United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011 No. 27

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, February 28, 2011, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 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, Creator of storm winds and innocent children. In You and through You all is held together. Lead us with Your penetrating wisdom.

May this Congress in all its deliberations be rid of absolute icons and move together to propose a common response to the overall security of Your people.

Integrate the information of this age with the practical and ethical standards that have guided Your people always through the mysteries of nature and the multiple legitimate needs of the most vulnerable in our midst.

Enlighten the Nation with Your word and Your grace 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia 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 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GRUESOME ANNIVERSARY OF FAILED STIMULUS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the gruesome second anniversary of the administration's misnamed stimulus plan. When this irresponsible plan of massive spending was introduced, liberals promised unemployment would not exceed 8 percent. At that time, House Republicans, led by JOHN BOEHNER, explained that our Nation cannot borrow and spend our way to prosperity, and the failure of this stimulus plan is a sad reminder of this.

Now, 2 years later, taxpayers have more than $817 billion added to the national debt. Unemployment is still above 9 percent and has been above 9 percent for 21 straight months. That means 14 million Americans are without jobs. Our debt is over $14 trillion.

I have introduced legislation for an audit of the stimulus to show the American people where their tax dollars were spent. Where is the money? Where are the jobs?

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

REGARDING THE REPUBLICAN CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, this week my Republican colleagues offered us a glimpse into their vision for America. It is a country where millions of women are turned away from basic health care, where the wealthy can buy access to our courts, and the poor are denied justice, where we abandon our obligation to pass on a cleaner, safer world to the next generation, where the voices of a thousand workers' cries for better treatment fall on a few pairs of deaf ears, where we deny children the arts education that has helped inspire the greatest culture on Earth.

This is not the America envisioned by the constituents I serve, among them thousands of America's Greatest Generation who fought during World War II and built an extraordinary Nation after the Great Depression. This continuing resolution is, quite simply, a disgrace to their vision and to their sacrifice. We can do better. We must do better.

Printed on recycled paper.

PROTECT SERVICEMEMBERS FROM SEXUAL ASSAULT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last year the military received over 3,000 reports of sexual assault involving other members in the service. This week, 17 veterans are saying that the military ignored their cases of sexual assault while they were on active duty. These accusations have occurred in all branches of the military.

The most recent complaint came from a woman who says she was drugged and gang raped by two fellow members of the Navy. This ended her career. Another rape victim reported the crime to the Marines, and she was ordered not to tell anyone, and to respect the alleged rapist, who was of a higher rank.

The perpetrators of rape in the military must be held accountable for their misdeeds, and victims should be respected and validated by the military. The United States has the world's finest military personnel, and we must support all of them, including victims of crime.

And that's just the way it is.

PROTECT THE CLEAN AIR ACT

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to warn my colleagues and the American public of a nasty little amendment in this CR. An amendment will be offered by the Republicans today to eliminate the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to enforce the clear mandates of the Clean Air Act.

The Supreme Court has ruled that the EPA owes the American public an obligation to reduce certain of these dangerous toxic gases. And yet, incredibly, the Republican Party wants to eliminate the ability to enforce that bill. Now, I think of this amendment as the dirty air act. And it is the dirty air act because if they pass it, that is what we'll get, dirty air.

Now, Americans, and I want to warn my colleagues, a poll distributed by the American Lung Association shows Americans are adamantly opposed to this amendment. They know we want clean air. They know we don't want more children's asthma. And we have got to defeat this amendment, defeat the dirty air act, keep the Clean Air Act as the law of this country.

LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, listen to the people. Kindergarten teachers, not a group easily riled, are amongst 30,000 of their neighbors in Wisconsin at the State Capitol. The audacity of their demand? The ability to negotiate a living wage, safe working conditions, and a dignified retirement.

These public servants make our society safe and functioning at an average wage of $30,000 a year. They did not cause the financial catastrophe in this country. That was the speculators and robber barons who received billions in TARP funds and then off-sourced it to avoid paying taxes. The folks in Wisconsin who are rallying teach our children to read.

At a time of Astroturf rallies, I urge all my colleagues, listen to that sound coming like a warm spring breeze off the prairie. That's the sound of America's proud middle class that built this country, and they have found their voice. We would all be wise to listen to the people.

THE CR AND THE DIRECTION OF AMERICA

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to talk about the CR in larger context. What's going on? The American people have been watching us debating this stuff for days now late into the night. What is it all about? What it's all about, Mr. Speaker, is which direction will America go in? Will we cut back and scale back vital programs that help Americans do better and move into the middle class? Will we cut back and scale back vitally needed regulations to help protect us, allow us to have clean air and clean water and important other rights?

Or, Mr. Speaker, will we have an America where we have labor rights, where we can organize, where we can have adequate regulations that give us the opportunity to a decent standard of life in America? It is a stark choice. A dim view where the vision is a small number of really wealthy people and a vast number of really desperate people, or a large, robust, strong middle class which powers America into the future? What we are fighting about is the soul of this country, the direction of this country. And the Democratic Caucus is standing firmly with the people as we have seen the people of Wisconsin stand up and snatch back their destiny from somebody who would take it from them.

So, Mr. Speaker, today focus your attention, the people are rising up around America, and the Democratic Caucus is standing strong right here.

CALIFORNIA SALMON INDUSTRY

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, our budget is a serious document and a statement of our values as a Union. Americans are depending on us to reduce the deficit in a responsible manner while growing our economy and putting people back to work. But as their ''so be it, let them eat cake'' approach to jobs and the economy shows, our Republican colleagues have chosen to abandon the responsibility for recklessness.

Now the Republicans are proposing to wipe out the California salmon industry and the thousands of jobs that depend on it. California's fishermen just made it through 3 years of unprecedented slowdown in the salmon industry. An estimated 23,000 jobs and $2.8 billion have been lost in just the last 3 years. These latest proposals threaten water supplies for millions, including both fishermen and farmers.

Mr. Speaker, salmon means jobs. I have met the people who make their living with salmon, and they are proud of their jobs. According to recent studies, restoring the California bay-delta could provide 94,000 new jobs and $5.7 billion in economic activity.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 92 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

□ 0910

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) 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, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the legislative day of Thursday, February 17, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 466 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 359, line 22.

AMENDMENT NO. 575 OFFERED BY MR. REHBERG

Mr. REHBERG. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be paid to any employee, officer, contractor, or grantee of any department or agency funded by title VIII of division B of this Act to implement the provisions of Public Law 111–148 or title I or subtitle B of title II of Public Law 111–152.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will state her point of order.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the Rehberg amendment because it violates clause 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5 by proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill. According to a cost estimate received from the Congressional Budget Office, the Rehberg amendment would increase net budget authority in the bill by $2 billion in fiscal year 2012 and a total of $5.5 billion over 10 years. Let me repeat that. That is adding $5.5 billion to the deficit. And I have, in my hand here, the CBO estimate of the budgetary effects of amendment 575 to H.R. 1, a CBO document.

The House rules package, adopted at the beginning of this Congress in House Resolution 5, includes the following rule in section 3(j)(3): ''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill.''

According to the CBO estimate, the Rehberg amendment does, in fact, produce a net increase in budget authority and is, therefore, not in order.

The majority have raised a point of order on all other amendments that violate this rule in section 3(j)(3) because they increase net budget authority; yet on this amendment by Mr. REHBERG, that is not the case. It would seem that on the question of health care, the majority is not abiding by its own rules to reduce the deficit.

I ask a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chair, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Montana is recognized.

Mr. REHBERG. I have been advised by the chairman of the Committee on Budget that my amendment complies with all applicable rules of the House. The point of order that my amendment violates clause 10 of rule XXI, known as the cut-go rule, is inapplicable in this case. The cut-go rule does provide a point of order against amendments to appropriations bills that cause an increase in mandatory spending over the 5-year scoring window. However, that rule contains an important exception. The point of order applies only to provisions that are modifications to substantive law. My amendment does not constitute such a modification; rather, it is a temporary provision limiting the use of funds in this act for the implementation of the law in a particular fiscal year.

As the chairman of the Committee on the Budget stated, my amendment does not make a modification to substantive law in a year after the year for which the bill makes appropriations. Accordingly, the prohibition contained in clause 10 of rule XXI does not apply to my amendment, and the point of order should be overruled.

And I respectfully ask the Chair for a ruling.

The Acting CHAIR. Does anyone else wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentlelady from Connecticut's point of order should be sustained, and, frankly, the chairman's arguments are deficient in two respects:

First, he notes that the chairman of the Budget Committee's opinion is that the point of order should not be sustained. Although I realize that the chairman of the Budget Committee's opinion by custom is given some sort of special gravity on these kind of questions, with all due respect, the Chair is the Chair. The Chair is the authority here, and the Chair's responsibility is to follow the rules of the House which very clearly state that a piece of legislation that has a net increase in budget authority is out of order under these circumstances.

Secondly, the chairman makes the argument that this is not a change in substantive law. One first would wonder why it's then being offered. But secondly, it seems to me that if agents of the executive branch have a responsibility and that responsibility includes discretion as to how to carry out a certain law, prohibiting them from carrying out that responsibility and limiting their discretion is, in fact, a significant change in substantive law.

On those grounds, I would urge that the point of order be sustained.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PALLONE. I rise to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I just find it incredible what I am hearing on the other side of the aisle here because we've gone through several weeks now where basically the rules have been changed so that the Budget Committee chairman basically does whatever he pleases and has the authority almost like equal to the rest of the House, the way the Republicans have given him this authority. It's sort of like a one-man dictatorship. So I'm not sure that I am particularly interested in his opinion on this one.

But beyond that—and I will follow up on my colleague from New Jersey—when you talk about substantive changes to the law, the whole purpose of this amendment is to basically gut the health care reform and make sure that it never takes place. And if it were to become law, if it were to be adopted, that is exactly what would happen. This has a major substantive impact.

And beyond that, what we're highlighting here is the fact that here we have the Republicans saying that they are trying to save money or cut spending when, in reality, what they are doing with this amendment is increasing the deficit and actually making it more difficult to create jobs.

I don't see how we could ever argue, frankly, that this amendment is in order. It clearly increases the deficit. It clearly increases the budget authority. It will kill the health care reform, and that's its purpose. So I would ask that the chairman rule that this is certainly out of order.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order.

Ms. DELAURO. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized.

Ms. DELAURO. The chairman has argued—with all due respect to the chairman—that the amendment does not violate clause 10 of rule XXI. But that is not the point of order that I raised. The point of order was section 3(j)(3) of H. Res. 5, and I will repeat what that says.

□ 0920

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill.'' This clearly, clearly proposes an increase. And we have the documentation from CBO.

So I am asking that this amendment be ruled out of order.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there anybody else who wishes to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chair, if I may respond.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. REHBERG. It doesn't matter which clause they want to draw from. The chairman said there is no impact.

My amendment scores at a savings of $100 million in the current fiscal year. That is substantive savings, and I again ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana violates section 3(j)3 of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(j)3 establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment, which proposes a limitation on funding in the instant bill for the instant fiscal year, does not propose a net increase in budget authority in this bill.

The point of order is overruled.

Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and straightforward. This amendment denies any funding provided by this bill to be used by the department or agency funded through the Labor-HHS title of the bill to support ObamaCare. It will create a firewall so that funds from this bill cannot be used for that purpose.

ObamaCare included mandatory funding for several provisions normally funded through the discretionary appropriations; for example, a $1 billion implementation fund. So, unfortunately, resources will be available to Health and Human Services. This amendment can slow but not completely stop the process.

I have tried everything within my power to write an amendment that would completely defund implementation yet withstand a point of order. This is the best I can do today. I liken the situation with this bill to trying to drive a car to the moon. A car is the wrong vehicle for that purpose, but a car can take us on the first leg of the trip. It can get us to the launching pad. And I will continue to do everything I can to finish the journey.

My goal, and the goal of the majority of Americans, is to repeal the new health care law. Until then, my objective is to defund it entirely and stop its implementation.

It is impossible at this time to describe the many reasons that justify defunding and repeal. Let me begin with my belief that the law is unconstitutional. It runs contrary to our most fundamental concepts of limited government and individual liberty and responsibility. It's a law designed by those who wish to control every health care decision made by health care providers and patients, by every employer and employee, by every family and individual. It will control every aspect of one-sixth of our economy.

This unaffordable program will cost $2.6 trillion in the first 10 years if fully implemented. Ninety percent of that cost is for Medicaid expansion and insurance subsidies. Roughly half of the Federal Government's costs will be paid through new taxes, penalties, and fees on individuals and businesses. The other half is covered by cuts in Medicare benefits.

The tax increases and regulatory burdens will be a significant drag on economic growth and job creation, and other costs to States, businesses and individuals are not included in the $2.6 trillion figure.

This is a job killer. How foolhardy to create a new entitlement program when we cannot pay for the ones we already have and cannot meet our current operating expenses without borrowing beyond our ability to repay. This is madness.

The structure of this bill was built on a foundation of multiple mandates, the individual mandate that requires people to purchase insurance whether they want to or not, mandates on States to create and operate insurance exchanges and to expand Medicaid dramatically, mandates on employers to provide insurance or be penalized, mandates regarding the precise terms of insurance policies that everyone ultimately must purchase, and on and on.

Our forefathers would be appalled to see the power over our health and lives that we are surrendering to government. They had firsthand experience with unfettered government control, and they carefully designed a Constitution to limit the government's power. We've learned nothing from them. Never has there been such a complete transfer of power to our government with such blind faith and hope that government will get it right when our experience in every other context is so totally to the contrary.

This is an experiment, a huge gamble imposed on us by those who did not read the legislation or fully understand its consequences. We are already catching glimpses of how government power will be exercised. Large corporations and unions have been granted waivers for mandates they cannot meet; large corporations with armies of lawyers and unions who hold a special place in the hearts, minds, and political campaigns of those who enacted this bill. Will Government be so accommodating to you?

There are problems with the existing health care system, but this law only makes matters worse. The law must be repealed so that it can be replaced with incremental, market-oriented, affordable measures to improve, rather than transform, our current health care system. In the meantime, implementation must be stopped.

There's a second reason to defund implementation. The law's individual mandate has been declared unconstitutional by two Federal judges. Judge Roger Vinson has written a powerful opinion that strikes down the entire law. The administration and Congress are on notice of the substantial risk that the Supreme Court will uphold Vinson's decision. If that occurs after a year or more of litigation, billions of dollars spent by the Federal Government to implement the law and by States, businesses, individuals, and taxpayers to comply with the law will have been completely wasted, thrown away. In light of the crisis created by our ballooning debt and anemic economy, it is fiscally irresponsible to go forward with implementation until the court challenge is finally resolved.

For these reasons, I urge you to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The American people want us to work together to address their top priorities—creating jobs, turning the economy around, and reducing the deficit. The Republican majority told the American people, Vote for me, that's what we are going to do. This is a classic case of bait and switch.

Their first order of business was to repeal health care reform, the results of which would add to unemployment, add to the deficit, and delay the economic recovery. And today, by denying funds for the implementation of health care, they are at it again.

This amendment would take away the consumer protections of the Affordable Care Act and put the insurance companies back in charge, a further demonstration of the majority's special interest priorities and an hypocrisy on job creation and deficit reduction.

Repealing health care will destroy jobs in the health professions. It will slow growth by 250,000 to 400,000 jobs a year. It will increase medical spending and add nearly $2,000 to the average family insurance premium. And according to CBO, repeal would add $230 billion to the deficit in the first 10 years and $1 trillion in the second 10 years. And let me repeat that. This amendment adds billions and ultimately trillions of dollars to the deficit, and it starts next year with $2.2 billion.

While my colleague will say that for the rest of this year that that isn't the case, one needs to just look at what the CBO says overall on the $5.5 billion in deficits that this would create. This is not what they promised the American people.

This amendment will allow insurers to charge women 48 percent more than men for exactly the same coverage. It allows insurance companies to once again discriminate against Americans with preexisting conditions, even children with preexisting conditions. Women may again be denied coverage because they survived breast cancer or because they were a victim of domestic violence or because they had a c-section. It will deny up to 4 million small businesses $40 billion in tax credits.

This amendment will increase drug costs for seniors. It will take away the 50 percent discount on brand name drugs for those who have found themselves in the doughnut hole. It will increase, also, seniors' health care costs, making lifesaving preventive services like mammograms, colonoscopies, wellness visits, blood pressure screenings, and diabetes screenings more expensive. This amendment will cost money and it will cost lives.

In Connecticut 191,000 children with preexisting conditions benefit from the health care reform law. More than 540,000 seniors with Medicare coverage no longer have out-of-pocket expenses

for recommended preventive services, and up to 15,400 small businesses in my district alone will benefit from these tax credits.

□ 0930

If this amendment passes, what will happen to children with preexisting conditions, to seniors in the doughnut hole, to small business owners trying to help their employees find quality health insurance?

I urge my colleagues to vote against this irresponsible amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my good friend from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As was so eloquently put forward by Mr. REHBERG, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Human Services Appropriations just a moment ago, this is a temporary limiting amendment on the appropriations for implementation of the Patient Protection Affordable Care Act.

''Bait and switch,'' that term was used by the other side just a moment ago in their arguments. Bait and switch. Think back to where we were just a little over a year ago in this House of Representatives when the Democrats' version of a health care bill passed. Where is that bill today? Somewhere in the dustbin out in the halls outside the office the former Speaker now occupies.

Bait and switch. What happened on Christmas Eve of last year of 2009? The Senate passed a bill, a bill that was never intended to become law. It was a placeholder. It was a vehicle to simply get the Senators home for Christmas Eve ahead of a snowstorm so that then everyone can come back to the Capitol in January 2010 and work on the bill that would ultimately become President Obama's health care reform. But it didn't happen. The Democrats lost an election in Massachusetts for the Senate seat, and that changed the paradigm, that changed the narrative, that changed the debate.

And then what happened? The House took up the bill passed by the Senate, conveniently, a bill that had been passed by the House of Representatives the summer before as a housing bill, H.R. 3590. Look it up on Thomas at home if you doubt. 3590 passed the Senate.

Why would Senator REID—why would the other body take up a previously passed House bill and turn it into a health care bill? Because it wasn't a health care bill; it was a tax bill. It was a tax bill that, by constitutional authority, had to originate in the House of Representatives.

So then the other body had the perfect vehicle: Take this housing bill, strip out the housing language, put in the health care language, pass it on Christmas Eve, and then we'll all gather back after the New Year's Eve festivities and create a conference committee and pass the President's signature health care legislation. But it didn't happen that way.

And then the elimination of opponents on the Democratic side began in sequential form such that by March 23 of last year enough Democrats had changed their votes and would support the Senate-passed House bill. And the question, Will the House now agree to the Senate amendment on 3590? was answered affirmatively.

But was that the end of the story? No. This was extensively litigated in the political arena last fall. And what was the judgment of the American people after the litigation in the political arena? The answer was: We don't want it. We don't want any part of it. Fix it. Do something.

So Chairman REHBERG is doing exactly that today. Within the limits that he is constrained by in a continuing resolution, he is providing the vehicle, the floor by which the implementation of this very flawed process, this very flawed law can now be contained.

It was important before, but 3 weeks ago it became critical. It became critical because of Judge Vinson's ruling. And why is that? And I encourage my colleagues to go to Judge Vinson's ruling. It's available on the Internet. It's not hard to read. It's about 75 pages.

Judge Vinson's ruling, page 76 of 78: ''Because the individual mandate is unconstitutional and not severable, the entire act must be declared void.''

Pretty clear language.

Now, why is it necessary to approach the funding? Because earlier in his opinion Judge Vinson observed: There is a longstanding presumption that officials of the executive branch will adhere to the law as declared by the court. As a result, declaratory judgment is the functional equivalent of an injunction.

Well, that should be good enough for members of the executive branch. They had the Federal agencies. But apparently that is not so, because what we see today in our committee hearings, in the headlines in the newspapers is that this administration is proceeding at light speed with implementation.

The previous health care czar is now the Deputy Chief of Staff in the White House. What does that tell you about their plans for implementation? In fact, the plans for implementation were going so fast that one of the chief architects of implementation was hired 1½ months before the bill was signed into law, and that's testimony that we heard in our committee in Energy and Commerce this past week.

I sent a letter to Secretary Sebelius this week asking her to provide for us what direction she was going to take in light of Judge Vinson's ruling.

In closing, I thank the gentleman for bringing this limiting amendment to the floor today. It is critically important that this Congress act to limit the implementation of this very flawed health care law. Let's get back to the work the American people asked us to do in the election.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 11, 2011.

Hon. KATHLEEN SEBELIUS,
Secretary of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY SEBELIUS: I write to inquire of the Department of Health and Human Services your response to and specifically subsequent implementation decisions made by the Department in the wake of Judge Vinson's ruling in The State of Florida v. United States Department of Health and Human Services. As you are well aware, the plaintiff sought declaratory judgment that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional as well as an injunction against its enforcement.

In his opinion, Judge Vinson relied on precedent in Committee on Judiciary of U.S. House of Representatives v. Miers to determine that when a court issues a declaratory judgment against federal officials, the ''declaratory judgment is the functional equivalent of an injunction.'' He quoted a previous United States Court of Appeals decision which further addressed his point, ''that officials of the Executive Branch will adhere to the law as declared by the court. As a result, the declaratory judgment is the functional equivalent of an injunction. . . There is no reason to conclude that this presumption should not apply here. Thus, the award of declaratory relief is adequate and separate injunctive relief is not necessary.''

