get on to business, put the American people back to work.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, before I yield to the gentlelady from North Carolina, I feel compelled to respond for just a minute to the remarks of my good friend from New Jersey that underscores the fundamental difference here.

We believe that the issues that we have been talking about and are talking about today and will be talking about next week strike directly to the problem of unemployment and the lack of jobs in this country. Without fiscal responsibility, without addressing the exploding debt, without addressing the job-killing health care plan, which we've done, and without addressing the blizzard of regulations that are coming out of this administration and every industry, we're not going to be able to create those jobs. It's a fundamental difference.

The debate will go on, but clearly we believe, and I believe, that we are directly addressing jobs because we found out over the last few years, certainly the last 2 years, that spending billions and hundreds of billions and trillions of dollars does not, in fact, put America back to work.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 72, which directs certain House committees to review the effect of Federal regulations on job creation and economic growth.

Last year, the Department of Education published a proposed regulation that sets a Federal definition of ''gainful employment'' and requires certain institutions of higher education to seek the Department's approval before creating new educational programs. This regulation will likely eliminate hundreds of course offerings and degree-granting programs at proprietary and nonprofit institutions of higher education, preventing students from having access to these programs and, often, to careers that will ensure that the United States remains competitive.

Access and affordability remain important pieces of the higher education discussion. As voters resoundingly underscored in November, the Federal Government should be focused on accountability for taxpayer money, but that responsibility should not come at the expense of educational opportunities for students.

□ 1030

Thomas Donohue, the president and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in a recent speech on the ''State of American Business,'' listed the gainful employment regulation as a prime example of Federal overreach. He pointed out that, if permitted to become final, the regulation would deny students access to colleges and universities across the country.

Fewer students receiving the education and gaining the skills necessary to get a high-skilled, high-paying job means fewer people entering the workforce. While the proprietary school sector is a diverse group of institutions, many of these colleges and universities serve individuals who are looking for short-term education or seeking certifications that can be obtained in a year or less. These are exactly the types of educational programs that provide individuals with new skills that can immediately be put to use in today's dynamic workplace.

One of the many benefits of the proprietary school sector is its ability to create quickly new programs to train students to help the local population meet the labor shortages of a particular area. Many of these institutions have advisory boards composed of key business leaders in the program areas offered by the institution. The proposed gainful employment regulation will take away that flexibility by requiring the Federal Government's approval for every new program created at a proprietary institution.

While we can all agree that we do not want bad programs to exist, this regulation paints an entire sector of higher education with the same brush and does nothing to give incentives to institutions to improve their student outcomes. This regulation could also have a disproportionate impact on programs that serve low-income students who may need to borrow more funding under Federal student loan programs to pay for their education.

In either case, colleges and universities will have difficulty enrolling students into educational courses that prepare them for careers. The gainful employment regulation is the exact opposite of what the Federal Government needs to be pushing during an economic downturn.

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

Once again, instead of working to rebuild our country and create jobs, this House of Representatives is engaged in a debate on a measure that offers neither. For 10 hours and 2 days, the House of Representatives' time is tied up on a motion telling our committees to perform their constitutional duties.

We understand that vigorous oversight and rooting out inefficiencies and waste are absolutely essential, and they are our duties and we must perform them on behalf of the taxpayer. That's not a question. We know that. In fact, on January 15, the Education and Workforce Committees unanimously approved an oversight plan. That plan calls for review of regulations. This resolution calls for review of regulations.

Today's debate is duplicative. It is duplicative of our oversight plans. It is unnecessary and a total waste of taxpayers' dollars. Worse yet, we are taking away valuable time when we could be rolling up our sleeves, getting the number one priority of the American people in front of us: creating jobs.

For instance, the Education and Workforce Committee could be responding to the very real skills crisis that our Nation's workers and businesses are facing. A recent article in the Washington Post found that, in November, there were an estimated 3.2 million job opportunities across the country. However, businesses interviewed by the Washington Post with ''help wanted'' signs were struggling to find workers with sufficient skills. This is in the United States of America. This has crippled their ability to keep the line running and keep their doors open. This is a major disconnect, Madam Speaker, a disconnect that must be explored and it must be quickly addressed.

Certain sectors, such as health care and technology, are projected to grow considerably over the next decade. These sectors actually require more skilled workers, not fewer. That's why our committees should be back in our committee rooms right now looking to ensure the connection between employers that want to hire and workers can be fulfilled. That means looking at training and education programs that connect to the jobs available today and in the future.

At a time when jobs are important, this shortfall means lost economic opportunity for millions of Americans. It means a shortfall of businesses that

want to make it in America, with American workers.

Now, when it comes to reviewing regulations, I have heard some disturbing views from the other side of the aisle recently. I refuse to accept the argument that our Nation's health and safety protections need to be reduced to the level of China's in order to compete.

There is a reason why the law of the land ensures basic health and safety protections on the job, and that reason is too often written in the blood of dead workers.

Rolling back protections to satisfy powerful special interests at the expense of worker safety is a fool's errand. Relying on faulty one-sided studies that exaggerate the cost of worker safety regulations while excluding any of the benefits, such as the life of a family's breadwinner, leads to a dishonest debate.

We have seen the deadly results of failing to properly regulate. We have seen what happens when you rely on self-certification, voluntary compliance, and inadequate protections. Eleven workers die when an oil rig blows up in the Gulf of Mexico. Workers die over and over again on massive construction projects on the Las Vegas Strip. Fourteen workers die in a sugar refinery outside Savannah, Georgia, because there are no protections covering combustible dust.

There are 700 workers losing their jobs in North Carolina because loopholes in OSHA regulations allow a massive factory explosion to happen. The explosion killed three and injured more than 50 workers; and that factory is now relocating rather than rebuilding, dealing this community a double tragedy.

Madam Speaker, without proper regulation and enforcement, workers are misclassified as independent contractors, robbing them of benefits, robbing our Nation's Treasury, and putting law breakers at an unfair advantage over law-abiding employers. And workers' hard-earned pensions are gambled away.

We have the best workers in the world, and these workers deserve basic protections. Our Nation's workers also deserve a Congress devoted to growing and strengthening the middle class, not meaningless debate like today's.

I urge this Congress, get to the business of the American people without delay. The business of this Congress should be about jobs, and the business of this Congress should be about rebuilding our Nation's competitiveness, and that business should begin now. We cannot afford any further delays or distractions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the chair of the Workforce Protection Subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, last November the people of Michigan, workers that long defined manufacturing, sent a message to Washington that business as usual in this town is not working.

Currently, the unemployment rate in my home State is at 11.7 percent and even higher in some counties in my Seventh Congressional District.

Over the past 2 years, we have witnessed burdensome laws being imposed on businesses and still feel the threat of costly regulation that prevents companies from growing and hiring. Small businesses are the engine of job creation in this country. Even the current administration believes ''that they bear a disproportionate share of Federal regulatory burden.''

The Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration reports the total cost of Federal regulation has increased to $1.75 trillion. The cost per employee for businesses with fewer than 20 workers now averages $10,585. A Heritage Foundation study found last year alone the Federal Government issued 43 major regulations, with costs estimated in tens of billions of dollars.

One of the threats many employers face is working with the current Department of Labors' Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Everyone recognizes the need for commonsense rules that promote workplace safety.

□ 1040

However, onerous rules and regulations should not be a roadblock to job creation and economic growth. Currently, regulations by OSHA cost small businesses, which are defined as businesses with fewer than 500 employees, between $650 and $781 per employee. There are serious questions about whether OSHA's ''punishment before prevention'' approach to workforce safety is really in the best interests of the workers.

Last month, OSHA withdrew two costly proposed regulations. OSHA's noise standard proposal would have mandated companies spend thousands or millions of dollars for quieter machinery when simple adequate solutions are already in place. A week later, OSHA temporarily repealed its musculoskeletal disorders reporting requirement after claiming it did not receive enough insight from small businesses to proceed. This would have overwhelmed our small business owners in paperwork and potentially opened the door for increased fines. And while it was repealed, I cannot stress the unease many businesses feel about knowing the fact that this is only a temporary withdrawal.

There have also been expressed concerns about the Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division recently establishing a new arrangement with the American Bar Association. This agreement, known as the Bridge to Justice Program, sets the stage for the potential of costly litigation of a great many companies by trial lawyers who are out to line their own pockets. This arrangement goes into effect when the Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division receives a complaint that it will not investigate. It sends the claimant referral to the American Bar Association, who will help provide private attorneys for them to pursue their claim. Will this new referral arrangement between the Wage and Hour Department and the American Bar Association truly help workers, or is it intended to punish the employers? This is a critical issue, especially for small businesses.

In our subcommittee, it is my goal to find answers to many questions facing our workforce and employers; questions like: Are the rules providing the necessary protection to workers or merely creating costly animosity between government and free enterprise? How can we more fully understand and protect the interests of workers and employers alike? In other words, are the regulations that govern our workforce sensible or arbitrary?

Madam Speaker, Congress needs to step up its oversight of the Department to ensure their proposals do not hinder a business's ability to grow, hire new workers, or ensure the cooperation of its employees to advance workforce safety.

It is my objective as the Subcommittee Chairman of Workforce Protections to examine regulations as they relate to the workplace. The committee will look at any policy or proposal, regardless of whether it is a Democrat or Republican idea, that may lead to fewer jobs and opportunities for the American workforce. We plan to hold hearings to determine how to best remove the burden of government regulation on our businesses while holding fast to our commitment to workplace safety.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, we need to talk more about what real regulations are that we should be focusing on, not the regulations for oversight that we have already determined we are going to handle committee by committee, particularly this committee, and we always have.

USA Today had an article about the sugar blast victims in Savannah, Georgia, and one of the victims is quoted in that article, because his brother was killed and he was injured. He says, ''I've been thinking about my brother,'' who was burned over almost half his body, and ''I know it could've been prevented.''

Now, I am going to say, with the right regulations, it could have been prevented.

Then the article goes on to say, ''Despite the outcry after the blast,'' the blast that I said had killed 14 people and injured 40 others, ''the United States still lacks Federal regulations requiring industrial plants to prevent the buildup of fine dust particles that can form explosive clouds in confined areas.''

The regulations that OSHA has to work with are so outdated that they

don't include sugar refineries or other industries that would benefit from having dust regulations.

The article went on to say that ''Federal regulators concluded that the explosion and fire at the refinery in Port Wentworth, just west of Savannah, was caused by a spark that ignited sugar dust like gunpowder.

''The blast set off secondary dust explosions that turned the packaging plant where Butler worked with his 35-year-old brother, John Calvin Butler, into fiery rubble.

''Last summer, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration proposed $8.7 million in fines against Imperial Sugar and cited the company for 211 safety violations at its two refineries here in coastal Georgia and in Gramercy, Louisiana.

''OSHA has a dust regulation from,'' as I told you earlier, ''the 1980s covering grain and plant silos. But another Federal agency says that's not enough because food processors,'' yes, ''wood manufacturers,'' yes, ''and other industries face the same risks.''

Why are they not covered? Where are the regulations? Why are we not bringing OSHA into the 21st century, instead of having a debate today that has nothing to do with jobs and protecting our workers, and instead talking about oversight regulations that we are already committed to deal with on our committee.

Madam Speaker, ''In 2006,'' the USA Today article goes on to say, ''the U.S. Chemical Safety Board, which investigates industrial accidents, called on OSHA to close that gap by adopting a new combustible dust regulation. Over the past three decades, the board says, about 300 dust explosions have killed more than 120 workers nationwide.''

Those are the regulations we should be dealing with. Those are the debates we should be having. Those are the steps we should be taking to bring OSHA into the 21st century, not keeping it back in the dark ages.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AUSTRIA).

Mr. AUSTRIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

I think we all agree that quality education is important, and I rise today to discuss a regulation that will unduly burden our schools and communities.

Last October, the Department of Education released the Program Integrity regulations. Many educators fear that these regulations will have a broad reach and require programs to be licensed in each State where students reside. Let met give you an example of a small university in a small county in Ohio, Pickaway County. This county lost 2,500 jobs and only has an 11 percent baccalaureate rate.

OCU created an online degree program which currently has 1,000 students enrolled from 15 States. In addition to educating these students, OCU has created over 150 jobs in 5 years. If required to be licensed in all 15 States, OCU will be forced to unenroll at least half of the online students and lay off staff. If implemented improperly, this regulation would impact smaller colleges and universities like OCU who don't have the resources to comply with this heavy burden.

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

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. AUSTRIA. Let me just conclude by just saying that the regulations are unclear with States as to what extent they are going to cover this program, and my hope is that the chairman will address this and the Education Workforce Committee will review this job-killing regulation.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I yield myself the balance of my time.

So we have had 10½ hours, 2 days of debate on regulations, oversight regulations, that our committee and other committees have already agreed they are going to deal with. This, to me, shows that the Republicans are truly in disarray. We are not discussing jobs, the most important issue in the United States of America for our people, and at the same time, in their disarray, the Republicans are pushing an irresponsible and dangerous spending bill that will threaten jobs.

I yield back my time.

□ 1050

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased that we're spending this time talking about real job creation. For the last 2 years, we've watched the Democrats spend literally trillions of dollars in failed efforts to create jobs, with more government spending. We need to get the private sector back to work.

We've heard examples here today, and we'll hear more this afternoon, of how this blizzard of regulations is getting in the way of that job creation and preventing Americans from getting back to work. We need to step up to our responsibility, and this is just the opening of that discussion as we step up to do our jobs in oversight.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to claim the Agriculture Committee's time, which I believe I am sharing with my colleague from Minnesota, and I yield myself 5 minutes.

Today, American agriculture is under attack. Every day, the administration seems to demonstrate just how vastly disconnected it is from the folks who feed us. The administration fails to realize that rural America's economy is dependent upon agriculture. The in-your-face approach that the administration has taken regarding government regulation has increased the cost of doing business for America's farmers and ranchers. If the administration is allowed to continue down this path, the only choice many farmers and ranchers will have will be to stop farming altogether. From the dairies of Vermont to the wheat fields near the Chesapeake Bay to the cornfields in the Midwest, American agriculture is under a constant barrage of irrational and unworkable regulations from the Environmental Protection Agency, which are burdensome, overreaching, and that negatively affect jobs in rural economies.

This EPA is mostly interested in pursuing the extreme agenda of environmentalist groups without any consideration for the impact it will have on our farmers and ranchers. For example, the EPA wants to treat milk spills like oil spills simply because milk contains animal fat. The EPA has suggested that milk storage should be regulated under the Clean Water Act as large oil tanks. The EPA wants farmers to till fields without producing any dust. Clearly, the folks at the EPA have never stepped foot on a farm in western Oklahoma, or otherwise they would know that dust happens, and all the regulations in the world can't eliminate its existence. The EPA wants farmers to ensure that none of the spray we use for pests drifts even 1 foot away from the original source.

The EPA has started an unprecedented re-reevaluation evaluation—yes, I said re-reevaluation—of the popular wheat control product Atrazine. In 2006, the EPA completed a 12-year review involving 6,000 studies and 80,000 public comments, yet one of the first orders of business for the Obama administration was to start all over after an article appeared in The New York Times. The EPA is trying to regulate watersheds based off of inaccurate and flawed models—a problem recognized even by the top officials at USDA.

The list goes on and on. But what further illustrates the alarming frame of mind of the EPA is that the agency has gone so far as to recently hold a contest for the public to create videos explaining what Federal regulations are ''important to everyone.'' In many instances, the agency is overreaching its authority. Instead of operating within the law, the EPA believes it can order Congress to pass legislation that gives it more authority and threaten to regulate anyway if Congress chooses not to act.

The message from the President is clear: Pass a cap-and-tax bill or we'll pursue an endangerment finding. Pass more authority to regulate watersheds or we'll proceed with an Executive order.

Sadly for America's farmers and ranchers, these regulations are not limited to the EPA. The Department of Agriculture's Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyard agency's proposed rule on purported ''fairness'' far exceeds congressional intent expressed in the 2008 farm bill. It lacks a credible economic analysis and has so far been the result of a regulatory process that can only be described as flawed. We have a responsibility to producers, packers, processors, retailers—and yes,

consumers—to continue to examine this proposal's implications and act accordingly.

In addition, over the past several months the CFTC and other Federal financial regulators have been engaged in writing unprecedented new regulations over the derivatives market. As Chairman Gensler reported in our committee yesterday, since September alone the CFTC has issued 39 new rule proposals involving thousands of pages of regulation. By comparison, before Dodd-Frank, the CFTC averaged about five rules per year. The speed with which the CFTC is issuing new rules precludes their ability to conduct an adequate cost-benefit analysis to ensure that the rules do not impose unnecessary or undue regulations on our financial system and our economy. And unlike many of the provisions of Dodd-Frank, title VII is not limited to financial firms. In fact, it has the potential to impact every segment of our economy, from farmers and ranchers to manufacturers and energy companies to the fields of health care and technology.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Many of the rules the CFTC has proposed would substantially increase the costs of hedging for commercial end-users, extending Wall Street regulation to Main Street companies. As we work to revive the economy and create new jobs, we simply cannot afford sweeping new regulations that are poorly vetted, that impose substantial costs that outweigh the benefit for our financial system and our economy, or that are crafted in the interest of speed rather than in sound policy.

The Agriculture Committee has set forth an aggressive oversight plan that will shine a bright light on these regulations and show the real-world consequences of them. I hope the administration will work with us in our efforts. Our Nation's farmers, ranchers, and small businesses are all counting on us to do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join in this discussion with my good friend Chairman LUCAS of the Agriculture Committee, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the chairman indicated, yesterday on a bipartisan basis we adopted the oversight plan, such as what we have done in the past when we were in charge of the committee, working in a bipartisan basis. And I would argue that the committee, under my jurisdiction, did the oversight work that was necessary and we made the changes and addressed the issues as they came up. We made significant improvements in the farm bill back in 2008 in terms of conservation programs, other kinds of things—crop insurance—through the new SRA that was adopted in May. So I would argue that we did our work on the Agriculture Committee.

A good part of the chairman's time was taken talking about the EPA. I couldn't concur with him more. But the problem is, we don't have jurisdiction over the EPA. I hope that under the new leadership here that we will be able to work with the committees that have jurisdiction so we can straighten out some of the things that are going on over in the EPA and some of these other agencies. But all we can control is what we have under our jurisdiction in the Agriculture Committee. And I can commit to you that the Democrats on the committee will work with the Republicans to make sure that we do the right things on the Agriculture Committee; that we follow the plan that we adopted yesterday, and we do the aggressive oversight. We are 100 percent in favor of that.

In terms of the issues that the chairman talked about that are under our jurisdiction, the GIPSA law or rule that's being proposed, the CFTC rule that's being proposed, these are still proposed rules, and they're going through the process. And I have some optimism that at the end of the day that those things are going to come to a point where they're readable and acceptable. But if they aren't, we will take a look at them.

□ 1100

In terms of the CFTC, there are a lot of rules and regulations that they are in the process of implementing. The reason they are doing it is that we asked them to do it. This is not something they have manufactured over there. This has been directed by the Congress, and I would argue that it's needed.

We had a situation before where they were only doing five regulations a year because we had a $600 trillion, $700 trillion market that was completely unregulated, completely in the dark, and it was a big part of this financial crisis and collapse that we had.

At the time that we did the CFMA back in 2000, we were told that the folks who were in the swap market were rich people, that they had to have $10 million to even get into this market, that they were gambling with their own money. Really, it was none of our business that they were rich. They knew what they were doing. If they wanted to gamble their money, that was their business. The problem, we find out, is that they weren't putting the money up. They weren't putting the capital and collateral behind these swaps, and it almost took down the entire world financial system.

So I would argue that a lot of what the CFTC is working on are things that are going to have to be done. Not that I'm a big fan of regulation, but in this case, the private sector went amuck in some of these areas. I think we are going to have to require that they put their money up, that they put up the capital and collateral, and that we make sure we don't get in this situation again where the public has to bail out these financial firms.

We heard yesterday from the Secretary that he has no intention of regulating the end users. We gave that exemption in the law, and it looks like, in the way he has implemented it, the end users are not going to be subject to these capital and margin requirements. On the other hand, the financial firms that qualify as swap dealers or as swap participants are going to have to put their money up, and it needs to happen because we don't want to get in this situation again.

Having said all of that, let's see what happens and what the final rules are that they come out with at the CFTC. Let's see what happens with the final rules that come out with regard to GIPSA. I am hopeful that we are going to get the right kind of outcome when they listen to everybody. They've had an open process, and they've been listening and taking thousands of comments. If there are problems and if they've gone beyond the law or if they've gone off in a direction that we didn't intend, I will work with the chairman to make sure we get that straightened out.

So I am here today to pledge the cooperation of the minority on these issues. I hope the chairman can convince his colleagues on these other committees, which are driving us nuts in some of these areas as well as some of these other agencies, to come up with some process where we can be involved to straighten some of that out. I would love to work with you on that. We are with you 100 percent, and I look forward to working with the chairman and with the other members to get the right kind of outcome.

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

Mr. LUCAS. The ranking member is always a pleasure to work with.

Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a lifelong farmer in support of House Resolution 72.

My family has been involved in farming for generations. My Granddad Zellmer raised corn and threshed wheat with the help of neighbors as a threshing crew. My Granddad Purdy was a cowboy, raising Hereford cattle.

Like today's farmers, they worked hard—investing their lives and resources to make a living for themselves and to feed the world. They would be shocked today by the amount of government interference in farming today and by the overreach of government.

The EPA is advancing numerous proposals that are harmful to agriculture. One rule wants to regulate dust on our farms. They call it ''air quality.'' Where I'm from, it's called ''living in the country.'' In case the bureaucrats in Washington haven't heard, driving on a gravel road and planting seeds in soil make dust. We don't need Washington to regulate dust. We need common sense.

The EPA wants to do more. It is reviewing again the registration of atrazine, which is a common, useful herbicide that has been used safely for over 50 years. This product encourages the protection of soil and less dust by using no-till agriculture.

It is time to get government out of agriculture and to preserve the farming heritage my parents and grandparents and so many others have passed on to future generations.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), one of our subcommittee chairmen.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I am here today to address regulations, primarily pending, that fall under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee I chair. These regulations, many of which seem to be both illogical and prescriptive, possess the ability to adversely impact economic growth.

The General Farm Commodities and Risk Management Subcommittee has jurisdictional oversight over the CFTC, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. Historically, the CFTC has been a model regulatory agency. As the implementation of Dodd-Frank has begun to unfold, however, this reputation has begun to suffer. With each rule proposed, a newfound distrust is growing between participants and the CFTC. I believe this springs largely from the arbitrary and confusing way in which the Commission is undertaking its mandates.

Currently, the commission's consideration of costs and benefits is sorely lacking. By prioritizing speed over deliberations, the Commission is not only producing poorly understood proposals; it is also creating an irrational sequence of rulemaking. Because so many of the rules hinge upon components of other rules, the order in which they are drafted and put before the public matters.

For example, the Commission has still failed to provide certainty regarding its definition of what constitutes a ''swaps dealer'' and who may be captured in that definition. The Commission is already attempting to categorize various commercial entities as ''swaps dealers,'' which makes no sense.

Following the financial crisis our country faced, Dodd-Frank was enacted. Make no mistake that the intent of Congress and the act was not to manage the individual risk on behalf of market participants but rather to mitigate those broad systemic risks that threaten the entire financial system. Yet the Commission is currently headed down a path that extends well beyond the statutory requirements of Dodd-Frank and is attempting, at the request of no one in particular, to micromanage individual risk across all industries and sectors.

To return to the ''swaps dealer'' example, in his confirmation hearing 2 years ago, CFTC Chairman Gensler stated that there were roughly 15 to 20 swaps dealers around the globe that represented 99 percent of the market for over-the-counter derivatives. Compare those comments to Chairman Gensler's stating just yesterday in front of the Agriculture Committee that he now believes over 200 entities would be captured by the definition.

This expansive definition will categorize far more firms as ''swaps dealers,'' and it moves far beyond the intent of Congress. It isn't difficult to see that the continued overreach of the Obama administration has become the rule, not the exception.

Again, Madam Speaker, we and the varied agencies of this country, independent or not, owe it to the American public to ensure the assorted regulatory schemes carried out by the Federal Government work to promote economic growth, competitiveness, and innovation. The CFTC's current track seems to be sacrificing these principles for the sake of political expediency.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another outstanding subcommittee chairman on the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution on regulations and jobs.

In particular, I would like to discuss the USDA's Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration's, or GIPSA's, proposed rule governing livestock and poultry marketing practices. This proposed rule should be carefully considered for its unintended consequences, particularly for those it is supposed to protect—livestock producers.

In the proposed rule, GIPSA is attempting to overturn numerous judicial decisions by stating, Finding that the challenge, act or practice adversely affects or is likely to adversely affect competition is not necessary in all cases. In other words, a plaintiff would no longer have to show actual harm when challenging a packer's activity. The rule would also ban packer-to-packer livestock sales and restrict dealers to representing a single packer.

While intending to strengthen the cash market, these changes are likely to actually disrupt orderly market transactions. It will have far-reaching implications for livestock procurement, impacting producers, packers, processors, retailers, and consumers. It far exceeds congressional intent in the 2008 farm bill. It lacks a credible economic analysis and is the result of a flawed regulatory process.

A subcommittee hearing last year demonstrated that concerns are widespread in the livestock community, and concerns are bipartisan here in Congress. We must continue to examine this proposal and act accordingly.

The 2008 farm bill process considered numerous proposals to address livestock marketing and procurement issues.

□ 1110

Most of these ideas were rejected by Congress, and the USDA was directed to conduct rulemaking on a narrow range of technical issues. The proposed rule that emerged went far beyond the intent of Congress and was seen by many as an agency trying to win by rulemaking what it had failed to win in courts.

The USDA determined that this was not a significant rule, even though observers assert that it will incur costs beyond the $100 million threshold for a significant rule. Therefore, no comprehensive economic analysis accompanied the proposed rule.

At least 10 times in the proposed rule GIPSA states some version of the phrase ''GIPSA believes that potential benefits are expected to exceed costs'' without offering any supporting evidence. The Secretary has since indicated that he will conduct a cost-benefit analysis. The taxpayers appropriated $13 million this year for USDA's Office of Chief Economist. That office should have performed an analysis before the rule was proposed so it could have been available during the comment period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROONEY. Madam Speaker, concerns about this bill are broad and bipartisan. Members of both parties have raised questions about the scope, process and intent of this rulemaking. The American people spoke in November to avoid these kinds of Washington insider bureaucratic nightmares. Our work on this rule is far from complete. We must continue our efforts. Therefore, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the subcommittee chairwoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT).

(Mrs. SCHMIDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I can't think of a single agency of the Federal Government that poses more threats to jobs in our economy than the Environmental Protection Agency. As chairwoman of the Nutrition and Horticulture Subcommittee, I am especially alert to the threat the EPA poses to those charged with providing food and fiber for our Nation.

There are so many examples of actions undertaken by this President's EPA that defy sound science, good judgment, and will only result in putting America's farmers and ranchers out of business.

For example, the EPA has proposed a zero-risk standard on pesticide spray drift. The EPA is proposing a standard that even it admits is unachievable. This proposed standard leaves our agricultural producers vulnerable to enormous compliance costs and untold numbers of potential lawsuits.

Another example, the EPA has withdrawn a proposed exemption for milk from the Oil Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures program. This move puts the livelihoods of our dairy farmers in jeopardy because they could face enormous compliance costs. Under this regulation, milk would be treated as if it were motor oil, thereby necessitating dairy farmers across the country to comply with costly, burdensome rules designed to control storage of toxic substances. As far as I can tell, the agency's only stated reason for withdrawing this proposed exemption is that it was initiated under the Bush administration. Yet more than 2 years later, our dairy farmers are still in limbo.

Another example of the EPA's disconnect with science at the expense of the economy is the agency's unprecedented multiyear, multimillion-dollar re-reevaluation of a popular herbicide. Only 2 years earlier, the agency completed a 12-year review of 6,000 scientific studies and concluded that the product is safe. I suppose the logic for this re-reevaluation is that with trillions of dollars deficits we face, we have the money to burn on pet causes of radical environmental groups.

As if the agency didn't have enough on its plate, we see that they have issued a draft pesticide registration notice entitled, ''False or Misleading Pesticide Product Brand Names.'' Note that the EPA is now attempting to regulate not the safety of the product but the name of the product and even the name of the company that manufacturers it. This notice threatens to undermine the very investment in our economy that this President spoke about 2 weeks ago in this very Chamber.

The President's EPA is threatening a potential loss of approximately $2.5 billion in brand equity for U.S. businesses.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the gentlelady 30 additional seconds to conclude.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I could go on and on, Madam Speaker, but the point of this is that the EPA is getting into areas where it doesn't belong, costing American farmers, American businesses, and good old Americans more money than they can afford.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a first-term subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 72.

This administration's EPA has been allowed to operate unchecked by proposing regulations and actions not based on sound science and data. For example, an issue receiving more attention in Pennsylvania is the proposed regulation of the Chesapeake Bay and surrounding watershed. These regulations have a devastating economic impact on my constituents. Unquestionably, the bay is in need and truly worthy of our support. However, the EPA's ''shoot first and ask questions later'' approach will have detrimental economic effects on rural communities.

The EPA, through a Presidential executive order, has created a Federal backstop for watershed implementation plans, commonly known as WIPs. This action has prevented the State's authority to implement their own strategies to clean up watersheds. Additionally, the EPA has proposed accelerated and unreasonable timelines for court-mandated total maximum daily loads, or TMDLs. The TMDL is a mandatory diet to restrict nutrient and sediment runoff. EPA has based the Chesapeake Bay TMDLs on its own bay modeling. This model has been called into question by many, including Limnotech, an independent and respected consulting firm on water issues.

Using the EPA's own data, Limnotech compared it against data from the USDA which showed inconsistent assumptions between agencies. The head of the USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service has recently gone as far as to say that the EPA's data on conservation practices is erroneous.

Agriculture is not receiving the credit it deserves towards reducing nutrient and sediment runoff. Yet the EPA is forcing the bay States to move forward on accelerated mandates using the agency's flawed bay model and limited feedback from the public and stakeholders. Although the EPA unfortunately has not performed any kind of economic analysis of TMDL, continuing on this path will undoubtedly cause severe economic impact on producers in rural communities.

For example, the Commonwealth of Virginia estimates it will cost $4,665 per taxpayer to meet the TMDL requirements, and Maryland estimates they're looking at $8,500 per taxpayer, or $10 billion over the next 10 years.

This is simply a fundamental difference between the approach of the Agriculture Committee and the strategy of this administration. The goal is the same, the vitality and health of the Chesapeake Bay, but the methods of achieving these goals could not be more different.

The 2008 farm bill provided incentive-based aid for farmers and ranchers to improve management practices which would have a direct result of improving water quality; but the administration simply does not want to give the time for these programs to work. Instead, they have done what they have been doing since taking office, overregulating farmers and ranchers and punishing States for not meeting certain arbitrary benchmarks.

Rural America cannot afford for the EPA to continue this arbitrary regulation and not recognize current conservation efforts. I strongly believe that we need to hit the pause button on the TMDLs and first perform a study on the progress already being made on the Chesapeake through existing efforts already being employed.

I'm proud of the fact that the farmers are taking real action on the ground every day to improve water quality in the Chesapeake Bay region and across the country.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to one of the senior members of the House Agriculture Committee and one of our subcommittee chairmen, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, with the comprehensive and detailed analysis that we've already received from our distinguished chairman and my colleagues, I'm not sure what I can add, but I will try.

Article I, section 1 of our Constitution provides that all legislative powers be granted to the Congress of the United States. I remember when I was in fifth grade, I had a teacher named Mrs. Arndt in a seminal moment in my education who taught us what was right at the time and what's been badly distorted since, and that is, that we have three branches of a government: an executive branch to apply the law; a judicial branch to interpret it; and a legislative branch to make the law.

□ 1120

Unfortunately, that has all been turned on its head. We used to have the conventional wisdom that as we left here, that the people's life, liberty, and property were safe. In fact, as my colleague and good friend RON PAUL said, When we leave here, we lose accountability, and we turn the process over to unelected bureaucrats.

The purpose of those constitutional provisions was to provide accountability through elections, the popular will; and yet this administration has consistently ignored separation of powers and legislative functions, blatantly and defiantly through unelected, often even unratified, unaccountable, nameless, faceless bureaucrats who continually thwart the popular will and sound public policy.

American agriculture, the worldwide leader in creativity and progress, the source of cheap food for a hungry world, is the prime target and victim. My colleagues have dealt very articulately with issues of price controls, GMO regulations, restrictive fees, and overly burdensome regulations.

In addition and specifically, Madam Speaker and Members of the House, we have dealt and continue to deal with an EPA, a USDA, and a U.S. Department of Transportation that have dealt in areas of dust, backdoor cap-and-trade enactments, the Clean Air Act, hours of service, GMO coexistence, and otherwise. The key is this: none of these actions by themselves could ever pass the House or the Senate. None of these usurpations of authority are authorized by the Congress, and all of these

serve to add dramatically to the cost of doing business and to reduce America's ability to feed our Nation and help feed the world.

Each one of us represents up to 800,000 people, and each one of us has to face the voters every 2 years. We have a sworn constitutional obligation to the American people which is being twisted and subverted daily by perhaps well meaning, but nonetheless unresponsive, people and agencies who have no practical scrutiny or control. And this bill, I contend, Madam Speaker, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, starts the process of restoration of legislative powers and upholding our fundamental, constitutional values, and the obligation to represent people rather than allowing people who were never elected or are unaccountable to run our public policy.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution and to share the sentiments of our hardworking dairy farmers in upstate New York. When I talk with farmers and other small business owners throughout the district, they constantly share with me the primary impediments to their growth: high taxes, out-of-balance regulations, spiraling health care costs, and rising energy costs.

Today I'll highlight just one example of an onerous regulation, a bureaucratic overreach that the EPA is threatening to visit upon our dairy farmers. Because milk has animal fat that the EPA defines as a nonpetroleum-based oil, the EPA is essentially treating our milk, our dairy product there, as a hazardous material. And if they do not get a waiver by November, our dairy farmers will have to invest in specialized containers and other equipment to be in compliance with new spill regulations. This will come directly out of their bottom line, and it makes no sense. I think we can all agree that we don't want to see spilt milk, but it's not a hazardous material.

Madam Speaker, I support this legislation because I want to help our family farmers thrive and flourish.

Mr. LUCAS. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. I rise in support of the resolution and look forward to reviewing a number of regulations and orders from Federal Government agencies.

One regulation I would like to address today is the USDA's departure from a science-based regulatory system for biotech crops. Two weeks ago, I spoke to a number of farm and agriculture groups from my district, and they indicated a real concern that the current politicization of the regulatory process could set dangerous precedents for open pollinated and biotech crops in the future.

The USDA has departed from the longstanding science-based ''coordinated framework'' between the USDA, EPA, and FDA that has been accepted throughout the world. By altering the process through using a rules approach, rather than science, this could have a significant negative impact on trade. In addition, I think it is important to make sure that all government agencies are allowing for a proper comment time for proposed rules and regulations. As a government, we need a full understanding of how our actions will affect those governed by the rules.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the Congresswoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

(Mrs. ROBY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 72.

Since becoming a Member of Congress, there has been a recurring theme in almost all of my meetings with constituents, the overreaching and burdensome nature of regulatory authority in Federal agencies. In my committee work just this week, I heard about the difficulties and the haphazard nature in which Dodd-Frank is being implemented and the negative impact of regulations in health care, education, and the National Labor Relations Board. It is obvious that the problem is not limited to one agency or industry, but is a growing trend by the administration in their approach to implementing regulations.

I would like to take a moment to talk specifically about the Environmental Protection Agency's boiler MACT ruling. It would lead to the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs, and it is estimated that the cost to the paper and pulp industry would be over $5.5 billion in capital and $1.2 billion in annualized costs.

The boiler MACT ruling is only one in a long line of troubling rulemaking decisions by the EPA and other agencies. Farmers have continually been faced with overreaching decisions such as rulings on pesticides, regulations of concentrated animal feeding operations, and nonpoint source pollution, to name a few. Alabama has a strong presence of agriculture, and I look forward to Congress exerting their oversight.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I next yield 1 minute to the good gentleman from the great First District of Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), my neighbor from across the line in Kansas.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I would like to thank Chairman LUCAS for the time to speak on an issue that is near to my heart.

Madam Speaker, I came to Washington, hoping to bring some common sense to a city sorely lacking it. We have too many regulations being written by too many bureaucrats who have no idea what the real world is like. And let me give you one real-world example.

Regulators at the EPA think that dust poses a serious health and pollution threat and have proposed significant reductions in the amount of dust that can be in the air. It's dry and it's windy in western Kansas, where I come from. So when we drive on the dirt roads common to rural America, we turn up dust in the air. To keep this from happening, the EPA recommends spraying dirt on the dry roads twice a day. Obviously they have never been to Kansas before. Kansans are hardworking people; and we don't have time to do this and, frankly, Madam Speaker, nor do we have the water to spray on these roads.

I welcome the opportunity this resolution provides for us to bring these regulators in and give them a picture of what life is like in the real world outside of Washington. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of House Resolution 72.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, we all know this is a challenging time for many families across America. Just like the rest of the country, folks in middle and south Georgia are struggling because of this economy. You see, the government has taxed and spent the American home into a recession. In fact, Madam Speaker, the current administration, in the last 2 years, in piling on regulation after regulation has made it more difficult for small businesses and family farms to grow and create jobs. Agencies like the EPA and laws like the recently enacted financial regulatory reform bill stand to do nothing but kill jobs. As a member of the Agriculture and Armed Services Committees, I look forward to working with my colleagues to tackle the burdensome regulations at these Federal agencies.

President Eisenhower famously said, ''Farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil and you're 1,000 miles away from the cornfield.'' We need to take an eraser to a lot of these rules and regulations that the bureaucrats in Washington are placing on the American small business owner.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would note to my colleagues on the floor, as you have seen today, the members of the House Agriculture Committee are very concerned about the impact that these regulatory issues have on farmers, ranchers, on processors, on the American consumer; and we are very committed to working in a bipartisan way with our colleagues on the entire Ag Committee to try and make sure that this onerous, burdensome, potentially economically destructive path that we seem to have gotten on in recent years is reversed.

□ 1130

We will use the oversight hearing process. We will use every tool available to us, working with other committees. We will in areas where perhaps we have some jurisdictional questions at least dwell upon the impact and the effect of direct regulation.

I promise you over the course of this session of Congress the next 2 years, it will be one of the highest focuses of the House Agriculture Committee, and perhaps, if we are successful, we will enlighten some unelected bureaucrats. Perhaps, if we are successful, we will prevent the implementation of rules and regulations that will not only prevent jobs from being destroyed but perhaps, if they are unfortunately implemented, destroy jobs that exist in this country. That's our commitment on this committee. That's our effort. We pledge very much to do that.

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

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

Madam Speaker, this week is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ronald Reagan, and I think it is altogether fitting that we quote Ronald Reagan at a time in which, 30 years from when he said it, we're dealing with the burdens of increasing regulation creating a noncompetitive situation for American workers. It was 30 years ago that America was in a malaise. It was 30 years ago that Americans found themselves without jobs and without hope. It was 30 years ago that they elected Ronald Reagan, a man of hope and conviction to tear down anything that impeded freedom and liberty, including the growth of government, who said:

''Now let there be no misunderstanding. It is not my intention to do away with government. It is, rather, to make it work; work with us, not over us; to stand by our side, not ride on our back. Government can and must provide opportunity, not smother it; foster productivity, not stifle it.''

When our committee put up AmericanJobCreators.com, we thought we might get a few hits. Today, the letters we have received from small and large businesses around the country, giving us with specificity regulations and regulatory excesses that are stifling their ability to create jobs, now is more pages than ObamaCare, more pages than any bill I've ever seen come from here are stacking up with specific problems that America is dealing with here today, whether it's EPA, OSHA, or just regulators who won't give an honest answer to a fair question based on laws in which we require them to provide answers.

America is falling behind and American jobs are suffering. So, Madam Speaker, our committee is dedicated to ensuring that regulatory reform occurs and occurs on our watch.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, as the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I rise in support of H. Res. 72. In fact, Madam Speaker, all of the ranking members of the committees that are debating H. Res. 72 have also joined me in expressing their support for this resolution. I believe that we should take every opportunity to thoughtfully and comprehensively reform regulations to ensure that they protect the health and welfare of the American people while not unduly impeding job creation.

Obviously, however, this resolution is unnecessary. Our committee already convened a hearing on this exact topic just yesterday. We also adopted an oversight plan that specifically addresses the topic. So spending 10 hours debating this noncontroversial resolution does not seem to be the best use of Members' time.

Importantly, any meaningful discussion of regulatory reform must be based on a comprehensive examination that considers the costs and benefits of regulations, that develops conclusions based on solid data, and that seeks input from a wide variety of sources.

President Obama launched such an examination when he issued an executive order last month requiring agencies to examine the costs and the benefits of regulations to the overall economy, to small businesses, and to American workers and families. Several of the witnesses who appeared before the committee yesterday testified that the President's initiative is an important first step. By the way, these were the witnesses that were called by the majority. I look forward to receiving the results of the President's review. I hope that our committee will also undertake a balanced and thoughtful evaluation of regulations.

And now, instead of wasting 2 days debating a resolution we all agree with, we should use our valuable floor time to consider legislation that will actually create jobs. With our national unemployment rate at 9 percent, and even higher among minority communities—and as I told my committee yesterday, there are areas in my district where the unemployment rate probably approaches anywhere from 20 to 35 to 40 percent—we should be focusing on concrete proposals to get our economy moving. That's what America wants, that's what America sent us here for, and that's what we should be about the business of doing.

In his State of the Union message, the President proposed an initiative to create jobs and encourage economic growth through the modernization of our Nation's infrastructure. And on January 26, the President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Tomas Donohue, and the President of the AFL–CIO, Richard Trumka, issued a rare joint statement applauding this proposal. Here is what they said:

''Whether it is building roads, bridges, high-speed broadband, energy systems and schools, these projects not only create jobs and demand for businesses, they are an investment in building the modern infrastructure our country needs to compete in a global economy.''

Similarly, in a study released by the National Transportation Policy Project in January 2011, Douglas Holtz-Eakin and Martin Wachs concluded after extensive analysis, quote, wise and well-targeted expenditures on transportation infrastructure can generate lasting productivity gains, while also providing a more immediate stimulus to accelerate the Nation's ongoing recovery from a devastating recession.

These are exactly the kinds of bipartisan efforts our committee and the Congress should be supporting. For this reason, I wrote yesterday to the chairman of the committee, Congressman ISSA, asking that we schedule a hearing on these issues, these job-creating issues. I asked that we invite the Chamber, the AFL–CIO, and Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood. I hope we will follow through on that idea. I think it would be a lot more productive than the debate we are having here today on this noncontroversial issue.

Importantly, as we consider such investments, we must also ensure that programs are in place to support small and minority-owned businesses that are so critical to the success of our economy. According to a report published in September 2010 by the Joint Economic Committee, three out of every four workers in the United States are hired by a firm with fewer than 250 employees.

□ 1140

These small businesses, which are the backbone of our economy, have struggled over the past 2 years with a lack of access to capital. And minority-owned businesses are particularly limited by their access to bonding. I would ask that the majority join us in trying to find ways to make sure that these businesses have an opportunity to be bonded. This is an issue that I started working on 30 years ago, and we see roadblock after roadblock with regard to bonding for small and minority businesses and women-owned businesses. We see it over and over and over again. That's what we need to be dealing with. Those are the kind of things.

And another thing that we find is that if you were to go into my district and bring together small businesses of all kinds, they would tell you that the thing that's stopping them from hiring people is things like access to capital. Many of them have had their lines of credit taken away. That's very significant. Anybody who has run a small business knows that a line of credit is essential and is extremely important for those small businesses to survive. And so, if we want to talk about trying to create jobs, which we should be, then I would hope that we would address that issue today.

And so with regard to bonding, I am introducing legislation that would expand the Department of Transportation's ability to assist disadvantaged business enterprises working in the transportation industry in obtaining bid, payment, and performance bonds. This legislation would also create a program through which up to five States could receive Federal funding to implement their own bonding assistance programs.

If the Republican leadership is serious, and I mean if they are really serious about creating jobs and making investment in our Nation's future, they should schedule time on the floor to consider legislation like this, rather than squandering days on pointless debates guaranteed to create zero jobs.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, as I introduce each of the members of my committee who sat through yesterday's hearing with witnesses on one side giving, in specificity, the problems, the regulations, what were the impediments to farming, to manufacturing and to mining, it is amazing that the gentleman quoted them, the gentleman from the other side of the aisle quoted them, but ignored his own witness who disputed any cost-benefit analysis being appropriate for looking at regulatory reform or even regulatory creation, preferring to simply say that all regulations should be judged on whether they do something, not what they cost.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

Mr. GUINTA. Madam Speaker, I rise to add my voice to those calling for the end of overregulation that is strangling our small businesses here in my home State of New Hampshire and across our great Nation. I believe that this is a central focus of the challenges that we face in this 112th Congress.

As other Members have suggested and stated, our Nation is run by small business owners, by employers who are hardworking, put their time and energy and effort into creating something, building something, creating new jobs for new opportunities. In my home State of New Hampshire, about 75 to 80 percent of our economy is dependent upon small business.

And what I heard in the testimony, in committee, and what I'd like to convey today is my great and grave concern for the fact that every small business owner has to pay $10,585 per employee for the regulatory burdens and requirements. That is a grand impediment to the creation of a small business opportunity. This is something that is centrally focused, that we have to address as a Congress. And I certainly urge the passage of this resolution.

Whether you are Laars, Incorporated in Rochester, New Hampshire, or Tee Enterprises in North Conway, New Hampshire, or J Dubbs in Manchester, New Hampshire, this impediment disallows the incentive that we believe is most important in our Nation.

I, as a Member representing New Hampshire, want to ensure that we create an environment where small business can grow, can succeed and employ people, in our great State and in our Nation.

There are two interesting things going on in New Hampshire: Project labor agreements that are infringing on the ability of a $35 million project being supported; and the OSHA demands over our small businesses. I hope and trust that we can pass this resolution.

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

I want to clear up something that the chairman of the committee just said that is not completely accurate. Yesterday, in our committee hearing, we had Dr. Shapiro to testify. And the thing that he said was that when regulations are created, they are created in favor of protecting the health, welfare, and safety of American people. And basically, what he was saying is that we want to make sure that while you look at the cost-benefit analysis, you've got to understand that sometimes it's kind of hard to quantify the benefit of not seeing a baby strangled in a crib, the benefit of making sure that people have clean water, the benefit of making sure that when we eat food that that food is healthy and that it's not poison, the benefit of seeing that if we eat a piece of fish that it's not filled with pfiesteria. Those are the kinds of things that he was talking about. And so he wasn't saying that we should not look at it. What basically he was saying is that you've got to understand that when we came to this Congress and we put our hands up and we swore, we swore that we would protect Americans. And that's what this is all about.

Mr. ISSA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ISSA. I was only quoting what the gentleman had said and reiterated that he still supported: Cost-benefit analysis is neither sound in theory nor useful in practice. We asked him. He said he still stands behind that. That's much broader than the gentleman said, I believe.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Reclaiming my time, as I said before, again, he was saying that regulations are put into effect to protect Americans. And I want to make it clear that we, on this side of the aisle, we have absolutely no problem with making sure that we look at regulations. If they are outdated, if they are overburdensome to the degree that there's no balance there, if they don't make sense, then we want to see those regulations go. But at the same time, what we're also saying is that it has to be a comprehensive examination. And I would think that the chairman of the committee would agree with me on that; that whatever we look at, because we want whatever comes out of this Congress to be credible and to be based on integrity, and we want the American people to buy into it, and hopefully this Congress to buy into it, that it would be a comprehensive view, that we'd look at the total picture, not just the cost, not just the benefit, but looking at it all.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, my Republican colleagues advocate a free market unfettered by what they say are job-killing regulations. It seems like to them every regulation is job-killing. We hear a lot about that.

What we don't hear from the Republican majority is anything about job growth. We don't hear any plans about job growth because the majority doesn't have any plans for job growth.

□ 1150

In fact, the Republicans spent the last 2 years obstructing pro-job growth policy just to score political points; but they are wrong about regulation.

For example, on the environment we hear from Republicans that environmental regulations are killing jobs, but the facts prove just the opposite. Based on recent estimates, total employment created by capital investments in the power sector over the next 5 years is estimated at 1.46 million jobs. That's an average of 290,000 jobs a year, in each of the next 5 years, and in a sector Republicans are telling us is full of job-killing regulations.

While we don't hear anything from the Republican majority about job growth, we do hear a lot about free markets. To them, all we have to do is eliminate regulations, and everything will be fine. Well, at least for some of their wealthy corporate contributors. The rest of us? We're on our own in the free market.

Madam Speaker, I wonder if my Republican colleagues think a market free of regulations will ensure the safety and reliability of the Nation's roads, railways, and airways. Our transportation system allows American businesses to transport their goods to retailers and consumers, and regulations make that system safe and reliable.

Do they think a market free of regulations will enforce international agreements? Agreements help American businesses sell their goods and services abroad, and regulations protect and enforce those agreements.

Do they think a market free of regulations will defend American's patents, copyrights and trademarks? Regulations protect American businesses against infringement, theft, and piracy.

Does the Republican majority think a market free of regulations will protect the hundreds of millions of Americans who are their consumers and workers, and ensure their continued safety and security?

When they were in the minority, Republicans worked hard to slow or even

end the recovery from an economic crisis that they created, the crisis that the President and the Democratic Congress began to solve, the economic crisis that the new Republican majority, again for political reasons, seems bent on bringing back by eliminating the very regulations that create jobs.

And I want to know if my Republican colleagues, who have not advanced one single plan to grow jobs here in this country, do they want to eliminate all regulations? Or do they just want to eliminate regulations that create jobs and protect Americans and that secure the economic and environmental future of this country? But they may also cut into the record profits of their wealthy contributors.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CLAY. Instead of spending hours or days on trying to score political points, the Republican majority should be joining Democrats and the President and focusing on growing jobs. Regulations—pro-growth, job-creating regulations—are a necessary successful way we can continue the Democratic recovery from the Republican economic crisis.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. ISSA. Under the rules of the House, isn't it true that the limitation on taking down somebody's words based on casting aspersions or specific actions against an individual, for example, not caring about Americans or wanting children to die for lack of regulation—isn't it true that we can only do that if they cite a person, not the Republican Party as a whole?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not respond to such a hypothetical question.

Mr. ISSA. Further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. ISSA. Would it be in order for me to bring a motion to take down the words based on that accusation that was just made against my entire party, alleging that we want to roll back so that children are not protected and the like?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair can not issue an advisory opinion. Is the gentleman from California making such a demand?

Mr. ISSA. Would it be in order for me to make such a demand?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair can not respond to such a hypothetical question. If a demand is made, the Chair will follow the regular process.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I think we're bigger than those accusations, regardless of it being likely to have been inappropriate by any standard.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. BUERKLE).

Ms. BUERKLE. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding his time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 72.

Last November, the American people sent a message to all levels of government: get the government out of the way so that employers can create new jobs.

Many in Washington seek a solution to our country's economic slowdown through a revision of the Tax Code and broad cuts in all levels of spending. I support these initiatives, but I do not believe they are enough. We must provide a climate for economic growth and job creation. Congress must relieve the American people from the hidden tax of excessive regulation and red tape. It is a tax that affects everyone, passed on every day in increased costs of products and services.

To put things in perspective, according to a report issued last year by the Small Business Administration, the approximate economic cost of regulation is a staggering $1.75 trillion annually. Increased regulations stifle job creation and the expansion of businesses, both large and small. It cripples their competitiveness in a global market while smothering the innovative spirit that has made the United States of America great.

Moreover, businesses are not the only ones who are harmed by these unnecessary regulations. Municipalities, school districts, not-for-profits, health care providers, and others serving the public pay a high cost to comply with the Federal bureaucracy.

Regardless of who I talk to in the great State of New York, I ask, What regulations burden you? Businesses of all sizes and from all industries talk about how they incur unnecessary overhead for compliance.

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

Mr. ISSA. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. BUERKLE. School districts tell my office of receiving Federal grants that will cost them two to five times the size of the grant to administer the grant.

Not all regulations are unwarranted. Most Americans would agree on the need for regulatory protection, and to assume otherwise of this committee is irresponsible.

Congress must address the cost to both business and the public before a new regulation is adopted. As Members of Congress, we cannot cede over the responsibility of legislation to the unchecked regulatory regimes that end up levying this hidden tax.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, it gives me great honor to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, the whip, Mr. STENY HOYER.

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This resolution directs the House committees to review Federal regulations for their effect on our economy. I agree with this resolution and I will vote for this resolution. In fact, that is an oversight, of course, that committees should in fact be carrying out without this resolution.

Democrats believe that it's important to vigorously review regulations to make sure they are keeping pace with the changing economy, and that's why President Obama has already issued an executive order that calls for such a review.

Where regulations are duplicative, where they stifle innovation and entrepreneurship, where they hold job creation back without protecting consumers, they should be revised or ended.

But let's also remember that Federal regulations keep our drinking water and our air clean, protect our children from unsafe toys and food, put a check on abusive practices of insurance companies and credit card companies, and help control the kind of Wall Street gambling that wrecked our economy just a few years ago.

□ 1200

As a matter of fact, even though regulations were on the books, we know they were not enforced, which led to literally the loss of trillions of dollars by homeowners, individuals and businesses. We want regulations that protect Americans and foster economic growth and will call the committees to review regulations with both of those goals in mind.

There is a reason that the Democrats have worked so hard to pass the Make It In America agenda, an agenda with which I am particularly identified. We need to in that agenda, if we are going to create the environment that I heard one of the Members on this floor talking about that will lead to businesses being able to make things in America and do so profitably, review regulations, review tax policies, and review other government policies to make sure we are competitive in the global marketplace. But we also want to make sure that we have consumers protected, as I said, and the environment protected, because there should not be a trade-off, but a complementary working of the two together.

The new environment the Federal Government ought to work to create will promote growth, jobs, and success of the American people. Make It In America not only means manufacturing it, but it means succeeding in America, succeeding in global markets.

I will, as I said, vote for this resolution. But the test will not be whether this resolution passes or fails. The test will be whether or not in fact we do the work that the American public expects us to do. The test will be whether our economy does succeed under the revisions we have made.

I tell my friends on that side of the aisle, neither one of us have done perhaps the job we should have done.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. But we ought to also be humbled by the fact that during the 30 years that I have been in office, for 20 of those years the Republicans have been in charge of the executive department of government. Just recently they were in charge, as a matter of fact, from 2001 to 2008, when we saw the deepest recession start and flourish and continue into this next administration since the Great Depression.

So let none of us on this floor point the finger at one another. The American people want to see solutions, not angry rhetoric. The American people want to see this economy grow and create the jobs that they need. All of us ought to be committed to that objective, and we ought to project to the American people that we are prepared to come together and work together and legislate together to achieve that end.

As I said, I will vote for this resolution, but the hard work is ahead of us.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. HOYER. Frankly, the adoption of this resolution could have been, as I am sure most of us on this floor know, probably been done by unanimous consent, because what it calls for is our responsibility and is absolutely essential if we are going to create the kind of environment to grow this economy, create the kinds of jobs and be competitive in international markets.

I again thank my friend for yielding the time, and I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the minority whip's statement that both sides over the years have not done enough. The 30-year buildup of regulatory excess is something that both sides need to take down.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I do rise in support of H.R. 72.

When the framers of the Constitution started writing, they began article I, section 1, with a simple and clear statement: ''All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.'' After a great debate, the priority concern was the possibility that some other entity other than Congress would attempt to exercise legislative powers or compel their will on American citizens.

If laws could be made by someone who has no accountability, they could create any rule based on their own preferences and force unchecked spending on the will of their fellow citizens without accountability. This is an unfunded regulatory mandate.