I would like to request information on how, in light of the declaratory relief issued by Judge Vinson, the Department plans to proceed in its implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this issue and I look forward to your response. Should you have any questions, please contact me in my Washington office at (202)225–7772.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL C. BURGESS, M.D.,
Member of Congress.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

The author of this amendment said a few minutes ago that this was a very simple and straightforward amendment. And that's probably true for Members of Congress who have government-paid health insurance, have policies that are looked after by a PPO to make sure that we get benefits. But if you are a member of the American public, this is not a simple and straightforward amendment. If you are a member of the American public, this amendment changes your life. For millions of Americans and for millions of their children, for millions of their parents this amendment changes their life. This isn't straightforward.

So many of our new Republican colleagues have come to town and said, I'm just one of the folks back home. I'm not enamored with Washington. I'm just one of the folks back home.

Vote for this amendment, and you won't be like the folks back home.

Vote for the amendment, and you will be very different than the folks back home, because you will have insurance and they won't. You will have coverage and they won't. You won't have lifetime caps and they will. You won't lose your insurance when you need it for you, your children, or your spouse, but your constituents will. You are not just like the folks back home. You are doing grave damage to the folks back home.

So you ought to think about this amendment before you vote for it. Not only does it add $5 billion almost immediately to the deficit; it adds $1 trillion to the deficit over 20 years, takes us in the wrong direction. But this punishes people back home. Talk to your constituents who now are the seniors who have that free physical checkup and have been given medicine, have been told about things that they are doing wrong with respect to their health and now can prevent additional doctors' visits and hospital care because of that checkup that they now get that this amendment would take away. Talk to the parents. And you really ought to talk to the grandparents of the children who now have coverage that didn't have it before. They are as concerned about the coverage of their grandchildren as they are about their Medicare coverage, which you will change with respect to the cost of pharmaceuticals.

No, this isn't simple and straightforward, and this isn't just like the folks back home. The folks back home are struggling every day to pay their insurance premiums. Pass this amendment, and once again the insurance companies can rip them off. Once again, they no longer have to dedicate 80 percent of your premiums to your health care. They can write themselves the bonuses, the advertising, the salaries, and forget the health care.

There won't be that kind of protection for people who struggle every month to achieve health care coverage, for the 9 million people who are in the middle of getting rebates now because of the change in the law to make sure that health insurance companies provide you health insurance instead of a funding stream for the executives.

No, this isn't simple and straightforward, and you are not just like the folks back home once you vote for this amendment. Is that clear?

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a new member of the Appropriations Committee, a great addition, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

You know, just listening to what we just heard from our colleague across the aisle, he said, Go back and talk to your doctors, talk to parents, talk to seniors.

You are missing the point. It's time to listen. That's what we've been doing. We've been listening. And the American people in November said it's time not only to defund this but to repeal this measure. Again, the House has moved forward to do so. Maybe you should quit talking to and start listening to.

Mr. Chairman, I'm here in support of this amendment because, simply put, it defunds ObamaCare bureaucrats. If this amendment is adopted, government bureaucrats cannot be paid so much as to lift a finger, move a paperclip, send an email if it has anything to do with ObamaCare.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Sir, I would rather just finish my comments here. They have plenty of time on their side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman does not yield for that purpose and continues to be recognized.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. And since today we're here to talk about saving the taxpayer dollars, let's remember the cost of ObamaCare.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia would need to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. So we are here today to talk about the taxpayers' money. Let's remember the cost of ObamaCare: $2.6 trillion over the first 10 years once it's implemented, $560 billion in new taxes on American families and businesses, unconstitutional mandates, higher premiums, and, yes, lost coverage.

The law is so damaging that the Obama administration themselves have granted at least 915 waivers for health plans and organizations.

□ 0940

Now, think about that savings—2.5 million people from ObamaCare.

Mr. Chairman, let's save the rest of America here today and let's support the Rehberg amendment and move on and zero out the payments to those ObamaCare bureaucrats.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, is it a violation of the House rules wherein Members are not permitted to make disparaging references to the President of the United States? In two previous gentlemen's statements on the amendment, both of them referred to the Affordable Care Act, which is the accurate title of the health care reform law, as ObamaCare. That is a disparaging reference to the President of the United States, it is meant as a disparaging reference to the President of the United States, and it is clearly in violation of the House rules against that.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has stated a hypothetical. The Chair will not issue an advisory opinion, but will inform all Members that remarks in debate must avoid personalities, including personalities toward the President.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

To the prior gentleman, I would just say you didn't listen to the people of this country; you sold them a bill of goods. You told them you were going to create jobs, you were going to reduce the deficit, and you were going to turn the economy around. You have done none of this. You have been here 6 weeks, 8 weeks; and you have not done anything. And with this amendment you will, indeed, by the CBO numbers, increase the deficit as soon as next year by over $2 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. How many times are we going to hear about repealing the health care reform instead of having an initiative that actually creates jobs? I go out. The gentleman from Georgia said, Are you listening to your constituents? Yes, I listen to my constituents. They tell us we should address job creation and the economy and not constantly argue over and over again about repealing health care reform, which we know is going absolutely nowhere. So when I listen, that is what I hear: jobs, the economy, not this constant repetition of repeal.

Now, I have a lot of respect for the gentleman from Montana, I have to say, but he talks about completely stopping and defending implementation. Well, the reason that the Republicans are saying that they want to defund implementation is because this health care reform is already working. Insurers now can't drop someone's coverage when they get sick; seniors are saving money on prescription drugs; young adults to age 26 are getting back on their parents' insurance; and small businesses are receiving billions of dollars in tax credits to provide health care coverage. This is moving along. This is working. That is why they want to stop the implementation, is because they know it is working.

Now, the defunding amendments will end all these benefits, putting health insurance companies back in charge of America's health care. The only person who benefits from defunding and repeal are the special interest health insurance companies that want to charge more and continue their discriminatory practices.

The gentleman from Montana talked about the cost. Well, the fact of the matter is that if we pass these defunding amendments offered in the guise of budget austerity, they are actually one step closer towards repealing the largest deficit cutter passed in the last decade, and that is the Affordable Care Act.

Health care reform helps tremendously in reducing the deficit. It will save $230 billion over the next 10 years and over $1 trillion in the 10 years after that. If we defund health care reform, there will be no prohibition on discrimination against over 100 million Americans with preexisting conditions, no prohibition on insurance companies canceling your coverage when you get sick, no prohibition on lifetime caps and annual limits, no required coverage for young adults on their parents' policies, no assistance for seniors struggling to afford the cost of drugs in the doughnut hole, no free annual checkups in Medicare, and no tax credits for families and small businesses to pay for health insurance.

Repeal, I stress, is a boon for the insurance companies, but an enormous setback for American families. If we pass this amendment, the insurance companies can raise their rates without review or transparency, they can deny coverage to millions of Americans with preexisting conditions, and they can cut off coverage when someone becomes sick.

I urge all Members to vote ''no'' on these defunding amendments. Health care reform is working. I go back home and people are pleased with it because already in many cases they are able to get insurance they weren't able to get before.

I am tired of hearing this over and over again. Concentrate on jobs and the economy, not this charade.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I respectfully do refer to it as ''ObamaCare.'' You would think that he would want his name attached to his signature legislation. But in four quick years, this Congress and this President have made what is a spending problem into a spending crisis. We wanted to create jobs. You wasted time on the health care reform that did not control the costs.

They call it affordable health care. Unfortunately, all it did was add people. It didn't control the costs of health care, and that is one of the reasons it needs to be repealed. We wanted to build an economy; they wanted to build government. So we call it what it is. It is ObamaCare. It is a travesty. It is Big Government. It is not controlling health care costs, and it needs to be repealed.

Today we are going to try to defund it, to the best of our ability; and if we are not successful this time, we are going to try again and again and again until we either have a Senate that is willing to pass it or a President that understands that we cannot do this to the American people.

At this time I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on HHS, Congressman REHBERG, for yielding.

I want to declare my support for this amendment, and I think he is happy if I refer to it as the Rehberg amendment. I also want to thank DENNY REHBERG for the work that he has done on this. America will never know, Mr. Chairman, how much work went into crafting this amendment to get this fix that does a little bit to take us down the road. And, boy, it is important to me to see $100 million cut out of the resources that would be used to implement ObamaCare.

Mr. Chairman, I am also very confident in declaring it to be ObamaCare. I listened to President Obama address it as ObamaCare on February 25 of last year at the Blair House during the health care summit. I thought that was the source of the moniker ObamaCare, was the President himself, and if anyone thinks otherwise, I think they should look back and check the record.

ObamaCare is this: It's not $1 trillion in deficit over 20 years if we don't go through with this atrocity; it's $2.6 trillion in spending in the first full decade, according to the chairman of the Budget Committee, PAUL RYAN—$2.6 trillion in spending.

We are here in this CR to cut spending. We know that we have to go into a national era of austerity because of the overspending that has taken place over the last 4 years in particular and the last 2 years in a hugely significant way.

□ 0950

We're looking at a budget now that has a deficit proposed by the President of $1.65 trillion. And if you roll back to the full Federal outlays in 1997, $1.6 trillion. The on-budget items in 2002, $1.6 trillion. And we have that much deficit proposed by the President. We want to shut off $2.6 trillion worth of irresponsible spending. We want to preserve the liberty and the freedom of the American people and the best health care system in the world. That's why you see sheikhs' planes landing in places like Rochester, Minnesota to get health care that they can't get in other places in the world. If Michael Moore thinks Cuba has the best health care system, I suggest he swim there. This country, we need to preserve the system we have and expand it. The Rehberg amendment helps slow down this implementation that is going on in an aggressive fashion by the Obama administration.

I happen to have in my hand, Mr. Chairman, an excerpt from a CRS report that tells you how duplicitous this bill once one picked it up and read it, the 2,500 pages. And in here are multiple places, over 50 places where ObamaCare actually not just authorizes, but it also appropriates—not completely unprecedented, but it is the largest, most substantial effort to trigger automatic spending that goes on in perpetuity, Mr. Chairman.

The number here is not $100 billion. The number on this CRS report is $105.5 billion over the next 10 years. And in the balance of this fiscal year, it's $4.95 billion that we're having trouble getting at. Thanks to DENNY REHBERG, we're getting at $100 million. I believe this amendment will pass today and it will go on this CR and it will become a significant leverage point over in the United States Senate.

Other components of this that need to be ripped out that—oh, wait a minute, I forgot to remind you. Again, H.R. 2, full repeal of ObamaCare. I was pleased to see language that I had worked on and drafted for all those months went over to the Senate where every Republican voted to repeal ObamaCare. Here we had bipartisan support for the repeal of ObamaCare—three times the bipartisan support described by then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI. And we sit here now with Americans that have—two-thirds of them by the polling—rejected ObamaCare.

In this bill, another piece that reads deceptively is this: ''The authority for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to do interdepartmental transfers in any amount greater than the 2008 budget bill,'' which means slush funds all through that Department to aggressively implement ObamaCare. The Rehberg amendment shuts off some of that—probably not all of that, but it gets at it and it lays the point out. And I hope that we can do better on some of the others into the future.

We also need to understand that when America has rejected a piece of legislation that so upsets all of our lives and takes away so much of our liberty and freedom, takes away our ability to buy a health insurance policy that is high deductible, high copayment, and low premium, that we have many more good solutions that will unfold here.

This bill is unconstitutional in four places at least, two Federal courts have ruled, so we know that it will eventually get to the Supreme Court. And we can never say with certainty what the result will be, but we know the certainty of the two Federal courts, Mr. Chairman. We must have the Rehberg amendment so the American people are dealt with respect and honor of their opinion. H.R. 1 cuts the funding; H.R. 2 repeals.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, let me just reiterate again: This amendment would not create jobs; it would not do anything to reduce the deficit. In fact, by the CBO numbers, it would increase net budget authority in the bill by $2 billion next year, a total of $5.5 billion over the next several years. It increases the deficit. Let's keep hitting it on that point.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. If this amendment would become part of the CR, there will be no CR, and that will be your responsibility, your responsibility.

This is an effort to repeal by paralysis, paralyzing the provisions that have gone into effect—preexisting conditions for children being covered, children under 26 having the ability to get insurance. It would paralyze the efforts to begin to implement the 2014 benefits.

Instead of searching for common ground, this amendment intensifies warfare. Instead of collaboration, this amendment would mean chaos.

The Republicans have become a wrecking crew, led by PAUL RYAN and wrecking Medicare. This amendment is a deeply dangerous prescription for Americans' health. This prescription needs to be rejected.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Does anybody honestly believe in America that by repealing ObamaCare it's actually going to cost the government money? It just doesn't pass the smell test. Yes, the way the CBO is scoring it based upon the questions that they are asked show it is. But nobody, honestly nobody in this country honestly believes that when you repeal a piece of legislation it's going to end up costing you money.

I now yield 5 minutes to one of the few people that clearly gets the entire picture, a doctor, one of our Members from the State of Georgia (Mr. PRICE), who understands that defensive medicine was entirely left out of this, but, of course, we know why. And it's one of the issues driving the cost of health care.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my friend, and I appreciate him for his remarkable leadership on this. Many of us tried to figure out how we could bring this issue to the floor under this bill, and you have done that.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about jobs, that this won't create any jobs. Well, I'll tell you some jobs that this will save if we pass this amendment and that's the physicians in this land.

As a physician—and if folks in this body talk to their doctors back home, they will understand the remarkable challenges and the number of physicians who are throwing up their hands and saying, I can't handle the hassles anymore; I can't believe the intrusion of the Federal Government into my ability to take care of my patients in the way that I deem best.

And so what are they saying? They're saying, well, there isn't any way for me to uphold and live by the oath that I took, to do what was best for my patients, and therefore I'm left in a remarkable moral quandary. And for many of them it is to say, I'm sorry, I'm no longer able to practice under this oppressive government.

The deficit. That's right, we ought to be talking about the deficit. Here's the track right here of the folks who have been in charge for the last 4 years. In 2006, they came in, and this is what the Federal Government was spending down here, a little over $2.6 trillion. The last year of their reign they're up in the $3.7 trillion, $3.8 trillion range. The deficit is about a third of that, this year coming up, $1.6 trillion. So Mr. Chair, to have our friends on the other side of the aisle tell us about deficit is a bit curious.

I'm reminded by my friend from Texas, a fellow physician who gave a remarkable recitation of the history of the law that we have in place now, the non-health care reform law that was enacted, and I'm reminded of the jubilation on the other side of the aisle when they passed this piece of legislation last March. At the time I had some serious conversations with friends on the other side because we weren't allowed to have this kind of robust debate. That wasn't allowed, it wasn't allowed in committee, it wasn't allowed on the floor of the House. The decisions had been made beforehand and the bill was shoved down the throat of the House of Representatives and the American people.

But I remember talking with them and I remember saying, It's puzzling to me why you're so enthusiastic and excited about this. There's no way that this law can go forward because it is clearly unconstitutional. And in fact now we've seen a Federal court in Virginia and a Federal court in Florida agree that the individual mandate—that the notion that the Federal Government can say to the American people, by virtue of being a citizen you must purchase this product and this is exactly what it must be. And that's what the law has done.

And so I believe that before we will hold another election in this country this law will be determined to be unconstitutional, which really is a shame because we will have missed a great opportunity.

My friend from Michigan who talked about bipartisan cooperation—of which there was none over the last 4 years in this arena—but we have missed a great opportunity, and hopefully we'll be able to enhance the opportunities that we have over the coming 2 years to be able to work together in a bipartisan way to address the challenges in health care. Because the status quo, as a physician and as a Member of Congress, the status quo is clearly unacceptable.

But when you look at the principles of health care—accessibility, making certain that people have accessibility to health care, which they don't right now and which this law actually harms; affordability, which is becoming more and more of a challenge to the American people and which this law actually harms—if you don't believe it, just ask the employees in businesses across this land who are having to pay higher premiums because of this law; the quality issues, all of the quality sorts of things that we all believe in so strongly and which this law actually harms because the only person who knows what's quality health care for you and your family is you and your family and your physician.

□ 1000

What this law does is remove this decisionmaking power from you and your family and your physician, and it replaces it with folks here in town who believe they know best what kind of health care you ought to receive. Then there is the responsiveness of the system and innovation in the system and choices, Mr. Chairman—choices that have been remarkably limited and will continue to be limited by this law.

So what Mr. REHBERG has done here is said that the only way that we can begin to dismantle this, which is what the American people desire in significant majority numbers, is to say you can't use resources that you have in your department to implement the law, itself. If the States and the Federal Government would listen to Judge Vinson in Florida, then they would realize that it, in fact, is their responsibility, that it is their responsibility not to implement this law.

So I urge adoption of the amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to get to work on the principles of health care, which this law absolutely ignored.

Ms. DELAURO. The Rehberg amendment would increase net budget authority in the bill by $2 billion in fiscal year 2012—that's next year—for a total of $5.5 billion over the next several years.

Mr. Chairman, 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. Mr. Chairman, all across the country this morning, millions of Americans got up for another day of searching the job search Web sites or looking at the want ads, enduring another day of courtesy interviews, pointless discussions with potential employers, and dreading the arrival of the letter carrier today because he is going to bring one more credit card bill or dunning letter for a bill that they can't pay.

Life has become a nightmare for 15 million unemployed Americans—and here we are in the House of Representatives. I don't think many of them got up this morning and said, I really hope that Congress for the second time in a month debates the repeal of the health care law. I think what our constituents said was, Why don't they get to work, working together to create jobs in this country?

Instead, the Tower of Babel that the House of Representatives has become this week has produced yet another meaningless debate on the repeal of the health care law, which followed on the heel of defunding Planned Parenthood last night.

Now, it's not bad enough what this bill doesn't do in having us work together to create jobs for the American people; it's bad in what it does do. It's very important that the Members understand the real-world consequences of the chairman's amendment.

If his amendment passes and if the parents of a child with juvenile diabetes wake up one day to discover that an insurance company won't sell their son or daughter insurance because that child has juvenile diabetes or that an insurance company will charge them four or five times the amount of the premium because the child has juvenile diabetes, the person at the Department of Health and Human Services who can step in and stop the insurance company from doing that won't be able to, because this amendment says, let's tie the hands of the people here to enforce the law.

If an insurance company says to a family who is grappling with a malignancy or a brainstem injury for their son or their daughter, ''You've run out of coverage. You've hit your lifetime limit. Too bad, so be it,'' the person who would be in a position to do something, to require an insurance company to pay those hospital bills, won't be able to do that because this is happening.

With all due respect, we've had a debate about using names this morning. I think we're using the wrong name for this amendment. This should be called the ''insurance company bill of rights'' because what it says is, anything any insurance must do at any time, so be it.

The American people deserve better than this. Members of the House should vote ''no'' on the Rehberg amendment and get back to the business of putting Americans back to work.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Montana has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. REHBERG. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. The Rehberg amendment increases net budget authority in the bill by $2 billion next year, a total of $5.5 billion over 10 years. It increases the deficit, and it puts the American people back in the hands of the insurance companies. Again, it's a classic bait and switch.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me to participate in this debate.

It's really quite amazing, Mr. Chairman, the alternative reality that has been created on the Republican side. They never liked the health care bill—I think people know that already—but it is the law of the land. They tried to repeal it. They haven't been able to do it. But the health care bill passed.

Under the laws of the United States, people have certain rights under this legislation. For example, insurers cannot drop people's coverage when they get sick. Seniors are saving money on prescription drugs. Young adults to 26 are getting back on their parents' insurance, and small businesses are receiving billions of dollars in tax credits to provide health care coverage.

The Republicans said they like all of that. They like that. When they give us a bill, they're going to have all that in it. Meanwhile, they want to stop those things from happening under the existing law. Defunding amendments will end these benefits, putting health insurance companies back in charge of Americans' health care.

We should realize, when we have a law, it should be implemented in a reasonable, responsive and efficient manner. States want it. Insurers want it. Businesses want it. Health care providers want it. Trying to starve a program so we cannot implement it in a reasonable manner is irresponsible.

Defunding amendments offered in the guise of budget austerity is actually one step toward repealing the largest deficit cutter passed in the last decade, the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act, if this amendment passes, will be stopped. There will be no prohibition against discrimination for over 100 million Americans with preexisting conditions; no prohibition on insurance companies canceling your coverage when you get sick; no prohibition on lifetime caps and annual limits; no required coverage for young adults on their parents' policies; no assistance to seniors struggling to afford the cost of drugs in the doughnut hole and no free annual checkups in Medicare; and no tax credits for families and small businesses to pay for health insurance.

The full impact of this legislation will happen in 2014, which will require the Department of Health and Human Services to put into place its implementation so that we can move on a clear, reasonable path to accomplishing these goals.

The repeal or even this defunding proposal is a boon for insurance companies, but it is an enormous setback for American families. That's why I urge all Members to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. REHBERG. My Democratic friends using the deficit argument is simply a diversion to draw attention from the real issue: the huge cost of this program.

At this time I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, seeing the gentleman from California down on the floor reminds me:

When this bill passed, the Congressional Budget Office told us there would be $142 billion in savings over 10 years; but less than 30 days later, the chief actuary at CMS, Dr. Foster, came forward and said the bill was going to cost $318 billion additionally over that time.

□ 1010

That's a $450 billion swing, and even in the United States Congress, we ought to be able to get a little closer than that.

I filed a resolution of inquiry with Chairman WAXMAN, who was then chairman of Energy and Commerce, who said let's sort this out. What did they know, when did they know it? Was Congress given inaccurate information before we voted on this very large bill?

I was never allowed to bring that forward. We could have solved that last year and settled that part of the debate last year.

Ms. DELAURO. CBO: Repeal of the health care bill would add $230 billion to the deficit in the first 10 years. The Rehberg amendment would add $2 billion in 2012, a total of $5.5 billion over the next several years.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

Another day on a bill that will not create one single job in the United States of America; in fact, a bill that will cost thousands of Americans their jobs. The response just the other day from our Republican colleagues: So be it.

Now we have an amendment before us to strip away critical patient protections for consumers, for our constituents. This is an insurance industry dream amendment. We heard from our colleagues they wanted to listen to the American people. They have not had one hearing, not one, to listen to the people around this country who were already benefiting from this bill.