It is my concern that in the race to regulate, we have moved from regulating American business to running State and local governments and have made them, in effect, Federal Government extension employees charged with regulating all aspects of public and private business. Every stage of business is now regulated, from how to interview an applicant to how to fire an employee.

Government paperwork abounds. Every company needs compliance officers and attorneys just to make sure they are running their business based on the preferences of someone from some agency they have never even heard of. That is not real job creation. American companies want to produce products and services, not hire de facto government employees. We need real job growth.

It is time for Congress to assume its responsibility. If there is a grievous regulation, it shouldn't be EPA's fault, HHS's fault or even the executive branch's fault. It is ours.

Let me give you some examples of these unfunded mandates in my own home State of Oklahoma. The City of Bartlesville, Oklahoma, is currently drowning under a new EPA requirement to filter the storm water. That is correct, filtering the rainwater.

The City of Bethany, Oklahoma, spent over a quarter of a million dollars in 1987 to put in two water wells, only to be required a few years later to take them out by EPA because of their wastewater. Then EPA changed their wastewater requirements in 2006 and cost the City of Bethany over $9 million. The street signs in Bethany must also change to a new type of reflective material to meet new DOT regulations, costing the city who knows how much.

The Oklahoma Department of Transportation has to go through millions of dollars of hoops to tear down an old bridge to replace it with a new bridge in the exact same spot. They have to navigate the Clean Water Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and many more, while people drive over an old, deteriorating bridge.

I will tell you, I will be the first to promote wheelchair ramps on sidewalks, but Federal interpretation of ADA to construct accessible curb ramps at intersections and other locations has been invoked where no connecting sidewalks even exist. In Oklahoma City, where I live, such a wholesale directive results in curb ramps that terminate in adjacent vacant lots, to a ditch, embankments, and sometimes straight into a light pole. The desire to do the right thing sometimes leaves no room for exercising common sense.

We are regulating common sense out of Federal, State and local governments, and we are costing State and local taxpayers millions in unfunded mandates.

Sometimes our regulations don't cost money but they do cost trust in the relationship between citizens and their Federal Government.

Last Christmas, a community bank in Oklahoma was told by a Federal regulator that their employees had to take off the buttons that said ''Merry Christmas, God is with us,'' and remove the scripture verse announcement on their board because it might cause someone to feel discriminated against that walked into the bank. This is a privately owned business in America.

Every person in that community has lost trust with the commonsense leadership of the Federal Government because we have allowed unchecked regulation. The assumption that Federal agencies are the only people who care about clean water, clean air, fair business practice, et cetera, is arrogant and misinformed. I don't know anyone who loves the air, water and land in Oklahoma more than Oklahomans, and I am confident that is true for other States as well.

We must take a serious look at unfunded mandates and regulations. We need to hear the cry of our cities, counties and States where they say please stop the flood of regulations. They want two things: predictability and clearly defined limited scope.

This is a bipartisan issue. We have common agreement with the other members of my subcommittee, and we will immediately take this up next Tuesday in our first subcommittee hearing.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Any review of our regulatory structures or the orders that are issued therefrom must weigh the cost of regulations against their benefits. Everyone who makes or installs air bags in cars, smoke detectors in office buildings, HVAC units in businesses and homes and tamper-proof packaging for food and pharmaceuticals, just to name a few, has a job, thanks to regulation. And when we don't have adequate regulations, bad things happen. We don't have to look that far.

Look at our financial crisis. Look at the recession. A financial disaster was created by a lack of regulation and by erroneously relying on the narrow self-interests of corporate management to protect their own businesses, let alone the common good.

□ 1210

And this is according to Alan Greenspan, because Mr. Greenspan told our Oversight Committee a few years ago, ''I made a mistake in presuming that the self-interest of organizations, specifically banks and others, were such that they were capable of protecting their own shareholders and their equity in the firms.''

Last year, the Office of Management and Budget performed a cost-benefit analysis of Federal regulations, which showed that the benefits of regulations

far outweigh their costs. Between 1999 and 2009, the estimated cost of regulations were between $43 billion and $55 billion, while the estimated economic benefits were between $128 billion and $616 billion. That means during that 10-year period the cost-to-benefit ratio of regulations was one-to-two, based on OMB's lowest estimations, and one-to-fourteen based on OMB's highest estimations.

So as we go into this great adventure about all of these regulations, we must look at the benefits of regulations—the economic benefits, the social benefits, the health benefits—if we're to come up with an accurate picture of the role of regulations in our society.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding and for his good work on this resolution and a host of other issues in leading our committee.

The President's executive order directing agencies to take into account the cost of cumulative regulations is an important step, moves us in the right direction, and something that we just, frankly, are getting an understanding of how the Federal Government should work relative to the private sector. Job creators do not live in a world where they are only subject to one regulation issued by one agency. Rather, job creators are subject to a myriad of regulations and compliance obligations enforced by the EPA, the Department of Labor, the IRS, Health and Human Services, and on and on and on.

The utilities sector offers fertile ground to begin understanding how Federal agencies should take into account the cumulative effect of regulations. From early 2009 to 2017, this industry will have to contend with no less than 35 separate regulatory deadlines. Those affected say looming regulatory changes have already caused two power plants to be shut down.

The manufacturing sector: this industry is hit the hardest by cumulative regulatory costs, with per-firm costs at over $600,000—half a million greater than the national average. Small manufacturers bear a proportionately larger regulatory burden, with an estimated cost of $26,000 per employee—more than double the burden faced by other larger manufacturers. The impact of regulations is especially important on small business owners. They serve as both entrepreneurial leaders but also as the regulatory enforcer within their company. The more time spent complying with regulations is less time they can spend meeting the needs of their clients and their customers, growing their business, and, most importantly, creating jobs.

I had an experience a few years ago. One of our manufacturers, a very successful business owner, wanted to meet with our U.S. Senator. I remember this meeting because I'll remember it forever. We were sitting in the meeting and our constituent said to our U.S. Senator, Senator, we can outcompete anybody. We are so efficient at what we do, the way we manage our business, our efficiencies we put in place, we feel like we can outcompete anybody. What makes it tough to win in the international market, what makes it difficult to compete and grow jobs, what makes it really difficult is the stuff you guys do. And he pointed right at the Senator. And it had an impact. He said, It's all the things we have to do to comply. That's what makes it difficult.

The American worker, the American family, they can outcompete anybody. Let's just get government off their backs so they can do the things that we've been doing in this country for 200-plus years—grow our economy, grow jobs, put families back to work, put people back to work, and improve this situation.

I look forward to the work that our Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs will focus on, trying to understand the cumulative impact that regulations impose on the job creators.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. I think we're a little perplexed over here. There's nobody on this side of the aisle that doesn't feel regulations ought to be reviewed. I don't think there's anybody on the other side that feels that way, and I think that everybody understands it's one of the roles of Congress, and particularly one of the roles of the Government Oversight and Reform Committee. It's in our rules. Every committee has already passed an entire plan for doing oversight.

So, essentially, the real question is we're spending 9½ hours here today to ostensibly give authority that already exists. So we're not spending 9½ hours on dealing with helping 14 million Americans who are out of work. Instead, we're not advancing any bill that would repair our economy or restore our manufacturing industry. We're not ensuring the country's global competitiveness. We're not enhancing our education system. We're not enhancing or reinvesting in our public infrastructure. We're spending 9½ hours allotting authority that already exists on that, and that just doesn't seem to be a good use of the time of this House. I think that's been noted over and over again.

It didn't stop Chairman ISSA from issuing 170 letters looking at the regulatory matters the other day. It didn't stop him from having hours of a committee hearing yesterday where we beat this same drum over and over again. Everybody understands that some regulation is sometimes taken to excess and sometimes the enforcements are taken in the wrong direction.

I take a back seat to nobody. I spent 4 years as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Policy and National Security. We had hearing after hearing exposing fraud, waste, and abuse in the billions in the Defense Department and related activities. So, yes, let's do it; but let's not waste our time talking about what we're going to talk about. Let's get out there and have the hearings. The committee is set up for that.

But let's also understand what's going on here. There's one side of this debate, my friends on the Republican side, who want to say the only factor to be considered when we're looking at regulation is its cost, and that's it. Well, if that were the case and we only focused on cost, there would probably be no regulations.

But if we look at our history, we've found it important and that there was undeniable progress when we implemented the regulations on child labor, on civil rights protections, 5-day workweeks, cleaner lakes and rivers, clean air, seatbelts and air bags, child-proof medicine caps, fire safety codes, and on and on.

There's value in some of these regulations that also have to be balanced against the cost. And when in fact the Office of Management and Budget did that, as Mr. KUCINICH just noted, their report estimated that between 1999 and 2009 the cost of the regulations was about $43 billion to $55 billion, but they were outweighed by economic benefits that were between $128 and $616 billion.

If you just look at the Clean Air Act, by some estimates that act accounted for $23 trillion in economic and health benefits. Thirty times higher than the cost to businesses. The Clean Air Act has created jobs—lots of jobs. In 2010, 1.7 million Americans were employed in environmental technology industries; 119,000 environmental tech companies produced $300 billion in revenues in 2010. And we're exporting these technologies. In 2008, the United States exported $43.8 billion in environmental technologies—more than any other country in the world.

So, Madam Speaker, let's be serious about this. We're talking about regulations. We're talking about the costs and the benefits and doing an analysis. And let's not waste 9½ hours talking about what we already have the authority to do.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, in section 2, article 1, asking for regulations that impede private sector job creation, I'm just sorry the other side doesn't understand. That's not cost; that's jobs.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I'm here today because I represent those small businessmen that are trying to make a living in towns like Butler, Pennsylvania, and Erie, Pennsylvania, and Greenville, and I've got to tell you, the rhetoric is absolutely off the charts. What we really need to see now are some results. Until

we get government's boot off the throat of small business people and allow them to move forward, do we want to be in the game? Heavens yes, I want to be in the game. So does everybody else want to be in the game.

We need to realize that all these taxes that we create or that we're trying to take in come from businesses that are profitable and people who are working. So if we're talking about growing an economy and if we're talking about cutting spending—and I do agree that cutting spending is important—we better wake up and start to smell the coffee.

We have overregulated these people to the point that they don't want to be in this game anymore. We've got to wake up. I repeat that because we are missing the boat on a very vital thing that's happening right now in this country. We need to get onboard with this. And I've got to tell you, insiders in this Beltway talk about too big to fail. For small business people, you know what we are? We're too small to survive, because we can't get the help from the people we need. All we get is a lot of talk and a lot of overregulation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

□ 1220

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The President has begun a review of regulations. Madam Speaker, you would think the majority would do something like declare victory. Instead, they prematurely held an oversight hearing with business, a one-sided hearing, rather than joining issue by calling in the agencies one by one to see what kind of a review the President is, in fact, doing.

I favor government for the good of the general welfare; therefore I have always hated government bureaucracy and regulations that make government, even the best of government, look bad. I headed a Federal agency, and I believe I will be more remembered for streamlining its processes than for the underlying mission. I eliminated a huge backlog of cases, and settled cases which had usually been carried to the full stream. Guess what? When we started to settle them, we got more remedies.

Instead, look at what the majority has done. They have changed the subject from jobs to reducing Federal power in the District of Columbia. One way in which they have done this is to spend their first month on bills which usurp control of local power and local funds from a local jurisdiction. That is the opposite of what they have claimed they want to do.

They have introduced a harsh anti-choice bill. What is the District of Columbia's spending of its local funds doing in such a bill? Yesterday, they introduced a bill to wipe out the local gun laws of a local jurisdiction after the courts have now found them to be constitutional. They have introduced a DC-only private voucher bill, not a national bill, after a compromise on vouchers for DC was already achieved and even though the District of Columbia has a home rule alternative, the largest alternative school system in the United States, where almost half of our children are in public charter schools.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. NORTON. I am grateful.

The majority has taken regulation, a subject on which there is a basis for areas of consensus, and has polarized it. They have broken their promises on jobs—look, no jobs bill—and on reducing Federal power by trying to literally usurp power from a local jurisdiction and dictate to that local jurisdiction from the Federal Government what it should be doing.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I would like to thank the gentleman from California for yielding me time this morning.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution. I commend the gentleman from Maryland, the minority whip, for rising in support of this resolution; and I would urge the rest of the Members on the other side of the aisle to follow their whip in support of this resolution.

As families struggle to pay their bills and as small businesses falter, the impact of overregulation could not be more devastating than it currently is. I stand here today, supporting and representing the good, hardworking men and women of Florida's Second District.

In Florida, we stand at nearly 12 percent unemployment. It is a historic number. I will tell you that the regulations that are coming through the EPA are going to further destroy and hamper job growth in our State. The EPA has allied with environmental activists to finalize numeric nutrient criteria for rivers and lakes. These crippling regulations due to take effect this year will penalize the State of Florida and could possibly destroy 14,500 agricultural jobs just in our State, according to the Florida Department of Agriculture and the University of Florida study. It could cost cash-strapped government entities across my State $21 billion in new water treatment facilities.

This week, I met with a member from a local municipality who said they had just completed a $17 million project and that, if these regulations go into effect, it is going to have to be repeated again, which will be another $17 million on top of the $17 million that they have just implemented.

It is time for Washington to get out of the way and to allow small businesses across my State and this great Nation to create jobs.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I would just say one thing to the gentleman who just spoke, which is that we agree with the gentleman from Maryland. We want a comprehensive look at these regulations.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR).

Mr. LABRADOR. Madam Speaker, I want to briefly speak about the impact the overbearing Environmental Protection Agency has in my district.

I want to begin by relating an anecdote that illustrates the arrogant and tone-deaf attitude the EPA has taken in its attempts to regulate almost everything that moves or breathes in Idaho's First Congressional District.

In the Federal Register, the Environmental Protection Agency announced a public meeting in Boise where my constituents could come and provide oral comments. Relying upon the EPA's notice in the Federal Register, my constituents attended in order to share their thoughts with the EPA, only to be told that oral comments would not be accepted.

My constituents try to do the right thing and play by the rules; but when the EPA writes the rule book in erasable or even invisible ink, my constituents become jaded and distrustful of the EPA, and they come to this body for assistance. They are done being treated unfairly by a Federal bureaucracy that no longer seems to care if it even obeys its own rules. This body must no longer tolerate such actions.

We must also not tolerate the job-killing regulations that the EPA dreams to implement. Even though the current and past administrations have recognized that the Clean Air Act is not appropriate for the regulation of greenhouse gases, the EPA nonetheless has chosen to ignore those findings and treat greenhouse gases as though they endanger the public health and welfare.

The EPA and other Federal agencies led by the White House are also charging ahead with policies, using questionable climate change science under the guise of protecting vulnerable or endangered species, policies that will do very little, if anything, to aid species, but that will most surely empower Federal bureaucrats and environmental lawyers. These policies will further restrict access to our water and land and will further hit our already struggling agriculture and resource-dependent communities.

Finally, the EPA and the National Marine Fisheries Service have ignored the ''best available data'' of farmers as they determine how pesticide registration affects salmon in the Pacific Northwest.

In an era in which the administration's failed fiscal and energy policies

are inflating food prices, the EPA piles on with its procedures that add nothing but uncertainty to the process.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, may I inquire, do I have the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from California to close this portion of debate.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank my committee chair for yielding me time. I appreciate his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution and recommend that we review regulations and the order from Federal agencies that they submit and control the private sector.

Since the onset of the recession, the driving policy in Washington has been to grow our economy for the long term. Some of our colleagues believe that we can achieve that by growing the Federal Government. However, more government and more regulations do not lead to more jobs. In 1988, Ronald Reagan stated that, in the end, it was not government regulation, high taxes or Big Government spending but, rather, free enterprise that led to the building of a great America.

Over the past 2 years, the American business owner has seen darker economic days than this country has seen in generations. Yet our businesses still push forward, innovating and adapting to the increasingly global marketplace that we live in. Our government must do the same thing. Astonishingly, a number of our colleagues believe that Federal regulations actually lead to more jobs and more productivity. Some have even called for more Federal regulation to spur job growth. Quite frankly, I think that's insane; and I think most Americans believe the same.

After hearing from job creators yesterday in our Oversight and Government Reform hearing, as well as hearing from job creators in my district, it is clear that the best way to help small businesses, America's job creators, is to look in our own backyard to see what onerous regulations and wasteful spending programs are getting in the way of free enterprise. That means a renewed commitment to tough government oversight and transparency. That's what this resolution does.

□ 1230

This Chamber must remain committed to enacting policies based on the principles of Ronald Reagan, reducing the size of government, increasing its efficiency, and making it accountable to those it serves, the American people.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I continue to reserve.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge CARTER.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend the chairman and his committee for the hard work they're doing here today.

While we look at bad rules, Madam Speaker, already on the books, let's not take new, worse rules on in the future. With a split House and Senate, it will be a tough job to repeal existing regulations in light of the Senate requirement of 60 votes to bring something to a vote in the Senate. It will be very difficult, but we have a special parliamentary tool to block new rules with the Congressional Review Act, which mandates a Senate vote on blocking new regulations of just 30 Members of the Senate. So we can have closure in the Senate with only 30 Senators joining us.

Today, we face new EPA attempts to shut down the Portland cement industry in our Nation, costing thousands of jobs. We face an EPA grab to take away Texas' ability to issue emission permits, undermining the economy of Texas and destroying job growth in our State.

We face an HHS scheme to kick small health insurers out of the market because they can't match the administrative cost ratios of their mega-insurer competitors.

But if we use our majority in this body to disapprove these bad rules, we can then convince just 30 of our Senators to join us and go along with it to bring it to the floor of the Senate for a vote, a straight up-or-down vote. I think we have a very good chance to stop these new rules that are in the pipeline.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to join our effort to use the Congressional Review Act to fight bad rules and save jobs. I thank you.

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

Madam Speaker, as I said a little bit earlier, this is not controversial. We're on the same page and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said it quite appropriately: We believe in effective and efficient government. There's nothing more important. When government performs effectively and efficiently, we all benefit.

I think the President was right when he issued Executive order number 13563, when he said that we want to look at outmoded, ineffective, insufficient, or excessively burdensome regulations to modify and streamline our rules. That's what we're all about, but I want to make sure that we do have that balance on both sides because of the fact that the American people are depending on us to be their line of defense.

As Mr. Stanley ''Goose'' Stewart said—he's a fellow who was part of the Sago Mine incident in West Virginia—and I'll close with these words. He said this to our legislators in a letter. He said, You were elected to represent the American people, but more importantly, you are Americans, and at the very base of it all you are human beings. The safety of our American people should mean more to you than extra profits for big corporations. It seems wrong to justify the filling of corporate bank accounts with the blood of American workers and the tears of their families.

With that, Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote for the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to Dr. GOSAR from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, red tape, the EPA, government regulations. When I travel my district, these words come up over and over again. These are not words of encouragement; these are words of frustration. Small businesses across Arizona are struggling to keep their doors open because government will not get out of the way. Enough is enough. Now is the time to make changes that will empower our Nation and put our people back to work.

Take, for example, the Navajo Generating Station in my district. They have state-of-the-art technology that makes them one of the cleanest coal power plants in the country. Yet, the EPA says this technology is not good enough. Out-of-touch bureaucrats at the EPA are threatening over 500 high-paying jobs in my district, over 80 percent of which go to the Navajo Nation, where unemployment is approaching 60 percent. The plant provides power to the major cities of Arizona and 95 percent of the power to the Central Arizona Project's canal, which in turn delivers 45 percent of the city of Phoenix's projected water demand and 80 percent of Tucson's projected water demand.

The EPA's attempt to shut down the Navajo Generating Station will put Arizona's water and energy security at risk. What is worse, the Navajo Generating Station is willing to comply with the EPA, yet the EPA is imposing timelines that no businesses can reasonably meet. Why, you may ask? Because the EPA is more concerned with their agenda than they are about the people of Arizona.

Today, I stand here asking my colleagues, the Senate, and the administration to listen to the people of my district. We have no more time to waste. We need to rein in government before it puts the rest of our country out of business.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, Madam Speaker, the American people do not yet really know the CFPB, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, but they probably know better the FCC, the SEC, the FTC, and the Consumer Product Safety Council—and to be honest, I got really tied up in the rest of the letters they put here. None of them, I repeat, none of them, are covered by the President's Executive order. For whatever reason, the President limited his Executive order to the non-independent

agencies, not even calling on the independent agencies to begin a review.

Madam Speaker, over the last half hour, we've heard again and again my colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying this is frivolous, it's not necessary. Yesterday, they called the whole hearing with American job creators, many of whom had responded to Americanjobcreators.com, they called it sort of anecdotal, or frivolous, or hyperbole.

Madam Speaker, it's time that we take seriously the loss of American jobs. Today's resolution does have specificity, does deal with the fact that Americans are suffering, and regulations are part of our competitive challenge.

Madam Speaker, I take STENY HOYER at his word that he supports this and wants to work together. I take the President at his word that it is time to do this review. I don't take the bureaucrats at their word that, like foxes guarding the henhouse, if you go back and tell them to guard again more carefully, that you are any more likely to have anything other than less chickens in the morning.

Madam Speaker, we cannot assume here in the House that over the last 2 years when Democrats controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House and did nothing to reduce regulations—just the opposite, increased them—and that the President, currently who is increasing regulation without one piece of legislation, trying to get card check through the back door and hundreds of other programs far beyond our demand, that if given the mandate to re-regulate what they've regulated, that they won't in fact use it as a chance to expand a liberal agenda in a way that will further hurt the American jobs.

We must be there hand-in-hand with this administration to make sure that every change in regulations is followed up with binding law that will, in fact, help the American people get back to work.

So, Madam Speaker, I am absolutely convinced that this resolution is necessary as a first step to make it clear that the House of Representatives is fully committed to getting Americans working again and Americanjob creators.com and other sites that are trying to collect this data from people who create jobs in America and the private sector, we are going to continue to gather and disperse those areas that American job creators are finding are impediments to their creating the jobs in America.

□ 1240

Lastly, Madam Speaker, you will hear in the days and weeks to come about corporate profits in America, and you will hear about the great profit growths of some of our best-known corporations. After yesterday's hearing, I went back and checked. Almost to a corporation, the growth in their profits has been disproportionate from overseas earnings, on overseas labor, and overseas development. Meaning, Madam Speaker, do not look to corporate profits as the bellwether. Do not look to the stock market as a bellwether.

American jobs are created when American companies are incentivized and given an opportunity to create jobs in America. That's what this resolution is about today. That's what the hearings and the markups will be in the days and weeks to come. That's the reason why we cannot leave it to bureaucrats behind doors that created these problems. Allow them to, in fact, reevaluate their own sins.

So, Madam Speaker, I am delighted today to support House Resolution 72 and to urge its consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the Republican leadership.

Mr. WALDEN. I thank my colleague from Texas.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill and the examination of the rules and the regulations that create uncertainty and increased costs and disadvantage our businesses, farmers, and ranchers. My wife and I were small business owners for nearly 22 years. I know what it's like to sign the front of a payroll check and to deal with government rules and regulations.

Here is a perfect example of what my farmers and ranchers face in Oregon. These are new rules that are coming out from the Environmental Protection Agency that are relying on what they even termed as a National Marine Fisheries Service document that was less than transparent. This affects new set-asides if you use modern chemicals at all to grow America's food and the world's food. These are new setback provisions that are being required in buffer zones that could, in some cases, be from 100 to 1,000 feet along any body of water, including intermittent streams. Now, if you are from sort of the dry side of Oregon, you have a lot of intermittent streams that only kind of flow with runoff, and they dry up. The practical effect, though, is that you could lose most of your farmland.

This is an example, run through their models, of what this could mean if this rule goes into effect. And you would take from 108 acres, which is the whole area here, and you would begin to reduce down the buffers to where you would be able to farm less than 10 acres. That means that for this farm, you could lose upwards of—this crop yield now would produce $21,000 in income. When the Federal Government's rules are fully implemented as described here, you would be down to $1,500. You can't farm if you lose much of your farm ground and you go from 108 acres down to 10.

This will occur all over the country, all over eastern and western Oregon, and it is an enormous Federal Government land grab that could affect between 40 and 67 percent of farmlands in Oregon. And in this case, it's an 83 percent reduction if taken all the way to the 1,000-foot buffer along these intermittent streams.

Ladies and gentlemen, we need to examine this and many other rules and regulations and look at their practical effect on the ground throughout the countryside, on the men and women who raise our food and produce the jobs in America.

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

Madam Speaker, back when I was campaigning for Members all across the country, I heard Republicans constantly talking about jobs. Despite the fact that the Democratic majority in the 111th Congress brought America back from the brink of a depression and presided over 10 straight months of private sector job growth, with Republicans obstructing every step of the way, the Republicans insisted they would focus on jobs, jobs, jobs.

But something must have happened to the Republicans over the holidays, because for the full month since the opening of the 112th Congress, the Republican majority has done literally nothing to create jobs. Republicans have held votes on 11 bills that do things like denying insurance to people with preexisting conditions and denying security funding to the area around the United Nations building in New York. Not a single one of these votes has created a single job for a single American.

Republicans are holding a host of committee hearings on issues like restricting access to women's legal health services and rolling back injured patients' legal rights. Not a single one of these hearings has created or will create a single job for a single American. Today we are talking and talking about a resolution that will instruct committees to conduct oversight, which they are supposed to do no matter what. This resolution would not create a single job for a single American.

This week, as our economic recovery is just gaining steam, the Republicans are proposing a spending bill that will curtail American innovation and clean energy and cut the number of cops on our streets. This will result in Americans losing their jobs and America being less safe and less prepared to compete in the 21st century global economy and to create jobs years into the future.

Republicans talked last year about how they would focus on jobs. But it seems that when they decide to focus on jobs at all, they are focusing on how to eliminate jobs.

Madam Speaker, I come from a district and a State where unemployment is unacceptably high and too many people have been out of work for much

too long. I honestly wish the Republican majority would focus on commonsense and pragmatic ways to create American jobs. If they decide to do this, they will find me to be a willing partner. But let's stop these shenanigans like we are seeing here today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, the cynicism on the part of the Democratic leadership is interesting. It was just announced yesterday that the Obama health care plan will net lose America 800,000 jobs. But it's also true that it will create millions of jobs, but it destroys millions more, a net 800,000 jobs. The Republican Party is here because of the miserable failure of the Democrat leadership in this House of Representatives and our President who has ruined millions of jobs in this country, and that is why the Republican Party is here to do something about that. Don't worry, we'll be adding millions of jobs.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), a freshman member of the Republican leadership.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, every single day Americans are asking, Where are the jobs? The answer is simple. Current regulations are destroying jobs. Last year alone, government regulations cost businesses more than $1.7 trillion.

As an example, this chart illustrates the significant burden that the Clean Air Act imposes on pulp and paper businesses in my district. These are all the regulations that could impact the industry in the next 10 years, with a price tag of 17 billion job-killing dollars, $17 billion.

Another example, the FDA has threatened General Mills with regulating Cheerios. Cheerios. Why? Because they don't like the health claim benefits on the box.

□ 1250

If we want to create more jobs in America, let's get the government out of the way, and we can start with the 157,000 pages of regulations.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my leader from South Carolina.

Madam Speaker, the prior gentleman who spoke is right. Americans are asking, ''Where are the jobs?'' And the majority is saying, ''We'll get to that later.''

This week, the first thing that they did was to try to rush to the floor, without hearings or consideration, an extension of the Patriot Act, which is a very serious and profound issue for the country. And it didn't work.

Then they brought to the floor a bill that was supposed to recover money from the United Nations, which we're all for, but the Congressional Budget Office says it wouldn't actually save any money. The New York City police commissioner said it would be harmful to his efforts to protect the people of New York against terrorism that might come up around the United Nations. And I think the rest of the world said, Why is the United States rocking the boat at a time when there is profound global crisis going on in the most dangerous area of the world? So that didn't work.

They then brought to the floor this bill, which commendably says that committees should look at whether there are regulations that don't make any sense, that are harmful to jobs and businesses in our country. They're right. We should do that. We're already doing it. In other words, each committee adopts what's called an oversight plan when it meets. It talks about all the different things it wants to do. In Education and the Workforce, we did that. In Armed Services, we did that. So we've now spent 9½ hours debating whether we should keep doing something we're already doing and bring to the floor someday, in the distant ozone future, actual bills that might actually reduce such regulations.