The provisions to ensure that kids with diabetes, leukemia, asthma, are not discriminated against by the insurance industry any more, not one mom was heard from.

Provisions to make sure that our constituents aren't denied their coverage when they need it the most. There are thousands of Americans out there already benefiting from that. Didn't listen to one of them.

And now under the guise of trying to save the taxpayer money, they are offering an amendment that, according to the independent, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, will increase the deficit over the next 10 years by $230 billion. And when it's fully implemented, the bill, and you strip it away, it will add $1.4 trillion to the deficit.

I just urge my colleagues to read the letter from January of this year from the head of the CBO to the Speaker of the House. It's right in there, plain and simple.

We had a hearing in the Budget Committee just the other day. I hope your colleagues on the Budget Committee may have talked to you about it because the head of CBO was before the committee and Members on the Republican side. Surely you must have arrived at this deficit number through double counting.

The head of CBO said very plainly there is no double counting. Read the lips of CBO. This adds $230 billion to the deficit over 10 years, $1.4 trillion over the next 20 years. So don't come to the floor here and pretend that by

enacting this amendment it's part of an effort to save taxpayer dollars.

This will add more red ink to this Nation's credit card, the same kind of red ink that we saw being added over the years and years and years of the prior administration. We are trying to turn the corner on that.

But all this does is add more. The cost is not just in terms of higher deficits; the costs are to the people throughout this country who are going to lose the important protections that this bill has provided them.

Shame on this House for spending time doing this rather than focusing on jobs and getting this economy moving.

Mr. REHBERG. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. The Rehberg amendment increases the deficit by $2 billion in 2012, $5.5 billion over the next several years, and does nothing to create a single job.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the Republicans' latest cynical and callous attempts to derail health care reform, and I think it's quite interesting that the gentleman from Montana would be dismissive of the issue of deficit reduction and that somehow that's now labeled a distraction.

I think that adding $5.5 billion to the deficit when we should be going in the opposite direction is far more than a distraction. It's a moral imperative that we not do that. In the past 6 weeks, we have seen the true face of the Republicans' legislative agenda. Rather than work to create jobs and improve our economy, they have focused on baseless attacks on American families.

With their repeal and replace bills, they have demonstrated that they don't mind if insurance companies drop patients as soon as they get sick, or that families wouldn't be able to save thousands of dollars by keeping young adult children on their family plan. And with this pernicious amendment, we now see their outrageous attempts to strip funding from the implementation of the health care law.

Let's be clear: Our colleagues across the aisle want to yank funding from a law that is already helping millions of Americans. This amendment would seize funding from the agencies and workers who have already been tasked with implementing the most essential tenets of the Affordable Care Act, provisions which are already making a world of difference in millions of lives.

If this amendment passes, seniors will be thrown back into the Medicare part D doughnut hole coverage gap and be forced to pay exorbitant costs for their prescription drugs. Women in desperate need of an annual mammogram or a colonoscopy will once again face prohibitive copays or perhaps face denial of coverage for the preexisting condition of simply having ovaries, and our Nation will once again return to the egregious practice of denying so many young children coverage for their health history that they cannot control.

Rather than roll back the hard-fought consumer protections and freedoms that unshackled Americans from the whims of private insurance companies, Republicans should be working with us to build on and improve the health care system. Instead, they wish to use this amendment process to reverse the progress that we have made with these vital health care reforms. I am glad the American people can see their hypocrisy right out in the open.

Mr. REHBERG. I continue to reserve, Mr. Chairman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. What is the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, would it be appropriate under the rules in the UC that have been suggested that we divide the question so that Members of Congress can vote individually on whether to deny seniors coverage for the doughnut hole, to deny coverage for pre-existing conditions, to deny small businesses from getting the tax benefit in this bill, all the different things—would it be appropriate to divide the question that way so that all of the benefits that Americans get they can see individually where my Republican friends stand on them?

The Acting CHAIR. Under the order of the House of February 17, 2011, even if otherwise divisible, an amendment to this bill is not subject to a demand for a division of the question.

Ms. DELAURO. The Rehberg amendment would increase the deficit by $2 billion next year, a total of $5.5 billion over the next several years, and that is the estimate of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. It increases the deficit and does not create any jobs.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you. I would like to say to the Republicans, be careful what you wish for. Your star is fading on this effort to repeal, to defund the Affordable Care Act. Only about 18 percent of Americans now are for full repeal of this bill.

And are you the ones that are going to go and tell the American people that insurance companies can drop you when you get sick? Children with preexisting conditions? Well, they can be denied coverage.

You go and explain that insurance companies can impose devastating annual and lifetime caps, and that pregnant women and breast cancer survivors can be denied coverage, and that being a woman will continue to be a preexisting condition. That's your mission if you were to succeed.

In passing this legislation, the American people finally said, this Congress said, that health care is a right, that it should not impoverish individuals. Vote ''no.''

□ 1020

Mr. REHBERG. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I stand in strong support of the Rehberg amendment. I do so because of this very controversial health care bill which was passed through strong-arm tactics last year during a time period when the American public was crying out against it. This was a product of the backroom deal-making in Washington, D.C. This is one reason why the Democrats lost control of the U.S. Congress. It wasn't so much the bill; it was the process.

But let's talk about the bill. An individual mandate that's already been ruled unconstitutional by two judges, a mandate which the Governor of Alaska is saying he is not even going to implement the rule. This is hardly a law that's bringing America together. This bill needs to be put on the back burner, and let us retool it and rework it. I believe that's what the Americans want us to do.

It destroys the doctor-patient relationship. One thing that's abundantly clear is people do not want the insurance companies telling the hospitals and the docs how to conduct medicine. But they sure as heck don't want government bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., and all of the hundreds of new agencies and the IRS agents coming in and telling the doctor how to conduct medicine. The cost of this—there is not one credible report that says this will bring down costs.

And I keep hearing this hollow cry from Democrats, suddenly with 15 million people unemployed, that they are concerned about jobs. I haven't met in the First District of Georgia or anywhere else I have traveled in the country one business person who says this is a great bill.

And I want to say this about 26-year-old children: As a father of four, and I have three kids under 26 years old, they are old enough to take care of themselves. They don't need the nanny state coming in. I have raised them to be responsible. At the age of 21, I expect them to go out and get their health care. You know, the average age in Vietnam I think was 19 years old. World War II, probably the same. And we have soldiers in harm's way all over the world who can take care of themselves. But we are saying but come home to mommy and daddy, we will take care of you until you are 26 years old.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. And let me say this, Mr. Chairman. If you talk to the Nation's Governors, Democrat and Republican, one of the biggest drains on their

expenses right now, on their budget, is Medicaid. Yet this bill increases the Medicaid rolls by 16 million people without funding it. If we want to break our States, we need to keep this bill. If we want to help them, we need to repeal it.

Ms. DELAURO. I remind the gentleman from Georgia that the taxpayers pay for Congress' health insurance as well. And any children that we have are covered under our health insurance. We are in a rarified air in that regard. We have health insurance, as Mr. MILLER pointed out. We go to the head of the line if there is anything wrong with us. That is not the case for millions of people in this Nation. And that's what the other side of the aisle would like to continue, that millions of people will not have the same kind of health care that we in the United States Congress have.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I strongly oppose this amendment because it is harmful to the American people. It adds significantly to the deficit. And I have listened to my constituents. And they tell me they are opposed to this defunding stunt. Why? If health care reform is defunded, who will ensure that seniors in the doughnut hole receive half-price medications this year? Who will process the small business tax credits that employers across the country are entitled to this year under the reform law? Who will keep insurance companies honest, protecting Americans from coverage denials and limits on care?

The Affordable Care Act is law. It's endorsed by the American Medical Association. And attempts by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to repeal it have failed. Instead of fighting this same battle over and over again and living in the past, Congress must turn its focus now to what the American people really care about: creating jobs and strengthening our economy.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another physician who clearly understands the cost of health care, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise wholeheartedly in support of his amendment to repeal the funding of ObamaCare. ObamaCare, in not just my opinion, but many others have expressed this, is possibly the worst piece of legislation passed in the history of this Congress. In fact, it would probably be better called ''patient pain and non-affordable care act'' because it has accomplished none of the goals that President Obama set out to accomplish, especially not lowering the cost of health insurance.

So we in this body, the Republican majority, in our initial week in the 112th Congress, we passed a repeal of ObamaCare. Unfortunately, our colleagues in the Senate, the Democratic majority, stopped that. It is our obligation to the American people to defund this wrongful piece of legislation. It is costing jobs all across this country.

Talk about things like who is going to solve the problem of the doughnut hole, as the gentlelady from California just said. Well, I will tell you who solved it, Big Pharma solved it when the President and the Democratic majority in the last Congress broke their arm and made them agree to cut their prices in half for their brand name drugs. So there are other ways to solve the doughnut hole problem than having the Federal Government take it over lock, stock, and barrel.

In regard to having children remain on the health insurance policy of their parents until age 26, why are they going to have to do that? Because they have no jobs. And why do they not have any jobs? Because of the job-killing bills like ObamaCare, and stimulus, and bailout, and I could go on and on and on. We have an obligation to defund this and to replace it with the right kind of legislation that will accomplish the goals of lowering health costs so that many more Americans can have health insurance and have good health insurance.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, it's often said that the facts are lost in the fog of war. The facts are lost in the fog of this debate. We should step back for just a few moments and see what this total picture is all about. This is nothing about a class war assault on the working men and women and the poor in this country, and literally around the world.

Take a look at all of the provisions and add them all up. The decimation of clinics that provide care to the poor and the unemployed. The decimation and the significant reduction of Medicaid, providing care to those who do not have high incomes, including the elderly and the disabled. The decimation now in this of the health care proposals, turning over to the insurance companies once again the opportunity to go after working men and women and deny them the coverage that they need.

Taken in total, and include the tax provisions for the great wealthy who will ultimately have their tax breaks paid for by the working men and women, put it all together, and this is class warfare by the Republicans against the working men and women of this Nation.

Mr. REHBERG. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady.

Eight hundred seniors gathered just a year or two ago, expressing their horrific opposition to the idea of being overwhelmed by this doughnut hole. My colleagues today are telling seniors all over America we now will close the door on you again. We will ensure that you will not have the money to pay for your rent or food because you will be paying these ridiculously high costs for your prescription drugs. That's what this amendment will do. It will close down potentially the Affordable Care Act that is providing a lifeline for our seniors.

And then if you are laying on the sick bed in your hospital room and you need more care and more care to restore yourself, you have a doctor or an administrator come in and say, your insurance company called and they're pulling the plug. Not the plug that the doctors are pulling, but they are pulling the plug. You have no more money, get out and try to do the best you can.

Two hundred and thirty billion dollars this amendment will cost us. But more importantly, this bill is not, the Affordable Care Act, unconstitutional. Only two courts have rendered that. And frankly, the Supreme Court will speak. Don't do this to the American people.

□ 1030

Mr. REHBERG. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me just repeat, to be absolutely clear, about what this amendment does.

It does not create jobs. It adds to the deficit $2 billion next year, $5.5 billion over the next several years. It does nothing to bring the deficit down. It increases the deficit, and it puts the American people back in the hands of insurance companies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am not the Speaker of the House. I am not the majority leader. But you know what I do? I represent more people in the United States Congress than anybody sitting in this body, consistently. After every census, I have the most population. I probably have more town hall meetings as well. I probably have more hospitals, more highways, more of everything in my congressional district. And I have had more town hall meetings, probably, than anyone, 75. And in those 75, they all tell me the same thing: They do need health care reform. They need to control the cost of health care.

But they get it. They understand, this does not do it. You would not need waivers for unions and big businesses if it was working. You would not need legislation to fix the 1099 on the penalty for the $600 purchases if it was working. You wouldn't have to cook the books, as they attempt to do, by counting a $750 billion tax increase as a reason to suggest that if we repeal it, it's going to cost the government something. That's funny money. It's not true. Nobody in America believes it.

Get out. Listen at your town hall meetings. Travel around my State. Do the 75 town hall meetings like I did. And you will find you cannot control the cost of health care if you leave defensive medicine out. We gave an opportunity for people to join the Federal system. It was turned down by the Democrats in committee. They voted it down on a party-line vote.

This is not the way to reform health care. It was done very quickly. In fact, the sponsor of the bill said I didn't need to read the bill. That's what I have staff for. It was so large, it was done so quickly, there was not enough input that the people of America know this is not the right thing to do. It's a job killer. It's going to bust our budget. In the end, it does, in fact, cost us $2.6 trillion to implement in the first 10 years.

Please support this. Let's begin defunding ObamaCare.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Democratic leader of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I commend her for her leadership on a very important issue, the health and well-being of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment that is on the floor today and also the underlying bill of which it is a part. The American people are desperate for jobs. They have sent us here to work together to create jobs; and in the 6 weeks of this new majority, not one piece of legislation has come forward to create one job.

Showing the lack of ideas to do so, the Republican majority has chosen, instead, to change the subject, taking up a bill of such consequence without hearings, without really an open process to make amendments to it, with the illusion of open debate. And now they come before us, again without hearings, in amendment form to this bill and say they want to have no funds go to enact provisions of the health care bill which was passed before.

Let's talk about the consequences of your action here today. What would it mean to people in our country if this amendment were to prevail? It may prevail on this floor, which is driving itself into irrelevance with the amendment process that is here, but that's another subject. Let's talk about the subject of this amendment. Let's talk about what this means to America's families. Let's talk about a family that came before a hearing that we had earlier in January.

We heard from Stacie Ritter. She has 12-year-old twins. When those adorable little girls were 4 years old, they were both diagnosed with cancer and faced years of treatment and recovery. Imagine if that happened in your family. Their mother said they were lucky that they did have health insurance, but the additional cost of the care for these children drove their family into bankruptcy. The children got well, thank God, but they had a preexisting medical condition for the rest of their lives—until this bill came along. And now their mother was pleased to testify they are not to be the objects of discrimination because they have a preexisting medical condition. They will not face annual or lifetime caps on the benefits they receive. These healthy young girls now will be able to proceed in a healthy way, not discriminated against.

Or let's talk about Vernal Branch, a woman diagnosed with breast cancer 15 years ago. Ever since, she has struggled to find health insurance because even though she had cancer and for the moment is free of cancer and, God willing, will be forever free of cancer, she had a preexisting medical condition which meant that she would be discriminated against in terms of getting health insurance—until this came along. Vernal Branch told us that the Affordable Care Act represents protection from the uncertainty and fear that came from being diagnosed and being denied health insurance coverage because of a past disease. Passing this amendment would stop the reform and mean that 129 million Americans, like Vernal, 129 million Americans would lose coverage because of a preexisting medical condition.

Do you understand what that means in the lives of these people?

And to our seniors, the subject has been brought up over and over again about our seniors. Claudette Therriault and her husband, Richard, are seniors on Medicare. Richard is a diabetic, and his insulin alone costs nearly $1,000 a month. When they fell into the doughnut hole, they were forced to choose between defaulting on the loan of their home or paying for Richard's health. As Claudette put it, Well, we chose my husband's health. But changes made, that we made in this bill, are starting to change the doughnut hole so families aren't forced to choose between paying their mortgage or paying for their medicine. Passing this amendment would mean that over 2.7 million Medicare beneficiaries would again fall into the doughnut hole, and Medicare would no longer be able to pay for the annual checkup for 44 million seniors in our country.

Mr. KINGSTON says that his children are old enough that they should be able to take care of themselves, even though they are under 26 years old. Bravo for you. But that's not the way it is for many young people across the country, even if they do have a job. You say they don't have insurance because they don't have a job. It may be news to you, but there are many, many, many working Americans who do not have health insurance. But they will under the Affordable Care Act.

If this amendment were to pass, if it were to become law, immediately all of those children who can now be on their parents' policy, if their parents are willing, would lose their health insurance.

□ 1040

With a job or without a job, these young people coming out of school are idealistic and ambitious. They want to follow their passions and their pursuits. That is what our Founders told them they could do—life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. These young people want a healthier life to pursue their happiness, to choose a job not based on the health benefits it may or may not provide, but to choose an occupation which addresses their aspirations—not ours, theirs.

So I just want to repeat back to our colleagues something I heard them say over and over again. They said, we didn't read the bill. Well, we did. But clearly, you did not. And I urge you to read the bill, because if you did, you would see that the bill puts medical decisions in the hands of patients and doctors, not your favorite insurance company. You would see that it brings down the cost of prescription drugs for seniors. You would see that it ends the days of discrimination based on preexisting conditions and lifetime caps on the care of children and families. You would see that under this bill, no longer would being a woman be a preexisting medical condition as it is now as women are discriminated against in terms of price and access to insurance.

You would see that it offers tax credits to millions of small businesses who choose to do right by their employees and offer insurance benefits.

It was for all of these Americans that we acted. It is for them that we stand here today to oppose this amendment.

And if you read the bill, you will see contrary—contrary to misrepresentations that were set forth by those who do the bidding of the health insurance industry in our country, you would see what the bill does. You would see that it is about innovation. It's about prevention. It's about a healthier America, not just health care in America. It's about using the technologies of the future. It's about bringing health care closer to people where they live to lower the cost, to improve the quality and to expand the access.

You would see that it is a bill about the future. Instead of the misrepresentations about this, that, and the other thing which I don't even want to repeat here, you would see that this is transformative for our country because it gives people the liberty, again, to pursue their lives.

So I would like to know how many of you read the bill? We read it over and over again, to each other, drilling down on different parts of it. So we know of what we speak when we come to this floor. And maybe if you knew more about it, you wouldn't be so quick to say—we do not want to allow children to stay on their parents' policies. We do not want to end discrimination on the basis of preexisting conditions for our children. We do not want to begin

to close the doughnut hole. We do not want to have preventive medicines without cost and copay for our seniors. And the list goes on and on. So that's what's happening here today.

This is again, yet again, another example of our friends standing up for the insurance companies at the expense of the American people, standing up for the insurance companies at the expense of the health and well-being of our country. It is again an example of Washington, D.C. holding on to the special interest status quo. It is again this Congress saying to the American people, we are here for the special interest, we are not here for the people's interest. To Stacie, we are not here for your two daughters. For Vernal, we are not here for women and having being a woman being a preexisting condition. To Claudette and Richard, to say to them, too bad about your mortgage. If you can't pay your mortgage because you have to pay your medical bills, so be it.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, which is another manifestation of the ''so be it'' attitude of some in Congress at the expense of many in our country.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, there are few policies passed in the past several decades that could do more harm to our country than last year's passage of the health care overhaul.

That is why I fully support the Rehberg amendment to defund Obamacare and the McMorris Rodgers amendment to bar the IRS from spending any taxpayer money on implementing the law. Not only will these amendments save billions and billions in taxpayer dollars, they will also halt the government takeover of health care dead in its tracks.

Mr. Chair, we cannot afford this misguided legislation that empowers bureaucrats and insurance companies rather than patients and their care providers. It creates constitutionally questionable mandates, raises hundreds of billions in new taxes, and penalizes job creators, families and businesses who do not comply with its draconian requirements.

In the middle of a nascent economic recovery, how can we allow this job-destroying bill to take root? We can't. This body has a responsibility to listen to the American people who are demanding that we uproot this legislation. These two amendments help us do just that and I am proud to support their inclusion in the continuing resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 266 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this Act or any previous Act may be used to carry out the provisions of Public Law 111–148, Public Law 111–152, or any amendment made by either such Public Law.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, amendment No. 266 is the amendment that has had a lot of discussion around the Chamber and around this country. And what it does is it recognizes the results of the CRS report, Mr. Chairman, this report dated just last Thursday, February 10, 2011. It took a long time to put all the numbers together in an official document that identified the money that is automatically appropriated in ObamaCare. In digging that out, there are dozens of locations that automatically trigger appropriations that go on in perpetuity. And the total in this report is $105.5 billion. And here we are in this continuing resolution that the CRS reports at $105.5 billion. I had been working on that for some months, and finally we came with a total.

But if we are not able to shut off all of the funding that is automatically appropriated in the ObamaCare legislation, both components of it, the reconciliation package and the bill itself, then forever this money goes forward, and the administration aggressively uses it to implement ObamaCare.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentlewoman continue to reserve her point of order?

Ms. DELAURO. I do, yes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Very briefly, I yield myself 30 seconds.

This amendment—this amendment—will add to the deficit in the next year—next year—$3.5 billion, and over the next several years $5.6 billion. It will not create a job and once again would put the American people back in the hands of the insurance companies without the ability to be able to get the kind of health insurance that they require to deal with any illness that may befall them.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman and Members, I thank my colleague from Connecticut for yielding to me.

Let me first say that I have read the bill. I was on the subcommittee and the full committee and served on the Health Subcommittee for many years. And I had many people ask me that. And believe me, when you spend hours and hours literally in testimony and amending the bill, you have the chance to read it.

And I would hope my Republican colleagues, and all of us, would do the same thing, our appropriators, I would hope they would read the appropriations bill if they are accusing us on the Energy and Commerce Committee who drafted that bill.

What this amendment would do would take away the funding that the Department of Labor and Health and Human Services would be able to enforce that insurance can't drop someone from coverage when they become sick.

□ 1050

They would take away that funding. Seniors would be saving money. They should enforce it, saving money for seniors for prescription drugs. Young adults up to age 26 are getting back on insurance with their parents. That would stop the Department of Labor and Health and Human Services from enforcing that law. Small businesses are receiving billions of dollars in tax credits to provide health care coverage. This would stop it.

Defunding health care would end these benefits and put insurance companies back in charge. The whole goal of the health care bill, whether you call it ObamaCare—I wanted it to be called the Gene Green bill. But I admit, I'm only one of 435 is to cut these benefits. That's what this bill is about in this amendment. It will defund the great things in the health care law.