Now if that really weren't bad enough, the majority really switched this week, from ignoring the jobs problem to worsening the jobs problem. Because out of the view of the public on this floor, in their private meetings, they're planning to bring to the floor next week a bill that will dramatically reduce investments, and let me give you an example. We only know what we read in the newspaper because my understanding is that they have yet to post their spending bill online, which they've promised to do 72 hours before it comes up, but you can project this out that they're probably calling for a 30 percent cut in things like air traffic controllers.

I want you to think about this, Madam Speaker, for a moment. Putting aside the obvious safety consideration, I don't think any of us would put anyone we love or care about on a plane we didn't think was safe. That's obviously true on both sides of the aisle, and I'm not suggesting the other side wants to do that. But there are consequences to not having a full complement of air traffic controllers. And beyond the safety consideration is an economic consideration: How can you have a thriving economy if people feel like they can't fly safely?

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

Mr. CLYBURN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. ANDREWS. I come from a State, New Jersey, which prides on being the medicine chest of the world, in our pharmaceutical industry. How can you have a cutting edge in pharmaceutical products if you lay off people from the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, that review the applications for new drugs? How can you have a supermarket industry that's thriving and employs millions of people in the agriculture and food industries if the people who inspect our meat and our milk and our food are not there?

Now these are questions that are going to be debated and answered next week here. They do have an effect on jobs—a profoundly negative effect on jobs. We understand that there is a common responsibility to enact sensible restraint on what our government spends. That's why Democrats balanced the budget when President Clinton was in office. That's why Democrats passed a pay-as-you-go statute.

I would urge that we return to the business of the House.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), a member of the Republican leadership.

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is all about the jobs, and that's exactly what this Republican majority has been fixated on ever since we've come into control of this House.

I will tell you that specifically we recognize that what we need to do to create jobs in this country is provide certainty, tax certainty, and, right here in this resolution, certainty that we are being clear, that we are going to address the regulations that are killing jobs in this country that the Democratic Party has allowed to happen over the last several years. We're going to change that today.

I rise in support of this resolution because small business owners in South Dakota and across this country are losing more of their bottom lines to red tape this year and in the past several years than they have in decades. Federal agencies continuously overstep their powers and impose new regulations, which not only raises the cost of doing business but feeds the uncertainty of doing business here in America. Today's economy is uncertain enough. The least we can do for our job creators is to provide them with stability by eliminating unnecessary and costly burdens.

The EPA is rife with examples of these burdens. This agency wants to penalize farmers for dust on their operations and what they produce. You can bet any South Dakota farmer tending their livestock, baling hay, or harvesting their crops would agree this is absurd.

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

Mrs. NOEM. I want to thank you for letting me voice my opinions on these regulations. We will address the problem.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I would now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina, our assistant Democratic leader, for yielding and for his leadership.

I strongly oppose H. Res. 72. This does nothing to create jobs. Secondly, it does nothing to address really the regulations and the policies that impact the poor and the long-term unemployed.

I submitted an amendment to this resolution that required each standing committee to review administrative actions or policies that ''reduce poverty and address the needs of the chronically unemployed.'' However, the Republican majority on the Rules Committee refused to include this modest but important provision. I am forced to conclude that my Republican colleagues don't quite understand the desperate conditions that confront the poor and long-term unemployed. Within the resolution, I see a list of directing actions to committees to review regulations that impede, discourage, hurt, harm, or limit the ability of agencies to achieve specific policy objectives. However, there are no directions to address the pain and the misery experienced by millions of poor people and the chronically unemployed.

In the United States, the number of persons below the poverty line increased from 39.3 million in 2008 to 42.9 million in 2009. In California, the rate increased from 4.8 million in 2008 to 5.1 million in 2009. Yet the resolution before us gives marching orders to committees to identify regulations that impede, fail, hurt, or limit. I cannot understand why the majority does not want to identify regulations that fail, hurt, or harm the poor and the chronically unemployed or limits the poor from achieving middle income status. This is not a partisan issue and we must all remember that poverty affects constituents that reside in Republican and Democratic districts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CLYBURN. I yield the gentlelady an additional minute.

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the new majority promised to provide a comprehensive plan to restore America to prosperity and to create jobs. Unfortunately, this resolution does not do anything to deliver on that promise.

Furthermore, I hope that this body, both Democrats and Republicans, will begin to focus on the fact that we have millions of people who are poor, who are low income, and who are chronically unemployed.

□ 1300

Whatever we do, we need a yardstick, and we need a criteria, and we need standards so that we can look at how what we do here on this floor elevates and lifts up people who are below the poverty line and helps them move into middle-income status. This resolution does not do that. It's really a bunch of rhetoric, as I see it. I really can't figure out what it's about. It does nothing, and it certainly does nothing to create jobs for those whom we care about.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the favorite son of the State of Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, today the folks on the other side of the aisle are actually arguing in the alternative. We heard the gentleman from New Jersey say, well, Republicans at least are finally getting to it. You don't need this resolution. And the gentlelady from California says, the resolution isn't good enough.

I think what is clear is one thing. What we've seen from the past 2 years has been failure. I mean, it's ironic. There's nobody, Mr. Speaker, that's on the floor today defending the economic policies of the past 2 years, the stimulus that promised 8 percent and obviously, the overpromising and under-delivering.

Jobs are job one of this Congress. It is imperative that we focus. And what we're doing with this resolution is putting an imprimatur of the work of these committees, saying your priority is to go through chapter and verse on these regulations and separate that out. The ones that don't add value, the ones that aren't making people safer, the ones that are complete nonsense, let's focus in on them, highlight them, and remove them.

We have to remove the barriers to job creation. That is our responsibility. That is what should be bringing us all together.

I urge the swift passage of this resolution.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, we just spent the past 2 days telling committees to do their jobs. Why aren't we focusing on creating jobs, creating jobs for the American people?

Let me be clear: I'm in favor of a strong and vigorous debate here on cutting redtape and finding bipartisan solutions to our Nation's problems. But to pretend that commonsense oversight measures to protect families and businesses are inherently burdensome with no benefit fails to acknowledge the reality of the financial disaster that was brought upon this country on Wall Street. It fails to acknowledge the disaster of the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. It fails to acknowledge toxic toys and drywall coming into this country. It fails to acknowledge the increase in deadly food-borne illnesses from lax oversight of our food safety system. And it fails to acknowledge what the American people want us to work on right now, and that's creating good jobs to support their families.

I believe that we all want what is best for the people we represent, although we often have different ideas about how to get there. But to structure a debate that is so one-sided, that attempts to gloss over the very events that created this recession, is not serving the American people. Let's look at the entire picture.

I will be offering a motion to recommit that will ensure we place a high priority on protecting the safety of America's food supply, safe drinking water, and the safety of children's toys in this country. This is, and should be, an essential function of our Nation's government.

Just last year, cadmium, a known carcinogen, was found in amounts in excess of 90 percent in children's bracelets imported from China. This stuff happens far too often, and without strong oversight and commonsense regulation, American children would continue to be put at risk.

I don't believe any of my colleagues here are against protecting public health and ensuring that we are doing our duty as elected officials to protect our constituents. That's why I'd like to reach out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and ask them to join us, join us in this motion to recommit which will instruct House committees to make the health and safety of our families a priority also. Preserving commonsense safety standards is just as important as reforming overly burdensome regulations.

Let's work together to help create the environment that protects our citizens. Let's move quickly to the jobs agenda that Americans want and deserve. Americans are still waiting for this House to take up the jobs agenda.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, my point to the Democratic Party and the leadership of that party is, wait no longer. The Republican Party is now in charge in this House, and our agenda is about jobs. It is about reducing spending, and it is about reducing the size of government.

And today, after 9½ hours of debate, we start with rules and regulations that not only stifle innovativeness, that stifle inventions, and jobs, and job creation, but it is harming the way of life of the free enterprise system and sapping the energy from that system.

By reviewing existing, pending, and proposed regulations from agencies of the Federal Government, Congress can begin to assist small and large businesses to focus on job creation, economic growth, and innovation. We first need to understand the too true impact that is being placed upon the free enterprise system.

We know with the current rules that are in place, $1.75 trillion dollars is the cost annually to the U.S. economic free enterprise system. It's time for Congress to reevaluate these rules and regulations.

Regulatory burdens are hindering job growth. They're hindering investment,

and innovation is eroding from the most basic elements of freedom in America. Congress and this administration must work together.

It made me proud to hear the minority leader, STENY HOYER, say today that he would be a part of and vote for this bill. However, our opportunity today must direct our committees and the entire focus of Congress to take the first step in reining in Big Government, reducing our deficit, and encouraging job growth and economic prosperity. This bill will shine the light on that process and will provide the necessary transparency and accountability for Congress to be looking at Federal agencies and rules and regulations.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues and I remain committed to putting America back to work. And this legislation is a step in the right direction. I encourage my colleagues and all of the Members of the Congress who are here today to say that we want to bring jobs back to America, but we're going to look at the rules and regulations that inhibit that. I say we should all vote ''yes'' on H. Res. 72.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, as a former small business owner and steadfast advocate of government accountability, it is a pleasure to speak today recognizing the important work that must be done to reduce the economic, job-crushing harm imposed by Federal overregulation.

As the economy struggles to recover and so many Americans remain jobless, it is critical that Congress takes immediate action to reduce waste and free up capital to unleash the job creating potential of small businesses and other private sector employers.

The need to improve government transparency and accountability motivated me to author bipartisan legislation, H.R. 373, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, which would expand cost estimate reporting requirements and close loopholes that have been used to leave the public unaware of the full impact of Federal mandates.

It is important to understand the real-world impact of overly burdensome Federal regulations that are acting as a boot to the throat of so many would-be job creators.

One example comes to me from a budding entrepreneur who has recently started his own remodeling business specialized in installing energy efficient doors and windows.

This man, who is too scared of the long arm of the Environmental Protection Agency to be identified, represents the universe of private employers who are uniquely positioned to quickly create the new jobs Americans so desperately need.

In his own words, this beleaguered entrepreneur explains that:

''Since the new lead laws were initiated on April 1, 2010 then moved to July 1, 2010 because the EPA was ill-prepared for all of the contractors to be registered and monitored, the complete law and process we must follow has been nothing short of a confusing, unnecessary mess.

''Although the law started with an 'Opt out option' allowing homeowners to opt out of 'Lead safe renovations' if they met the criteria of no children under age six and no one pregnant in the household, that exception was eliminated because we were told that it is 'unconstitutional' to ask if someone is pregnant. Now we are required by law to follow a laundry list of 'Lead Safe Renovations' guidelines, with fines for each violation amounting to $36,000 per occurrence.

The contractor continues: ''The EPA states the health risks but I am unaware of any data to support this outrageous new law. There are so many contradictions in this law such as we are to test for lead on any house built on or before 1978 and if there is lead we must be certified as a 'lead safe renovator' which requires spending $200 to attend a class, $300 on the EPA's registration fee and $60 to register in Iowa. At that point, we must initiate lead 'abatement' procedures. This multi-step process involves:

''1) Testing for lead with lead test swabs costing $4.50 each.

''2) Properly recording all data for six years or risk a significant fine and audit by the EPA.

''3) Plastic off inside rooms by taping plastic on doors, vents, windows, floor and all other indoor surfaces.''

''4) Plastic off the outside area, 10 feet away from structure and 20 foot wide posting with warning sign and caution tape, which imposes approximate costs of $100 for each section of the structure for plastic and tape.

''5) Optional donning of a non-reusable lead suit, respirator and shoe covers, which cost $40 to $60 each time used.

''6) Start abatement process of removing wood with lead on it and wrapping this wood in more plastic, duct tape shut and throw in landfill. Although I am uncertain how safe the heavy duty plastic is for the landfill, I'm sure the EPA will find out 15 years from now and make the public pay for it.

''7) Use a certified HEPA vacuum cleaner to clean the room before using baby wipes to wipe down the inside of the room from ceiling to floor. When complete, test sections of each room must be wiped with clean baby wipes and photograph comparisons of the test wipes with official EPA chart. HEPA vacuums cost anywhere from $250 to $3000 and baby wipes a few dollars for each job and every photograph and all information must be recorded or risk large fines.

''Originally the EPA said this would only add approx 5% onto the cost of a job. In my experience it has added no less than 25% and sometimes as much as 40% per job, depending on difficulty.

''Furthermore, these rules are inconsistent as they do not apply to nursing homes and homeowners can still work on their own homes without following the regulations.

''The lead laws contradict OSHA requirements as putting a ladder on plastic or scaffold creates an obvious safety hazard, meaning we could be fined by OSHA for following EPA lead laws.

''The EPA is relentless in accusing businesses of not following all the rules, even though the businesses are following the rules they were taught in the class.

''We in the industry understand parts of the law, but things continue to change fast without proper notice. Something must change before this continues to suffocate the remodeling industry in this free democratic society. Unfortunately we feel these new laws are nothing less than a government power grab in the name of 'keeping people safe from lead poisoning'.''

Mr. Speaker, this is just one of a million examples of the long arm of the Federal Government reaching down to grab the throat of innocent, hard-working job creators of this great country.

If we are serious about creating jobs, we should stop the talk. Stop the government spending. And act to unleash the job growing potential of the private sector.

I urge your support for this resolution which is a first step towards these ends.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 72.

It's been five weeks since the House Republican leadership convened the 112th Congress. But we've yet to see any legislation brought to the floor to spur job creation, as they promised. None.

And just yesterday Republicans voted against allowing a jobs bill—the Build America Bonds to Create Jobs Now Act—to even come to the floor for a vote.

Instead of focusing on jobs, they are spending ten hours this week talking about how Congress should perform oversight duties.

Forgive me if I point out that this is one of the main responsibilities of Congress. Don't waste ten hours talking about it, just do it.

And if a House Committee does anything right now, I'm sure our constituents would appreciate sending them an American job-creating bill.

Our economy is showing clear signs of recovery, but it is fragile and there is still much more work to do. There are too many Americans out of work and even more struggling to make ends meet.

We should be building on the economic recovery efforts of the last two years, not backtracking. But that' s just what' s happening.

Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN is dictating spending caps for fiscal year 2011, which will cut the same types of discretionary spending that was such a critical component in the Recovery Act—making Chairman RYAN'S plan a veritable ''anti-Recovery Act.''

Democrats in Congress have committed to measuring every effort by whether it creates jobs, strengthens the middle class, and reduces the deficit. Well so far, the Republican leadership gets a ZERO for the 112th Congress.

I say to my Republican friends, let's stop wasting time and let's get to work!

Oh, and if you are serious about weighing the benefits of Federal regulations, I recommend my colleagues read the Bush Administration's 2008 report to Congress on the subject.

That report found the annual benefits of Federal regulations to the American public outweighed the costs by as much as 14 to 1. So perhaps we should be reading that report on the floor instead of this colossal waste of time.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the American economy and the American people are still struggling to get back on their feet. Unemployment has remained between 9 and 10 percent for over two years and there is no immediate relief in sight.

Each week I return to Kansas and meet with local businesses, and each week, whether I am meeting with infrastructure providers like WATCO in Pittsburg, manufacturers like MGP Ingredients in Atchison or Alexander Manufacturing in Parsons farmers and ranchers in Brown County or CPA's in Baxter Springs, I hear the same sad story time and again.

Overbearing regulation from the Federal Government, whether it be from the EPA, the USDA, HUD, the Department of Transportation, the SEC, or the IRS Regulators, at every turn are making job creation, investment, expansion, or growth too complex and too costly.

For too long Washington has sent mixed messages to the nations job creators and small businesses. It appears we have one foot on the gas pedal and one foot on the brake. The rhetoric has urged our employers to step on the gas and invest and begin hiring again but this administration has slammed their foot on the breaks issuing hundreds of burdensome regulations that make job creation private investment and innovation nearly impossible.

It's time for the rhetoric in this town to be met with corresponding action. I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution to reduce burdensome regulation and create a measure of certainty for our nation's job creators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H. Res. 72, which would allow for nearly 10 hours of debate on Congress' authority to conduct oversight of executive agencies and the regulatory process. While there is no express authority in the Constitution for oversight, it is implied in Congress' myriad enumerated powers. We have a longstanding system where the executive branch promulgates regulations. If there is a problem with the regulations, the remedy is for the Court to invalidate—not the Congress.

The new House majority promised leaner, more efficient, more focused government. Yet today we are wasting time and money debating a question that was already resolved. This is cheap political theater.

This resolution is redundant and unnecessary. It is simply a waste of time. Americans are hurting. Spending 9½ hours debating something House Committees already have the authority to do is a slap in the face to the millions of unemployed individuals in this country.

I am ready to roll my sleeves up and get to work and help those who have been harmed because of deregulation. I am ready to do what my constituents elected me to do—focus on growing the economy and creating jobs.

We should be spending our time discussing legislation that will allow us to invest in America and grow the middle class.

I strongly oppose this resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support House Resolution 72.

House Resolution 72 directs House Committees to review excessive and costly Federal Government regulations. These excessive and costly Federal Government regulations stifle job creation and contribute to the uncertainty preventing small-businesses from hiring new employees.

Recently, the Washington Post reported "nonfinancial companies are sitting on $1.8 trillion in cash." I wondered why that is. After speaking with many Nevada small-business owners the answer is clear: economic uncertainty. The uncertainty created by these government regulations is a key reason Nevada suffers from the highest unemployment in the Nation at over 14 percent.

We are only beginning to scratch Obamacare's overly burdensome, regulatory-riddled surface, and what we've found is alarming. Just this week I asked Gail Johnson, who employs young teachers, if there are regulations in Obamacare she feels are overly burdensome and interfering with her ability to do business. One example she pointed to is a regulation that now requires employers who provide health insurance plans to offer policies that have no dollar limits on durable medical equipment—like a walker.

Unsurprisingly, there is a cost to having that kind of coverage added. Yet, Ms. Johnson's employees are young, so why should they be forced to have coverage they don't need! There are many people like Ms. Johnson in Nevada, forced to pay for something they neither want, nor need.

I'm anxious to dig into the rest of Obamacare and the many other regulatory-riddled laws passed through Congress without regard for their economic impact. Nevada families shouldn't suffer because Washington bureaucrats are out of touch with reality.

I do believe smart regulations are a necessary and important part of the Federal Government's role in keeping us safe. That said, we must not allow the Federal Government to continue stifling our return to economic stability and growth. I look forward to reviewing and removing job-killing federal regulations so we can get Nevadans back to work.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying resolution, H. Res. 72.

What's happening right now is that Congress passes a law, but then doesn't get any say in the policy.

Well intentioned laws like the Clear Air Act and the Clean Water Act are emboldening the executive branch to advance policies through rulemaking that they know would never make it out of Congress.

During Fiscal Year 2010, the Obama Administration adopted 43 new major regulations. These regulations put over $26.5 billion in new burdens on Americans. Ten rules adopted by the Environmental Protection Agency alone cost $23.2 billion.

Today, I want to bring attention to one example of agency rulemaking: the EPA's numeric nutrient water quality standards rulemaking.

I want clean air and water. It's what Florida's about. The numeric nutrient criteria proposed is an EPA takeover of the state's water quality. Given the organic makeup of Florida and the natural phosphorus levels in our state, the ratios set by the EPA may be scientifically impossible to reach.

Compliance will require an investment of billions of dollars that will be passed on to Florida taxpayers, effectively resulting in a new tax levied on all Floridians. Another analysis estimates that the EPA rulemaking will impose statewide costs ranging from $3.1 to $8.4 billion per year for the next 30 years. To put that in perspective, Florida's total budget is $64 billion. Florida Dept. of Agriculture study shows that Florida's agriculture community alone will lose 14,545 jobs and of lose $1.148 billion annually.

During the State of the Union, President Obama promised to fix federal regulations that put an unfair burden on business and hinder growth and development.

I can't think of a better example of such a regulation than the numeric nutrient criteria.

The Federal Government creates an average of 4,000 final regulations each year.

H. Res. 72 is an important step in reining back these regulations.

With that, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting both this rule and the underlying resolution.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 72. Since becoming a Member of Congress, there has been a reoccurring theme in almost all of my meetings with constituents—the overreaching and burdensome nature of the regulatory authority of Federal agencies. Regardless if the meeting is with farmers, business owners, factory and mill workers, energy producers, doctors and teachers, all of them have been negatively impacted by unbalanced decisions by Federal agencies. All these groups want is fair, reasonable and balanced decisions. In my Committee work this week, I heard in the House Agriculture Committee about the difficulties in the haphazard nature in which Dodd-Frank is being implemented. In the House Committee on Education and Workforce, I heard testimony regarding the negative impact of regulations in health care, education, and the National Labor Relations Board. It is obvious that the problem is not limited to one agency or industry, but a growing trend by the Administration in their approach to implementing regulations.

I like to take a moment and talk specifically about the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed Maximum Achievable Control Technology for boilers. It is not even clear that the technology the EPA is requiring even currently exists. I have heard from several groups both here in DC and back in the district that the ruling would lead to the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs at a cost of tens of billions of dollars in cost in implementing the rule. For example, it could result in the loss of 17,000 jobs in mills and 55,000 jobs in surrounding communities in the pulp and paper industry. It is estimated the cost to the industry would be over $5.5 billion in capital and $1.2 billion in annualized cost. New air regulations could total about $4 billion annually, which is over 4 times the entire industry's profit in 2008. This would eliminate the industry and push jobs overseas leaving us relying on foreign markets for products.

The Boiler MACT ruling is only one in a long line of troubling rule-making decisions by the EPA and other agencies. In my State of Alabama, that has a strong presence of agriculture, farmers have continually been faced with over-reaching decisions such as rulings on pesticides, regulations of concentrated animal feeding operations, ruling on genetically engineered crops, definition of navigable waters and nonpoint source pollution, to name a few. We cannot continue to be faced with regulations that are not consistent, that overly impede on particular industries, discourage innovation and eliminate jobs and businesses.

I look forward to Congress exerting their oversight power and to reign in the Federal agencies. Congress must ensure that we have regulations that are done fairly in a balanced manner to ensure the safety and health of the American people while controlling for overly burdensome cost on our society.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against H. Res. 72. I am slightly puzzled about why we used floor time for a resolution that directs committees to conduct oversight, which they already have the power to do and

should be doing, but I appreciate this opportunity to highlight how we can change the narrative from good regulations vs. bad or unnecessary regulations to one of better results achieved faster and at less expense.

Through my experience as an administrator responsible for compliance, and as a policy maker at the local, State and Federal levels, I have spent a great deal of attention on regulations.

Commonsense regulations from food safety, to lead-free children's toys, to environmental protections keep us safe and have saved countless lives. They prevent us from prioritizing short-term gains by corporations over the long-term prosperity of this nation. Indeed it was the lack of regulation in the financial industry that led us into this current recession.

I hope we can reframe the regulatory debate to satisfy both sides and better serve the public. I believe we can, and should, move towards the next generation of performance driven regulation. This can reward innovation and increase efficiency while at the same time holding people accountable and achieving better results.

The administration has already made great strides in this area by appointing a Chief Performance Officer at OMB. There is a tremendous opportunity between the White House and other Members of Congress in both parties who want to usher in a new era of more effective government.

Instead of repealing regulations and continuing to rehash old arguments, which will be to the detriment of our constituents' safety and our nation's long-term interests, I hope my colleagues will join me in thinking about how we change the way we regulate to be more effective and efficient.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 72, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Carnahan moves to recommit the resolution H. Res. 72 to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. PRIORITY.

In carrying out the requirements of section 1, relevant committees shall place a high priority on preserving the standards that ensure the safety of the Nation's food supply, safe drinking water, and the safety of children's toys.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 178, nays 242, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—178

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—242

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

NOT VOTING—13

Bass (CA)
Berman
Bilbray
Cooper
Crowley
Giffords
Harman
Neal
Pingree (ME)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scott, David
Smith (WA)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1334

Messrs. STIVERS, BROOKS, JONES, Ms. FOXX, Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, AKIN, and SMITH of Texas changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 391, noes 28, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

AYES—391

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—28

Chu
Clarke (NY)
Cohen
Conyers
Dingell
Ellison
Engel
Filner
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Moore
Nadler
Olver
Payne
Rangel
Richmond
Schakowsky
Towns
Waters
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—14

Bass (CA)
Berman
Bilbray
Cooper
Crowley
DeLauro
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Harman
Neal
Pingree (ME)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Smith (WA)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1351

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 344, nays 50, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—344

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns

Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—50

Altmire
Baldwin
Brady (PA)
Burgess
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Chandler
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Costa
Courtney
Dicks
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Foxx
Fudge
Garamendi
Hanabusa
Hanna
Heller
Hinchey
Hirono
Johnson, E. B.
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
McGovern
Miller, George
Moore
Olver
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Price (NC)
Rahall
Richmond
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Shuler
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Visclosky
Waters
Weiner
Wu

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—38

Ackerman
Baca
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Buchanan
Carnahan
Carter
Cooper
Crenshaw
Crowley
Davis (IL)
Gallegly
Giffords
Gohmert
Grijalva
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Holden
Honda
LaTourette
Lynch
Markey
Meeks
Neal
Paul
Pingree (ME)
Quigley
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Young (AK)

Ms. WILSON of Florida changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea''.

□ 1358

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purposes of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the coming week.

I now yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

No votes are expected in the House on Friday.

The House will consider two bills next week. On Monday, the House will consider H.R. 514, a bill to extend for the short term three expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005.

□ 1400

As the gentleman knows, we passed a rule for its consideration yesterday. The balance of the week will be spent on H.R. 1, a bill to fund the government through the remainder of the fiscal year. And I yield back.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me ask the gentleman, he mentioned on Thursday, is the gentleman confident we will be leaving by 3 o'clock or shortly thereafter on Thursday and doesn't expect to be here on Friday?

Mr. CANTOR. I will say to the gentleman from Maryland that he is correct. We expect to abide by the calendar and the provisions set for it therein, intending to depart here by 3 p.m. on Thursday of next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that comment. I know the gentleman will be brief today. But I do want to ask a question with reference to the 302(a) allocations, 302(b) allocations that the Appropriations Committee dealt with and then dealt with a product consistent with those numbers.

It is my understanding that that has now changed or is expected to change in terms of the 302(b) allocation numbers and that they are being modified; am I correct? As I understand it, they have not been modified in the Appropriations Committee and will not be subject to a vote in the Appropriations Committee, and that that number out of the Appropriations Committee may not be the number that will be reported out to the floor next week. Is that correct?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, 302(a) always was intended to be spending brought down to 2008 levels or less. And that is the intention of the bill that will come to the floor next week, H.R. 1, that we will abide by our commitment to reduce discretionary nonsecurity spending by $100 billion for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that answer. Will there be another markup of the Appropriations Committee to attain that number?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, it is very straightforward. The next action of the committee will be to file the bill. The bill will be put online this evening for the public to see, for Members to review, so that we abide by the rules of this House which require for a 3-day layover prior to taking up a bill for debate on the floor of the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman and will end it with this: I am then to understand there will be no markup in the Appropriations Committee on the proposed cuts that will be brought to the floor? Am I correct in that?

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. We can discuss it at a later time when we have more time.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman very much.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2011

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING ROBERT H. SHUMAKER AND THE VIETNAM PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address this body because in 1965 on this day, my uncle Robert Harper Shumaker was shot down over North Vietnam. He was the second pilot shot down and spent 8 years and 1 day in captivity. Tomorrow we celebrate the release of the POWs in Vietnam, a day that many will remember, one of the bright spots of the Vietnam war, when so many of our servicemen were released. Those 8 years in captivity, while we can never regain those years, we can never thank the heroes for what they have done quite fully. But we can remember and we can thank them for all that they have done. Those that wear the uniform today, we thank you for your service.

I am honored today to be among my new colleagues, the gentleman from Texas, SAM JOHNSON, who has served in this House ably for a long number of years. He actually served with my uncle and was next door in solitary confinement for over 3 years. So today, while we remember those who were shot down in 1965, my uncle Robert Harper Shumaker, tomorrow we recognize all those who were released.

NORTHEAST REGION UNITED WAY 211

(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 recognize the Northeast Region United Way 211. United Way 211 is a free, confidential number to call for anyone who needs help and answers in the capital region, from securing adequate care for a child to helping an aging parent to finding substance abuse assistance.

Mr. Speaker, 2010 was a busy year for United Way 211 northeast region, with over 9,100 calls, and they are projecting over 1,000 calls a month for 2011. Why do people call this number? The top reasons deal with some of the most basic needs a person has: keeping a roof over one's head, putting food on the table, and trying to find a place to go to work.

Take Mary in my district, for example. Mary made $48,000 in the first 6 months of 2009 but then got laid off with the downturn in the economy. As an unemployed individual who had gone through all of her savings since losing her job through no fault of her own, she called to receive help in filing her taxes. Or take George—again, a resident of the 21st Congressional District—a senior who suffers from seizures who called because he couldn't afford Medicaid deductibles for his seizure medication. He was in danger of running out of medication the following week. United Way 211 was able to assist George with his finances and get him back on track to managing his own health.

Mr. Speaker, these are the benefits of the United Way 211 Northeast Region.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO PUBLIC BROADCASTING?

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this next week we are going to have a very interesting conversation here in Washington, D.C., where the zeal that some of our friends have for both an ideological agenda and an effort at trying to cut government spending wherever they can, will put public broadcasting in the crosshairs.

I think it's an unfortunate development, one that's going to be a disappointment to the 170 million Americans who rely on public broadcasting every month. It's going to be particularly unfortunate if this agenda succeeds because it's not going to punish people in New York, or Portland, Oregon, or Seattle, or San Francisco. They will always have public broadcasting, although it will be diminished because of what some of my friends on the other side of the aisle hope to accomplish. But the real losers are going to be people in small-town and rural America. It costs 11 times as much to broadcast a signal to the far reaches of eastern Oregon than it does in the metropolitan Portland area. People should watch this discussion carefully. A lot depends on it.

LOST PUBLIC SECTOR JOBS

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, both sides of the aisle agree that the top three priorities for this Congress are jobs, jobs, jobs. But when you look at what the new majority wants to do with the Federal budget, you really have to wonder, are they serious?

Now in the private sector, we've actually seen job growth for the last 12 months, 36,000 more jobs last month. But we've lost hundreds of thousands of public sector jobs. And what should be of most concern to all Americans is that since 2008, more than 200,000 public sector jobs in the education arena—primarily teachers—have been lost; and at that very same time, student enrollment has gone up by 750,000 students. So you lose 200,000 educators while student enrollment goes up 750,000? That's our seed corn for our future. And what's going to happen with this new budget that we will be debating next week is that it is going to be far worse than anything we could have imagined, and that will hurt the future of this great country.

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 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1907

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) at 7 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES AND BUDGETARY MATERIAL

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE 112TH CONGRESS

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Rules of the House of Representatives, so far as applicable, shall govern the Committee and its Subcommittees, except that a motion to recess from day to day, or a motion to recess subject to the call of the chair (within 24 hours), or a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, is a non-debatable motion of privilege in the Committee. [House Rule XI 1(a)]

(b) SUBCOMMITTEES.—Each Subcommittee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and its rules so far as applicable. Written rules adopted by the Committee, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each Subcommittee of the Committee. [House Rule XI 1(a)]

(c) COMMITTEE RULES.—The Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Chair of the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year. [House Rule XI 2(a)(2)]

(d) AVAILABILITY OF PUBLICATIONS.—To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form, including on the Committee website. [House Rule XI 2(e)(4)]

(e) COMMITTEE WEBSITE.—The Chair of the Committee shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee Members and other Members of the House. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may maintain a similar website for the same purpose, including communicating information about the activities of the minority to Committee Members and other Members of the House.

(f) VICE CHAIR; PRESIDING MEMBER.—The Chair shall designate a member of the majority party to serve as Vice Chair of the Committee, and shall designate a majority member of each Subcommittee to serve as Vice Chair of each subcommittee. The vice chair of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, shall preside at any meeting or hearing during the temporary absence of the Chair. If the Chair or Vice Chair of the Committee or Subcommittee are not present at any meeting or hearing, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at the meeting or hearing. [House Rule XI 2(d)]

(g) MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE.—The Chair is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chair considers it appropriate. [House Rule XI 2(a)(3)]

(h) CONFERENCE COMMITTEES.—Recommendations of conferees to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members which shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio of the Committee.

(i) USE OF HEARING ROOMS.—In consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chair of the Committee shall establish guidelines for the use of Committee hearing rooms.

(j) NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION.—All national security information bearing a classification of secret or higher which has been received by the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in Executive Session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping. The Chair of the Committee may establish such regulations and procedures as in the Chair's judgment are necessary to safeguard classified information under the control of the Committee. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any Member of the Committee or any other Member of the House of Representatives who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

(k) OTHER PROCEDURES.—The Chair of the Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out these rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee.

RULE 2. REGULAR, ADDITIONAL, AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) REGULAR MEETINGS.—Unless dispensed with by the Chair of the Committee, the Committee shall meet on the second (2nd) Wednesday of each month at 10:00 a.m. if the House is in session. If the House is not in session on that day and the Committee has not met during such month, the Committee shall meet at the earliest practicable opportunity when the House is again in session. [House Rule XI 2(b)]

(b) ADDITIONAL MEETINGS.—The Chair of the Committee may call and convene, as the Chair considers necessary and in accordance with Rule 4(b), additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose under that call of the Chair. [House Rule XI 2(c)(1) 3

(c) SPECIAL MEETINGS.—Rule XI 2(c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby incorporated by reference. [House Rule XI 2(c)(2)]

RULE 3. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS GENERALLY

(a) IN GENERAL.—Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair, or in the Chair's absence, by the Vice Chair of the Committee or by the ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair. [House Rule XI 1(c)]

(b) OPENING STATEMENTS.—Insofar as is practicable, the Chair, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall limit the total time of opening statements by Members to no more than 10 minutes, the time to be divided equally between the Chair and Ranking Minority Member.

(c) ADDRESSING THE COMMITTEE.—The time any one (1) Member may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration by the Committee or the time allowed for the questioning of a witness at hearings before the Committee will be limited to five (5) minutes, and then only when the Member has been recognized by the Chair. This time limit may be waived by the Chair pursuant to unanimous consent. [House Rule XI 2(j)(2)]

(d) REQUESTS FOR WRITTEN MOTIONS.—Any motion made at a meeting of the Committee and which is entertained by the Chair of the Committee or the Subcommittee shall be presented in writing upon the demand of any Member present and a copy made available to each Member present.

(e) OPEN MEETINGS AND HEARINGS.—Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing of the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) or 2(k)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(f) AUDIO AND VISUAL COVERAGE.—

(1) Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, these proceedings shall be open to coverage by audio and visual means, except as provided in Rule XI 4(f)(2) of the House of Representatives.

(2) To the maximum extent practicable the audio and video coverage shall be in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings.

(3) Operation and use of any Committee internet broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House.

(4) To the maximum extent practicable, the Committee shall maintain the recordings of the coverage of such hearings or meetings in a manner easily accessible to the public.

(5) The Chair of the Committee or Subcommittee may not limit the number of television, or still cameras to fewer than two (2) representatives from each medium (except for legitimate space or safety considerations, in which case pool coverage shall be authorized).

(6) Radio and television tapes, television films, and Internet recordings of any Committee hearings or meetings that are open to the public may not be used, or made available for use, as partisan political campaign material to promote or oppose the candidacy of any person for elective public office.

(7) It is, further, the intent of this rule that the general conduct of each meeting or hearing covered under authority of this rule by audio or visual means, and the personal behavior of the Committee Members and staff, other government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio, and press media personnel, and the general public at the meeting or hearing, shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House in its operations, and may not be such as to:

(A) distort the objects and purposes of the meeting or hearing or the activities of Committee Members in connection with that meeting or hearing or in connection with the general work of the Committee or of the House; or

(B) cast discredit or dishonor on the House, the Committee, or a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner or bring the House, the Committee, or a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner into disrepute.

(8) The coverage of Committee meetings and hearings by audio and visual means shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this rule.

(9) The following shall apply to coverage of Committee meetings or hearings by audio or visual means:

(A) If audio or visual coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(B) The allocation among the television media of the positions or the number of television cameras permitted by a Committee or Subcommittee Chair in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(C) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between a witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the Committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(D) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but may not be placed in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(E) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media may not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the Committee is in session.

(F) (i) Except as provided in subdivision (ii), floodlights, spotlights, strobe lights, and flashguns may not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting.

(ii) The television media may install additional lighting in a hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in a hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of a hearing or meeting at the current state of the art of television coverage.

(G) If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by a Committee or Subcommittee Chair for coverage of a hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be permitted on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(H) Photographers may not position themselves between the witness table and the members of the Committee at any time during the course of a hearing or meeting.

(I) Photographers may not place themselves in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(J) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(K) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(L) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner. [House Rule XI (4)]

RULE 4. CONSIDERATION OF MEASURE OR MATTER

(a) IN GENERAL.—Bills and other substantive matters may be taken up for consideration only when called by the Chair of the Committee, except those matters which are the subject of special call meetings outlined in Rule 2(c).

(b) NOTICE.—

(1) (A) The Chair of the Committee shall announce the date, place, and subject matter of a committee meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which members have notice thereof. [House Rule XI 2(g)(3)]

(B) A committee meeting may begin sooner than specified in subdivision (A) (in which case the Chair shall make the announcement specified in subdivision (A) at the earliest possible time) if—

(i) the Chair of the Committee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, determines there is good cause to do so; or

(ii) the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present. [House Rule XI 2(g)(3)]

(2) (A) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the consideration of a measure or matter, or at the time of the announcement under (b)(1)(B) made within 24 hours before such meeting, the Chair shall cause the text of such measure or matter to be made publicly available in electronic form. [House Rule XI 2(g)(4)]

(B) To the maximum extent practicable, a written copy of the measure or matter to be considered and the original text of the measure to be considered for purposes of markup shall be made publicly available in electronic form for at least 48 hours in advance of consideration, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays.

(3) A notice provided shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form. [House Rule XI 2(g)(3)]

(c) SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS.—To the maximum extent practicable, amendments to a measure or matter shall be submitted in writing to the Clerk of the Committee at least 24 hours prior to the consideration of the measure or matter.

(d) INVESTIGATIVE OR OVERSIGHT REPORTS.—A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read in Committee if it has been available to the Members for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day). [House Rule XI 1(b)(2)]

(e) PRIVATE BILLS.—No private bill will be scheduled by the Chair of the Committee if there are two (2) or more Members who object to its consideration.

RULE 5. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER (A)

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Notwithstanding paragraph (2), a subpoena may be authorized and issued in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities to require the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers and documents as deemed necessary, only when authorized by majority vote of the Committee or Subcommittee (as the case may be), a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chair of the Committee, or by any Member designated by the Chair. [House Rule XI 2(m)(3)(A)]

(2) The Chair of the Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, or, if the Ranking Member cannot be reached, the Ranking Minority Member of the relevant Subcommittee, may authorize and issue such subpoenas as described in paragraph (1) during any period in which the House has adjourned for a period longer than three (3) days. [House Rule XI 2(m)(3)(A)]

(3) A subpoena duces tecum may specify terms of return other than at a meeting or a hearing of the Committee. [House Rule XI 2(m)(3)(B)]

(4) The Chair, or any Member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses before the Committee. [House Rule XI 2(m)(2)]

(b) SENSITIVE OR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—Unless otherwise determined by the Committee or Subcommittee, certain information received by the Committee or Subcommittee pursuant to a subpoena not made part of the record at an open hearing shall be deemed to have been received in Executive Session when the Chair of the Committee, in the Chair's judgment and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, deems that in view of all of the circumstances, such as the sensitivity of the information or the confidential nature of the information, such action is appropriate.

RULE 6. QUORUMS AND VOTING

(a) QUORUMS.—

(1) One-third (1/3) of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for all purposes except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this Rule. [House Rule XI 2(h)(3)]

(2) A majority of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of reporting any measure or matter, authorizing a subpoena, closing a meeting or hearing pursuant to clause 2(g) of Rule XI of the House, releasing executive session material pursuant to clause 2(k)(7) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, or where required by any other Rule of the House.

(3) Two (2) Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, which, unless waived by the Chair of the Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, shall include at least one (1) Member from each of the majority and minority parties. [House Rule XI 2(h)(2)]

(b) VOTING BY PROXY.—No Member may authorize a vote by proxy with respect to any measure or matter before the Committee. [House Rule XI 2(f)]

(c) REQUESTS FOR RECORD VOTE.—A record vote of the Members may be had at the request of three (3) or more Members or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by anyone (1) Member.

(d) POSTPONEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS.—The Chair of the Committee, or of any Subcommittee, is authorized to postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment, and to resume proceedings on a postponed question at any time after reasonable notice. Upon resuming proceedings on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed. [House Rule XI 2(h)(4)]

RULE 7. HEARING PROCEDURES

(a) ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING.—The Chair shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of a hearing, and to the extent practicable, a list of witnesses at least one (1) week before the commencement of the hearing. If the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this Rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest, and made available in electronic form. [House Rule XI 2(g)(3)]

(b) WITNESS STATEMENT; TESTIMONY.—

(1) Insofar as is practicable, no later than 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance, each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file in printed copy and in electronic form a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and a curriculum vitae. [House Rule XI 2(g)(5)]

(2) Each witness shall limit his or her presentation to a five (5) minute summary, provided that additional time may be granted by the Chair of the Committee or Subcommittee when appropriate.

(3) In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness. Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears. [House Rule XI 2(g)(5)]

(c) QUESTIONING WITNESSES.—The right to interrogate a witness before the Committee shall alternate between Majority and Minority Members. Each Member shall be limited to five (5) minutes in the interrogation of witnesses until such time as each Member present who wishes to be recognized has been recognized once for that purpose. No member may be recognized for a second period of interrogation until each Member present has been recognized at least once. [House Rule XI 2(j)(2)]

(d) EXTENDED QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES BY MEMBERS.—Notwithstanding Rule 3(c), upon a motion, the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may designate an equal number of Members from each party to question a witness for a period of time equally divided between the majority party and the minority party, not to exceed one (1) hour in the aggregate or, upon a motion, may designate staff from each party to question a witness for equal specific periods that do not exceed one (1) hour in the aggregate. [House Rule XI 2(j)(2)]

(e) MINORITY WITNESSES.—Whenever any hearing is conducted by the Committee on any measure or matter, the minority Members of the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chair by a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one (1) day of hearing thereon. [House Rule XI 2(j)(1)]

(f) ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD.—Members of the Committee have two (2) weeks from the date of a hearing to submit additional questions for the record to be answered by witnesses who have appeared in person. The letters of transmittal and any responses thereto shall be printed in the hearing record.

(g) ADDITIONAL HEARING PROCEDURES.—Rule XI 2(k) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby incorporated by reference.

RULE 8. PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING MEASURES OR MATTERS

(a) FILING OF REPORTS.—

(1) It shall be the duty of the Chair of the Committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the Committee and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote. To the maximum extent practicable, the written report of the Committee on such measures shall be made available to the Committee membership for review at least 24 hours in advance filing. [House Rule XIII 2(b)(1)]

(2) The report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within seven (7) calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the Clerk of the Committee a written request, signed by the majority of the Members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the Clerk of the Committee shall transmit immediately to the Chair of the Committee notice of the filing of that request. [House Rule XIII 2(b)(2)]

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report of the Committee on a measure or matter that has been approved by the Committee shall include the matters required by clauses 2(c) and 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(c) SUPPLEMENTAL; MINORITY, OR ADDITIONAL VIEWS.—Clause 2(I) of House Rule XI is hereby incorporated by reference.

(d) IMMEDIATE PRINTING; SUPPLEMENTAL REPORTS.—This Rule does not preclude—

(1) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless a timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by this Rule; or

(2) the filing by the Committee of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by that Committee upon that measure or matter.

(e) REPORT LANGUAGE ON USE OF FEDERAL RESOURCES.—No legislative report filed by the Committee on any measure or matter reported by the Committee shall contain language which has the effect of specifying the use of federal resources more explicitly (inclusively or exclusively) than that specified in the measure or matter as ordered reported, unless such language has been approved by the Committee during a meeting or otherwise in writing by a majority of the Members.

RULE 9. OTHER COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS

(a) HOUSE REPORTS.—

(1) Any document published by the Committee as a House Report, other than a report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee, shall be approved by the Committee at a meeting, and Members shall have the same opportunity to submit views as provided for in Rule 8(c).

(2) Not later than the 30th day after June 1 and December 1, the Committee shall submit to the House a semiannual report on the activities of the Committee.

(b) OTHER DOCUMENTS.—

(1) Subject to paragraph (2) and (3), the Chair of the Committee may approve the publication of any document as a Committee print which in the Chair's discretion the Chair determines to be useful for the information of the Committee.

(2) Any document to be published as a Committee print which purports to express the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Committee or any of its Subcommittees, other than a report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee, must be approved by the Committee or its Subcommittees, as applicable, in a meeting or otherwise in writing by a majority of the Members, and such Members shall have the right to submit supplemental, minority, or additional views

for inclusion in the print within at least 48 hours after such approval.

(3) Any document to be published as a Committee print, other than a document described in subsection (2) of this Rule, shall—

(A) include on its cover the following statement: ''This document has been printed for informational purposes only and does not represent either findings or recommendations adopted by this Committee;'' and

(B) not be published following the sine die adjournment of a Congress, unless approved by the Chair of the Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(c) JOINT INVESTIGATION OR STUDY.—A report of an investigation or study conducted jointly by the Committee and one (1) or more other Committee(s) may be filed jointly, provided that each of the Committees complies independently with all requirements for approval and filing of the report. [House Rule XI 1(b)(2)]

(d) POST ADJOURNMENT FILING OF COMMITTEE REPORTS.—

(1) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, an investigative or oversight report approved by the Committee may be filed with the Clerk at any time, provided that if a Member gives notice at the time of approval of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that Member shall be entitled to not less than seven (7) calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report. [House Rule XI 1(b)(4)]

(2) After an adjournment sine die of a regular session of a Congress or after December 15, whichever occurs first, the Chair of the Committee may file the second and fourth semiannual Activity Report for that Congress with the Clerk of the House at anytime and without the approval of the Committee, provided that a copy of the report has been available to each Member of the Committee for at least seven (7) calendar days and that the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a Member of the Committee. [House Rule XI 1(d)]

RULE 10. GENERAL OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

(a) OVERSIGHT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall conduct oversight of matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee in accordance with House Rule X, clause 2 and shall review and study on a continuing basis laws, programs, and Government activities relating to nonmilitary research and development. [House Rule X 3(k)]

(2) OVERSIGHT PLAN.—Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plan for that Congress for submission to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on House Administration, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of Rule X of the House of Representatives. [House Rule X 2(d)]

(b) INVESTIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chair of the Committee may undertake any formal investigation in the name of the Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(2) SUBCOMMITEE INVESTIGATIONS.—The Chair of any Subcommittee shall not undertake any formal investigation in the name of the Committee or Subcommittee without formal approval by the Chair of the Committee, in consultation with other appropriate Subcommittee Chairs, and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. The Chair of any Subcommittee shall also consult with the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee before undertaking any investigation in the name of the Committee.

RULE 11. SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Committee shall have the following standing Subcommittees with the jurisdiction indicated.

(1) SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT.—Legislative jurisdiction and general oversight and investigative authority on all matters relating to energy research, development, and demonstration and projects therefor, commercial application of energy technology, and environmental research, including:

(A) Department of Energy research, development, and demonstration programs;

(B) Department of Energy laboratories;

(C) Department of Energy science activities;

(D) energy supply activities;

(E) nuclear, solar and renewable energy, and other advanced energy technologies;

(F) uranium supply and enrichment, and Department of Energy waste management and environment, safety, and health activities, as appropriate;

(G) fossil energy research and development;

(H) clean coal technology;

(I) energy conservation research and development;

(J) energy aspects of climate change;

(K) pipeline research, development, and demonstration projects;

(L) energy and environmental standards;

(M) energy conservation, including building performance, alternate fuels for and improved efficiency of vehicles, distributed power systems, and industrial process improvements;

(N) Environmental Protection Agency research and development programs;

(O) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including all activities related to weather, weather services, climate, the atmosphere, marine fisheries, and oceanic research;

(P) risk assessment activities; and

(Q) scientific issues related to environmental policy, including climate change.

(2) SUBCOMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION.—Legislative jurisdiction and general oversight and investigative authority on all matters relating to competitiveness, technology, standards, and innovation, including:

(A) standardization of weights and measures, including technical standards, standardization, and conformity assessment;

(B) measurement, including the metric system of measurement;

(C) the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce;

(D) the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

(E) the National Technical Information Service;

(F) competitiveness, including small business competitiveness;

(G) tax; antitrust, regulatory and other legal and governmental policies as they relate to technological development and commercialization;

(H) technology transfer, including civilian use of defense technologies;

(I) patent and intellectual property policy;

(J) international technology trade;

(K) research, development, and demonstration activities of the Department of Transportation;

(L) surface and water transportation research, development, and demonstration programs;

(M) earthquake programs (except for NSF) and fire research programs, including those related to wildfire proliferation research and prevention;

(N) biotechnology policy;

(O) research, development, demonstration, and standards-related activities of the Department of Homeland Security;

(P) Small Business Innovation Research and Technology Transfer; and

(Q) voting technologies and standards.

(3) SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND SCIENCE EDUCATION.—Legislative jurisdiction and general oversight and investigative authority on all matters relating to science policy and science education, including:

(A) the Office of Science and Technology Policy;

(B) all scientific research, and scientific and engineering resources (including human resources), science, technology, engineering and mathematics education;

(C) intergovernmental mechanisms for research, development, and demonstration and cross-cutting programs;

(D) international scientific cooperation;

(E) National Science Foundation, including earthquake programs;

(F) university research policy, including infrastructure and overhead;

(G) university research partnerships, including those with industry;

(H) science scholarships;

(I) computing, communications, networking, and information technology;

(J) research and development relating to health, biomedical, and nutritional programs;

(K) research, development, and demonstration relating to nanoscience, nanoengineering, and nanotechnology;

(L) to the extent appropriate, agricultural, geological, biological and life sciences research;

(M) and materials research, development, and demonstration and policy.

(4) SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPACE AND AERONAUTICS.—Legislative jurisdiction and general oversight and investigative authority on all matters relating to astronautical and aeronautical research and development, including:

(A) national space policy, including access to space;

(B) sub-orbital access and applications;

(C) National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its contractor and government-operated labs;

(D) space commercialization, including commercial space activities relating to the Department of Transportation and the Department of Commerce;

(E) exploration and use of outer space;

(F) international space cooperation;

(G) the National Space Council;

(H) space applications, space communications and related matters;

(I) earth remote sensing policy;

(J) civil aviation research, development, and demonstration;

(K) research, development; and demonstration programs of the Federal Aviation Administration; and

(L) space law.

(5) SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS AND OVERSIGHT.—General and special investigative authority on all matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

(b) RATIOS.—A majority of the majority Members of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority Members of each Subcommittee and shall authorize the Chair of the Committee to negotiate that ratio with the minority party; Provided, however, that the ratio of majority Members to minority Members on each Subcommittee (including any ex-officio Members) shall be no less favorable to the

majority party than the ratio for the Committee.

(c) EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The Chair of the Committee and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall serve as ex-officio Members of all Subcommittees and shall have the right to vote and be counted as part of the quorum and ratios on all matters before the Subcommittee.

(d) REFERRAL OF LEGISLATION.—The Chair of the Committee shall refer all legislation and other matters referred to the Committee to the Subcommittee or Subcommittees of appropriate primary and secondary jurisdiction within two (2) weeks of the matters being referred to the Committee, unless the Chair of the Committee deems consideration is to be by the Committee. Subcommittee Chairs may make requests for referral of specific matters to their Subcommittee within the two (2) week period if they believe Subcommittee jurisdictions so warrant.

(e) PROCEDURES.—

(1) No Subcommittee shall meet to consider for markup or approval any measure or matter when the Committee or any other Subcommittee of the Committee is meeting to consider any measure or matter for markup or approval.

(2) Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony or evidence, mark up legislation, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. For matters within its jurisdiction, each Subcommittee is authorized to conduct legislative, investigative, forecasting, and general oversight hearings; to conduct inquiries into the future; and to undertake budget impact studies.

(3) Subcommittee Chairs shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chair of the Committee and other Subcommittee Chairs with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

(4) Any Member of the Committee may have the privilege of sitting with any Subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no Member who is not a Member of the Subcommittee shall vote on any matter before such Subcommittee, except as provided in subsection (c) of this Rule.

(5) During consideration of any measure or matter for markup or approval in a Subcommittee proceeding, a record vote may be had at the request of one (1) or more Members of that Subcommittee.

(6) Each Subcommittee of the Committee shall provide the full Committee with copies of such records of votes taken in the subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee as the Chair deems necessary for the Committee to comply with the rules and regulations of the House.

(f) CONSIDERATION OF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS.—After ordering a measure or matter reported, a Subcommittee shall issue a Subcommittee report in such form as the Chair of the Committee shall specify. To the maximum extent practicable, reports and recommendations of a Subcommittee shall not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of 48 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays, from the time the report is submitted and made available to the Members of the Committee and printed hearings thereon shall be made available, if feasible, to the Members of the Committee, except that this Rule may be waived at the discretion of the Chair of the Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

RULE 12. COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) TRANSCRIPTS.—The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee and Subcommittees shall be published as a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved. Transcripts of markups shall be recorded and published in the same manner as hearings before the Committee and shall be included as part of the legislative report unless waived by the Chair of the Committee. [House Rule XI 2(e)(1)(A)]

(b) KEEPING OF RECORDS.—

(1) The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee action, which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. The result of each record vote shall be included in the report of the Committee, made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and shall be made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote. [House Rule XI 2(e)(1)(B)]

(2) Information made available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those Members present but not voting. [House Rule XI 2(e)(1)(B)]

(3) Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the Chair shall cause the text of each such amendment to be made publicly available in electronic form. [House Rule XI 2(e)(6)]

(c) AVAILABILITY OF ARCHIVED RECORDS.—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair of the Committee shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee of any decision, pursuant to Rule VII 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee. [House Rule XI 2(e)(3)]

(d) PROPERTY OF HOUSE.—

(1) Except as provided for in paragraph (2), all Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as its Chair. Such records shall be the property of the House, and each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, shall have access thereto.

(2) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, other than Members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, may not have access to the records of the Committee respecting the conduct of a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House without the specific prior permission of the Committee. [House Rule XI 2(e)(2)]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, February 11, 2011.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING INTERIM BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2011–2015

MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 3 of House Resolution 5, I submit for printing in the Congressional Record budget aggregates and allocations for fiscal year 2011. This submission includes allocation of budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2011 and the period of fiscal years 2011 through 2015.

These interim levels will be used to enforce sections 302(f), 303(a) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Sections 302(f) and 311(a) prohibit the consideration of legislation inconsistent with the budgetary levels set forth in the budget resolution and the accompanying report. Section 303(a) prohibits the consideration of legislation providing new budget authority or changing revenue until Congress adopts a budget resolution for a fiscal year.

For House authorizing committees, the interim allocations and aggregates are set for fiscal year 2011, and the period of fiscal years 2011 through 2015, at the levels included in the ''Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2011 Through 2021'' published by the Congressional Budget Office (the CBO baseline). They reflect legislation enacted through the end of the 111th Congress. A separate 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2011 was inserted in the Congressional Record on February 8, 2011.

The aggregates serve as a ceiling on spending and a floor for revenue. These levels serve as the budget for fiscal year 2011, a year for which Congress did not adopt a budget resolution. They are temporary and will be effective until they are superseded by the adoption of a concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 2012.