Let's go back and talk about the things that we all agree that need to be changed. But if you take away the money, we'll lose this for all the folks in our districts.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank Mr. KING for yielding.

Make no mistake about it—the effort on the part of STEVE KING is to defund ObamaCare. This Chamber already passed a bill to repeal ObamaCare, which the American people have asked. This is now an effort to defund ObamaCare. Because as we have seen from the Congressional Research Service, the ingenious nature of the ObamaCare bill was to already put the funding in place so that if the majority lost the gavel, which they did, the new majority would be unable to defund this bill.

Speaker PELOSI said it well last year when she said we had to pass the bill to know what is in it. We only found out recently that literally tens of billions of dollars have already been appropriated to fund ObamaCare. It was put in ''mandatory spending,'' spending

where this Chamber would not have access to be able to defund the bill.

If we are unable to defund the bill now, make no mistake, Mr. Chair, this Chamber and the American people will do everything they can to make sure they put into place a new President, a new Senate, and a House that will have the requisite courage to finally defund the government takeover of health care.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and in opposition to the underlying bill.

I fail to see how Republican efforts to eliminate all funds for health reform will create jobs or help our fragile economy recover. Instead, defunding health reform would leave behind thousands of whom I represent in Wisconsin, thousands of Wisconsin families who have already begun to experience the benefits of health care reform.

Should the Republican efforts succeed, tens of thousands of young adults in Wisconsin would stand to lose their insurance coverage through their parents. Once again, children would be refused insurance, discriminated against because of preexisting conditions. And nearly 50,000 Wisconsin seniors would face higher prescription drug costs. What's more, the efforts to defund the health care reform law come on top of extreme cuts to community health care centers and family planning clinics.

While I agree with my Republican colleagues that we must reduce the deficit and bring the budget into balance, we must be smart about it. And this amendment is not smart about it. This unwise bill jeopardizes our Nation's health, our Nation's recovery, and our Nation's future. And it's particularly troublesome to me this week because it falls on top of efforts by Wisconsin's governor to cut health, education, and public safety services, and to take away the rights of public servants to provide them.

Mr. Chairman, today I stand in solidarity with my fellow Wisconsinites as I fight for a better future for all Wisconsinites and all Americans. I urge my colleagues to oppose Republican efforts to defund the health care reform law and to oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in full support of the King amendment. I was at the well just a few minutes ago in support of the Rehberg amendment. But what this amendment does is eliminate and stop the funding, the hundred billion dollars' worth of funding that was automatically put in this bill to prevent, if we took over the majority of this House, Mr. Chairman, as we have done, or try to stop us from stopping the worst bill that's ever been passed in the history of the Congress. And we have to do this.

This is a pledge to the American people. We can do it. We can start over, we can make this bill right, we can enact health care reform that truly does bring down the cost for patients so they can get access, they have more control, and that we don't destroy the medical profession in the process of continuing this wrongheaded, boneheaded ObamaCare bill.

So I want to stand strongly with my colleague from Iowa in supporting this amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate that.

My friends on the other side of the aisle talk about the need for listening to the American public. Well, I have been back home in my district meeting with providers, people in the insurance industry, hospitals, nurses, doctors and they are dealing with this plan moving forward. Many are excited about the opportunities to take advantage of it. The protections that are under way in the law right now are popular with the public because they are important to the public.

My friends talk about listening to the American citizens. The Associated Press pointed out in a poll last month that the overwhelming majority opposed the notion of trying to defund health care. In fact, in that same poll, 43 percent thought the protection should be expanded.

We are in a situation now where we can make a profound difference in improving the quality of health care in this country while we reduce deficits.

Putting sand in the health care gears, arguing, trying to create confusion is not moving us forward. Work with our hospitals, work with our doctors, work with our citizens. Make health reform work for America.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment No. 266, someone put the moniker on it ''The Silver Bullet Amendment.'' And as much as we have all worked here to try to find the right way to shut off all of the funding to freeze in place the implementation and enforcement of ObamaCare, many of us have worked in a number of different ways. This is the amendment that looks at the pattern that was set, that I understood, back in 1974, when there was a CR before the House of Representatives that shut off all funding that would go to the Vietnam War for offensive or defensive operations, in the air, over the land of, the seas adjacent to, or the countries adjacent to it. That language covered everything, and it stopped bullets on the dock from going into the hands of people to defend themselves.

I disagree with the policy. But the foundation is here in multiple places in the history of this Congress. This is the language that shuts off the funding of ObamaCare until such time as H.R. 2 becomes law. That's the repeal legislation that becomes law. This is H.R. 1. It's completely appropriate—and H.R. 2 and H.R. 1 are married together—that we shut off the funding for implementation of ObamaCare, all of it, the entire $105.5 billion that was slipped into this report that we just got back last February 10.

So I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1100

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. What we need to be doing is to focus on jobs to grow the economy and to reduce the deficit. This amendment does none of the above. Essentially what it does, it takes us back into the hands of insurance companies when they had free rein to raise rates, to reject claims and deny coverage to families and businesses who would have no recourse. It protects their CEO bonuses and their corporate profits.

We need to be about the business of creating jobs. This amendment does nothing to do that and increases the deficit. It should be absolutely clear to everyone here and everywhere else what this amendment does.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' It waives existing law.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has stated a point of order against the amendment. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is a point of order that has been raised on my amendment that I referred to as the silver bullet amendment. I think it does not consider a duty that we have here in the House of Representatives, and that is we stand here and take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, each one of us. I bring in my Bible to do that. And I take it very, very seriously when we take an oath to uphold the Constitution.

We don't take an oath to uphold a rule, but we take an oath to uphold the Constitution. And as I look into this Constitution and read through it, Article I, Section 5 reads in pertinent part: ''Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.'' And because each House can determine the rules of its proceedings here in this Constitution, you have in your hands the gavel, Mr.

Chairman, and the power and the authority to determine those rules, at least to make a strong recommendation to this body.

I would urge that we understand that two Federal courts have found this bill, ObamaCare, to be unconstitutional, and it is immoral and unjust and irresponsible to waive any opportunity to shut off the billions of dollars that are automatically appropriated in a deceptive fashion and continue for the implementation of ObamaCare because we might think somehow that a rule would trump the very Constitution itself.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WEINER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chair, I agree with the gentleman. His amendment is clearly in order. But I know this because if this were legislating on this bill, that would mean that they can legislate. They controlled the House and the Senate and the Presidency; they were unable to legislate. We've been here for 8 weeks; they're unable to legislate. It is impossible to believe he is legislating in this bill.

The point of order, if I may speak to it, suggests that the gentleman is legislating on an appropriations bill. I have watched those guys. They're incapable. There is no way this is legislating. So I believe the point of order should be struck down. It is impossible. After 8 weeks they haven't legislated. They had 8 years in the majority, and they didn't legislate. How can it possibly be, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order is correct?

The gentlelady from Connecticut is rarely incorrect, but if you think they're legislating, impossible, almost metaphysically impossible for the gentleman to legislate. He doesn't know how. How can we possibly have the legislating in this bill?

I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. Let us have this debate because if it is that moment, if lightning is striking, if it is chilly in hell, then maybe this is the moment we have been waiting for—the Republican majority is going to start legislating. Please, praise God, maybe this is the moment.

So I think the gentleman is correct. He is not legislating in this bill because it is impossible for them to do so because they simply don't know how.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that the amendment proposes explicitly to supercede existing law.

As such, it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT NO. 267 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the provisions of Public Law 111–148, Public Law 111–152, or any amendment made by either such Public Law.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment No. 267 is an amendment that is narrowed in its scope in anticipation of the point of order that was raised by the gentlelady from Connecticut, and I can't help but reflect on what it must have been like before in this body before the invention of television. But my Amendment No. 267 says this in pertinent part: ''No funds made available by this act may be used to carry out the provisions of ObamaCare.''

So what this does is, for the appropriations that go on outside of the scope of this continuing resolution, we have lost that point of order. But this amendment goes to those funds that are appropriated within it, down the exact same path as the Rehberg amendment, except it goes to the outside of the particular Department of Health and Human Services as the narrower scope of the Rehberg amendment. So this goes broader than just HHS, but it does go directly to shutting off all funds within this CR that would be used to enforce or implement ObamaCare.

I have made my arguments, Mr. Chairman, on that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, poll after poll shows that Americans oppose repealing or defunding health care. The latest one says 62 percent of Americans oppose these efforts. Why? Because they have figured out that the nonsense coming from Republicans over the last several years about this being socialized medicine or a government takeover is just that—it is nonsense.

What they figured out is that this is helping millions of Americans all around this country, millions of Americans like a little 8-year-old boy named Kyle McCollough who had the courage to walk into my office yesterday and tell me about his battle with hemophilia. His family has to put out $10,000 a month to pay for his medications, and repeal of this legislation means bankruptcy for his family and for him a lifetime of worrying as to whether he has a job that covers his illness or whether he has the medications to stay alive.

That is why 62 percent of Americans oppose what the Republicans are trying to do on this floor. And for anyone that votes for this, they have to have an answer to them and they have to answer to little Kyle McCollough.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the doctor from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, one thing that is lost in this debate is this fact, and that is there is a difference between coverage and access to care. I have been a physician for 35 years. I can tell you that today, pre-ObamaCare, we have 85 percent coverage, but we have 100 percent access to care. Anyone who wishes can report to any emergency room in this country and receive care. Now, they may receive a bill, but if they pay that bill or not, they can still return for care.

Now let's move to Canada and the U.K. where they have supposedly 100 percent of coverage. Well, they oftentimes wait a year, maybe 2 years, for a CT scan or an MRI scan, and then once they get the results back, they may wait another year to get surgery.

□ 1110

It's not unusual to be told, hey, we could have helped you had we made the diagnosis in time.

It's perfectly acceptable in these countries to have a death rate from lack of treatment. Look at the death rates from cancer, prostate, breast cancer in our country versus others; a horrific difference. Why? Because we diagnose it much earlier; we treat it much more aggressively.

But if we go forward with this ObamaCare, then what we will have is budgets coming up against the decision on what type of care our citizens can receive. We'll be taking it out of insurance companies; but, yes, we'll also be putting it in the hands of the government.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I come before you today after spending 27 years in the health care industry representing my local hospitals, and I can tell you that this bill was supported by them because it creates care in our communities, and it creates jobs in our communities.

If we're going to focus on how to improve care and reduce cost, the bill is replete with opportunity. We can support accountable care organizations, we can support medical home pilots, we can support community health centers, we can support electronic medical records, we can support telemedicine, and we can support the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation. That is how we're going to improve

care, reduce cost, and deliver benefit to our constituents.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, just earlier we heard the former Speaker come to the floor just moments ago and say that she has now read the bill. Uh-hmm. Of course we heard her famously saying before that we had to pass the legislation in order for her to find out what was in the bill.

We can tell you who has read the bill, and that is the courts of this great country. And the most recent Federal courts said they have read it, and they have found that the bill is unconstitutional. For this is the first time in the history of this country that the price of citizenship, this is the first time in the history of this country that the price of freedom, this is the first time in the history of this country that the price of being an American is that you have to buy a particular product that some unknown, faceless bureaucrat here in Washington ordains that you have to buy.

We have come to the time that liberty is being taken away from us, that the strong hand of a Big Brother is reaching out and telling us you have to do this and you have to do that as the price of freedom and the price of liberty.

Yes, to answer your questions. Yes, we will legislate; yes, we will address health care; yes, we will address the American people's interests in this area. And I commend the gentleman from Iowa on this amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. I remind the gentleman that the courts are split two and two.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to King amendment No. 266.

It has been said that we are the sum total of our experiences, Mr. Chairman, and that is certainly true. My experience consists of growing up in a low-income minority community whose history dates back more than 150 years since slavery. I represent that district, the First District of North Carolina, the fourth poorest district in the country.

My constituents, Mr. Chairman, overwhelmingly support the Affordable Care Act. Why? My constituents know that their insurance costs are soaring, exceeding more than 18 percent per year in increased costs. For those constituents who don't have insurance, they know that they will be able to qualify for Medicaid if their income is less than 133 percent of the Federal poverty line.

My rural hospitals, Mr. Chairman, know that finally when patients walk into their emergency rooms, the hospitals will be paid for their care, and they will not continue to face bankruptcy.

Mr. Chairman, this assault on the Affordable Care Act is unfounded, it's unnecessary; and I ask my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining for each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 1¼ minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from Connecticut has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Republicans seem to be pretending that emergency room care is free. Every insured American is paying an extra 1,100 bucks this year—$1,400 in Oregon—for those who are uninsured. We want to begin to address that problem, get them in earlier, get them treatment, less expensive, don't pass the costs on to other Americans. Personal responsibility.

We outlawed the worst abuses of the insurance industry—canceling your policy when you get sick even though you've been paying the premiums, preventing people from getting health care because of a pre-existing condition.

I heard from a dad whose young son with birth defects is finally getting covered for those issues because of this law. And then the students I met at Lane Community College—21, 22, 23 years old, getting an education, wanting to get in the workforce—they thanked me for their health insurance. They need that health insurance.

The Republicans said they were going to repeal and replace. Well, they've been pretty darn silent on the replace side, maybe because it upsets their patrons in the insurance industry who are so generous at campaign time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I really take issue with the gentleman that declared this to be nonsense. This is not nonsense. This is very, very serious business. This is the largest taking of American liberty in the history of this country. And the shenanigans that went on to put this bill in place, you could not have sent this bill out on the floor of the 111th Congress and had it pass if it were all packaged up together in one big stack. It was two pieces of bills. And we listened to Dr. BURGESS earlier about all of the things that took place to represent this bill in one place or another, to put it together, including a promise of an executive order that was designed to trump the very Congress itself.

And here we are, with the first opportunity to put the brakes on ObamaCare—yes, we've passed the repeal, H.R. 2. This is H.R. 1. It's here because it's more important to the Speaker than H.R. 2. And that means that we must shut off this funding to ObamaCare.

This CRS report, $105 billion automatically appropriated over a 10-year period of time that goes on in perpetuity, sending the tentacles of this malignant tumor down. It is metastasizing as we speak, and American liberty is being strangled off by ObamaCare. This amendment is the amendment that shuts all of the funding within the CR. It must be passed by this Congress to keep faith with the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. May I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, we've been here now the better part of 2 months, and we've seen political theater go on and on and on. Each day we bring out something that looks like it might have some usefulness, but it turns out it's just more political theater. We read the Constitution in here. Well, that took us a day. Then we spent 9 hours arguing about a bill that we knew wasn't going anywhere. Then we brought out the health care bill. Then we keep doing this. Meanwhile, the American people are saying—and Bill Frist—now, I wouldn't say Dr. Frist was a good friend of mine, but he was the majority leader in the Senate, a Republican, a doctor who said don't repeal this law, fix it.

There have been no hearings in 2 months about how you would fix the bill, and yet the American people—the problems that my colleagues come out here talking about one after another are multiplied by the millions in this country. They know there's a problem, they don't want to repeal it. The numbers for repeal have been dropping as the people have seen more and more provisions of this law come into effect. They want you to fix it, not political theater. It doesn't help them in the emergency room or in the doctor's office.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. If I could just get the attention of the gentleman who is the author of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has the time.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would ask her, at the appropriate time, to yield for an answer.

Here is my question: Let's say we have a person who is on Medicare who

has $100 a week on drug costs and they hit the doughnut hole in August of the year.

□ 1120

The way the law works right now is they will get help to continue to pay for their prescription drugs in the form of either a cash rebate in the past or a discount in the future.

I wonder if the gentleman could explain to us what will happen to those Medicare recipients when they hit the doughnut hole if his amendment becomes law.

I would ask the gentlelady to yield to him for an answer.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

To the gentleman from New Jersey as to his question on the doughnut hole, I understand. Under the current circumstances of the doughnut hole, there are many people in the lowest incomes who are not affected by it.

Ms. DELAURO. Reclaiming my time, I think we want to try to answer the gentleman's question.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. The question was: What about someone who is in the doughnut hole? What happens to him under your amendment?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. To compress my response, I think it's a bit unclear because we don't know how the Secretary of Health and Human Services may respond when the funding is shut off.

Ms. DELAURO. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, it is not unclear at all.

What would happen under the gentleman's amendment is the prescription drug price of this senior would go up dramatically, and he would have to pay the entire cost of that prescription until he hit, I think, the $5,100 limit. This is substantive legislation, the effect of which will dramatically raise prescription drug costs for America's neediest seniors.

I thank the gentlewoman for her time.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, when you take a look at what is happening here, the effort to repeal, to kill, to stop the Affordable Health Care Act is an assault on the American public, and it would give back to the insurance industry their opportunity to deny benefits, to deny coverage.

It is hard to understand how in this period of time when we should be talking about building jobs that our colleagues would put before us legislation that would, in fact, destroy over 800,000 jobs and destroy the opportunity for millions upon millions of Americans to have health care that they could afford. For small businesses to be able to provide the health care to their employees and to receive a reduction in the costs of that health care, it is hard to understand why they would be doing this when we need jobs, when we need health care.

When you look across the broad impact of H.R. 1, it is an assault on the working men and women of the poor in this country. When you take a look at the tax proposals put forward by the Republicans, it is to benefit the high and the mighty and the wealthy to the detriment of the working men and women and the poor of this country.

This is flat-out class warfare against the working men and women of this country. Plain and simple.

If you remove health care, you remove their ability to get health care, and you remove their ability to be healthy and to work. If you remove the clinics, you remove their opportunity to get health care. If you cut back on Medicare and Medicaid, you remove their ability to have health care.

It is an assault on the working men and women, on the elderly and the poor in this Nation. That's what it adds up to.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. I would just say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I was in almost all of the meetings in our caucus. This bill was read provision by provision, sentence by sentence, and we had the staffers there who wrote these provisions under the direction of our chairman at that time.

This was carefully considered, and any idea from the gentleman from New Jersey that it wasn't is just an outrageous statement on his part, and he ought to be ashamed of himself.

Ms. DELAURO. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, once again, as to what we are doing here, this amendment just mirrors the prior amendment of which we had a discussion. We keep saying it over and over again: Your inability to come here, as you promised, to create jobs for the American people, to lower the deficit for them, and to turn the economy around has failed.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I rise to oppose the King amendment.

Repealing or de-funding health care reform is part of the Republicans' No Jobs Agenda. The Affordable Care Act will create jobs. One study says that repealing the law will put in jeopardy the 250,000 to 400,000 new jobs this law will create each year.

More importantly, de-funding the Affordable Care Act will jeopardize the many benefits this law provides to the American people.

1. The Affordable Care Act prohibits insurance companies from denying coverage to people with pre-existing conditions, like diabetes, heart disease, cancer, and HIV/AIDS.

2. Starting this year, the Affordable Care Act provides seniors in the "donut hole" a 50 percent discount on brand-name prescription drugs.

3. Also starting this year, small businesses may qualify for a tax credit that covers up to 35 percent of the cost of providing health insurance to their workers.

4. The Affordable Care Act provides $11 billion for community health centers, which serve low-income and uninsured families in my district and throughout the country.

5. The Affordable Care Act provides $15 billion for wellness and prevention activities, such as cancer screenings and child immunizations.

6. The Affordable Care Act provides funding to train additional primary care doctors and nurses, who will be able to serve patients in underserved parts of the country, like Los Angeles County.

7. Most importantly, the Affordable Care Act guarantees all Americans access to affordable health insurance that covers essential medical benefits and that cannot be taken away when they get sick and need it most.

De-funding the Affordable Care Act will impact all Americans, but especially harm the least of these—women, children, people of color, the poor, the homeless—people who often lack a voice and whom I have championed during my four decades in public service. People of color are disproportionately impacted by a lack of access to health insurance. According to the Department of Health and Human Services' Office of Minority Health, 20 percent of African-Americans were uninsured in the United States in 2007, and 32 percent of the Hispanic population was uninsured.

Quality health care must be available for all Americans regardless of race, level of income, gender, or the existence of a pre-existing condition. That's why the Affordable Care Act specifically addresses health disparities and protects the rights of people with pre-existing conditions, and that's we must fully fund the Affordable Care Act.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 268 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of any Federal department or agency with respect to carrying out the provisions of Public Law 111–148, Public Law 111–152, or any amendment made by either such Public Law.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, amendment No. 268 goes to the end of the bill. It simply says that none of the funds made available in this act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of any Federal department or agency with respect to carrying out the provisions of ObamaCare. It is that simple.

It is one additional way to slow down the implementation and the enforcement of ObamaCare until such time as we see that day that the full repeal is signed by, hopefully, the next President of the United States, unless the one we have today has a reconsideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment and the underlying bill go in precisely the wrong direction.

We should be talking about strengthening the historic reform that we passed last year. We should not be tearing it apart, because we all know that its repeal will leave millions out in the cold, stripping them of access to affordable health care; and it will cost small businesses the incentives and the tax breaks that they would get. It all goes in the wrong direction.

The majority claims to believe in cutting government spending above all else; yet the CBO has concluded that, over a 10-year period, up to 2021, their bill would add $230 billion to the national debt. Now, if you're really serious about reducing our debt, you should have a robust public option. That would save $68 billion.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We keep hearing from the Democrats that we're here and that we're not doing a jobs bill.

Why are we doing this bill? Why are we doing this bill now? It's because you guys did not pass a budget. We are on FY11, as you know, because you did not take care of your business. We are reaching back, trying to finish up what you guys should have done by October 1 of last year.

By the way, this does create jobs, because the small businesses do not want government-mandated health care; and the folks back home don't want bureaucrats coming in between the doctor-patient relationship, which is what ObamaCare does. Now, we know the nanny state wants full control from cradle to grave, but folks back home don't want it. That's what November was about.