For questions, please contact Paul Restuccia, Chief Counsel of the Budget Committee.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

APPROPRIATE LEVELS

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Years	
	2011	2011–2015
Budget authority	2,964,850	.....
Outlays	3,131,363	.....
Revenues	1,662,481	11,420,669

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year 2011	Total 2011–2015
Committee on Agriculture		
BA	16,075	290,699
OT	15,575	288,356
Committee on Armed Services		
BA	138,450	739,019
OT	142,424	738,484
Committee on Education and the Workforce		
BA	16	−17,002
OT	2,847	−8,040
Committee on Energy and Commerce		
BA	348,856	1,858,975
OT	345,001	1,822,721
Committee on Financial Services		
BA	−4,155	59,880
OT	−1,762	30,392
Committee on Foreign Affairs		
BA	31,596	126,407
OT	26,346	134,041
Committee on Homeland Security		
BA	1,535	8,135
OT	1,411	7,897
Committee on House Administration		
BA	60	304
OT	58	391
Committee on the Judiciary		
BA	7,186	43,296
OT	7,382	41,466
Committee on Natural Resources		
BA	9,937	35,120
OT	7,602	35,279
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform		
BA	95,290	502,784
OT	91,439	483,402
Committee on Science, Space and Technology		
BA	116	614
OT	123	628
Committee on Small Business		
BA	0	0
OT	0	0

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year 2011	Total 2011–2015
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure		
BA	71,549	360,915
OT	15,988	82,574
Committee on Veterans' Affairs		
BA	1,161	11,827
OT	1,295	12,443
Committee on Ways and Means		
BA	1,156,980	5,587,569
OT	1,158,913	5,590,239

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 2011, at noon.

RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of May 28, 2010, through January 5, 2011, shall be treated as though received on February 11, 2011. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

373. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations [Docket No.: R-1387] (RIN: 7100-AD50) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

374. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

375. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-B-1165] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

376. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8161] received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

377. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fiduciary Duties at Federal Credit Unions; Mergers and Conversions of Insured Credit Unions (RIN: 3133-AD40) received January 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

378. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anthropomorphic Test Devices; Hybrid III 6-Year-Old Child Test Dummy, Hybrid III 6-Year-Old Weighted Child Test Dummy [Docket No.: NHTSA-2010-0147] (RIN: 2127-AK34) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

379. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry and Standards of Performance for Portland Cement Plants [EPA-HQ-OAR-2002-0051; EPA-HQ-OAR-2007-0877; FRL-9253-4] (RIN: 2060-AQ59) received January 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

380. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Action to Ensure Authority to Issue Permits under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program to Sources of Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Finding of Failure to Submit State Implementation Plan Revision Required of Louisville Metro Air Pollution Control District for Jefferson County, Kentucky [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0107; FRL-9253-2] received January 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

381. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Action to Ensure Authority to Issue Permits under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program to Sources of Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Federal Implementation Plan for Jefferson County, Kentucky [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0107; FRL-9253-3] received January 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

382. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories: Gasoline Distribution Bulk Terminals, Bulk Plants, and Pipeline Facilities; and Gasoline Dispensing Facilities [EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0406; FRL-9253-7] (RIN: 2060-AP16) received January 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

383. A letter from the Deputy Chief, OET, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Establishment of a Model for Predicting Digital Broadcast Television Field Strength received at Individual Locations [ET Docket No.: 10-152] received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

384. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — High-Cost Universal Service Support Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service [WC Docket No.: 05-337] [CC Docket No.: 96-45] received January 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

385. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Preserving the Open Internet Broadband Industry Practices [GN Docket No.: 09-191] [WC Docket No.: 07-52] received January 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

386. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Preserving the Open Internet Broadband Industry Practices [GN Docket No.: 09-191] [WC Docket No.: 07-52] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

387. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Guides for the Jewelry, Precious Metals, and Pewter Industries received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

388. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Notice of Availability of the Models for Plant-Specific Adoption of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler TSTF-513, Revision 3, ''Revise PWR Operability Requirements and Actions for RCS Leakage Instrumentation'' [NRC-2009-0444] received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

389. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-703, ''Food, Environmental, and Economic Development in the District of Columbia Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

390. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-723, ''Procurement Practices Reform Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

391. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-722, ''Criminal Code Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

392. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-721, ''Fiscal Year 2011 Supplemental Budget Support Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

393. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-720, ''Brownfield Revitalization Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

394. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-719, ''West End Parcels Development Omnibus Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

395. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-718, ''Homeless Services Reform Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

396. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-711, ''Comprehensive Plan Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

397. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-710, ''Reasonable Health Insurance Ratemaking and Health Care Reform of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

398. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-709, ''Southwest Waterfront Redevelopment Clarification Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

399. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-708, ''District Property Security Assessment and Implementation Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

400. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-707, ''Alternative Equity Payment Allocation Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

401. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-706, ''Washington Convention and Sports Authority Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

402. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-705, ''2 M Street, N.E., Real Property Tax Abatement Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

403. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-704, ''H Street, N.E., Retail Priority Area Incentive Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

404. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-717, ''TANF Educational Opportunities and Accountability Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

405. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-716, ''Bicycle Commuter and Parking Expansion Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

406. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-715, ''Payment of Full Hotel Taxes by Online Vendors Clarification Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

407. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-714, ''Real Property Tax Appeals Commission Establishment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

408. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-713, ''Interstate Compact for Juveniles Temporary Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

409. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-712, ''Attorney General Subpoena Authority Authorization Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

410. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Retention Standard; Emergency Rule [Docket No.: 101203602-0602-1] (RIN: 0648-BA29) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

411. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2011 Gulf of Alaska Pollock and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts [Docket No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-AX119) received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

412. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2011 Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amount [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XA120) received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

413. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2011 Bering Sea Pollock Total Allowable Catch Amount [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XA121) received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

414. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Vessel Capacity Limit in the Purse Seine Fishery in the Eastern Pacific Ocean [Docket No.: 100311144-0623-02] (RIN: 0648-AY75) received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

415. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Amendments 20 and 21; Trawl Rationalization Program [Docket No.: 100212086-0532-05] (RIN: 0648-AY68) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 347. A bill to correct and simplify the drafting of section 1752 (relating to restricted buildings or grounds) of title 18, United States Code (Rept. 112–9). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 394. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–10). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 386. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for aiming laser pointers at airplanes, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–11, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 386 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 1. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 653. A bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to improve regulations dealing with the disclosure by financial institutions of nonpublic personal information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 654. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe regulations regarding the collection and use of information obtained by tracking the Internet activity of an individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 655. A bill to honor Susan B. Anthony by celebrating her legacy on the third Monday in February; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 656. A bill to advance the mutual interests of the United States and Africa with respect to the promotion of trade and investment and the advancement of socioeconomic development and opportunity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. POSEY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. KLINE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WATT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HALL, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 657. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to reduce the number of civil service positions within the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LONG, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. REED, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 658. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for

the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MARCHANT, and Ms. FOXX):

H.R. 659. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the 10-percent penalty with respect to early retirement distributions for certain unemployed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide individual and corporate income tax relief and to extend 100 percent bonus depreciation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rollovers from other retirement plans into simple retirement accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 662. A bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia):

H.R. 663. A bill to delay the implementation of the health reform law until the Supreme Court determines the constitutionality of the individual mandate; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, Rules, Appropriations, and House Administration, 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. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 664. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize appointment of Doctors of Chiropractic to regular and reserve corps of the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 665. A bill to establish a pilot program for the expedited disposal of Federal real property; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 666. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Center for Health Statistics, to allocate such sums as may be necessary for the collection of statistics from the most recent versions of the Standard Certificates of Live Birth and Death and the Standard Report of Fetal Death; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 667. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to create a demonstration project to fund additional secondary school counselors in troubled title I schools to reduce the dropout rate; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HALL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WEST, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TURNER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 668. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to protect the bulk-power system and electric infrastructure critical to the defense and well-being of the United States against natural and manmade electromagnetic pulse (''EMP'') threats and vulnerabilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 669. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require 12-month continuous coverage for children under Medicaid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BOREN, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BACA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 670. A bill to convey certain submerged lands to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in order to give that territory the same benefits in its submerged lands as Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa have in their submerged lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 671. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to require 12-month continuous coverage under the State Children's Health Insurance Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 672. A bill to terminate the Election Assistance Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. HELLER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 673. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the depreciation classification of motorsports entertainment complexes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PETRI, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 674. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the imposition of 3 percent withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. NUNES, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HELLER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. KIND, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 675. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to expand the permissive exclusion from participation in Federal health care programs to individuals and entities affiliated with sanctioned entities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. DICKS, Ms. CHU, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 676. A bill to provide for comprehensive health insurance coverage for all United States residents, improved health care delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KIND, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 677. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a lifetime income disclosure; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KISSELL (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 678. A bill to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to provide for the treatment of dividends paid on shares of preferred stock, held by the Secretary of the Treasury, that were issued by financial institutions which received financial assistance under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KISSELL (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JONES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SHULER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 679. A bill to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from procuring certain items directly related to the national security unless the items are grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LONG, Mr. POSEY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 680. A bill to prohibit United States contributions to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 681. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to finalize a proposed rule to amend the spill prevention, control, and countermeasure rule to tailor and streamline the requirements for the dairy industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

H.R. 682. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the contribution limits to dependent care flexible spending accounts and to provide for a carryover of unused dependent care benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 683. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide grants to the National Urban League for an Urban Jobs Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.J. Res. 26. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Congressional succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Res. 86. A resolution recognizing the importance of trade to the United States economy and the importance of passing free trade agreements with Colombia, South Korea, and Panama; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. STARK, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H. Res. 87. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H. Res. 88. A resolution expressing solidarity with the people of Egypt in their democratic aspirations as they begin a new chapter in their country's proud history; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself and Ms. FUDGE):

H. Res. 89. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Internal Revenue Service should immediately update its collection policies and procedures in order to more adequately protect and assist taxpayers suffering an economic hardship; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. HALL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H. Res. 90. A resolution recognizing the 75th birthday of the Honorable Barbara Charline Jordan, American politician, leader of the Civil Rights movement, first African-American elected to the Texas Senate, first Southern black woman ever elected to the United States House of Representatives, inspirational figure in the Progressive movement, and recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom Award; to the Committee on House Administration.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 1.

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

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 653.

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

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

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 654.

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

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

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 655.

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

Article I—The Legislative Branch.

Section 1—The Legislature: All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 656.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 657.

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

Clauses 1 (''spending'' clause) and 18 (''necessary and proper'' clause) of Article 1, Sec. 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 658.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 659.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 660.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Deence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 661.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of, and the 16th Amendment to, the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 662.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, Clause 7, and Clause 18.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:
H.R. 663.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution. ''The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:
H.R. 664.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, §8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:
H.R. 665.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2.

By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 666.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:
H.R. 667.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill in enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:
H.R. 668.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:
H.R. 669.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, §8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. SABLAN:
H.R. 670.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:
H.R. 671.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, §8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. HARPER:
H.R. 672.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution granting Congress the authority to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of holding Federal elections.

By Mr. HELLER:
H.R. 673.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HERGER:
H.R. 674.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. HERGER:
H.R. 675.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. CONYERS:
H.R. 676.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLT:
H.R. 677.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KISSELL:
H.R. 678.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KISSELL:
H.R. 679.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 680.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to explicitly lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to cut spending; as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:
H.R. 681.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional authority for this bill is Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which allows Congress to do that which is necessary and proper for the execution of laws. In this case, it is necessary and proper to direct the EPA to avoid the excess and duplicative regulation of dairy farmers and producers.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:
H.R. 682.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. TOWNS:
H.R. 683.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This Bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, known as the ''General Welfare Clause.'' This provision grants Congress the broad power ''to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''
(Please note, pursuant to Article I, section 8, Congress has the power ''to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.'')

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:
H.J. Res. 26.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution on congressional succession is proposed pursuant to the authority granted Congress by Article V to propose amendments to the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 3: Mr. BERG, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 5: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 11: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CUELLAR, and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 29: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 59: Mr. PAUL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 104: Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 116: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 132: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 140: Mr. BROOKS and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 153: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 178: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 181: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 186: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 198: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 213: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 217: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 262: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 303: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 321: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 333: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 343: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 351: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 358: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 384: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 387: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 397: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 408: Mr. LONG, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 410: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 413: Ms. NORTON and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 417: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 420: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 426: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 428: Mr. AKIN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MACK, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 436: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 440: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 445: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 459: Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. ADAMS, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 462: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 470: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 472: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 481: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 509: Mr. NUNES, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PEARCE, Mr.

CONAWAY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BERG, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BONNER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 520: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 521: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 525: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 548: Mr. COBLE, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 556: Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.R. 584: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 589: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 606: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 609: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. RIVERA, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. CAMP, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H. Res. 11: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Res. 20: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 36: Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CHU, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H. Res. 60: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 61: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 69: Mr. REYES.

H. Res. 74: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 84: Mr. WELCH.

H. Res. 85: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.R. 1, Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING PRESIDENT RONALD WILSON REAGAN

SPEECH OF

HON. AARON SCHOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 2011

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, it's a great honor to talk for a few minutes this afternoon about our 40th President—Ronald Reagan.

I am sure many are asking how the youngest Member of Congress can relate to the oldest President. Well, the truth is while growing up in the 80's I can only admit knowing of the President by seeing him on TV, but it was the eight years of his presidency that helped define the principles I hold today.

In my mind, President Reagan is still as relevant today as he was during his presidency. In fact, many of the issues we face today are eerily similar to those we faced in the 1980's—Tax Code reform, volatility in the Middle East, discussions about America's strength and role among the global community and our uniqueness, but most importantly the role of government in our lives.

It was Reagan who took on the daunting task of Tax Code simplification, and he got it done. He helped America regain her economic footing again; and it's the same level ground we are seeking today.

It was Reagan that always displayed that characteristic optimism of America's brilliance that was so vital to the American mindset back then. It's with that optimism that we found our strength especially during difficult times.

Communism was plaguing the world—we defeated it.

The tragedy of the Challenger—it was Reagan that comforted us, but reminded us that ''the future doesn't belong to the faint-hearted; it belongs to the brave.''

Today, we find ourselves facing a dangerous ideology that runs counter to ours, and we are constantly reminded that the future we strive towards is no less challenging and risky than that of previous generations. We are witnesses to new and vital democratic movements around the world, and yet again today we are going through the growing pains of what government means to us.

As I conclude my remarks, I think it is only fitting to do so with a Reagan quote that encapsulated the final words of his third State of the Union, and that sums up the legacy he left behind, that we strive for again, and why my generation and I are able to stand before you today . . . .

''Let us be sure that those who come after will say of us in our time; that in our time we did everything that could be done. We finished the race; we kept them free; we kept the faith.''

Well, Mr. President, job well done. We'll take it from here.

A TRIBUTE TO HATTIE RUTH PERSONS-NELSON

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the life of Hattie Ruth Persons-Nelson.

Hattie Ruth Persons-Nelson was born on July 20, 1938 to the late Woodward Thomas Person and Hattie Williams-Persons in Buena Vista, Georgia. Hattie was a delightful youngster who loved to laugh and had a zest for learning, completing two grades in one year in grade school.

Hattie migrated to New York City in 1959 where she resided on Washington Avenue with her aunt, Fannie Williams, and maternal uncle, Elder Eugene Williams, founding pastor of the Evergreen Church of God In Christ. Hattie was a dedicated member of Evergreen before changing her place of worship in 1972 where she joined the New Canaan Baptist Church under the leadership of the late Reverend A.L. Cunningham and Reverend Richard J. Lawson, current pastor.

Hattie's dedication to the Lord and her church compelled her to work tirelessly in pursuit of the crown she will receive in heaven. In her service at Evergreen Church of God In Christ, Hattie served as a Trustee, Data Entry Secretary, president of the Hospitality Committee, Christian Council member, Women's Day Committee secretary, and special projects organizer. In her service at New Canaan Baptist Church, this servant of God was president of the Senior choir, president of Georgia/Alabama Club, member of the dynamic traveling Mass Choir, member of the Matron Mission Club, Chairperson of Women's Day, Pastor's Aide Club member and Church Clerk.

Hattie loved organizing a project and recruited any and everyone who crossed her path. She was passionate about upholding the legacy of the African-American Experience through her yearly Black History Month celebrations, empowering youth with educational trips to Washington, DC, giving out literature, overseeing yearly family reunions, and organizing various fundraisers and events bringing family and friends together, including her famous Reach One, Teach One programs. Hattie can surely be described as a people person, a mover and shaker, a person of purpose and passion, always lending a hand in support of some cause, albeit large or small.

Hattie was an employee of the Equitable Life Assurance Society in New York for thirty years before retiring. After retirement, she joined the campaign for Congressman EDOLPHUS TOWNS and was later hired to work at the Towns' House of Representatives District Office on Court Street, downtown Brooklyn. She was always dedicated to the service of her community. Hattie will be dearly missed by all who worked with her.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life of Hattie Ruth Persons-Nelson.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL MARRIAGE WEEK

HON. MIKE PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of National Marriage Week, which occurs annually during the week of February 7th. National Marriage Week was established to help couples strengthen their commitment to each other by hosting special events, marriage classes, and home support groups. While it is important for couples to focus on their marriage every day, National Marriage Week is an excellent opportunity for Americans to rededicate themselves to their spouse and to their family.

Marriage was ordained by God and instituted among men. It is the glue that binds the American family, and the safest harbor in which to raise children. Studies indicate that men and women who have a strong marriage tend to live longer, have better health, and experience more personal joy. Strong marriages also create the safest harbor for children to flourish and experience the complete spiritual, moral, emotional, educational, and financial benefits of both parents.

I have been a long-time advocate of traditional marriage, and have been proud to support numerous pieces of legislation to protect this sacred institution. The family structure is the cornerstone of our society, and I can think of no better time to emphasize its importance than National Marriage Week. I encourage all Americans to use this opportunity to renew their commitment and devotion to their spouse, and to personally take the steps they can to preserve this important institution.

WAYNE PISANO CONGRESSIONAL REMARKS

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Wayne Pisano, Sanofi Pasteur President and CEO, for his service to the vaccine industry and Pennsylvania upon his retirement from the company.

A St. John Fisher College biology undergraduate and MBA graduate of the University of Dayton, Ohio, Wayne combines a deep understanding of science as the key to human health, while employing a perceptive knowledge of business strategy and growth through meeting critical public health needs. Wayne has consistently demonstrated a keen ability to understand the movement of the vaccine market and work proactively to position Sanofi Pasteur as both a leader in vaccine production and a role model for partnerships and foresight within the industry.

Upon joining Sanofi Pasteur as Vice President, U.S. Marketing in 1997, Wayne quickly established a unique role for Marketing in a historically industrial- and commodity-driven organization. In his Marketing leadership role, he revised the business plan process and introduced product branding, positioning and the concept of core-brand selling arguments, driving significant net sales growth through innovative thinking. As the head of the more than 480-member team, Wayne created a multi-disciplinary team approach within the Marketing and Sales organization, achieving high-level, unprecedented collaboration across the group.

Next, as Senior Vice President of Commercial Operations, Wayne collaborated with the Canadian business unit president to develop Canada's first long-term growth strategy, resulting in full restructuring of the marketing and sales group. As Wayne facilitated the transition of the U.S. operations to the new U.S. business unit head, the company continued to exceed budget, experiencing double-digit growth and breaking the $1 billion revenue milestone for the first time in 2003.

Within the vaccine industry, Wayne played a key leadership role when routinely administered vaccines were in short supply. In 2002, Wayne presented on behalf of PhARMA to a congressional hearing on fragility of vaccine supply. Backed by a U.S. General Accounting Office report, Wayne eloquently presented the facts regarding the complicated nature of vaccine manufacturing and the economic challenges of vaccine manufacturers, resulting in changes to the national policy on Vaccine Injury Compensation.

In 2003, Wayne stepped into the role of Sr. Vice President, Global Commercial Operations, in which he put his talents once again to the company's long-term growth, assuming responsibility for the Strategic Planning function and developing the company's first 10-year strategic plan. In this role, he introduced the franchise concept and implemented the portfolio design to drive the growth strategy. Wayne led the formation of global Commercial Operations, integrating the U.S., Canadian and International business units; Medical Affairs; Pricing & Health Economics; Franchise Management; New Product Marketing and Demand Management groups. In doing so, Wayne moved the Commercial Operations organization of more than 2,000 associates into a cohesive and collaborative team focused on achieving overall corporate goals. For the first time in company history, the organization exceeded 2 billion Euros in sales, with all business units achieving double-digit growth.

Understanding the growing importance of the influenza franchise, Wayne drove the development of the long-term global strategy for influenza, resulting in the elevation of several projects within the R&D portfolio and the decision to invest more than 200 million Euros in new and expanded manufacturing facilities. This investment included the production of a second influenza production facility at Sanofi Pasteur's Swiftwater, Pennsylvania campus, which remains the largest influenza vaccine manufacturing facility in the world. Additionally, he drove the global licensing strategy for Fluzone and Vaxigrip influenza vaccines, making them interchangeable in some markets.

Wayne advocated and implemented a comprehensive global formulation, filling and packaging strategy to ensure early and timely delivery of influenza vaccine and, years before the onset of the 2009 influenza pandemic, established the Pandemic Planning function placing it at a high level of importance for imminent public health needs. Still looking to the future, Wayne has paved the way for new influenza products to meet unique patient immunization needs, including Sanofi Pasteur's Fluzone High-Dose for those 65 years and older and the upcoming intradermal vaccine technology targeting young adults.

Three years ago, Wayne brought his strategic expertise to the role of Sanofi Pasteur President and CEO. Soon afterward, he began replenishing the pipeline through project in-licensing and acquisitions. By the end of 2008, the company, under Wayne's leadership, acquired and fully integrated biotech firm Acambis, adding several phase-II projects—C. difficile and Dengue (Acambis) and Mabs Rabies (Crucell)—and important pre-clinical projects (e.g., pseudomonas aeruginosa Mabs, Intra-dermal influenza, HPV) into the pipeline. That year, he also implemented a pre-emptive effectiveness and efficiency program focused on shifting resources into critical activities to secure the company's long-term growth.

In 2009, Wayne further strengthened the company's critical emerging markets position through the acquisition of India's Shantha Biotechnics to provide a high-tech platform of affordable vaccines and a robust pipeline. His leadership saw the expansion of global industrial operations with new vaccine manufacturing facilities in Shenzen (China), Ocoyoacac (Mexico), and solid partnerships across all continents, including Brazil, Russia, Japan, Turkey, Thailand and Algeria. His committed global focus has led to significant steps forward in addressing the gap between developed nations and countries with vast and dire unmet medical needs, setting Sanofi Pasteur apart as a leader truly dedicated to its Vision of preventing suffering or death from any vaccine-preventable disease.

At the end of February 2011, after 14 years of service, Wayne Pisano will retire as the chairman and CEO of Sanofi Pasteur. I commend Mr. Pisano for his distinguished career and leadership in the advancement of immunizations and the eradication of vaccine-preventable diseases.

IN MEMORY OF BILL PORTMAN

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of Bill Portman, the father of our fellow colleague Senator Rob Portman. Bill was a loving father who taught his son the value of hard work and devotion to his community.

Bill exemplified the American dream. He founded his own business, Portman Equipment Company. Through his hard work he was able to turn his business into a successful enterprise, one that eventually employed over 300 people in the Cincinnati community. Throughout this venture, his son, Rob was working right beside him, learning the virtue of hard work through his father.

On top of being a successful businessman, he was also a loving and caring father. In fact, he always put his family first. He strove to teach his children the values that allowed him to be so successful. He made sure to pass on these values and educate his children on the importance of honesty, integrity, faith, respect for others and community service.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in remembrance Bill Portman. His achievements and legacy will forever be remembered. I extend my sincerest condolences to our colleague Rob Portman and the entire Portman family as they mourn the loss of this extraordinary and loving individual.

ROOSEVELT DAM CENTENNIAL

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to note that on March 18, 2011, my home State of Arizona will celebrate the centennial of Roosevelt Dam, a great accomplishment that for 100 years has served our people. I wish to reflect on what the structure has meant for the Salt River Valley, the State of Arizona, and the Salt River Project, SRP.

Growing up in Claypool, Arizona, I journeyed north on State Route 88 hundreds of times to visit Theodore Roosevelt Lake and view Theodore Roosevelt Dam. The massive dam seemed to tower into the sky and was an engineering marvel to a small boy. The lake provided hours of recreational activities and adventures well into my teen and young adult years.

To understand what Roosevelt Dam will mean to the greater Phoenix metropolitan area during the next 100 years, there are a few attributes that must be noted.

The most important characteristic is certainty. Roosevelt Dam was designed to bring stability to weather-related patterns ranging from drought to flooding, so it is well-suited to provide certainty for the greater Phoenix metropolitan area's future water supplies. The conservation ethic will continue to be an important facet in Arizona's water future. In 1911, Roosevelt Dam was one of Arizona's first significant acts of conservation; 100 years later, the dam is still one of the most important examples of resource stewardship, as it stores water for millions of people. As the ethic of conservation evolves during the next 100 years, Roosevelt Dam will continue to epitomize this concept because it helps ensure certainty.

Adaptability is Roosevelt's second most important attribute, enabling the dam to be the continual cornerstone for the Phoenix area's development. The dam has been modified multiple times, including improving water management operations, increasing storage capacity, enhancing hydropower capability and creating features for flood control. Roosevelt Dam and SRP provided Arizona the ability to adapt from an agriculturally based economy to a knowledge-based one. Both must continue to adapt to deal with the changing nature of Arizona, including evolving economies, increasing political complexity and emerging environmental challenges. This ability to adapt is vital, because the delivery of reliable water and power is the underpinning for Arizona's next century.

A final characteristic is stewardship. Roosevelt Dam and SRP have been leaders in renewable water and power for Arizona during the past century, and must continue to do so to ensure Arizona's future. From the beginning of the 20th century, SRP's visionary founders were advocates for Arizona as they used federal resources to build Roosevelt Dam, which created the state's largest sustainable water supply.

Mr. Speaker, Roosevelt Dam and SRP have been with us since before Statehood. This vital bedrock of infrastructure, and the homegrown organization that operates it, will continue to be stewards for Arizona's future prosperity.

HONORING DANIELLE COLSON

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and honor a young lady from South Florida, who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in her community. Danielle Colson, 18, of Pembroke Pines has been named one of the top honorees in Florida by the 2011 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in each state and the District of Colombia.

Ms. Colson, a senior at American Heritage School in Plantation, is being recognized for distributing 4,500 backpacks filled with school supplies and toiletries to needy children and people living in homeless shelters since 2007. Danielle, who volunteers at the shelter and has also collected other items for its residents, encourages members of the community and students at local schools to make donations to support her backpack project.

In light of numerous statistics that indicate Americans today are less involved in their communities than they once were, it's vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contribution this young citizen has made. People of all ages need to think more about how we, as individual citizens, can work together at the local level to ensure the health and vitality of our town and neighborhoods. Young volunteers like Ms. Colson are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow. Prudential Financial created the program that brought this young role model to our attention in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their lead. Over the past 16 years, the program has become the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, and has more than 95,000 young volunteers at the local, state, and national level.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily applaud Ms. Colson for her initiative in seeking to make her community a better place to live, and for the positive impact she has had on the lives of many. She has demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly exemplary, and deserves our sincere admiration and respect. Her actions show that young Americans can, and do, play important roles in our communities, and American's community spirit endures and holds promise for the future.

HONORING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF TRANSYLVANIA COUNTY IN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. HEATH SHULER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the sesquicentennial of Transylvania County in Western North Carolina. Transylvania, a county of 29,000 residents, is home to picturesque beauty and is known as the "Land of Waterfalls."

In 1861, Representative Joseph P. Jordan introduced a bill to the North Carolina House of Commons to establish a new county. Transylvania County was then formed and held its first County Commission meeting on May 20th of that year. This day is notable in North Carolina's history as it represents the day the State seceded from the Union. The next day, Transylvania County possessed no money, courthouse, jail, or a bank, yet was busily mustering a company of volunteers to serve for the Confederacy.

A century later, Transylvania County led the State of North Carolina in fully integrating its public school system. In 1963, Brevard High School became the first high school in the State to field integrated athletic teams.