So what we're trying to do is finish up the unfinished business of the Pelosi House from last year so that we can move forward on the coming year, FY12. We will continue to have this debate, but we are trying to protect the doctor-patient relationship, not create a doctor-bureaucrat-patient relationship, which ObamaCare does.

□ 1130

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentlelady.

When you consider how rhetoric doesn't square up with reality in this institution, the gentleman from Iowa started by saying this is the greatest threat to personal liberty in history. Well, we have some young people here today, and I guess he thinks that Plessy vs. Ferguson and Dred Scott and Lincoln's suspension of habeas corpus, that those didn't represent a threat to personal liberty.

Now, President Bush said that the best way to get health care, for those who were outside the mainstream, was very simple. You could go to an emergency room.

That is not health care. That treats the issue in front of the individual. It denies preventive care. It doesn't offer assistance to women who are in need of additional health care. This proposal that we passed was modest, and it was market driven. It kept the private sector alive and it put in place basic protections for the American consumer.

I wish that we could have a separate vote on the individual proposals that we included in that bill, and I guarantee you we wouldn't be talking about death panels; we would be talking about the idea of extending health care benefits to all members of the American family, including the 51 million who find themselves outside of the mainstream.

Just think of it today. This is more of a threat to liberty than Plessy vs. Ferguson and Dred Scott and Lincoln's suspension of habeas corpus.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered today which wold repeal the historic health care reform bill.

With passage of the new law last year, American families can take back the control of their health care.

The law bars insurance companies from discriminating coverage based upon pre-existing conditions, health status and gender.

The law caps the out-of-pocket health care expenses that have bankrupted many American families.

The law allows individuals and small businesses to purchase affordable insurance from competitive marketplaces.

And—the law contains the cost of health care while reducing the deficit by $138 billion over the next 10 years.

We solved the dilemma so many Americans families face on a child's 22nd birthday by extending dependent benefits until age 26.

I am an ardent supporter of Social Security and Medicare. The new law filled the Medicare prescription donut hole and provided new wellness and preventive benefits seniors.

We made history last year with this new law. And yet, today, this amendment seeks to undo all of this progress, all of these achievements, all of these new protections and benefits for Americans.

I have visited the world-class hospitals of Massachusetts and spoken with the administrators, doctors, nurses, and other health care professionals. Massachusetts is way-ahead of the rest of the country in requiring health insurance coverage for almost all of our citizens. And I can tell you the state is better for it. The hospitals are better for it.

I urge opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the judge and Congressman from east Texas, Mr. LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, we heard Minority Leader PELOSI saying earlier that we were here as Republicans siding with the insurance companies. Revisionist history is great, but if you go back and look at who was supporting the ObamaCare efforts, you had the insurance companies lined up all out there, supportive.

You had the big pharmaceutical companies all out there supportive. You saw the American Hospital Association out there supportive. You saw the AMA out there supportive. You saw AARP. They were seen out there encouraging all of the ObamaCare stuff. Naturally they stand to gain with UnitedHealth more than anybody. They are the biggest sellers of Medigap insurance.

So if you really want to look at history, who was it that was not supportive? Well, folks, we heard from them in November. It was the American people.

That's why we are here. We are with small business. They will create the jobs. We are with the American people. That's why we are doing this.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The Chair would note that the point of order by the gentleman from New York continues to be reserved throughout.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Good afternoon. Madam Chair, somewhere in America today a family is losing their home because they can't afford the health care premiums for a diabetic dad and a hypertensive mom. Somewhere in America tonight a child will die because they have been denied health care because of a preexisting condition.

Somewhere in America tomorrow a family will go bankrupt because they took care of a cancer-stricken family member.

Black, white, Hispanic, Asian, urban, rural Republican, Democrat, independent, tea party, it doesn't matter.

At some time in our life we will all get sick. We need health care.

But you know what? We, as Members of Congress, are very fortunate. We all get health care. We get the very best.

But what about Jennifer and Lisa and James and grandma and grandpa and the Johnsons and baby Joshua? We represent them too. They deserve what we get.

My constituents sent me to Washington to preserve the affordable health care legislation. They are proud of the product that the 111th Congress and NANCY PELOSI and President Obama produced. Long live affordable health care legislation.

On behalf of the people of this Nation who depend on our leadership, I call upon you to defeat this amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you to the gentleman from Iowa for offering this important amendment.

The liberal talking point in the debate thus far has gone something like this: We can't defund ObamaCare today because we have to focus on job creation.

Now, that is very interesting, coming from the liberals in this Chamber who spent literally trillions of dollars out of the public Treasury only to see 2 million jobs lost in the private sector because of their failed policies on job creation.

ObamaCare will likely create the largest government bureaucracy in the history of our country, filled with even more government jobs than any other agency. There is one thing that ObamaCare will likely do very, very well, and it's this: It will create the largest bureaucracy of government workers in the history of the Nation.

It isn't that we will necessarily get more doctors; it isn't that ObamaCare will necessarily give us more nurses or truly more health care.

What we will get from ObamaCare, according to the Congressional Budget Office, is increased costs in health care with a huge bureaucracy, all designed for the purpose likely of saying ''no'' to people when they need to have access to health care.

What a bargain, Mr. Chairman. Pay more, get less. That's the reason why I believe the Rasmussen poll came out last week and said that 58 percent of the American people are begging this Congress to repeal ObamaCare. Repeal we will, and defund we must.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you very much to my dear friend.

This is a siege on the lives of innocent Americans. It is a siege by undocumented claims of unconstitutionality.

When Justice Scalia said the relevant inquiry is simply whether the means are chosen or reasonably adapted to the attainment of a legitimate end under the commerce clause. It is. This bill is constitutional.

What this gentleman wants to do is to literally shut down community health clinics that are now under the Affordable Care Act. He wants to make sure that children are not getting immunized. He wants to make sure that HIV patients are not getting their medicine. He wants to make sure that seniors who can come to these clinics are not able to access them. He wants to make sure that families are getting no coverage. This is the end result of this very, very dangerous amendment.

In addition, we have to respond to someone who got up and actually said this is the worst bill that has ever been passed. What about the slave laws? What about the fugitive slave laws? How dare anyone suggest this is the worst bill when we give opportunity to all Americans.

This amendment should be denied. They should listen to Senator Frist, who said this bill is a good bill. There are Republicans who believe we should provide health care for America.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, I recall back at the beginning of the Obama administration when President Obama said that we are in an economic calamity, an economic mess, and we couldn't fix our economic problems unless we first fixed health care. And so his solution for spending too much money was to spend a lot more money, $2.6 trillion on health care.

So if we couldn't first fix the economy unless we first fix health care, let me take that philosophy and turn it this way. We can't fix health care unless we first repeal ObamaCare. That's where this country is today. We can't put the replacement in place, we can't put the fixes in place until we pull this thing out by the roots.

And the only way to do this today is to shut off the funding. The repeal is over there in the Senate. The House voted in a strong way to repeal ObamaCare. H.R. 1 is the unfunding of ObamaCare. It is the vehicle to do it. This amendment is one of the vehicles that contributes to that cause.

Again, I thank DENNY REHBERG and the people that did this work and all those people that worked on this cause. I urge adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1140

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chairman, the American people want us to focus our time and attention on creating jobs. They want us to turn the economy around. They want us to reduce the deficit. The total of the two amendments that have just come before this body would increase the deficit, increase it, the first one by $5.5 billion over the next several years, and this one at about $5.3 billion over the next 5 years.

That's not what you told them you were going to do. You told them you were going to create jobs and roll back the deficit. What you are doing here is putting the American people in the hands of the insurance companies again to make their decisions about health care. And we have health care in this body. Millions in this Nation do not.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill, which doesn't create jobs, doesn't turn the economy around, and adds to the deficit.

POINT OF ORDER

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, I do.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Chair, I make a point of order that the gentleman's amendment is not in order because it results in a net reduction of revenues to the Treasury, in violation of the rules of the House and in violation of the rules stipulated in this bill. I explain that in the following way:

As the gentleman surely knows, if his amendment is successful, the checks that are going to small businesses today, the tax breaks that they are getting to provide health care to their workers and the fact that there are no burdens on those small businesses means that they are going to have less money to spend, therefore less people they will be able to hire, a reduction in the amount of jobs, a reduction in the amount of revenue coming into the government, an increased burden on government services.

In fact, the gentleman would say that anyone that would be writing the check to give back to citizens, they can't do it. Anyone taking that check, bringing it to them can't any longer do it. Anyone cashing that check would be in violation of the law. This amendment says that anyone getting a tax break under this bill would have to give it back. That would provide a net reduction in the amount of economic activity and job creation in this country, and therefore his amendment is out of order.

The Acting CHAIR. Is the gentleman making a point of order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5?

Mr. WEINER. I actually withdraw my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman withdraws his point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MRS. EMERSON

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Internal Revenue Service to implement or enforce section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, section 6055 of such Code , section 1502(c) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, or any amendments made by section 1502(b) of such Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentlewoman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chair, this amendment will prevent the appropriation of any funds in this act to implement or enforce the provisions within the health spending law that require the IRS to verify that individuals have health care coverage and impose penalties on those who don't comply.

The fate of this mandate in the courts is uncertain, but we know that it already has been ruled upon by the American people. They don't want and shouldn't suffer a mandate from government to engage in specific economic activity. As a matter of fact, my own State of Missouri passed a ballot initiative last August by a vote of 71 percent not to enforce the individual mandate.

This is the bright lights example of what's wrong with the health care law. It compels Americans to give up their freedoms, to render their choices, and part with their hard-earned money to support a system of health care designed by and run by the Federal Government through a maze of boards, committees, and bureaucrats.

No Americans should be forced to buy or purchase health insurance they neither want nor can afford, and the Federal Government has never based the purchase of a good or service as a condition of being a law-abiding citizen. The American people need some form of protection that the IRS will not begin to aggressively implement the individual mandate, and this measure ensures that it won't be implemented prior to the end of fiscal year 2011.

States, including my own, small businesses across the country, and individuals of their own volition deserve the chance to speak on this important matter in the courts before the law adds extraordinary new burdens to the fiscal responsibility of the State governments, forces small businesses to fire employees they value, and compels individuals to spend money they would rather save. For all these disconcerting reasons, I urge you to support this crucial amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. I think before we go any further on this subject, we really have to understand what is happening here. The majority party would like to do away with the health care reform law, and the way to do that is exactly that way, to try to do away with the law. But they don't have the votes in both Houses to do that. So what they're trying to do is not fund provisions that have to go into place.

So at this moment what Mrs. EMERSON is trying to do is say that no funds can be used to impose this mandate. Now, this particular part is going to get played out in the courts. So let's be honest: the courts will have to decide why it's okay to mandate that you have car insurance but not this particular issue. And there are going to be a lot of other issues that are going to be done. But the issue here is that they would like to legislate on this bill the end of health care. And that's just not going to happen.

Lastly, what this amendment does is speak to the larger issue, which is that in this country now we have a law that provides access to quality health care to all residents regardless of who they are, where they live, or their income. The only people who are upset about this bill, about this law, and have done a good job of telling the American people that this is the end of the world, are the insurance companies who now have to step up to the plate and follow the law.

So we know what this is about. We know what you are trying to accomplish, but it's not going to work. It's not going to work this way, and it's not going to work in rescinding the law.

Lastly, you know that every so often I give advice to the Republican Party because I like you. If you keep calling it ObamaCare, you know what's going to happen? It's going to make it through the courts, and 20 years from now you are going to have Social Security, Medicare, and ObamaCare, and you would have cemented his legacy forever. So we thank you for that, and I am sure the President thanks you.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding, and I rise in opposition to this amendment. The reason I do is as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, we had Commissioner Shulman before us talking about the IRS role in the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. And he said virtually all of the additional funding that they will receive will be used for outreach efforts to inform small businesses of the tax cuts that they are now eligible to receive with the implementation of this law.

That means 16,000 small businesses in my district alone in western Wisconsin are receiving tax credits under the Affordable Care Act, making it more affordable for them to provide health care coverage to their workers.

And if you look at the 50 million uninsured individuals in this country every year, the bulk of them are working Americans, typically in small businesses or family farms who have a hard time providing health care coverage. And yet the IRS is going to be doing outreach to them to let them know the benefits they are eligible for, along with other individuals throughout the country, of what they are eligible for in the Affordable Care Act to make sure they receive quality, affordable health care coverage. That in essence would be the IRS role. And I think for that reason we should vote against this amendment.

□ 1150

Mrs. EMERSON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. How much time do I have, Madam Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Missouri has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I would just like to point out, again, the gentlewoman's amendment is just like the others we've heard before. It is going to completely eliminate implementation of the health care reform because the bottom line is that, if this amendment were to pass, then all of the positive things that have already gone into place in terms of eliminating discrimination against preexisting conditions or the other discriminatory practices, like lifetime or annual caps, or the requirement that young people up to the age of 26 be able to get insurance coverage on their parents' policies, all of these things essentially depend on the mandate, because without the mandate, what happens is that insurance companies go back, again, to discriminatory practices. This is nothing more but an effort essentially to eliminate the health care reform. Whether it's defunded, whether it's eliminating the mandate or the other amendments that we're going to see later today because this is a package. And we all know, it's absolutely clear, that without the mandate, it is going to be impossible to carry out the coverage and the implementation of these important provisions that eliminate discrimination.

Mrs. EMERSON. At this time, Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

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

The issue is, is this constitutional? It's not whether it's a great idea, whether an individual mandate is going to save us all. The issue is whether it's constitutional. Now I do not believe the Constitution gives the Federal Government the authority to force an American to buy anything, whether

it's health care insurance, whether it's a car, or whether it's a box of doughnuts. And if we allow the Congress to go in and force Americans to buy a product or be punished by paying a fee which is a fine, and if you don't pay the fine, you could be prosecuted under the IRS code and go to prison, then where does it stop? Where does Congress then stop its nonsense of forcing Americans to buy products all in the name of saving us all?

This portion is unconstitutional. We should not force Americans to buy any product. And we should defund the individual mandate for the simple reason it's unconstitutional. Let's talk about that issue in this discussion and debate on the House floor.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from the great State of California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, the issue before us is whether the IRS should be able to enforce the laws, in this case the health care laws. During the first decade of the 2000 period, there was enormous Medicare fraud going on. In the health care bill, additional agents were added to the IRS and other agencies to enforce the Medicare laws against fraud. This provision would defund that and make it impossible to enforce the laws and prevent Medicare fraud. A very bad idea.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Mrs. EMERSON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise to ask a question of the Chair. Who has the right to close on this amendment?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has the right to close.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Chair, parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. EMERSON. Is it not correct that I would have the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The manager in opposition would be entitled to close.

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. EMERSON. Number one, my colleague tried to make a comparison between car insurance and health insurance. First of all, auto insurance, if you will, deals with liability and the harm that you may do to others. Health insurance has to do with a liability to yourself. It's totally different. And I don't believe that any State actually requires comprehensive insurance. The bottom line is, we do not want the IRS implementing now regulations that may be overturned perhaps in the near future in the courts.

At the end of the day, we do not know what the courts are going to say about the constitutionality of an individual mandate. And as such, it seems irresponsible for the Internal Revenue Service, when it has so many demands on its time and on its employees, to implement something that we don't know whether or not it's actually going to become the law of the land. So with that, I believe very strongly that the IRS should not be spending those moneys in FY 2011, and we will deal with 2012 at the time when it comes up.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Let me just very quickly in closing say that I was very surprised and interested in hearing that the Republican Party is going to move next on undoing the mandate on car insurance throughout this country and other insurance. We know what this is. This is a way to try to kill the law of the land. This should not be done. And I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 552 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER

Mr. SCHRADER. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (other than a provision relating to amounts required to be made available by a provision of law), divisions A and B of this Act appropriate for fiscal year 2011, for each agency for which amounts were made available (with respect to division A) in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–118) or (with respect to division B) an appropriations Act referred to in section 1101(a), such amounts as may be necessary, under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts and at the level specified in section 1101(c), except that such level, with respect to the following appropriations Acts, shall be equal to the following percentages of the amounts made available for such agency in such Acts for fiscal year 2010 (other than amounts required to be made available by a provision of law), including transfers and obligation limitations:

(1) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–117), 89 percent.

(2) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–118), 101 percent.

(3) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–83), the percentage required to bring the aggregate amount appropriated in such Act for fiscal year 2010 (other than amounts required to be made available by a provision of law) to $42,517,000,000.

(4) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (division E of Public Law 111–117), the percentage required to bring the aggregate amount appropriated in such Act for fiscal year 2010 (other than amounts required to be made available by a provision of law) to $74,682,000,000.

(5) All other appropriations Acts referred to in section 1101(a), 96 percent.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, expenditures made pursuant to the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 111–242), shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization provided by division A in the same manner as provided by this Act with respect to division B.

(c) Amounts appropriated by subsection (a) may be allocated by the applicable agency head among agency accounts, programs, projects, and activities, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Chair, colleagues, I have enjoyed seeing this open process in this body for the first time in a long time, as far as it goes. However, a real open process would allow for real alternatives representing meaningful compromises in scope as well as in the particulars. America needs and deserves a real bipartisan solution that is more than political theater and actually has a chance of being a viable compromise with the Senate and President.

I took two messages from the election last November: America wants jobs, and they want to see their Nation's fiscal health restored. To achieve these dual objectives, we need to have a careful balance between ensuring this fragile recovery and beginning the march to prudent fiscal reform. Expert economists and previous CBO directors agree that $61 billion in reductions to the 2010 budget level, which we are currently debating, representing a 14 percent hit to our domestic spending on education, health care, public safety, and economic development, would be a crushing, crushing burden on job creation and our economic recovery.

Contrary to the lofty rhetoric surrounding the CR's role in correcting our budget deficits and national debt, this deals with less than 15 percent of our budget.

□ 1200

I'm afraid this is merely a political exercise. America is begging for more from its duly elected Representatives. The proposed CR does not even get to the mythical $100 billion in reductions that were talked about during the political campaign. This proposal was not even considered by the Republican leadership as real. They opted for a more reasonable $34 billion reduction target before being hijacked by politics again. Where are the open committee

hearings? Where is the testimony from individuals, businesses or agencies? We are operating with virtually no deliberation at all; and oftentimes, Members have mere minutes to evaluate the amendments.

Members have literally been working day and night for a reasonable compromise. We need a CR that gets us through these tough times and sets the stage for real fiscal reform.

I have such a proposal before you here today. My alternative CR requires a 4.7 percent, across-the-board reduction in domestic spending for the remainder of 2011. The only exception is the Census Bureau. My proposal strikes more appropriate reductions in military spending while at the same time protecting our warriors in the field. As the Secretary of Defense has stated, we need to eliminate costly weapons systems, way over budget, out-of-control civilian contracting and achieve much needed efficiencies in the agency. So rather than a 2 percent increase, we talk about a 1 percent increase.

This proposal, which I hope is taken as a beginning for a bipartisan compromise on the continuing resolution, makes real cuts of about $20 billion in our current level of spending, enough to be meaningful, with 7 months remaining in our calendar year, or our fiscal year, but not enough to undermine the recovery. It's simple, it's serious, and it's real.

I urge its adoption.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI, which states in pertinent part: an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment attempts to create a legislative formula for spending.

I ask for a ruling.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be recognized to speak to the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment seeks to establish a legislative formula for funding. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. KIND

Mr. KIND. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide payments (or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to provide payments) to the Brazil Cotton Institute.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Chair, my amendment is very simple and straightforward. It would save the American taxpayers $150 million a year by ending a new American taxpayer subsidy that is going to Brazilian cotton agribusiness. If this program sounds crazy, it's because it is. But it's also the truth.

How did we get to this point? Well, Brazil had a successful WTO challenge against our own cotton subsidy program under our own farm bill. They prevailed; and you would think that the logical, reasonable response from us would be to reform our cotton subsidy program. But that's not what happened.

Instead, a new program has been created to the tune of $150 million per year to buy off Brazil cotton agribusiness so they won't pursue economic sanctions against our country. It's foolish, it's wasteful, and it speaks to the need for us to get into serious farm bill reform, especially under the title I subsidy commodity programs. We need to eliminate this new subsidy and then get onto the tough lifting of comprehensive farm bill reform.

I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. I rise in opposition to the Kind amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Madam Chairman, in 2004, the WTO, the World Trade Organization, found the United States guilty of illegal subsidies to American cotton farmers. It's been a long process, but Brazil is a very important ally of ours. We get along fine. They are very important to us strategically in our own hemisphere, so we want to get along with Brazil. And because of that, we worked out this settlement which kept Brazil from putting retaliatory tariffs on us. That saved us money.

If we did not agree to this—which Mr. KIND has pointed out—$147 million, we would have to pay $829 million. This is less, and it only is in effect until the farm bill is passed. In the 2012 farm bill, we'll deal with that.

With that, I yield 1½ minutes to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This transfer of funds was established as part of an agreement negotiated between the U.S. and Brazilian Governments. As a result of this agreement negotiated by the USTR and USDA, Brazil agreed to suspend retaliation against U.S. exports. If this amendment passes and the funds are not transferred in compliance with the agreement, then the U.S. will be in violation of the agreement. Brazil would then have the right to immediately impose punitive tariffs on U.S. exports. What Mr. KIND's amendment does is invite a trade war.

The U.S.-Brazil agreement is in place only until the 2012 farm bill is completed. This provides an opportunity for the U.S. to determine what adjustments to current law are necessary as a part of the next farm bill to bring the U.S. cotton program into compliance with the WTO ruling. This amendment should not be on this bill. It is a policy change.

Please join me in defeating this amendment.

Mr. KIND. Madam Chair, I respect my colleagues' position. The answer is not to create a new $150 American subsidy program going to Brazil. The answer is to reform our programs now in the United States.

And with that, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chair, I think if we were to have a contest on your YouCut for the single stupidest thing the Federal Government could do, it would be to take $120 million more of American tax dollars and send it to subsidize Brazilian cotton farmers so we can continue to subsidize American cotton farmers. That's what we're talking about.

I find it somewhat ironic that my friends who are the great believers in free enterprise and the free market think somehow there's an exception for agriculture. But whether you do or you don't, sending money to Brazilian cotton farmers at a time when we are making fundamental cuts here is problematic.

It also illustrates my problem with the structure of this bill. I was hard-pressed to find offsets so we could continue to fund enforcement of securities fraud or consumer protection. Where could we have gotten the money? Well, we could have gotten it from Brazil. Instead of sending it to Brazilian cotton farmers, we could have used it for our own law enforcement. But the bill is structured to protect this. At least we cannot waste it.

So let's be very clear. To protect our right to continue to subsidize American cotton farmers, we are going to subsidize Brazilian cotton farmers. Lunacy.

Mr. KINGSTON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KIND. Madam Chair, at this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I hope that nobody in this Chamber or watching here misses the irony of this, that we are spending money to subsidize Brazilian agriculture so that

we can continue to subsidize agriculture here. That is just incredible when you think about it.

And what this amendment will do is to force us back to the table. It won't spark a trade war. It will simply say, all right, stop subsidizing your own agriculture in a way that violates your trade agreements. That's what we want to do is force the issue where we can actually get out of these subsidy programs. We cannot continue to send money to Brazil so that we can continue to subsidize agriculture here. It just makes no sense at all. This is a great amendment. I hope that my colleagues will support it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chair, I yield myself 10 seconds. I just want to point out that I understand and hear what the folks are saying, but we are in a situation where we have an existing farm bill. If we do not do this, it is going to cost American taxpayers $682 million. That was the WTO agreement.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, the ranking member of the Ag Subcommittee on Appropriations, Mr. FARR.

□ 1210

Mr. FARR. I think that this is a problem. And I think Mr. KIND has a way of looking at trying to remove the money, but it's not going to make the problem go away.

I agree that this is a thing that needs to be addressed because there's going to be retaliatory implications if this money is just pulled, and those retaliatory implications are unknown to an awful lot of other agriculture who may even support this amendment. So it is an idea that we need to address. This is not the place to address it.

I oppose the amendment.

Mr. KIND. Again, the answer is not to invite a trade war. The answer is to fix our problem here in America by reforming the long overdue cotton subsidy program.

With that, I yield 1 minute to my friend from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. We've got everything but murder going on here.

We're being blackmailed by the Government of Brazil, and so we are giving precious U.S. taxpayer dollars, $147 million, to Brazil for their cotton farmers while I have got small farmers going broke. Now, come on.

And now we hear from the gentleman from Georgia, well, that's what the law says. Hey, you just repealed health care. You can change the farm bill. We can do away with these obscene subsidies, $3.4 billion bilked from U.S. taxpayers going to subsidize cotton farmers, who use subsidized water on top of that, whose total crop value was $4 billion. So $3.4 billion of it is our taxpayer subsidy. This is indefensible.

Take this step now, and then next week you can repeal the farm bill and replace that.

Mr. KINGSTON. I would remind the gentleman from Oregon we are going to reauthorize the farm bill next year, which is what this is all about.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

While far from perfect, this agreement was arranged by the Obama administration and the country of Brazil. This will incite a retaliatory trade war against the United States' intellectual properties. It won't have anything to do with tariffs on U.S. agriculture, but it will hurt other segments of our economies.

The 2008 farm bill was a contract with American farmers. They have put business processes in place based on that 5-year contract. We will renew and renegotiate that contract in 2012. It makes no sense to unwind this on a piecemeal basis right now.

This is a smokescreen by the other side who wants to go after the farm bill. Madam Chairman, they have gone after it time and time again. But the contract with American farmers, which allows Americans to enjoy the cheapest, most affordable, most abundant and safest food and fiber supply in the world, is on the backs of this farm bill. Reopening it now on an ad hoc piecemeal basis is the wrong policy for this country. Voting for this is a vote to institute a trade war with Brazil, no matter what the rhetoric is from the other side.

Oppose this amendment.

Mr. KIND. Madam Chair, what is really ironic in this debate is that cotton prices are at an all-time high in the marketplace, and yet it shows the built-up resistance in this institution to get to the hard work of reforming these farm subsidy programs, which is long overdue. They claim they are going to do it in the next farm bill, but there is no assurance when that is going to come up. It could be 3 years from now. That could be an additional half billion dollars from the American taxpayer for subsidies flowing to Brazil. The answer is to do it now rather than waiting next year or 3 years from now, or maybe never at all.

I have been around here long enough to know the powerful special interests that resist farm reform. We should do it and save taxpayer dollars at the same time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, who will explain why this saves $682 million and complies with WTO laws.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Chair, I am sympathetic to this amendment. The United States should live up to its WTO obligations, particularly if we expect other countries to do the same.

Paying Brazil about $12 million a month rather than complying with the WTO decision regarding cotton subsidies isn't the best way to resolve this dispute. I acknowledge that. But this settlement is necessary to prevent Brazil from imposing almost $1 billion in retaliation against American goods and services, as it's entitled to do.

This retaliation could take many dangerous and costly forms, including high tariffs on our American sales abroad and allowing Brazil to no longer protect American intellectual property rights. Such retaliation would be devastating. It would cost U.S. jobs and harm thousands of innocent workers who have nothing to do with this case.

As a result, I must oppose this amendment and urge its defeat.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KIND. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. KIND

Mr. KIND. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by division A of this Act may be used to research, develop, test, evaluate, or procure any of the following:

(1) Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle.

(2) Surface-Launched Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missile program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Madam Chair, my amendment is pretty straightforward and simple. It would eliminate two weapons programs that the Defense Department, Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the bipartisan fiscal commissions all say are not necessary, they are not needed, they don't go to improve military readiness, and they are redundant. It's the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle as well as the Surface Launch Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile System, the SLAMRAAM for short.

Now, I am not going to get into the details as to why these weapons programs should be defunded. Those serving on the committee have heard these arguments for years. But what I want to make is a larger point here today; that if we're going to be serious about true deficit reduction, the defense aspect of the Federal budget also has to

be on the table. And what better place to start than by listening to our own military leaders who continually tell this Congress: Stop appropriating money for weapons systems we don't want, that we don't want to use, that aren't necessary, they don't enhance military readiness, and they are not going to support our troops in the field. And these two programs fit that bill.

Now, we had a previous amendment from Ms. WOOLSEY in regards to the EFV program. She laid out the reasons behind that, that I don't have to get into. But the fact is defense spending is the second largest spending category in the entire Federal budget after health care costs. And if that is taken off the table, which I hear too often from too many of my colleagues, it's going to make restoring the fiscal health of our Nation that much more difficult.

And with just the elimination of the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle, Secretary Gates estimates it could save the American taxpayer over $12 billion. And then for the SLAMRAAM program, General Chiarelli estimated that would save an additional $1 billion. When the budget is going to be tight and there's inevitably going to be an increasing squeeze on our military and military readiness, what better place to start than these weapon programs that the military is not even asking for and instructing Congress to stop the insanity?

But I was also proud in the last session of Congress that the Democratic majority moved forward on another important area of defense reform, and that's the weapons procurement program. A recent General Accounting Office report indicates that current weapons programs in the pipeline today are over $300 billion over budget.

So this blank check that defense contractors expect from the American taxpayers has got to end, or we will spend ourselves into oblivion and we won't get a good bang for the taxpayer dollars and we won't be doing right for the American fighting soldier.

So the point of my amendment is simple. It's going to be tough making the type of budget decisions that we have to make in a bipartisan fashion to get these structural deficits under control. The defense budget should also be fair game for scrutiny and transparency and cost savings. And what better place to start than where our own military leaders are instructing us to go: weapons programs they don't need, will save money, reduce the redundancy, and help deal with the budget deficits that we're facing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1220

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, we had a long discussion on the EFV program, and this legislation provides for an agreement that we are just about to reach where it is a win-win situation. It is a win for the taxpayer. The taxpayer is not going to have to pay $145 million in termination costs. The same money can be used to complete the program as it stands.

The Marine Corps is satisfied with this. I have been discussing this with Secretary Gates for quite a long time now. Too often the military starts a program, a great idea, spends a lot of money in the conceptual design, research and development, only to cancel the program, get nothing for it and lose the money. Here is a case where we win. Three billion dollars has already been spent. We get to take advantage of completing that program with the money that we would pay to terminate the program anyway.

SLAMRAAM is basically a similar program, much smaller than the EFV program, but SLAMRAAM is similar. They are just about to complete the development stage and have SLAMRAAM on the shelf in the event they need to go to procurement immediately for an immediate need.

So I am opposed to this amendment. It doesn't do good for the taxpayer or the military.

I want to compliment Mr. KIND, because we have had several opportunities to work together with his constituents, wounded constituents and their families, and he has been very, very helpful. I want to thank him for having worked on those issues.

I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment for the same very reason. The Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle is coming to an end. I agree with the chairman. It makes me cringe that they have spent $3 billion on this, but for an additional $34 million, we can finish the R&D phase of this program. That is what the chairman was talking about. Then we don't have to pay $145 million, as I understand it, in termination costs. I think it is just wise to get the final research done. So I would reluctantly have to oppose this amendment because it would take away our opportunity to get this better agreement that the chairman is talking about.

SLAMRAAM is an AIM–9 missile that is ground-based, and this program is coming to an end. It is being terminated as well, and we support that.

Again, I think we should reject the gentleman's amendment, but the outcome of what he is talking about will be achieved in the very near future.

Mr. KIND. Madam Chairman, I am just going to conclude my statement with this. I have great respect and admiration for the two gentlemen who have been serving on the Defense Appropriations Committee for years and I am not going to stand here and pretend that I know more about the defense budget than these two gentlemen do. I don't. But I do tend to listen carefully to our own military leadership at the Pentagon.

Secretary of Defense Gates said about the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle that over two decades the program is going to consume half of the Marine Corps procurement funds and nearly all of the ground vehicle budget, something they are trying to avoid. Even though the Marine Corps Commandant General James Amos has supported the EFV in the past, he has now recognized that this is ''an onerous fiscal program.''

So if we can't start here with these programs, where are we going to go in defense for cost savings?

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. As I understand the arguments of the chairman and the ranking member, it is we are going to get rid of these eventually, but let's not do it too quickly because we might save money prematurely. I have never heard a weaker defense for continuing to spend money, that at some point we are going to stop. So why not stop now? So I think the gentleman from Wisconsin ought to be supported.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I will conclude this debate.

This is probably a very well-intentioned amendment, but it just gets in the way of working out solutions that are a win for the taxpayer and a win for the military. We should take advantage of every opportunity that we have to save the money for the taxpayer and get them something for it. That is what this amendment would prevent from happening.

We had a lengthy discussion on the EFV earlier in the debate yesterday, and I am more convinced than ever, as well-intentioned as the amendment might be, it is just not a good idea and it is not in the best interests of the taxpayer or the military.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KIND. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 75.708 of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations, as it relates to section 5205 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7221d).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, this amendment would help increase the ability of the administration to leverage the resources they already have to support expansion and replication of charter schools that have shown to be effective.

Basically, this amendment will remove a regulation that prevents subgranting and doesn't allow charter school grants to be done through intermediaries, which are generally venture philanthropy organizations like New Schools Venture Fund and Charter School Growth Network. These organizations have proven that they can help guide charter schools and CMOs, organizations that manage one or two charter schools and help build them into successful, multisite organizations that support student success.

These venture philanthropy organizations use the same model in the nonprofit sense—I want to emphasis they are nonprofits—as venture capital does in the private sector and support excellence in the charter schools that are part of their portfolio. They encourage rigorous evaluations. They provide strategic guidance to board membership.

One of the issues we frequently have with charter schools is lack of quality governance. These intermediaries actually can help establish quality governance, which is such an important determinant of whether a charter school is successful or not. They can provide flexibility and provide specific interventions as needed. When something isn't working, they can help.

Finally, it will empower the administration to help be able to work through venture philanthropy organizations to better leverage Federal funds. If you have X dollars in Federal funds, they can combine that with two-X or three-X in private philanthropic capital they have raised to have a more meaningful impact on student achievement, to help expand and replicate what we know works with regard to charter schools.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from California, ranking member of the Education Committee.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for this amendment. I would hope he would withdraw this amendment so we would have an opportunity to go through exactly what the thresholds would be for the Department to award this right to the grantors to make these subgrants.

Obviously, you have been a leader in the effort of improving the quality and number of charter schools, but this is a $50 million pool of money that could rightfully be used for this purpose, but I think we want to make sure that we have some assurances as to accountability and the kinds of subgrants that would be made to expand the universe of high-quality, high-performing charter schools.

I know that Congressman KLINE is also supportive of this amendment, but I think it would be best if we had an opportunity to walk through it and then either approach the Department to rewrite the regulation or to have legislation from the committee.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman and look forward to working with the chair and the ranking member to ensure that the administration has all the tools they need to make sure that the limited resources they have for expansion or replication of models that we know work are used in the highest-leveraged way possible.

Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

□ 1230

AMENDMENT NO. 400 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes that the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill already passed in the reading.

Does the gentlewoman from Texas seek unanimous consent to offer the amendment at this point in the reading?

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I do.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I am very sorry that the gentlelady cannot offer her well-thought-out amendments on a technicality, but I will yield 3 minutes to her to explain what her amendments would have done if they had been in order.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. It's unfortunate that Republicans want to issue a point of order. We asked unanimous consent for amendments that have been placed timely into the RECORD against jobs. And that is what my amendment is about. It clearly is about restoring the $5 billion that the Republicans want to take out and block American jobs.

You can clearly see how long we've been here, and there have been actually no jobs being created by Republicans. This amendment does simply one thing: It restores the $5 billion in stimulus dollars that have created thousands upon thousands of jobs. It has created this housing for low-income housing. It has created this kind of map that shows that stimulus jobs have been all over America and created 585,653 jobs, 253,000 projects.

It is interesting that our friends can support President Obama on agricultural subsidies, but they can create no jobs, and they want to oppose restoring the $5 billion in stimulus dollars—and I might call them reinvestment dollars.

In addition, our friends want to ignore the fact that by taking away $5 billion they close what we call community health clinics. Yes, this is where Americans are now getting their good health care, in community clinics.

So I would argue that it is a shame that we have a situation where you cannot present this amendment. Jobs, the idea of infrastructure investment, the idea of low-income housing that is being created, and as well, projects like housing for the elderly in Minnesota, Kawana Village Apartments that are in the Washington area, Father Murphy Phase III, 10 new rental duplexes in Shawnee, Oklahoma. Blackfeet housing, 223 homes, again, in Montana. Mount View Village Lodge, again in Alaska. And of course Pueblo Housing in El Paso, Texas. Can you tell me why you want to eliminate the idea and the ability for individuals to work by taking away the moneys that have been invested in America? That is what this has done.

In Houston alone, Center Point has been able to improve their grids to provide more energy for our community. We have gotten $849 million that has put people to work and has provided health care, has improved the environment. I would ask my colleagues to take away the point of order, to not say I'm out of order.

You're putting a point of order on American jobs. And I think it is insane to not be able to allow a Member to stand and say that the moneys that you're taking away have proven themselves to be moneys that have been legitimate and have called upon the American people to rise up and to be employed.

There are people who are now at their 99th level of not being able to get employed and get unemployment insurance. They need these jobs. The $5 billion that will be taken away will be impacting projects yet to come that will help rebuild America's infrastructure.

I thank the gentleman from Washington for allowing this explanation, but I hopefully will be heard at least by the colleagues and the people of the United States on this amendment, restoring simply $5 billion.

There was a second amendment that was going to make the point that we don't want Americans to know how much great work the Recovery Act has done by taking money away for signs

that have been put up. I'm willing to withdraw that amendment because $5 billion is $5 billion to put Americans to work. I am simply appalled at the fact that we don't have the opportunity to share with the American people their tax dollars to make sure that they have the opportunity to work, to have good health care, to have housing, and to have good energy relief to make sure that our environment is safe and that we expand our independence by having the kind of energy efficiency that seniors are in need of.

So to the gentleman from Washington, I do want to acknowledge that the Recovery Act moneys have been an effective tool for building jobs. And frankly, 1,000 jobs were created in Houston.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Many economists today say that if we had not had stimulus, unemployment would be at 13 percent. I hear so often over on the other side that it didn't work.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I hear so much talk on the other side that the stimulus program didn't—reputable economists say the unemployment rate would be at 12.5 to 13 percent if we hadn't had the stimulus package. And again, that's why we're so worried about the magnitude of the cuts here having a countercyclical effect. So I appreciate the gentlewoman's work on this.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) Each amount made available by the following provisions of division B of this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by the following percentage:

(1) Section 1101(a)(5) and title IX, 11 percent.

(2) All other provisions of such division (except as provided by subsection (b)), 5.5 percent.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts made available—

(1) by section 1101(a)(3) and title VI;

(2) by section 1101(a)(6) (with respect to division E of Public Law 111–117) and title X; and

(3) for Israel, by section 1101(a)(6) (with respect to division F of Public Law 111–117) and title XI.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, the American people spoke loud and clear in November, and they have continued to speak and hold us accountable. Their message is clear: They are overtaxed, this government is overspent, and they have had enough of Washington passing bills, regulations, rules and programs they can't afford and do not want. They have said stop the out-of-control spending.

Washington does not have a revenue problem; Washington has a very serious spending problem. They are ready for us to change the way the system operates. They want the fiscal house in order, and there is a systematic way we can approach this.

In the past couple of years, 26 different States have used this method—indeed, even Tennessee, my State, used it during a time of fiscal crisis. They have replaced billions of dollars in deficit spending and projections with spending cuts, and now it is time for the Federal government to follow the States.

The Republican Study Committee amendment makes an 11-percent cut on our legislative branch spending and a 5½ percent cut in other non-Defense, non-Veteran, non-Homeland Security accounts. This amendment will save $22.2 billion for the balance of this fiscal year and from this year's deficit. I know not everyone is a fan of across-the-board cuts, but many of us are and so are our constituents.

This is a concept that should be implemented at the Federal level. And indeed, it has been used before. President Roosevelt used it during World War II, and from 1942 to 1944 they cut 20 percent. President Truman, with the Korean War, they cut 28 percent in 1950. It is used. It works. It has a history of working. It is imperative that we get the spending cut. And across-the-board spending reductions are a very responsible way for us to do this.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. DICKS. Let me remind my colleagues what the underlying CR does to existing programs even before we consider the additional across-the-board cut offered by Mr. JORDAN:

A cut of $107 million from food safety inspections. This amendment by Mr. JORDAN would take an additional $5.6 million. The CR also already cuts $400 million to the Food and Drug Administration, and this amendment would take an additional $22 million. Cuts to State law enforcement assistance of $1.3 billion, 35 percent compared to the current rate; the Jordan amendment would cut an additional $68 million. The original version also completely eliminated the Cops Hiring Program, but an amendment passed by the House this week from our side prevailed, reinstating some of that funding.

□ 1240

It cut $661 million below the current rate from the Army Corps of Engineers, leaving hundreds of communities without critical flood control and navigation work. The Jordan amendment would cut an additional $35 million.

The CR also completely eliminates weatherization in State energy programs.

It cuts $648 million from the Nuclear Nonproliferation program, increasing the likelihood of bomb grade material entering the United States. The Jordan amendment would cut an additional $37 million.

The CR cuts safe drinking water and clean water State funds by 56 percent, or $1.7 billion. The Jordan amendment would cut an additional $167.2 million.

The CR cuts the maximum Pell Grant amount by $845. These grants help more than 8 million students afford college. The Jordan amendment exacerbates that reduction by taking an additional $962 million from the program.

The CR cuts Head Start by more than $1.1 billion, which is $500 million below the 2008 level. The Jordan amendment would cut an additional $338 million, meaning that individual students would lose their right to Head Start, that the teachers would be fired, and that people would be unemployed because of this amendment.

Then Transportation and HUD, which already saw a cut of nearly $14 billion, would be cut by an additional $3.7 billion, impacting critical funding for roads and bridges and infrastructure across this country.

This is a meat ax approach on top of a meat ax approach—it's a double meat ax approach. It is an amendment that we should defeat and defeat soundly.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH of Illinois. I rise today in support of amendment No. 104.

You know, we have spent the past few days talking about billions here, billions there—real programs, real people. But the American people have got to be shaking their heads.

We are broke. We are $14 trillion in debt, and we know it's more than that. By 2014, in interest on the debt alone, we will spend more than we will on all non-discretionary spending except for defense. By 2014, every citizen in the United States will spend $2,500 just to pay interest on the debt.

I appreciate the leadership the Republican leadership has provided in being as bold as they can be on necessary, important spending cuts; but

my colleagues, we've got to have faith in the American people. They are ahead of us on this. They are ready. This is one of those rare moments when the American people are asking us to be bold, when they are asking us to go one step further.

I have a brother who has been in the financial services industry for 20 or 30 years. He sent me a text last night, which read: Keep the cuts coming, baby.

The lack of leadership the White House is providing on this issue is stunning. You have to lead. The American people are ahead of us. To get back to real FY08 spending levels, to actually get $100 billion in cuts, my colleagues, don't be afraid of that. That's what the American people want.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

I am in opposition to this amendment, Madam Chairman. The House Republican package that we have before us already represents the largest reduction in discretionary spending in the history of the Nation. It is a historic package with much needed spending cuts and reductions that meet and exceed the pledged goal of cutting $100 billion.

In this package, there is $106 billion in cut spending, including the termination of 150 programs. These reductions were tough, thoughtful, and were made by the people who know those programs best. They went through the budget line by line, cutting or eliminating programs that don't work or that we can no longer afford. The subcommittee chairs, the staff, and our Members worked around the clock to make it happen. They did the hard work of getting deep into the weeds, making the best possible choices of exactly where and how to make these cuts.