Over one-third of the County's area is comprised of national and state parks and forests. This includes Blue Ridge Parkway, DuPont State Forest, Gorges State Park, Caesar's Head, Holmes Educational State Forest, and Pisgah National Forest. From the spectacular views from Chestnut Knob to the humbling cascades at Pisgah National Forest's Looking Glass Falls and the other 249 waterfalls in the area, Transylvania County embodies all that is Appalachian.

On February 15, 2011, Transylvania County will hold a very special public gathering celebrating the 150th anniversary of its formation by the North Carolina Assembly. This will launch a year-long series of events, activities and education. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Transylvania's sesquicentennial and its contributions to the United States and the great State of North Carolina.

INTRODUCING THE RETIREMENT SAVINGS ACT OF 2011

HON. PAUL C. BROUN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced the Retirement Savings Access Act of 2011. This legislation would allow financially struggling Americans access to their retirement dollars without penalty.

As the economic downturn continues, most Americans who have fallen on hard times are not looking for the Federal Government to bail them out. Instead, they are simply asking for the government to get off their backs.

Currently, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) levies a 10% penalty on all early withdrawals from Investment Retirement Accounts (IRAs), meaning money that is taken out of an account before a beneficiary turns 59½ years old. This provision encourages saving for retirement and planning for the future, but it is a menacing tax to levy on people who are in dire financial straits, such as the unemployed.

This legislation would exempt individuals who have already exhausted the standard 26 weeks of unemployment benefits from the tax penalty they would otherwise normally incur for a withdrawal from their retirement accounts before they reach 59½ years of age.

We have bailed out Wall Street financial institutions and propped up the ailing automotive sector. But it is our constituents who are hurting the most, and this legislation would help them access their own money without a government penalty for doing so.

HONORING MICHAEL STARKS

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Michael Starks, the first African-American graduate of Tulane University School of Law and the first African-American lawyer in the New Orleans City Attorney's office. As the Congressman from New Orleans and a graduate of Tulane University School of Law, I would like to call attention to Mr. Stark, a man whose dedication to the legal institution knew no bounds.

Mr. Starks, was a native New Orleanian who graduated from the University of New Orleans and the first African-American admitted to Tulane's law school. He graduated from Tulane's School of Law in 1968.

He served as an Assistant City Attorney during the tenure of three mayors. After leaving City Hall, Mr. Starks was an attorney for the Housing Authority of New Orleans until Hurricane Katrina struck.

Mr. Starks passed away on Saturday, January 29, 2011 at Life Path Hospice in Temple Terrace, Florida at the age of 67.

He was survived by his sister, Sandra McCollum, and daughter, Michelle Starks, and granddaughter.

I am saddened by his passing, in prayer for his family, and inspired by his life's achievements.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to recognize Mr. Michael Starks.

FIGHTING MEDICARE FRAUD

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleague Ways and Means Health Subcommittee Chairman WALLY HERGER (R–CA) to re-introduce the Strengthening Medicare Anti-Fraud Measures Act.

This bipartisan legislation is a direct byproduct of a joint hearing held by the Ways and Means Health and Oversight Subcommittees

last year. The hearing was on efforts to reduce fraud, waste and abuse in Medicare.

We heard testimony at that hearing from two panels of witnesses. The first panel consisted of Members of Congress pursuing legislative initiatives to reduce Medicare fraud, waste and abuse. The second panel was made up of government witnesses: Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services (OIG), The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and the Government Accountability Office.

Numerous witnesses raised concerns about limitations to the authority of the Office of the Inspector General to minimize Medicare fraud. From this discussion it became clear to Representative HERGER and me that we should change the law in order provide the Inspector General with the additional requested tools to better protect Medicare.

This is a simple bill with only two provisions. It expands the OIG's permissive authority to ban executives whose companies have been convicted of Medicare fraud from the program. Second, it expands the OIG's permissive authority to exclude affiliates of corporations convicted of fraud, including parent companies hiding behind convicted corporate shells.

The first change is important because it will enable the OIG to protect Medicare from executives who circumvent exclusion by moving to another company. Under current law, executives whose companies are convicted of fraud can be excluded from Medicare. However, if the executive has left the company by the time of conviction, he or she cannot be barred from Federal health care programs. These executives are able to move from one company to another and continue to defraud Medicare, seniors, and taxpayers.

The second change provides the OIG with stronger tools to address corporations that have engaged in fraud. Companies that engage in fraud often set up shell companies to insulate themselves from liability. Criminal settlement negotiations can result in the conviction of these shell organizations with no real operational impact on the parent company. Without discretionary authority to exclude parent companies from the program, the OIG is missing a tool in its arsenal that could allow the government to exclude particularly bad actors or obtain stronger prospective remedies in settlements.

This legislation passed the House of Representatives last year by voice vote. Unfortunately, it was not taken up in the Senate. We urge our colleagues to cosponsor this bill so we can quickly enact these new anti-fraud tools to protect Medicare beneficiaries and all of America's taxpayers.

INTRODUCING THE SUSAN B. ANTHONY BIRTHDAY ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month to introduce the Susan Brownell Anthony Birthday Act. This bill will designate the third Monday in February as the day to celebrate the legacy of Susan Brownell Anthony, a pioneer of the women's rights movement, and its leader for more than 50 years.

Born on February 15, 1820, Susan Brownell Anthony met Elizabeth Cady Stanton in 1851 and attended her first women's rights convention in Syracuse in 1852. At that convention she was inspired to join the fight for women's suffrage, asserting that this was 'the right women needed above every other.' The first proposal for women's suffrage was presented to Congress in 1868, and the first formal women's suffrage amendment to the Constitution of the United States was introduced in January 1878. For 35 years after that first proposal was made, Susan Brownell Anthony appeared before every Congress to ask for passage of a suffrage amendment, demonstrating her unwavering dedication to the cause. Her last public words before her death on March 13, 1906 were 'Failure is impossible.'

Between 1917 and 1919, over a thousand women held a vigil outside the White House, asking, 'How long must women wait for liberty?' Unfortunately, Susan Brownell Anthony did not live to see her dream of women's suffrage become a reality, but her heroic efforts were not in vain. The nineteenth amendment, also called the Susan B. Anthony Amendment, was ratified on August 26, 1920 giving the right to vote to American women. The text of the 19th amendment states that "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The United States has previously recognized Susan Brownell Anthony's tremendous contributions to our Nation. To commemorate her legacy, a marble statue of her and her women's rights colleagues, Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, was dedicated in the United States Capitol in 1921. Susan Brownell Anthony's picture appeared on postage stamps in 1936 and 1955. Her home in Rochester, New York, has been a National Historic Landmark since 1966, and in 1979, her image was placed on a dollar coin.

I am proud that the work of Susan Brownell Anthony and her fellow suffragists has been acknowledged and honored in these ways. However, as the founder and leader of the women's movement in the United States, Susan Brownell Anthony deserves a permanent place in our history. The journey to equality is long and difficult, but it well worth the fight. Passage of the Susan Brownell Anthony Birthday Act would make February 21st the first Federal holiday that celebrates the birthday of a woman, and would allow all women and men in the United States to celebrate and honor the legacy of a true American heroine.

CONGRATULATING ODALMY MOLINA

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate a young student from South Florida, who has achieved national recognition by excelling in the classroom and in her community. Odalmy Molina, from Cuban descent and a student at Hialeah High School, received the Youth Award from the Hispanic Heritage Foundation, which recognizes the most impressive Latino High School seniors.

Ms. Molina's family history is a sadly familiar story to many of us, that of losing a loved one to cancer. I too, have experienced the same loss, but know that family suffering can strengthen our passion to succeed and become better individuals. Ms. Molina's deep desire to one-day find a cure for cancer is fueled by her passion to replace the hurt and suffering of those affected by cancer with hope and solace. Her desire has led to a constant quest for knowledge, by either assisting scientists in performing lab work at the Miami project to Cure Paralysis; co-publishing original research presented during the Annual Neuroscience Research Day; or serving as the youth co-chair for the American Cancer Society. These extraordinary accomplishments at such a young age are an inspiring example to all of us.

The Hispanic Heritage Foundation is a national non-profit that inspires, identifies, prepares and positions Latino leaders for classroom, community and workforce. After receiving 10,000 applications annually, HHF honors more than 150 students at ceremonies with partner universities in ten regions across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily applaud Ms. Molina for her accomplishments, for she is a fine example of the best and brightest in South Florida. She has demonstrated a level of commitment that deserves our sincere admiration and respect. I am confident that she will continue to accomplish great things for our community in South Florida and our country.

IN RECOGNITION OF BOY SCOUT TROOP 1818 AND CUB SCOUT PACK 1818

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pack 1818 and Troop 1818, the Jewish Cub Scout Pack and Boy Scout Troop that are based in my Mantua neighborhood in Fairfax County. Cub Scout Pack 1818 boasts 34 boys ranging from Grade 1 to Grade 5. Chartered by the Olam Tikvah Men's Club since 2000, Pack 1818 provides an opportunity for these boys to take in a variety of sports, crafts, and outdoor activities, like hiking and camping.

This year, Tiger Cubs include: Jacob Boyett, Elijah Fischer, Benjamin Golden, Ari Pearlstein, Nathan Rothberg, Isaac Saiger, and Matthew Wurmser. Wolf Cubs include Jacob Book, Nathan Chernys, Ben Engler, Daniel Fertel, Alex Frame, Zach Grossman, Sebastian Jones, Aidan Jupiter, Jacob Hemmerdinger, Rueben Hemmerdinger, Solomon Hutchins, Ben Neifeld, and Zachary Shmargal-Ellison. Bear Cubs include Mitchell Akawie, Samuel Goldberg, Jared Johnson, Michael Krasovsky, Ilan Nabatkhorian, Lars Rosen, and Jacob Rutzick. First year Webelos include Solomon Jones while second year Webelos include Joshua Ackerman, Kenny Book, David Chernys, Daniel Dorlester, Jordan Lamar, and Aaron Shurberg.

I am especially pleased to note that these last six boys—the second year Webelos—will

transition to Boy Scouts during a ceremony this evening. Each of those boys has earned the Arrow of Light award.

Following this ceremony, the number of boys in Troop 1818 will be 18, which in Jewish tradition corresponds to life. Troop 1818, which is only three years old, has emerged as an important force in the lives of these young boys. Troop 1818 provides opportunities to build lifelong skills and values and to make lasting friendships through weekly activities and a variety of outdoor programs. The boys have a chance to earn merit badges in such diverse areas as engineering, camping, orienteering, nuclear science, and first aid. This past year, boys from Troop 1818 got to learn CPR, build and sleep in a snow igloo, and attend the 100th anniversary National Jamboree with Scouts from around the country and world.

Troop 1818 currently includes Benjy Ackerman, Max Chernys, Jamie Frame, Josh Hone, Casey Lamar, Ezra Lapidus, Levi Meerovich, Josh Rutzick, Sam Rutzick, Ezra Postelnek, Yosef Postelnek, and Zach Watts. These boys have made significant accomplishments over the past year—earning merit badges and multiple rank advancements—which they will receive at their semi-annual Court of Honor this weekend.

Finally, I'd like to also recognize Robert Book, who founded Troop 1818 and currently serves as Committee Chair for Pack 1818. An Eagle Scout himself, Robert is being recognized this weekend for his accomplishments by being presented with the Shofar Award.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues join me in congratulating these scouts and also in thanking the troop leaders, parents and families for their dedication to our youth.

CONGRATULATING MS. BARBARA ALLEN AS A WINNER OF THIS YEAR'S PURPOSE PRIZE

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Ms. Barbara Allen on the occasion of being named as a winner of the Purpose Prize. Ms. Allen was selected from over 1,000 applicants for her work raising funds for public school art programs.

The Purpose Prize is an award given by Civic Ventures, a think-tank that focuses on work and social purpose. For the past five years the purpose prize has been given to 10 people, all age 60 and over, who have developed new ways to solve social problems. As individuals who have completed their mid-life careers, the winners of the purpose prize have all shown that social innovation is not the sole province of the young. Civic Ventures considered the Purpose Prize to be not a lifetime achievement award, but an investment in the future of the winner.

Ms. Allen has won this award through her laudable efforts to maintain the arts in public schools. She is the founder and CEO of Fresh Artists, a nonprofit that has raised more than $100,000 benefiting 272 Philadelphia public schools to the enrichment of over 53,000 children. Fresh Artists utilizes the creativity of our students to achieve the goal of funding the art programs that can help more students harness their own creativity. The organization invites students in grades K through 12 to donate their artwork to be used in large-scale reproductions. Fresh Artists then collects monetary donations from businesses and organizations who display the artwork in their buildings. The donations are then used to buy art supplies for Philadelphia's most under-resourced public schools. Since its founding in 2008, Fresh Artists has installed nearly 600 reproductions. Barbara Allen's vision and dedication to the arts have provided students with an opportunity to not only have their work displayed, but also to have their work contribute to the purchase of supplies that allow other students to produce further works of art.

I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Ms. Allen on this momentous occasion. Her dedication to the art will ensure that the students of Philadelphia's public schools continue to have access to the supplies that will allow them to fully realize their creative potential.

TRIBUTE TO MR. CHARLIE BURRELL

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and exceptional accomplishments of Mr. Charlie Burrell, known internationally as "the Jackie Robinson of classical music" and the "titan of the classical and jazz bass," on the occasion of the celebration of his 90th birthday.

Charlie was born in Toledo, Ohio, in 1922, and raised in Detroit, Michigan. An acclaimed contrabass player, he was one of the first African-American musicians to break the color barrier of a major U.S. symphony. Honored by the Alphonse Robinson African-American Music Association for his invaluable contributions, he has received accolades from his colleagues for having opened the door for other African-American musicians by demonstrating that they did not have to be relegated to stereotypical musical styles.

Charlie began the pursuit of a musical career at an early age at the encouragement of his mother. A chance hearing of a performance of the San Francisco Symphony led to his desire to become the first African-American musician to perform with the company—a dream he would realize twenty-eight years later.

Although a dedicated student of classical music, Charlie and his friends embraced jazz music and practiced it whenever possible. At seventeen, Charlie was even asked to join the Lionel Hampton Big Band, affording him the opportunity to travel the country with some of the jazz greats of the time. Upon graduation from Cass Technical High School in Detroit, then one of the most prestigious music schools in the nation, Charlie saw his classmates move directly into professional symphonies, while he was unable to because of the color of his skin. But that never deterred his resolve to play.

In 1941, he attended the New England Conservatory of Music and then joined the Navy where he was stationed at the Great Lakes Naval Base outside Chicago. There, he was selected to join the first-ever all-Black Navy band, a recruiting device the Navy developed to encourage African-American enlistment. Following his honorable discharge from the Navy, he attended Wayne State University with an eye towards teaching music in the public schools. At the time of his graduation, he once again faced the challenge of discrimination when was told by the administrator of music for the Detroit School System there would be no African-American music teachers in their schools.

But Charlie continued to pursue his dreams. After he was turned down for auditions with four different companies, he moved to Denver, Colorado, where he worked at Fitzsimons Army Hospital and enrolled in the University of Denver to earn his teaching certificate. He later taught for the Denver Public Schools. A chance meeting with John VanBuskirk, the lead bass player with the Denver Symphony, led to an audition with the company. Charlie broke through the color barrier of the time to become the first African-American musician to join the Denver Symphony Orchestra.

And in 1959, realizing his childhood dream, Charlie Burrell went on to become the first African-American musician to ever play in the San Francisco Symphony. During his five-and-a-half year stay in San Francisco, he also became the first African-American to play with the San Francisco Opera and the San Francisco Ballet orchestras, and the first African-American professor at the San Francisco Conservatory of Music.

Upon arriving back in Denver, he was hired again by the Denver Symphony Orchestra where he performed for more than thirty years. Whenever top jazz musicians performed in Denver, Charlie was often called on to play with them.

During his lifetime Charlie has mentored and performed with many musicians. He has played with nearly all of the great names in the jazz world: jazz bass great Milt Hinton; jazz stride pianist Fats Waller; Lionel Hampton; jazz trumpeter Clark Terry; bassist Major Holley; and jazz trombonist Al Grey. One of his favorite vocalists was the late Billie Holliday. He is especially proud of his cousin, the renowned pianist George Duke, and his two-time Grammy award-winning niece, jazz vocalist Dianne Reeves, both of whom he taught and mentored.

On a personal note, Charlie played bass in a jazz trio founded by my uncle Al Rose. The Al Rose Trio became the first racially integrated jazz group in Denver, and when my uncle passed, Charlie asked me if he could be my Honorary Uncle—which he is to this day.

Retired from the Denver Symphony Orchestra since 1999, Charlie continues to be an active member of the community, on occasion playing his bass with his Cousin Purnell Steen's swing quartet. A comment he made during a PBS "Special Jazz in Five Points" broadcast best sums up his life, "Music is my great love affair, and, in fact, it is my first, and always has been, my first."

Charlie has been and continues to be an inspiration to musicians young and old all across our country, but we in Denver are incredibly blessed and proud to call him one of our own. I join all my constituents in wishing Charlie a very happy birthday and congratulating him for his lifetime of achievement.

HONORING PRESIDENT RONALD WILSON REAGAN

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 2011

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1911, America's fortieth president was born in a small midwestern town. A century later, we remember Ronald Wilson Reagan as a great man and a great leader who personified and advanced the highest ideals of the American people at home and abroad. He may have started his life with a humble beginning in America's heartland, but at a time when America longed for leadership, he answered the call to service.

After eight years of his presidency, the communism of Soviet Russia was collapsing, the American military was rebuilt, the nation's economy restored and its moral fabric renewed. As he said himself, President Reagan left America ''more prosperous, more secure, and happier than it was eight years earlier.''

Many will remember him as the Great Communicator. But as the President said many times, he was not a great communicator; he communicated great things. He communicated the traditional American values anchored by his profound Christian faith.

His ideas were simple, straightforward and distinctly American. President Reagan believed that freedom depended on limited government. He fiercely advanced the principles of less government, less taxes, a strong defense and a commitment to traditional moral values.

Mr. Speaker, like many Americans, President Reagan changed the course of my life. I had the honor of meeting him in the summer of 1988 as a candidate for Congress. Determined to say something of great meaning to him, I looked the President in the eye and thanked him for all he had done to inspire my generation to believe in American again. He responded with characteristic humility by saying that ''the American people decided it was time to right the ship, and I was just the captain they put on the bridge when they did it.''

In the midst of his extraordinary gifts, Ronald Reagan was a deeply humble man who believed in God and the American people with an unshakable faith. He also was able to find inspiration in his beloved Rancho del Cielo. When I had the opportunity to visit the ranch, I immediately understood why President Reagan found solace in its beauty. He spent many a day working at the ranch, and it is not difficult to believe that he contemplated many important decisions while clearing brush, fixing fences and breaking new trails in his jeep. The Young America's Foundation has since taken responsibility of the ranch, and I commend them for preserving this significant part of Ronald Reagan's legacy.

In his Farewell Address to the nation, President Reagan spoke poignantly of the distance that high office can place between the servant and the served.

He said, ''One of the things about the presidency is that you're always somewhat apart. You spend a lot of time going by too fast in a car someone else is driving, and seeing the people through tinted glass—the parents holding up a child, and the wave you saw too late and couldn't return. And so many times I wanted to stop and reach out from behind the glass, and connect.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, one hundred years after his birth and two decades after he left public service, the American people are still connected to President Ronald Reagan's American ideals and values, which endure to this day.

HONORING LELA DUFFEL MORRIS

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Mrs. Lela Duffel Morris, the first African-American graduate with a Bachelor of Science in Nursing at the University of Washington, a career nurse, and a trailblazer in the field of occupational and public health. Mrs. Morris and her husband of 62 years, Dr. Walter Morris, have been stalwart members of the Bay Area community for decades. A loving wife, mother, grandmother, friend and colleague, Mrs. Lela Morris will be forever remembered for her warmth and compassion. With her passing on February 1, 2011, we are reminded of her life's journey and the joyful legacy she inspired.

Lela Duffel Morris was born on April 23, 1927, and was the youngest of Thomas Duffel and Harriett Jones Duffel's 12 children. Just before Lela's birth, the family relocated from the state of Louisiana to Beaumont, Texas. And, not long after Lela was born, her mother passed away. As the family struggled through the heights of the depression, Lela was sheltered from hardship and nurtured by her father and siblings.

In the fall of 1945, she enrolled in the School of Nursing at the University of Washington (UW), becoming the first African American to be admitted, and later, graduate from the nursing program. Mrs. Morris' subsequent career in public health began in the District of Columbia, where she saw a need for regulation and advocacy in occupational and environmental health issues.

At a time when workers were far too often exposed to hazardous workplace conditions, Mrs. Morris became founding director of continuing education for the Northern California Occupational Health Center, a division of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

In her over 50-year career, Mrs. Morris received many accolades, including the 2001 Distinguished Alumna Award from the UW School of Nursing and the Alumni Advisory Council, as well as special recognitions from the Northern California Public Health Association, the American Lung Association, the Golden State Medical Association and the American Cancer Society.

In the midst of her career and raising four children, Mrs. Morris received a Master of Public Health degree from the University of California, Berkeley. She also taught college health education courses and served as guest editor of the American Association of Occupational Health Nurses Journal. She was an active volunteer with community organizations, such as the Oakland Bay Area Chapter of The Links, Inc., Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, and the Auxiliaries of the National, Golden State and Sinkler-Miller Medical Associations.

On a personal level, I will always remember Mrs. Morris' gentle and kind spirit, but also her strength and brilliance. Her smile lifted my spirits, and she always offered a word of encouragement. She and her husband, Dr. Morris, were my early supporters when I first ran for public office in 1989. They consistently supported me throughout my many campaigns. And for that, I am deeply grateful.

Today, California's 9th Congressional District salutes and honors a wonderful human being, Mrs. Lela Duffel Morris. The contributions she made to others throughout her life are countless and precious. Our community is indebted to her work with East Bay organizations and to her many civic contributions over the years. My thoughts are with Dr. Walter Morris, his family, and Lela's extended group of loved ones as we celebrate her incredible life. May her soul rest in peace.

TRIBUTE CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE CITY OF EAGLE POINT, OREGON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise today to mark the centennial of the City of Eagle Point, Oregon. Eagle Point was named for a prominent rocky cliff east of town that was a popular nesting place for eagles.

Today Eagle Point is known as ''The Gateway to the Lakes'' as it sets the scene for tourists and other visitors traveling east to view Crater Lake and the majestic natural wonders of the southern Cascade Range.

During the gold rush days of the 1850s—before it was even considered a ''town''—Eagle Point was known for its rich agricultural production and became the ''food basket'' to the Rogue Valley. That regional importance was solidified in 1872 when the Snowy Butte Mill was built along the banks of the nearby Little Butte Creek. The grist mill quickly became an economic hub for the area. It is said that wagons lined the road to the mill for miles waiting to have their grain ground into flour. In addition to local farmers, the mill was important to Native Americans, who traveled more than 90 miles over the Old Military Trail from Fort Klamath to trade leather and berries for flour.

It wasn't until the Pacific & Eastern Railroad arrived in the early 1900s that a commercial district was established in Eagle Point, and as a result, the city became incorporated in 1911. As Eagle Point blossomed it became the home to three hotels, a livery stable, blacksmith shop, a few saloons, and some dance halls known for their ''rowdy behavior and bootleggers.'' Three of the original brick buildings which housed the bank, confectionary store and general store still stand and are now home to modern businesses.

Eagle Point residents have gone to great lengths to preserve their history. In 1987, the citizens of Eagle Point relocated a queenpost truss covered bridge built in 1922 from Antelope Creek and placed it across Little Butte Creek for children to cross as they make their way to and from school. In addition to the covered bridge, the Butte Creek Mill also serves

as a link to the past, and is still in operation today. This historic, water-powered grist mill with its original, 130 year-old, French-quarried buhr stones is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is a popular tourist attraction.

Despite nearly doubling in size over the last decade, modern day Eagle Point continues to be a great place to live and raise children because of its small town rural charm, excellent schools and beautiful surroundings. Along with its rich history and rural setting, Eagle Point boasts a world-class Robert Trent Jones II-designed 18-hole golf course, which has attracted golfers and new residents alike.

Many notable celebrities have called Eagle Point home including Ginger Rogers, Patrick Duffy, and Kim Novak.

Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 2011, Eagle Point kicks off its Centennial Celebration. I invite my colleagues to join with me in wishing "Happy Birthday" to a growing, thriving city which serves as the "Gateway to the Lakes" and a window into southern Oregon's rich history.

TRIBUTE TO LA GRAN PARADA DOMINICANA DEL BRONX, INC.

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February our nation celebrates Dominican Heritage Month. I rise today to pay tribute to La Gran Parada Dominicana del Bronx, Inc., a valued institution in New York that promotes and celebrates Dominican life and culture.

The Bronx is home to one of the fastest growing Dominican populations in the country, and organizations like La Gran Parada Dominicana del Bronx help us to keep pace with this cultural enlargement. They articulate the Dominican experience here in the U.S., as well as the many ways in which Dominican Americans activate our national endeavor and strength.

Mr. Speaker, Dominican Heritage Month commemorates the anniversary of Dominican independence. It represents, as well, a moment when we pause to consider the growing influence Dominican Americans are having in this country.

Most Dominicans in the U.S. migrated here after 1960; the first generations put down strong roots in the Northeastern states of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and also Florida. Migration increased steadily in the 1970s and more so during the 1980s. Today the Dominican American community is primarily an immigrant community, with all the struggles and triumphs that accompany this experience. It is also a relatively new immigrant community, which means, among other things, that we—as a nation—have the joy of being able to witness history unfold before us, as newness gives way to establishment, and first steps lead to progress and ultimately to Dominican power. Already, we idolize Dominican Americans in our national culture and sport, and see an ever-growing number in public offices throughout the land, serving their constituents with honor.

La Gran Parada Dominicana del Bronx, Inc., was founded in May 1989 by Felipe Febles and Rosa Ayala. Its founders, friends, and allies had the foresight to recognize the value the Bronx would hold for Dominican Americans in years to come. They believed the Bronx would one day serve as a launch pad for Dominican aspirations across the U.S., and that the borough deserved an institutional partner worthy of the people who reside here. This belief has proven correct and in La Gran Parada Dominicana del Bronx, Dominicans from the Bronx have support to match their considerable talents.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bridge-building organization, one that understands honoring cultural achievement in America is at its best a shared experience. For this reason, I ask that my colleagues join me in paying tribute to Dominican Heritage Month 2011, and to an organization helping to bring it to life in New York City, La Gran Parada Dominicana del Bronx.

HONORING BRIGADIER GENERAL CAROL ANN FAUSONE

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Brigadier General Carol Ann Fausone upon her retirement from the Michigan National Guard after 34 years of dedicated and meritorious service.

In 1971, Carol Ann Fausone graduated from Cardinal Mooney High School in Youngstown., Ohio. After earning a bachelor of science in nursing from the University of Michigan in 1975, Carol Ann received her commission as a medical officer in the United States Air Force in 1977. She went on to earn the first of two master of science degrees from Madonna University, the first in administration in 1985 and the second in nursing in 1995. Brigadier General Fausone completed numerous compliments to her vast education in the interim and also attended Capstone National Defense University in 2003.

Brigadier General Fausone has been the recipient of numerous military awards and commendations including the Air Force Legion of Merit, Air Force Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Air Force Commendation Medal, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with one oak leaf cluster, the National Defense Service Medal with one oak leaf cluster and the Air Force Achievement Medal. She has also been decorated with the U.S. Air Force Senior Nurse and Chief Nurse Badges. In addition, Brigadier General Fausone was honored as the Air National Guard's Medical Readiness Officer of the Year in 1988. In 1994, she received the Nightingale Excellence in Nursing Administration Award from Oakland University and the 191st Airlift Group Commander's Trophy. The Brigadier General earned the highest award given by the National Guard Association of Michigan in 1995, the Major General John A. Johnston Award for Excellence.

Truly a pioneer of service women, Carol Ann Fausone was the first to be Michigan medical officer to achieve the rank of a general officer and on March 1, 2002 became the first woman in the Michigan National Guard to be promoted to the rank of Brigadier General. After having spent the last 8 years of her illustrious career as Assistant Adjutant General for Veterans Affairs for the State of Michigan, Brigadier General Fausone was pinned with the Distinguished Service Medal and praised for her dedication and service upon her retirement.