In contrast, rather than make careful decisions on specific programs, the Jordan amendment hits everything indiscriminately and in a heavy-handed way. We were elected to make choices, not run on automatic pilot.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KLINE) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 266. An act to redesignate the Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge as the Sam D. Hamilton Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge.

S. 307. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the ''W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

S. 365. An act to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

The gentleman before said, in the base bill, these represent the largest cuts we've ever made. That is true, but we are running the largest deficit we have ever run. We have had the largest debt we have ever had, and what the situation calls for are deeper cuts than are in the underlying bill.

If we are really going to get on the right track here, we have got to understand that we have to make unprecedented cuts and realize that what we are doing here is a rounding error compared to what we are going to have to do with entitlement spending, which is going to come. But to ensure that we can make those choices when we deal with entitlements, we've got to go deeper than we are going in this base bill.

Again, we are running a deficit of $1.5 trillion this year on a debt of $14 trillion. The $100 billion in the base bill is 1/15th of the entire deficit that we are running—just 1/15th. That's not enough. We have to go further. I support the Jordan amendment. Let's make deeper cuts.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY), who has been the chair and ranking member of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Thank you for allowing me to speak on this.

Madam Chair, I am embarrassed to be here. I am embarrassed to be a Member of this House right now. I am embarrassed to have to stand up here and fight for the little people who can't fight for themselves.

I was here on 9/11. I was in my office, and the police officers came in to get me out of my office. I wanted to stay. They said, No, Congressman, we've got to get you out. As he's taking me out, he's going back in. He's putting his life in harm's way, and we're talking about taking money from him. It's totally ridiculous.

Madam Chair, we don't want to hurt our little guys and gals; we don't want to hurt our House staff members; we don't want to hurt our administrators, our Sergeant-at-Arms, our doorkeepers, the ladies in the cloakroom who take good care of us. All of these people and the administrators here don't make overtime. They put their time in like we do.

We're running 67 hours in this House today—67 hours. Do you know what it's costing us? $2 million to put this CR on a bridge to nowhere. That's where it's going. It's a disgrace that we've got to hurt the little people, and I'm not going to let that happen.

You hear about yield back. Well, we yield back. We want them to yield back their money. We want them to yield it back to us. They do an excellent job.

Madam Chair, I don't want them to yield back. I'm not going to let them yield back. I'm not even yielding back now. I'm just done.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 11 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

Mr. GUINTA. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for yielding time.

Madam Chair, I am not embarrassed to be here as part of this institution. I am honored. I am honored to represent New Hampshire in its quest for fiscal discipline, fiscal responsibility, and fiscal restraint.

□ 1250

Ladies and gentlemen, we are at the precipice of our country in terms of spending. We simply offer an amendment that further reduces the necessary spending restraints our country is demanding. This is about listening to our country, listening to the people who just elected this Congress to restore discipline with respect to our spending recognitions in Washington.

Ladies and gentlemen, this amendment, which I am happy and honored to cosponsor, first cuts our own institution. In New Hampshire, I say to the people in New Hampshire, we are going to cut first ourselves before we make other tough cuts in this country.

This amendment further reduces our own expenditure. And, finally, it takes 5.5 percent across the board with a few exceptions in the eight non-security divisions of the CR.

I support this amendment. I think we have to get serious about spending in this Nation and send a strong message that we are listening to the American people.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished former chairman and ranking member of the THUD Subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairman, this is a thoughtless and destructive amendment. I strongly oppose the underlying bill and believe it profoundly limits the transportation options for Americans and will damage our economy through hundreds of thousands of lost jobs. But I do respect that Chairman LATHAM provided oversight and made tough decisions on priorities.

Unfortunately, the Jordan amendment, after all these days of individually considered amendments, does none of that. It reduces every account by 5.5 percent without any understanding or probably even concern for

the impact. For example, it ensures a part-time air traffic control system by cutting more than half a billion from the operating expenses of the FAA. Does the gentleman really intend to close down the Columbus, Cincinnati and Cleveland airports 1 day each month?

This amendment would result in the funding shortfall of nearly a billion dollars in the tenant-based section 8 program, resulting in the eviction of 120,000 people.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a valued member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. COLE. This has been a great week for fiscal conservatives. Under Chairman ROGERS and the Appropriations Committee and the entire Republican Conference, we have actually enacted or are on the verge of enacting historic cuts and passing them through this body. We have let others come and participate with their ideas and suggestions.

My concern is not the amount of money involved in the amendment; it's the method adopted to achieve the savings. Across-the-board cuts essentially mean you lose the ability to eliminate, to root out and to prioritize. In fact, you adopt the priorities of the people that wrote the original budget. And with all due respect to my friends on this side, that means we are adopting our friends' on this side's priorities when we cut in this manner.

So I think we should embrace the spirit behind this amendment—it's well motivated—but reject the method, and go back to the thoughtful, targeted and tough kinds of decisions that Chairman ROGERS, the Appropriations Committee and our entire conference and every Member has had the opportunity to participate in.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise in support of this amendment.

The American people have spoken. They demand that Washington stop its out-of-control spending now, not sometime in the future. And despite what the administration tells you, every last dime in this bill will be borrowed. Every last dime of the $1 trillion will be borrowed. The cost of this bill, this bill alone, will exceed $500 for every single household in America, just for this bill.

We have to stop the spending now. We cannot afford it. The massive debt burden on our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren cannot be afforded.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to add my voice in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend from Ohio.

I, too, am a member of the RSC. I think many of the good points that have been made on the House floor during the last few days can be attributed to the good work and the heartfelt convictions of the members of the Republican Study Committee and its longstanding commitment to freedom and liberty. But I believe this approach taken by this amendment is misguided.

Madam Chair, the Appropriations Committee has put before the House a CR that makes significant cuts to all areas of our Federal Government, but these cuts have been made with deliberate intent and after careful consideration. In other words, they have been done surgically, and I believe this amendment would take a more indiscriminate hatchet approach.

The Republican Pledge to America states, ''we will roll back government spending to pre-stimulus, pre-bailout levels, saving us at least $100 billion in the first year alone''; but it doesn't say we have to accomplish this task in the first spending bill before us, and it did not envision accomplishing it in the remaining 7 months.

I hope we can defeat this amendment.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chair, this Nation currently faces a $1.65 trillion deficit, $14 trillion national debt. And despite all the talk for the President's so-called fiscal discipline, this administration just proposed a budget that will add $12 trillion to that mountain range of debt facing our children and grandchildren.

Fortunately, under the leadership of Chairman ROGERS, House Republicans are keeping our word to the American people. We said, if you gave us a second chance to lead this Congress, we would find at least $100 billion in savings this year, and House Republicans will do that before we adjourn for this week.

But House conservatives believe we can do more. I truly believe that the Jordan amendment—which provides an across-the-board cut of 5.5 percent, more for the legislative branch, doesn't touch our most cherished ally, Israel—is one of those opportunities where you have a chance to underpromise and overperform.

We said to the American people that we would do at least $100 billion. We have added hundreds of millions of dollars to that. Let's do more. Let's do $22 billion more. Let's underpromise, overdeliver, and set this Nation back on a pathway towards fiscal responsibility and reform.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who is the ranking member on the Labor-HHS subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. If the majority party really wanted to do something about the deficit, they could look to other parts of the budget for significant cuts in savings instead of coming back over and over again with ever-deeper cuts to the programs that make investments in education, in health care, in job training and in scientific research.

Democrats are committed to reducing the deficit. We believe you ought to start by ending the tax subsidies and special interest waste. Let's look at it:

Forty billion dollars in oil subsidies, $8 billion in farm subsidies, $7.4 billion that could be saved by shutting down the practice of treaty shopping, $3 billion a year that could be saved if we allowed cheaper generic drugs in the market.

This across-the-board amendment cut is an example of the majority's reckless rush to slash without regard to the impact on the economy, the businesses that create jobs, or middle class working people who are doing their best for their families and educating their kids for the future.

The majority is hitting families and children and the elderly, and they are not laying a glove on the special interest tax subsidies.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I rise in strong support of the Jordan amendment. I am obviously not a freshman. I have been in the Congress for 26 years. I am very supportive of what Chairman ROGERS and all the appropriators have done.

I think it's an interesting point to have the ranking minority member yielding to the chairman of the committee, but that's Congress at its finest.

But I would point out that our budget deficit this year is $1.6 trillion. I would point out that the Obama budget, the smallest deficit it reports over a 10-year period, is about $750 billion.

□ 1300

The Republican Study Committee, under the leadership of Mr. JORDAN, is the point of the spear that is lancing the out-of-control, reckless Federal spending that is bankrupting this country. This amendment complements what Chairman ROGERS has done. We need to support it, to put them in the best position when we have the negotiations with our friends in the other body. Please vote for this necessary amendment.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Notre Dame and California (Mr. LUNGREN), the former Attorney General.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I stand before you as a conservative member of the Republican Study Committee, former chairman of the Republican Study Committee, in strong opposition to this proposal.

Across-the-board cuts are a lazy Member's way to achieve something. This will cut 11 percent for the security of the Congress. Since the tragedy in Tucson, I have had innumerable Members come to me as the chairman of House Administration and asking me what more we can do for the security of this House, our Members, and our constituents. There is not a single Member of this House who has asked me to cut security. Quite the contrary. This would cut 250 officers. It would not allow me to do the things you have asked me to do in terms of securing your offices here or at home.

Secondly, the greatest obligation we have here, I believe, is oversight of the Federal Government. So what does this amendment do? It cuts us twice as much as those we are supposed to follow. It makes no sense whatsoever. If you want us to do our job and be secure in our job, I would humbly ask you to defeat this amendment.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the gentleman's comments.

I would take issue with saying any Member of this House is lazy or that this is a lazy process. Indeed, it is not. As I said, 26 States have used across-the-board cuts to get their fiscal house in order. This government has overspent. We have to get it under control. Let's complement what has been done by the appropriators and make these across-the-board cuts.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment.

Folks, it's time to stop the spending insanity in this country. The American people know the government's too large, it spends too much money, and indebts future generations. We are $14 trillion in debt and we are $1.5 trillion in the red this year.

I am part of an 87-Member freshman class that said go back to the drawing board, get us a hundred billion; but don't stop there. Do not stop there. We have got hard decisions to make in this body. Everyone's got to row this boat if we are going to survive as an American government. We have got to stop. I support this amendment, and ask you to do so as well.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished ranking member of the Agriculture Subcommittee from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. We have been on a 3-day marathon talking about how we are going to cut, squeeze, and trim the Federal Government. Frankly, we haven't even hit the big stuff. Seventy-five percent of the budget isn't even up for discussion here on the floor. What you are seeing with this amendment is you are taking a meat axe to essentially a bloody mess.

We know this bill is not going anywhere because it doesn't really get into trying to do structural reform. If we really wanted to deal with debt, you deal with a plan to get rid of debt, not just with a hacking and hacking away. Let's devise a plan that will really make this country deal with its debt just like you do with your mortgage, your long-term mortgage. It's a lot of money. People aren't scared, as long as they have a job, to how they are going to pay their mortgage because they have a plan. That's not what we are getting at. This amendment is a meat axe to a bloody mess that ought to be opposed.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee, and a member of the Defense Subcommittee, Mr. KINGSTON of Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise in opposition to this amendment. And I do so as a proud RSC member and somebody who fought hard to get us to $100 billion in this cut, who has pledged to work for more cuts in fiscal year 2012. I support the Goodlatte balanced-budget amendment and the spending cap.

But I have got to say to my conservative friends, when you cut across the board, who do you think is going to be in charge of where these cuts come from? The EPA Director, who is putting in the clean air and all the greenhouse emissions stuff. Do you think she is going to cut that out of her budget? What about the Department of Justice? You think they are going to take this out of the lawsuit money to Arizona? What about the EPA that came up with a law that dairy farmers had to have an emergency response plan if they spilled milk because it was considered an oil? What about the immigration department? Do you think they are going to back off their priorities, or do you think they are going to implement RSC priorities?

You and I have some disagreements with the administration, so I don't see why it helps us to empower them to make the decisions on where this 5 percent will come from. Because I can say if I was them, I know what I would cut, and it would not be the priorities that you would have.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding time.

I rise in support of the Jordan amendment. You know, many people here have taken notice that many of us are freshmen. Well, I am a freshman, and I am proud to be a freshman. I tell you this, one thing I am not a freshman at, I am not a freshman at trying to perpetuate my family's 55-year-old business that's struggling under the taxation and the regulation of this Federal Government. I am not a freshman when it comes to that.

I am an expert, because that's what my dad did and that's what my granddad did. And God willing, if this body practices courage and does what is right, my children and my grandchildren down the line will be able to continue and perpetuate that line of tradition.

You know, I hear the words meat axe and draconian. What's draconian and meat axe is leaving every American in this country with $43,000 of national debt, $14 trillion of debt, which puts us at a very weak standing among the world, which owns now 50 percent of our debt. That is a security issue.

People stand here and they talk about security. Nothing is greater to our security than making sure that we own our debt rather than those countries around the world who mean us harm.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Melbourne, Florida, where my uncle was the former mayor, Mr. POSEY.

Mr. POSEY. I thank my friend across the aisle for the time. I thought the across-the-board cuts were not supposed to apply to national security. I thought we were going to make cuts like the folks back home make cuts. If a family back home gives an across-the-board 5 percent cut and they apply it, they are in deep trouble.

They might be able to cut back on their entertainment. They might be able to not go out to eat an extra night. They may be able to cut back on their water or their electric usage. But if they pay their mortgage company 5 percent less than is due for the security over their head, they are out on the street; and they end up in bigger problems than they started. So I think that's why we need to make these cuts surgically in our budget.

Let's take NASA, for example. The committee already cut over $300 million from the NASA budget. The Weiner amendment cut $300 million more almost. Why would anyone want to yield the ultimate military high ground, which is space, to countries who in the very best of times are not friendly to us? Space is the free world's Golan Heights. I implore my colleagues to help defeat this very, very well-intended, but misguided, amendment. Thank you very much.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the lady from Tennessee for yielding. You know, I came down here because I heard the opposition to this amendment decrying about the devastation that will occur to the country if this amendment were to pass, and I would like to make just two points.

One, discretionary spending in this country has increased 38 percent in the last 4 years, 38 percent. Has Americans' spending increased 38 percent? Has Americans' income increased 38 percent? No. All this amendment does is it

asks the government to spend what it spent 2 years ago.

□ 1310

Most Americans would probably like to do that. Why is that such a devastation? But there's even a greater reason. We have a $1.5 trillion going to $1.6 trillion deficit. If we do not get this debt under control—and fast—we will be making cuts of 50 percent overnight because of the debt crisis that will hit when people stop buying our debt. Madam Chair, this does not threaten government services. It is actually a step toward saving them from the debt crisis that is ahead of us.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) who is the chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee and a valued senior member of the Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to associate my remarks with those who rise to oppose the amendment, basically because it's across the board. Right now we are affecting the Army Corps of Engineers in a way that will affect most of our major navigation around the country. Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio River. We need to get these projects moving. They are important to commerce, billions of dollars of commerce, suppliers, producers. And lastly, there is a national security aspect. We need to maintain the reliability of our nuclear stockpile. That's under the Department. There is nothing more important than the nuclear stockpile. Protecting that stockpile, making sure it's reliable, and that we meet the requirements of cleanups across the Nation. Across the board cuts would impact that in a big way.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, how much time do we have on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 2 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Commerce, Justice, and Science Subcommittee.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

I rise in opposition to the amendments. If we really want to deal with getting deficits under control, we have got to deal with entitlements. Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, that's where we have to go.

Secondly, this really will result in the layoffs of several hundred FBI agents at the FBI. We met with Director Mueller on Friday. Can you see the message when Osama bin Laden in a cave in Pakistan hears that the FBI has had a layoff of FBI agents? Thirdly, it would require layoffs at the DEA.

Lastly, for anybody interested in NASA—and so many Members came up to say, Please, help NASA—this would result in a $1 billion cut of NASA and the losses of thousands of jobs not only of NASA employees but also NASA contractors in Alabama, in Florida, in Texas, in California, and around the country. I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the author of this amendment.

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Chair, let me start by thanking the Appropriations Committee. I do appreciate the work they have done. Look, this is unprecedented. Appropriators cutting tens of billions of dollars, getting to the $100 billion that is so important and what we told the voters we were going to do. I appreciate that.

But I am still struck with this fact: One thing that the American people understand is that spending is out of control. There is no way around it. And several speakers have went through and listed this program that would be impacted, this agency that would be impacted. Look, I understand that. It's not pleasant to reduce spending. I get that. But I always bring it back to what the typical family has to do.

Think about the family out there who is making $50,000 a year and spending $85,000. There are some good things that that other $35,000 is being spent on, probably some very good things. Maybe they are going out to dinner or they have an entertainment night, and they are doing good things, healthy things for their family. But the point is that they are spending more than they are taking in, and they have to cut back, even if some of those things are positive things.

And the Federal Government is even worse because we are taking in $50,000 and spending $85,000 year after year after year, and the President's budget highlights that. We run trillion-dollar deficits for the next decade. We pile up more debt on top of the $14 trillion. This amendment builds on a good bill and simply says, Let's get to a full $100 billion in savings outside of national defense and non-security savings. We think that's a good first step towards putting this country on a path that is actually sustainable, as the gentleman from Arizona pointed out, towards at least reducing our deficit by one-fifteenth. Imagine that, just one-fifteenth. This is what the American people sent us here to do. This is what the American people elected 87 freshmen Republicans to do, just this very thing, to reduce spending.

I just want to finish with this, because sometimes the people of this country say it a lot better than the politicians. In my time in public life, I have never seen the American people more receptive to the things that have to be done to fix this country. They get it. The central question is, Will the political class demonstrate the same commitment, the same courage that the American people have demonstrated over the last year? Let me read you this, and this just came to our office 2 days ago.

''Dear Representative JORDAN, my research center receives the majority of its funding from Federal Department of Education sources. If those funds are cut, we stand to lose our programs and, as a result, maybe our livelihoods. However, my greater concern is with the future of this Nation. Federal spending, if not dramatically cut, will inevitably lead to this Nation's ruin and will destroy all opportunities for our children. We must bring sanity back to the management of our Nation's fiscal resources. JIM, our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortune, and their sacred honor to create an exceptional Nation where our rights are endowed by our Creator. If I have to sacrifice my livelihood to maintain this great experiment called America, it's the very least I can do in service to this country. Please stand firm in your fight for fiscal responsibility to preserve this great Nation.''

Colleagues, that's the standard of the American people. That's the commitment we have to meet. That's what this debate is all about. If we don't do this, the future for our kids and our grandkids is diminished. This is about making sure America remains the greatest country in history.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho, MIKE SIMPSON, who has been the ranking member on Interior and now the chairman of the Interior and Environmental Subcommittee.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It's important to remember what we're doing here. We're dealing with a CR that funds the government for the last 7 months. This is not a full-year appropriation bill. We're dealing with a much shorter period of time. So the $100 billion that we were asked to reduce in this budget, if you looked at it, by the time this probably gets done, would, in effect, be about $200 billion if it were a full-year appropriations bill. The Appropriations Committee has done its job. It has done what our Conference asked us to do.

We had actually had amendments on the floor that would reduce some accounts to less than what they have in the appropriations process. So I guess they would be paying us, I don't know. But some of the amendments have just gone too far. This one I think goes too far. And as some have said, across-the-board cuts don't give us the opportunity to decide what our priorities are. What we need to do is make sure that we get this amendment defeated, that we get this CR to fund the government for the last 7 months passed, and then get on with doing a budget for 2012, which was not done last year, and pass the appropriations bills so that we can fund the government for the next year at a level that I think many of the

RSC members will be happy with when we get that done.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished lady from Texas, KAY GRANGER, who is the chairman of the State, Foreign Ops Appropriations Subcommittee.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may yield but not blocks of time.

□ 1320

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the Jordan amendment.

This amendment would cut an additional $2.5 billion from the State, Foreign Operations title of the CR after the subcommittee has brought significant and thoughtful cuts to the table. This title is already $10 billion below 2010, including supplementals. To achieve that, we put lower priority programs on pause, reduced and eliminated underperforming, wasteful and duplicative programs and zeroed out administrative priorities like climate change.

The programs that are funded in the State, Foreign Operations title of this bill protect our top national security priorities. The gentleman claims his amendment exempts national security, but it does not exempt the national security provisions in the State, Foreign Operations title. The Jordan amendment reduces U.S. operations in frontline states including Afghanistan and Iraq.

The subcommittee has tried to responsibly protect these funds from drastic reductions in the State, Foreign Operations title, given that we have men and women in harm's way in our civilian forces just as we do in our military forces.

Aside from cutting $450 million from security assistance, the amendment would cut $55 million from the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund.

Israel is protected from this amendment's cuts, but Egypt, Jordan, Afghanistan, and Iraq are not. Given the fragile situation in these frontline states and in the Middle East, I believe cutting these funds would undermine our security.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I must oppose the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, THUD, Mr. LATHAM from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I appreciate very much what's going on and the reduction of spending. I'm just very concerned that this is not really a thoughtful way of doing it, that if we're after waste, fraud and abuse in our budget, this is going to cripple us as far as finding out where those places are. It will continue to fund items, lines in the budget that have waste, fraud and abuse and will not eliminate those.

And also, when you look at just the transportation portion, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) brought the point up too, but this would, in fact, stop air traffic control for a period of weeks. And I don't think many of us here would like to see our airports close down for several weeks because we don't have air traffic control. And that's exactly what would happen.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri, the chairman of the Financial Services Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mrs. EMERSON. I want to echo the words of all of our colleagues in opposition to this bill.

Let me talk a little bit about two things that in my bill, the Financial Services bill, that would be drastically impacted.