Mr. Speaker, as Brigadier General Carol Ann Fausone begins a new chapter in her life with her beloved husband Jim, there is no doubt that she will continue to advocate for the rights of our nation's veterans. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Brigadier General Carol Ann Fausone and in recognizing her years of loyal service to our community and country.

HONORING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF CLAY COUNTY IN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. HEATH SHULER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the sesquicentennial of Clay County in North Carolina. Clay, the smallest county in North Carolina with an area of only 221 square miles, has developed a flourishing community and embodies all that is Appalachia.

In 1860, George Hayes ran for a seat in the North Carolina House of Commons on a platform of creating a new county and county seat in the area of southern Cherokee County. In February of 1861, after his successful election, Representative Hayes introduced a bill to establish Clay County, was named in honor of Henry Clay, U.S. Secretary of State and Senator from Kentucky. Rep. Hayes later received recognition for helping form the new County when the County seat, Hayesville, was named in his honor.

Now, Clay is a thriving community of 10,000 residents. Clay County's education system received national recognition through the prestigious Communities in Schools Organization Accreditation. This award shows the commitment the entire County has to educating the youth in the community and preparing them for successful and productive futures.

Clay County is home to the beautiful Nantahala National Forest which is being developed as a forest, game, and trout preserve. The county also boasts one of the best trout streams in Western North Carolina at the Fires Creek Wilde Life Management. From the spectacular views of sapphire-blue waters in Chatuge Lake to the picturesque beauty of Nantahala National Forest, Clay County encompasses some of the best of Western North Carolina's natural treasures.

On February 21, 2011, Clay County will hold a very special public gathering in celebration of the 150th anniversary of its formation by the North Carolina Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Clay's sesquicentennial and its contributions to the United States and the great state of North Carolina.

NATIONAL MARRIAGE WEEK

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of National Marriage Week, which occurs annually during the week of February 7th. National Marriage Week was established to help couples strengthen their commitment to each other by hosting special events, marriage classes, and home support groups. While it is important for couples to focus on their marriage every day, National Marriage Week is an excellent opportunity for Americans to rededicate themselves to their spouse and to their family.

Marriage was ordained and instituted by God. It is the glue that binds the American family, and the safest harbor in which to raise children. Studies indicate that men and women who have a strong marriage tend to live longer, have better health, and experience more personal joy. Strong marriages also create the safest harbor for children to flourish and experience the complete spiritual, moral, emotional, educational, and financial benefits of both parents.

I have been a long-time advocate of traditional marriage, and have been pleased to support numerous pieces of legislation to protect this sacred institution. The family structure is the cornerstone of our society, and we should emphasize its importance. I encourage all Americans to use this opportunity to renew their commitment and devotion to their spouse, and to personally take the steps they can to preserve this important institution.

COMMEMORATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. ALBIO SIRES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Black History Month and commemorate the heroes of the African-American community, the accomplishments they have achieved for their communities and the freedoms they bravely championed for all Americans.

This year, the theme of Black History Month "African Americans and the Civil War" allows us to reflect on just one of the many moments in history where African Americans played a significant role in the fight for freedom.

Roughly 179,000 African-American men served as soldiers in the U.S. Army and another 19,000 in the Navy. 2,900 of these men were from the State of New Jersey. African American women, while not formally permitted to join the army, nonetheless served as nurses for the wounded.

Their valiant efforts and the extraordinary sacrifices helped unite a divided country and free millions from slavery.

During Black History Month we must also commemorate the accomplishments of the civil rights activist, both known and unknown, who helped imbed equality in the fabric of our great nation.

The impact of African American's service to this country since its founding has been immeasurable, and there is no doubt that they will continue to shape the future success of our country.

REGARDING LEWISBURG, WV AS ''COOLEST'' SMALL TOWN IN AMERICA

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, one hundred and thirty nine thousand and sixty eight visitors and residents and still counting have cast votes to designate Lewisburg in my home State of West Virginia, as the coolest small town in America. Whether victory in this contest is ultimately ours or not, we have learned a lot, reminded a whole lot of our friends not to be strangers, and have won new interest from around the country. To all those who competed in this year's effort, we salute you. Of course there are many towns across this great country and in West Virginia that are cool, worthy of recognition, and multiple honors. But to be the coolest, you have to heat up a lot of energies, and fire up plenty of old fashioned grit and hard work, and burn untold candles at both ends, and exhaust a multitude of warm hearts.

And Lewisburg has done just that. Not just in the last year, either. Lewisburg's charm, its endearing hospitality, historically spans the centuries, back to America's earliest beginnings. Nestled in the peacefully lush valley of the Greenbrier River, Lewisburg has hosted Presidents and Generals, Yankees and rebels, patriots and loyalists.

Historic Lewisburg is the county seat of Greenbrier County, and named after Andrew Lewis, a young surveyor, who, in 1751, established a camp near the spring, located behind the present courthouse, and known since that time as the Lewis Spring. In 1782, Lewisburg was formally established by an act of the Virginia General Assembly. The Old Stone Church in Lewisburg, the county seat, was the first Presbyterian Church built west of the Allegheny Mountains and has been in continual use since 1786.

The Greenbrier Valley and mineral-rich springs were fertile grounds for prosperous farming and elegant resort hotels and spas for visitors.

Today, Lewisburg—with its many 18th and 19th century buildings—is home to families, young professionals, and senior citizens and hosts thousands of visitors from all across America and around the world each year. Its vibrant performing arts community offers live performances by artists from around the world, arts in education programming, classes, workshops, fine art exhibits, an independent film series, and more in its own Carnegie Hall—one of only four Carnegie Halls still in continuous use in the world.

But above all its fine attributes, Lewisburg's lasting legacy will be its people, and their close knit neighbors in West Virginia.

INTRODUCING THE JUMPSTARTING OUR BUSINESS SECTOR ACT OF 2011 (JOBS ACT)

HON. PAUL C. BROUN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced the Jumpstarting Our Business Sector Act of 2011 (JOBS Act). This legislation permanently eliminates capital gains and dividends taxes, as well as the corporate tax rate. Additionally, it allows for 100 percent of business expensing for 2012.

As our Nation's unemployment continues to hover around 10 percent and the federal "stimulus" bill passed last Congress did little to improve our economy, it is time that Congress does what should have been done in the first place: help small businesses create jobs.

Abolishing capital gains and dividend taxes would be a much more effective means of stimulating the economy than more government spending. The elimination of these taxes would not only provide a short-term "stimulus," but they would encourage new long-term investment and growth.

By the end of 2011, the United States will have the highest corporate tax rate of the 34 countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Eliminating the corporate tax rate will immediately increase the competitiveness of our economy, attract more investment, and lead to job creation.

In addition, extending 100 percent of business expensing for 2012 will provide an incentive for businesses to invest more money back into the business, setting the stage for expansion and the creation of new jobs.

Small businesses are the engine of our economy and create the vast majority of new jobs in this country. And yet, nothing that the Federal Government has done so far to address our economic crisis has been directed towards helping our business community.

We have seen the effects of unchecked and unwarranted Federal Government spending on our economy and employment. Now is the time to once again put our trust in the small businesses and entrepreneurs and to get the Federal Government off their backs and out of their way. I believe the JOBS Act will be a positive step towards that goal.

ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, while it is my hope that the Andean Trade Preference Act has promoted trade between the Andean countries and the United States and in so doing it has acted to limit drug production, I and many of my colleagues remain deeply concerned over certain recent conduct by the Peruvian government with reference to its treatment of U.S. investment in Peru. I would ask that a letter my colleagues and I recently sent in regard to this matter be made a part of the record. And I would hope our Government would work diligently to protect the interests of our U.S. citizens in this regard. I would

hope before Congress is asked to extend this Act again, the Peruvian government will have addressed this concern so that it will not be an issue when a further extension is requested.

FEBRUARY 8, 2011.

Hon. HILLARY CLINTON,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, DC.
Hon. TIMOTHY F. GEITHNER,
Secretary, Department of Treasury,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SECRETARY AND MR. SECRETARY: We are writing you to raise a serious concern relating to the treatment of a U.S.-based company by the Government of Peru. We understand that this company has received disparate treatment by that Government and is apparently the subject of a possible expropriation. We understand that the Department of State is aware of this situation and that it has already expressed its concern to the Government of Peru.

As we understand it, Doe Run Peru (''DRP''), owned by the Renco Group, a U.S.-based holding company, owns a smelter in Peru that has been in operation for almost 100 years, though DRP has only operated the smelter since 1997. At the time that DRP acquired the smelter from the Government of Peru, DRP agreed to assume certain environmental upgrade costs associated with the smelter, and the Government of Peru assumed soil remediation costs for cleaning up the surrounding community. We understand that by 2009 DRP had invested $315 million in meeting the terms of the agreement, and, during this same period of time, and up until this date, the Government of Peru has spent nothing to fulfill its obligations.

While DRP has proposed good faith negotiations, to date the Government of Peru has refused to enter such discussions. Though DRP has completed eight and a half of the nine environmental commitments contained in the 1997 agreement, DRP has indicated its willingness to take further and additional steps, but for whatever reason the Government of Peru refuses to enter such negotiations.

We urge the Treasury Department and the State Department to work together on this matter as it raises very serious issues, particularly since the U.S. provides major funding to the Inter-American Development Bank that in turn is quite active in Peru. A de facto expropriation would raise questions about the appropriateness of further IDB investment in Peru. We would hope that your two Departments would communicate on this matter with the IDB and express the concerns of this Government and the consequences that might flow from an expropriation by the Government of Peru.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. PAYNE,
Member of Congress.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. MICHAEL P. KUZMA, JR.

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Michael P. Kuzma, Jr., who has virtuously served the United States and the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Since 1999, Mr. Kuzma has served as the ARISS/Technical Support Division Chief at the U.S. Army Recruiting Headquarters at Ft. Knox, KY. This month, Mr. Kuzma will retire after 44 years of dedicated service to the United States Army.

In his role as Technical Support Division Chief, Mr. Kuzma is responsible for supporting all USAREC mission requirements through modernization of automation tools, business processes and training. He has worked on innovative and cost effective automation solutions to help provide technical support and services to the G3 staff.

A native of Long Island, NY, Mr. Kuzma enlisted in the Army in September 1966. Mike and his wife Pat have been married for 41 years and have two sons, Travis and Michael.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring Mr. Michael P. Kuzma, Jr., because of his dignified and steadfast commitment to the U.S. Army, U.S. Army Reserve, his soldiers, the citizens of this country and the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

TRIBUTE TO BOB WILSON

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding member of the Florence sporting community, Mr. Bob Wilson. For over 30 years, Mr. Wilson has been passionately involved in the sport of basketball in my district. In honor of his unwavering commitment, later this month Mr. Wilson, a former player and coach at Francis Marion University (FMU), will be inducted into the University's Athletic Hall of Fame.

As a player, Mr. Wilson made an exceptional contribution to the University's basketball team. After transferring from Western Kentucky University in 1978, he played two seasons for the Patriots from 1978 to 1980. Wilson appeared in 58 games, assisting the team to a combined 42–19 win-loss record. He averaged an impressive 15.2 points and 5.0 rebounds per game. At the end of his career, Mr. Wilson owned the Patriot men's record for free-throw accuracy. To this day, despite playing only two seasons, Mr. Wilson ranks 22nd on the career scoring list with 880 points.

The 1979–80 season was a professional highlight in Mr. Wilson's basketball career. As co-captain, he scored a career-high 33 points in a win over Coastal Carolina in 1979. He also won the Francis Marion Coaches' Award and was voted the ''Best Shooter'' by the coaches in District Six of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA). That season the Patriots also recorded a 24–7 mark, which was the best the school had achieved to that date.

At the conclusion of his playing career, Mr. Wilson was named as part of the Francis Marion University All-Decade Team for the 1970s. He also graduated from FMU with a B.A. Degree in History in 1982 and later a Master's Degree in Education in 1991.

Reflecting his love and passion for the game, Mr. Wilson returned to Francis Marion as an assistant coach for eight seasons. In his tenure as part of the coaching staff, Francis Marion achieved a 142–100 mark and the program's only appearance in the NAIA National Tournament in 1991.

Mr. Wilson has subsequently taught in Florence School District One and has taught and coached at both West Florence and Wilson high schools. In his four seasons coaching at Wilson he guided them to a 76–31 mark and the 2007 AAA State Championship.

Mr. Wilson will be inducted into the Hall of Fame in a ceremony that will take place during the Homecoming activities on Saturday the 26th of February in the Smith University Center gymnasium on campus. Another Florence resident, Ms. Kim Slawson Hawkins, will also be inducted at the ceremony. Mr. Hawkins and Ms. Wilson will join 35 other members in the Francis Marion University Athletic Hall of Fame, which has been in existence since 1991.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in recognizing the significant contributions that Mr. Bob Wilson has made as an athlete and coach for the past three decades. I applaud and thank him for his services to the youth of my district and to the broader South Carolina sporting community.

HONORING MARSHALL FAULK

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, around this time last year, New Orleanians celebrated the Saints' Super Bowl victory. This year, we are celebrating Mr. Marshall Faulk's recent induction into the Pro Football Hall of Fame. Despite Louisiana's rich football heritage, Marshall is the first native New Orleanian to receive the honor and we are very proud of him.

Marshall Faulk is one of the best hybrid running backs and receivers in the world, which is why he was inducted into the Hall of Fame in his first year of eligibility. During his 12 years in the National Football League, split among the Indianapolis Colts and St. Louis Rams, he earned amazing statistics and awards. Marshall ranks fourth all-time in total yards from scrimmage. His 6,875 receiving yards are the most ever by a running back. Marshall's 136 career touchdowns, 100 of which are rushing, rank seventh of all-time. He has won three Offensive Player of the Year awards, was recognized in 2000 recognition as the NFL's Most Valuable Player, and called the ''greatest show on turf'' when the Rams won the Super Bowl in 2000.

A graduate of Carver High School, Marshall is really dedicated to New Orleans. He became a three-time consensus All-American at San Diego State and then the No. 2 overall pick in the NFL draft by the Colts, but began as a humble kid in the 9th Ward with a dream. I was touched to learn that, as a kid, Marshall sold popcorn at the Superdome to get closer to the football world. He recognized his gift and studied his craft—even as a stadium vendor.

After Katrina, Marshall toured his childhood neighborhood, the 9th Ward, and then donated $70,000 to Desire Street Ministries, a youth organization near the old housing development site. He understands that it takes the entire New Orleans community to rebuild our hometown.

I applaud Marshall Faulk for his induction into the Pro Football Hall of Fame and, on behalf of all New Orleanians, wish him well.

HONORING JOSEPH D. BUFF FOR HIS SERVICE TO McDOWELL COUNTY

HON. HEATH SHULER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 2011

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable community leader, Jonas D. Buff. For ten years Mr. Buff served on the Board of Commissioners for McDowell County while also serving as its Chairman in 1994. His dedication and commitment have brought growth and progress to McDowell County.

Mr. Buff's work to strengthen his County has included securing the location and grants to oversee the purchase of the McDowell County Industrial Park which is now home to three industries that are currently providing jobs to residents and economic development to the area. Mr. Buff also sought to recruit the State Prison facility to the County which now employs close to 400 individuals.

A strong proponent for the Nebo community owning its own water supply, Mr. Buffs advocacy helped bring about the ''Nebo Community Water System.'' Water lines and waste management are now extended to include a greater area, servicing more residents and laying a foundation for future growth.

In addition to aiding in the County's infrastructure growth, Mr. Buff was a strong supporter of volunteer and emergency services. During his tenure, the county implemented E–911 and Emergency Medical Dispatch and two EMS Base Stations were constructed.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the dedication that Mr. Buff has demonstrated in creating positive change for his County. His legacy highlights the lasting impact each hardworking person can impart to their community.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, February 14, 2011.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 32 public bills, H.R. 1, 653–683; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 26; and H. Res. 86–90, were introduced.

Pages H722–24

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H725–26**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 347, to correct and simplify the drafting of section 1752 (relating to restricted buildings or grounds) of title 18, United States Code (H. Rept. 112–9);

H.R. 394, to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–10); and

H.R. 386, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for aiming laser pointers at airplanes, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–11, Pt. 1). **Page H722**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 344 yeas to 50 nays with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 34.

Pages H685, H714–15

Directing certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government: The House agreed to H. Res. 72, to direct certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, particularly with respect to their effect on jobs and economic growth, by a recorded vote of 391 ayes to 28 noes, Roll No. 33. **Pages H686–H714**

Rejected the Carnahan motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 178 yeas to 242 nays, Roll No. 32. **Page H713**

H. Res. 73, the rule providing for consideration of the resolution, was agreed to on Thursday, February 10th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, February 14th, when it shall convene at 12 noon for morning hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. **Page H715**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:10 p.m. and reconvened at 7:07 p.m. **Page H716**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H713, H714, and H714–15. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Committee Meetings

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Assessment of Reentry Initiatives, Recidivism and Corrections Spending. Testimony was heard from R. Seth Williams, District Attorney, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and public witnesses.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on the Postal Service. Testimony was heard from David C. Williams, Inspector General, U.S. Postal Service.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE'S ROLE IN CYBER

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing on What Should the Department of Defense's Role in Cyber Be? Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor and Pensions held a hearing on Emerging Trends at the National Labor Relations Board. Testimony was heard from Arthur Rosenfeld, former General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board; and public witnesses.

CHEMICAL TERRORISM

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies held a hearing entitled ''Preventing Chemical Terrorism: Building a Foundation of Security at Our Nation's Chemical Facilities.'' Testimony was heard from Rand Beers, Under Secretary, National Protection and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; George S. Hawkins, General Manager, Water and Sewer Authority, District of Columbia; and public witnesses.

PATENT REFORM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition, and the Internet held a hearing on Crossing the Finish Line on Patent Reform: What Can and Should Be Done. Testimony was heard from Paul Michel, former Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Federal Circuit; and public witnesses.

OIL SPILL PREVENTION AND RESPONSE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation and the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a joint hearing on Improving Oil Spill Prevention and Response, Restoring Jobs, and Ensuring our Energy Security: Recommendations from the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling. Testimony was heard from the following members of the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling: Donald F. Boesch; and Terry D. Garcia; and ADM Thad Allen, USN (Ret.), National Incident Commander, BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.

SOCIAL SECURITY'S NEW NATIONAL COMPUTER CENTER

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security and the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure held a joint oversight hearing on the Progress Made to Replace the SSA's National Computer Center. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the SSA: Patrick P. O'Carroll, Jr., Inspector General; and G. Kelly Croft, Deputy Commissioner, Systems; and David Foley, Deputy Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, GAO.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of February 14 through February 19, 2011

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, at approximately 2 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of S. 223, FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act. At 4:30 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of James E. Graves, Jr., of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, and Edward J. Davila, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, with a voice vote on confirmation of the nomination of James E. Graves, Jr., of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, and a roll call vote on confirmation of the nomination of Edward J. Davila, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, at 5:30 p.m.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: February 17, to hold hearings to examine agriculture and growing America's economy, 2:30 p.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Armed Services: February 15, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael Vickers, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Intelligence, and Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, both of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

February 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: February 17, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the

Dodd-Frank implementation, focusing on a progress report by the regulators at the half-year mark, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: February 15, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012, 2 p.m., SD–608.

February 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 and revenue proposals, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: February 16, to hold hearings to examine safeguarding our future, focusing on building a nationwide network for first responders, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: February 16, to hold hearings to examine the U.S. Department of Energy's budget for fiscal year 2012, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: February 15, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Daniel M. Ashe, of Maryland, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, 10 a.m., SD–406.

February 15, Subcommittee on Green Jobs and the New Economy, to hold hearings to examine green jobs and trade, 2:30 p.m., SD–406.

February 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine national leaders' call to action on transportation, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: February 15, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012, 2:30 p.m., SD–215.

February 16, Full Committee, to continue hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: February 15, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, subcommittee membership and jurisdiction, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, and the nominations of Sue Kathrine Brown, of Texas, to be Ambassador to Montenegro, Daniel L. Shields III, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to Brunei Darussalam, David Lee Carden, of New York, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, all of the Department of State, and Eric G. Postel, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, 3 p.m., S–116, Capitol.

February 17, Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps and Global Narcotics Affairs, to hold hearings to examine United States policy toward Latin America, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: February 16, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, Public Health Service nominations, and an original bill entitled Technical Amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: February 15, organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee and rules of procedure for the 112th Congress, 10 a.m., SD–342.

February 15, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine counterterrorism lessons from the U.S. government's failure to prevent the Fort Hood attack, 10:30 a.m., SD–342.

February 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine saving the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, 9:15 a.m., SD–342.

February 16, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine improving Federal employment of people with disabilities, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

February 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Homeland Security, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: February 16, organizational business meeting to consider electing Chairman and Vice Chairman, committee rules, and any other organizational business items during the 112th Congress, 11:30 a.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: February 16, to hold hearings to examine targeting Web sites dedicated to stealing American intellectual property, 10 a.m., SD–226.

February 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jimmie V. Reyna, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, John A. Kronstadt, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Vincent L. Briccetti, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Arenda L. Wright Allen, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, and Michael Francis Urbanski, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia, 3 p.m., SD–226.

February 17, Full Committee, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, subcommittee membership and jurisdiction, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, S. 193, to extend the sunset of certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, S. 49, to amend the Federal antitrust laws to provide expanded coverage and to eliminate exemptions from such laws that are contrary to the public interest with respect to railroads, and the nominations of Sue E. Myerscough, and James E. Shadid, both to be a United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois, Susan L. Carney, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, and Michael H. Simon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: February 17, organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for the 112th Congress, 3:30 p.m., SR–301.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: February 16, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

February 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the SBIR and STTR programs, 10 a.m., SR–428A.

elect Committee on Intelligence: February 16, to hold hearings to examine the worldwide threat, 10 a.m., SH–216.

February 17, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, February 15, Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, hearing to review implementation of title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Part II, 1 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

February 15, Subcommittee on Rural Development, Research, Biotechnology and Foreign Agriculture, hearing to review the various definitions of rural applied under programs operated by the USDA, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

February 16, Subcommittee on Nutrition and Horticulture and the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, joint hearing to consider reducing the regulatory burdens posed by the case National Cotton Council v. EPA (6th Cir. 2009) and to review related draft legislation, 1 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

February 17, full Committee, hearing on reviewing the state of the farm economy, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, February 16, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2012 national defense authorization budget request from the Department of Defense, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

February 17, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2012 national defense authorization budget request from the Department of the Air Force, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, February 15, hearing on the President's Fiscal Year 2012 Budget, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

February 16, hearing on the Department of the Treasury Fiscal Year 2012 Budget, 2 p.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, February 15, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing on Investigating OSHA's Regulatory Agenda and Its Impact on Job Creation, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

February 16, full Committee, hearing on Policies and Priorities at the U.S. Department of Labor, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, February 15, to consider the Committee Oversight Plan for 112th Congress; followed by a markup of the following bills: H.R. 358, Protect Life Act, as amended; H.R. 525 Veterinary Public Health Amendments Act of 2011; H.R. 528, Neglected Infections of Impoverished Americans Act of 2011; and H.R. 570, Dental Emergency Responder Act of 2011, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

February 15, Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, hearing entitled ''Environmental Regulations, the Economy, and Jobs,'' 1 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

February 16, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled ''Network Neutrality and Internet Regulation: Warranted or More Economic Harm Than Good?'' 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

February 16, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Health Care Issues Involving the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight,'' 9:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

February 17, Subcommittee on Commence, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing entitled ''A Review of CPSIA and CPSC Resources,'' 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

February 17, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Impact of Medical Device Regulation on Jobs and Patients,'' 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, February 15, hearing entitled ''Assessing the Regulatory, Economic and Market Implications of the Dodd-Frank Derivatives Title,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

February 15, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''An Analysis of the Post-Conservatorship Legal Expenses of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac,'' 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

February 16, full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Final Report of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

February 16, Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity, hearing entitled ''Are There Government Barriers to the Housing Market Recovery?'' 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

February 17, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled ''Understanding the Federal Reserve's Proposed Rule on Interchange Fees: Implications and Consequences of the Durbin Amendment,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, February 15, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing on Does the U.S. Have a Policy toward Latin America? Assessing the Impact to U.S. Interests and Allies, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

February 17, full Committee, hearing on Watching the Watchers: The Need for Systemic Reforms and Independence of the State Department Inspector General, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, February 15, Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, hearing entitled ''Securing Our Borders—Operational Control and the Path Forward,'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

February 17, full Committee, hearing entitled ''The President's FY 2012 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security,'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, February 15, hearing on Military and Overseas Voting: Effectiveness of the MOVE Act in the 2010 Election, 10:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, February 14, Subcommittee on Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on the Role of Public Employee Pensions in Contributing to State Insolvency and the Possibility of a State Bankruptcy Chapter, 4 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

February 15, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, hearing on the Reauthorization of the Adam Walsh Act, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

February 15, Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition and the Internet, hearing on Ensuring Competition on the Internet: Net Neutrality and Antitrust, 1:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

February 16, full Committee, hearing on the Constitutionality of the Individual Mandate, 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

February 16, full Committee, to continue markup of H.R. 5, Help Efficient, Accessible, Low-cost, Timely Healthcare (HEALTH) Act of 2011, 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

February 17, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing on the Going Dark: Lawful Electronic Surveillance in the Face of New Technologies, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, February 15, Subcommittee on Technology, Information Policy, Intergovernmental Relations and Procurement Reform, hearing Unfunded Mandates and Regulatory Overreach, 9:30 a.m., 2203 Rayburn.

February 16, Subcommittee on Government Organizations, Efficiency and Financial Management, hearing on Making Sense of the Numbers: Improving the Federal Financial Reporting Model, 1:30 p.m., 2203 Rayburn.

February 16, Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight and Government Spending, hearing on the Stimulus: Two Years Later, 9:30 a.m., 210–HVC.

February 17, full Committee, hearing on Waste and Abuse: The Refuse of the Federal Spending Binge, 9:30 a.m., 210–HVC.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, February 16, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on a review of the Federal Aviation Administration's Research and Development Budget for Fiscal Year 2012, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

February 17, full Committee, hearing on An Overview of the Administration's Federal Research and Development Budget for Fiscal Year 2012, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, February 16, hearing entitled ''Putting Americans Back to Work: The State of the Small Business Economy,'' 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, February 15, Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, hearing on Accelerating the Project Delivery Process: Eliminating Bureaucratic Red Tape and Making Every Dollar Count, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

February 17, Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, hearing on Sitting on Our Assets: Rehabilitating and Improving our Nation's Rail Infrastructure, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, February 17, hearing on Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2012, 9:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, February 15, to consider the Committee's Oversight Plan for the 112th Congress, 12:55 p.m.; followed by a hearing on the President's Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Proposal, 1 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

February 16, to continue hearings on the President's Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Proposal, 10 a.m. and 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, February 17, executive, hearing on FY 2011 Budget Overview, 10 a.m., 304–HVC.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: February 16, to hold hearings to examine Lithuania's leadership of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), focusing on the challenges that the Lithuanian chairmanship faces, 3:30 p.m., SD–562.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, February 14, 2011

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of S. 223, FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act. At 4:30 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of James E. Graves, Jr., of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, and Edward J. Davila, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, with a voice vote on confirmation of the nomination of James E. Graves, Jr., of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, and a roll call vote on confirmation of the nomination of Edward J. Davila, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, February 14

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E207
Broun, Paul C., Ga., E209, E214
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E215
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E210
DeGette, Diana, Colo., E211
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E209, E210
Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E215
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E208
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E212
McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E213
McIntyre, Mike, N.C., E214
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E210
Pastor, Ed, Ariz., E208
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E214
Pence, Mike, Ind., E207, E212
Rahall, Nick J., II, W.Va., E214
Richmond, Cedric L., La., E209, E215
Schock, Aaron, Ill., E207
Schwartz, Allyson Y., Pa., E211
Serrano, José E., N.Y., E213
Shuler, Heath, N.C., E209, E213, E216
Sires, Albio, N.J., E214
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E209
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E207
Walden, Greg, Ore., E212

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.