Number one, an additional 5.5 percent cut totaling $1.02 billion would actually reduce assistance to small businesses but would hurt agencies that protect American citizens from deceptive business practices and fraud.

In addition to that, it would result in dangerous cuts to the Treasury Department's Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, funding for enforcement of Iran sanctions, judicial security and drug task forces.

I realize it's a well intentioned effort, but it goes too far. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairwoman, the CR, I believe, is irresponsible, but this amendment would commit this country to an economic death spiral. It may sound like heresy, but the reality is you can't run the strongest government and the strongest economy in the world on less than 15 percent of GDP.

Look back to the Clinton years when we were at 20 percent. We had the strongest economy ever. People at the top tax rates brought home more after-tax income than any time in American history. We created 23 million more jobs and we had a surplus. And that surplus is what we should be aiming for.

Not only do we need to cut spending, sure, but we also need to raise revenue. We need to come to a balance. This is an imbalanced amendment. It is an irresponsible one, and our country and our people deserve better.

Mr. DICKS. In closing, let me point out that the amendment to impose an across-the-board cut would allow OMB to make the individual funding decisions. We have spent 4 days and nights thoughtfully considering programs and levels. This amendment is not thoughtful and should be defeated.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 199 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Justice, or any other Agency, to litigate the continuation of the case United States of America v. The State of Arizona and Janice K. Brewer regarding Arizona law S.B. 1070.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I understand a point of order is reserved by the other side.

This amendment to the CR is very simple. The State of Arizona has implemented laws in its State to protect the dignity and sovereignty of the State. The United States Federal Government, in all of its awesome power, has jumped in and sued the State of Arizona at taxpayers' expense, preventing them from enforcing the rule of law in their own State.

The Federal Government doesn't enforce the rule of law on the borders. Just recently, the GAO has reported that only 44 percent of the border is secure. That means somebody else controls the other 56 percent of the southern border, and it is not the United States of America. Arizona is trying to protect its people. The Federal Government won't protect the border, but yet it sues the State of Arizona.

This legislation will prohibit the Federal Government from using its resources and any money to implement the lawsuit against the United States of America v. The State of Arizona and Janice Brewer, the Governor thereof.

It's a very simple amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend for yielding.

This law, and I understand that a point of order has been raised, but this is serious business we're talking about here. The sovereign State of Arizona is being overrun by dangerous people, that being murderers, up and down that border.

I've been to that Arizona border. I've seen the fence being built in Arizona, and I've seen the fence that it replaced, which wouldn't even hold in a pair of goats. And yet we have a flood flowing across this border.

And so what does the Governor of that State do? Steps forward and says that the Federal Government is not meeting its obligation. We are going to protect our citizens.

Now, one of the things that I have been very concerned about—I will yield to my friend in a moment.

One the things I have been very concerned about, as I've watched the judiciary and the legal system develop, is we've learned how to use our court system as a battering ram against our opponents, both our opponents in business and now our opponents in politics and in other places, just to batter them into position. The United States Government should not be battering the State of Arizona into a position that the State believes is contrary to the will of their people.

I now yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I want to thank my friend, Congressman CARTER, for yielding.

You see, the problem I have is that 2 hours ago, 3 hours ago, there was great debate about the States who took on the Federal Government over a question of the constitutionality of ObamaCare; and there was a decision that was rendered, and that's going to go to appeal, and everybody is happy because they agree with the decision.

In Arizona, Arizona decided to pass SB 1070. It went to Federal court. Judge Bolton decided that some sections were constitutional, some were unconstitutional, and we are now going through the process of the Ninth Circuit and probably to the Supreme Court.

So what's good for the goose is good for the gander. So I would tell you, why don't you let the process occur, and that way we'll know whether or not Arizona has the power to deal with immigration and whether or not the States can deal with the constitutional issue of ObamaCare.

Mr. POE of Texas. This issue is an issue of public safety, which is the first obligation of the Federal Government, to protect the people, to protect the homeland. And that is why it's important the Federal Government get out of the way of the State of Arizona trying to protect the good citizens there in Arizona from the drug cartels that are coming into their State.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. FATTAH. I continue to reserve.

□ 1330

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. My strong opposition to this amendment is because it would bar the Department of Justice or any other Federal agency from challenging the constitutionality of this law in Arizona or any other law.

The precedent being set by the Poe amendment, if it were to be adopted, would establish a dangerous new standard. It opens the door to congressional restraints on active pending Department of Justice litigation in a potentially endless variety of cases through backdoor de-funding moves.

The precedent is being set here, and I appreciate the gentleman's point about Arizona working its will; but there are also people that believe in the Constitution, as we all do, who would want to know that the law in Arizona passes constitutional muster. This is what this lawsuit is about. This is why we have separation of powers. This is why we have a Constitution, to protect the interests of all people.

SB 1070, you can support it; I can oppose it. The point being that there is a third part of our government that will decide whether or not this law is constitutional. I believe all of us would like to uphold constitutional laws.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FATTAH. I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, I wish to speak on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, the law does not legislate. In fact, it prohibits legislation. All it does is tell the Department of Justice they can't spend any money on this lawsuit.

I would accept the ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment requires new determinations of Federal officials. Specifically, the amendment would require discernment of what actions amount to continuation of litigation. By limiting funds for the ''continuation'' of a case, the amendment would occasion more than merely incidental decisions as to what tends to continue it.

The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 50 by Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 232 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 214 by Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. PENCE of Indiana.

Amendment No. 533 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment No. 524 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 466 by Mr. POE of Texas.

Amendment No. 575 by Mr. REHBERG of Montana.

Amendment No. 267 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 268 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 83 by Mrs. EMERSON of Missouri.

Amendment No. 89 by Mr. KIND of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 88 by Mr. KIND of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 104 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 148, noes 281, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

AYES—148

Andrews	Clarke (MI)	Edwards
Bachmann	Clarke (NY)	Ellison
Baldwin	Clay	Farr
Barrow	Cleaver	Fattah
Barton (TX)	Coffman (CO)	Filner
Bass (CA)	Cohen	Fudge
Becerra	Conyers	Garamendi
Berman	Costello	Garrett
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Gosar
Blumenauer	Crowley	Griffith (VA)
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Gutierrez
Braley (IA)	Cummings	Hanabusa
Camp	Davis (IL)	Harman
Capps	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Capuano	DeGette	Herrera Beutler
Carnahan	DeLauro	Higgins
Carney	Deutch	Himes
Castor (FL)	Dingell	Hinojosa
Chabot	Doggett	Hirono
Chandler	Doyle	Holt
Chu	Dreier	Honda
Cicilline	Duncan (TN)	Huizenga (MI)

Israel
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kingston
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Napolitano
Noem
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Rokita
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—281

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Cardoza
Giffords
McCollum
Quayle

1358

Messrs. PENCE, MACK, ALEXANDER, SCOTT of South Carolina, BOUSTANY, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, NUGENT, ROHRABACHER, CASSIDY, BACA, BUTTERFIELD, VISCLOSKY, MARCHANT, THOMPSON of Mississippi, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Ms. RICHARDSON changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. GOSAR, LARSON of Connecticut, GARRETT, CLARKE of Michigan, JONES, MANZULLO, FILNER, DAVIS of Illinois, RUSH, GUTIERREZ, COURTNEY, HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. PELOSI changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CANTOR was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Chairman, I will be brief.

First of all, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member DICKS and their incredible staff for the leadership and amazing endurance that they have displayed through this process.

Madam Chairman, they, along with the staff of the Parliamentarian's Office, the Clerk's office, the Congressional Budget Office, the Sergeant at Arms Office, many of the leadership offices, Members' offices, and of course the Capitol Police, have been working around the clock, literally, in order for us to facilitate this debate. So I thank all of the staff.

Madam Chairman, we've had an extraordinary debate, and I want to thank the Members for their patience, their enthusiasm, and their participation in this remarkable development of events in this debate.

□

I would say to Members that all of us want to finish and complete this bill today.

Madam Chairman, I would say, as Members know, we are operating under a unanimous consent agreement; and under that agreement, we still have 18 hours of debate and 103 amendments to go. Now, while none of us want to restrict anyone's ability to speak their piece and voice their opinions, certainly a lot has been said throughout the last 80-some hours of discussion on this bill, so I would ask Members to be mindful of the prudence of being concise and expeditious in their remarks. If we proceed in that vein, Madam Chairman, perhaps we could finish at a reasonable hour this evening.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Leader, I understand your recognizing Mr. ROGERS and Mr. DICKS and others and our staffs for their fabulous work; but I think it would be a shame if we didn't recognize a specific person who has essentially been Mr. ROGERS' right hand during all of this discussion. He is leaving the House at the end of the month to go to the private sector. He is a fabulous, fabulous guy, who is respected on both sides of the aisle.

Let's give Jeff Shockey a hand.

AMENDMENT NO. 232 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. CAPITO). Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 98, noes 331, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

AYES—98

Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capuano
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—331

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Gutierrez
McCollum
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1407

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 214 OFFERED BY MR. KLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 289, noes 136, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

AYES—289

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

NOES—136

Ackerman
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)

Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Markey
Matsui
McCaul
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Sewell
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Clarke (NY)

NOT VOTING—7

Broun (GA)
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
McCollum
Meehan
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1410

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 92, the Kline Amendment No. 214, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 92 I mistakenly voted "no." Please let the RECORD reflect that I intended to vote "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 185, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

AYES—240

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
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
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
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
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)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
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)

NOES—185

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
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
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords
Gutierrez
Harper
Hinojosa
Keating
McCollum
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1413

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 533 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 185, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

AYES—243

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor

Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
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
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
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)

NOES—185

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

NOT VOTING—5

Giffords
Hinojosa
McCollum
Quayle
Woolsey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1417

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 524 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 231, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

AYES—196

Ackerman
Adams
Amash
Baldwin
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—231

Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Maloney
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon

McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
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)
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Aderholt
Giffords
Gutierrez
Hinojosa
McCollum
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1420

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, I inadvertently voted against Amendment No. 524 which would protect our libraries and booksellers from Patriot Act searches and seizures. I change my vote to a "yea," as I did in 2005 when I voted in favor of this very amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 466 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 249, noes 177, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

AYES—249

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
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)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
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
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
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)

NOES—177

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kildee
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)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords
Green, Gene
Grimm
Hinojosa
Kaptur
McCollum
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1423

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GRIMM. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 96, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 96, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 575 OFFERED BY MR. REHBERG

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 187, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

AYES—239

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
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
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
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
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
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
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)

NOES—187

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
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
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
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)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Ellison
Giffords
Hall
Hinojosa
McCollum
Quayle
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1426

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CRAVAACK. Madam Chair, on rollcall vote 97, I mistakenly voted "no." I intended to vote "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, on February 18, 2011, I inadvertently missed rollcall No. 97. Had I been present, I would voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 267 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 187, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

AYES—241

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
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
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
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
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)

NOES—187

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
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
Cooper
Costa
Costello

Courtney
Critz
Crowley
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
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
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)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Giffords
Hinojosa
McCollum
Quayle
Schock

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1429

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 268 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 191, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

AYES—237

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
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
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
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
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
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
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
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)

NOES—191

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
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
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
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
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
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)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Diaz-Balart
Giffords
Hinojosa
McCollum
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1432

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HANNA. Madam Chair, on rollcall vote No. 99, I inadvertently voted "no." I had intended to vote "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MRS. EMERSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 182, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

AYES—246

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
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
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
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
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
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
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
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)

NOES—182

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
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
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
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
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
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)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Giffords
Hall
Hinojosa
McCollum
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1435

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. KIND

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 246, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

AYES—183

Adams
Amash
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Brady (PA)
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Crowley
Culberson
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Hall
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Holt
Honda
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Luján
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nugent
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Polis
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rigell
Rivera
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Terry
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner
West
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—246

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Filner
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Guthrie

Gutierrez
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hirono
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Moore
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Velázquez
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Hinojosa
McCollum
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1440

Messrs. WALBERG, AL GREEN of Texas, MORAN and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Chair, on rollcall 101, I mistakenly voted "no"; however, I intended to vote "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. KIND

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 306, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

AYES—123

Amash
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Camp
Campbell
Capps
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Cooper
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Doggett
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Goodlatte
Griffith (VA)
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hurt
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Keating
Kind
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—306

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carnahan
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Filner
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
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)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Hinojosa
McCollum
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1443

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 147, noes 281, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

AYES—147

Akin
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Canseco
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Davis (KY)
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
LaTourette
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—281

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Giffords
Hinojosa
McCollum
Owens
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 1446

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 103, I inadvertently voted "yea." I intended to vote "nay."

RECOGNIZING CONGRESSWOMAN HARMAN

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Today may well be the last day of a very distinguished career of Congresswoman JANE HARMAN from California. And I want to recognize JANE in the well, and you can say a few words, and then we will have some other people making brief comments.

JANE.

Ms. HARMAN. Thank you, NORM DICKS, my longest-standing, certainly not my oldest, friend in the House, and thank you, colleagues.

My congressional career will close on February 28 so that the constitutionally required special election to replace me can coincide with a statewide referendum Governor Brown intends to hold in California later this year. This timing will save taxpayer money, a very good thing, ensure a higher turnout, and most quickly fill the vacancy created by my resignation.

The messages that have flooded my offices since I have announced my departure have touched me deeply. The extraordinary honor of a congratulatory statement by the President was completely unexpected and absolutely thrilling. But the message I may treasure most came from one of my four children. It said simply, ''Brave Mama.''

For 17 years, I have worked my heart out for the people of California's 36th Congressional District. I cast votes with which some strongly disagreed, but I have always tried my best to listen and lead.

The opportunity awaiting me at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars is enormous, following in the footsteps of our former Member, Lee Hamilton. It is truly a center of excellence and a place where I believe I can add real value to bipartisan scholarship and policymaking. But nothing—and I mean nothing—will ever replace the two-decade long journey I have just completed as I sought and won a seat in Congress, my first and only elected office.

I have worked closely with many of you in committees and caucuses, like the Blue Dogs and the New Democrats, and on legislation. With some here, I have visited garden spots, like North Korea, Libya, Syria, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Yemen, to assess the threats we face. And those threats, as you all know, are extremely serious. Such foreign travel is, I believe, a wonderful way to build personal bipartisan friendships, something dearly needed here.

As a lifelong, passionate, ''bipartisan in my bones'' Democrat, I have been criticized by both sides. But the center is where, in my view, most Americans are and where, in many cases, the best policy answers are. I will bring that perspective with me to my new post at the Wilson Center.

Let me make two final points.

First, over the years, I have worked hard to hire and train the best staff on the planet.

□ 1450

We call ourselves Team Harman. And at annual reunions, I marvel at how they and their families have grown. I truly love them and know how their extraordinary efforts are appreciated by my constituents and by other offices.

And second, I always say that I represent the smartest constituents on earth. This is not a joke. They have

helped me enormously to do my job well. Sidney, my young Sidney and I, and our ever-growing family thank them for the milestones and the memories. I may be changing my day job, but not my residence or my heart.

So as I conclude my final statement on the floor of this House, I depart with great affection and gratitude to wonderful colleagues, to very longstanding friends, to a leadership with whom I have worked closely, to my sisters from California and throughout the United States, on both sides of the aisle, all of you have become valued, valued, valued, very valued friends. And I thank you, again, for the honor of serving with you.

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. To our valued, valued, valued friend, JANE HARMAN, to a proud Californian, to a great leader in our country, I know I speak for everyone in this Congress on this occasion when I say we have been proud to call you colleague and, again, for many of us, to value you as a friend.

JANE's contribution to our country is one as a patriot. Not only for her great service in the Congress of the United States, but she and her family, her young Sidney, have been a source of strength to our country, whether it comes to security, our national security, the arts, or the education of the next generation.

We all know that our first responsibility is to keep the American people safe. No one has done more in that regard than JANE HARMAN, and also in conveying the values of our great Nation throughout the world. The Woodrow Wilson Center is fortunate indeed to have her leadership. It will be a great combination.

And so I say, JANE, we all choke up when we hear you say it's your last statement on the floor. We have all benefited from your wisdom. We congratulate you and send you off with great love, brave mama.

Mr. DICKS. I now yield to the Democratic Whip, the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Washington State for yielding, and I thank the leader for her remarks.

JANE HARMAN and I have known each other for almost half a century. We in fact grew up together in many ways, became involved in public service, and I have seen her grow into one of the great leaders in this country on issues of national security.

National security is one of the most bipartisan issues with which we deal. Everyone knows that we swear an oath to defend the Constitution and laws of this Nation, and that we have a responsibility to ensure the safety of our country and the safety of our people. Few among us have taken more to heart that responsibility than JANE HARMAN of California.

JANE, of course, as all of you know, served on the Intelligence Committee. She served on the Intelligence Committee as ranking member for a long period of time. And if you ask the people in the intelligence community or in the defense community—and of course she served on the staff of the Department of Defense as well in a number of administrations—they will tell you that JANE HARMAN is as knowledgeable, as incisive, as thoughtful, as analytical as anybody with whom they have dealt in the Congress of the United States. We will be a lesser Congress for her leaving us and have less of an expertise, although many experts we still have.

JANE has been a voice to the American people on the focus that we have needed to keep our country safe and to confront those terrorists who would put us at risk.

JANE, we owe you a debt of gratitude, your constituents owe you a debt of gratitude, and your country owes you a debt of gratitude.

The sadness of your leaving is leavened somewhat by the fact that you will continue to be involved and your expertise will continue to be available in your new position as the leader of the Woodrow Wilson Center, a distinguished center of thought and focus on issues of international security and policy.

We thank you for your service. We wish you the very best. And we are so glad to know that you are just a few blocks down the road so that we will be able to call upon you to give your very thoughtful insights, analysis, and advice to the issues that confront this Nation and all of us, Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, which, as you rightly point out, is not an issue of ideology but of practical safety for our citizens and Nation.

Thank you, dear friend. Thank you, dear colleague. Thank you, dear American leader.

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from California, our former chairman of the Appropriations Committee and Defense Subcommittee, Mr. LEWIS, our good friend.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

As Arlene and I were sharing thoughts about you, dear JANE, she expressed some consternation that she had not been able to find a young Sid. But, nonetheless, she suggested she was going to put up with me anyway.

JANE, we have admired your work for all of my life in public affairs. Since I have been in the Congress you have become a wonderful friend as well as a policy partner. I can't tell you how much I have enjoyed our years together on the Intelligence Committee.

Our work on behalf of our national security together hand in hand has been very important to Arlene and myself. You are a wonderful person, a wonderful personality, and we love you and wish you well as you go forward, JANE.

Mr. DICKS. I have known JANE for 42 years. She was a staff assistant to Senator Tunney when I was a staff assistant to Senator Magnuson. We have worked together as colleagues ever since. We love Sidney. We are so excited that there still is a Woodrow Wilson Center for you to go to. We appreciate your great service to our country and thank you for everything that you have done.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. I know we have lots of work to do here and we have gone through an extraordinary process over the last few days, but the moment I heard something was being said about my friend JANE HARMAN, I wanted to rush downstairs to say that when I think of JANE HARMAN, I think of the quintessential individual committed to bipartisanship.

She has always worked to reach across the aisle, whether it's dealing with national security and foreign policy issues or domestic issues or, for us, issues as we share the representation of Los Angeles area.

□ 1500

And I want to say that the Woodrow Wilson Center is going to be—we all respected Lee Hamilton—but an even greater place now with JANE HARMAN there.

Mr. DICKS. JANE, we wish you well at the Woodrow Wilson Center. Lee Hamilton did a fantastic job. We know you will too.

AMENDMENT NO. 336 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not later than 90 after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall, jointly—

(1) study the effect that this Act will have on job levels; and

(2) report the findings of the study in the Employment Situation Report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I yield myself 4½ minutes.

My amendment is very simple and very straightforward. It would simply append to the end of the bill a requirement that not later than 90 days after

the enactment of H.R. 1, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall jointly conduct a study that would illustrate the effect that this act will have on job levels and, second, that these effects will be reported on a monthly basis to the American people on the first Friday of each month.

We have competing visions of what the effect of H.R. 1 will be. We have the Economic Policy Institute, which has estimated that the implications of H.R. 1 will be a job loss of over 800,000. We have the Center for American Progress saying that the result of passing H.R. 1 will be a job loss of 650,000 jobs directly and 325,000 indirect jobs lost.

And then we have Speaker BOEHNER. Speaker BOEHNER says, and I'm quoting him exactly, he says that if we reduce spending, we'll create a better environment for job creation in America.

And so very simply put, what my amendment does is it finds out who's right. Is the Economic Policy Institute right? Is the Center for American Progress right? Or is Speaker BOEHNER and others who believe that this will in fact create jobs?

And let me say why I am so focused on this.

H.R. 1 cuts funding for the Office of Science by 20 percent, $1.1 billion; and it cuts funding by 40 percent for the energy efficiency and renewable energy program. These are the two programs that support a Department of Energy lab in my district. That is the second largest employer in my district.

And so I asked the administrators of the lab to tell me what the implications would be. So this is one set of cuts in one district on one facility. And what the implications will be would be a layoff of a third of the workforce and the shutdown of two very important analytical pieces of equipment that attract 3,300 scientists from all over the world.

So we would lay off a third of my constituents, and we would reduce the number of scientists who use this facility by 3,300. So that's 3,300 people not staying in our hotels, not renting our cars, not eating in our restaurants, not buying their coffee in our delis.

That's just one district, one facility, one decision.

Let us find out whether or not this bill, H.R. 1, will in fact be the engine of job creation that the majority has presented it to be, or will it destroy jobs as we believe it will and as the Center for Academic Progress believes that it will.

With that, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman and rise to support his amendment.

We should have a quantifiable way of finding out the impact of this continuing resolution on job creation. What else could be more important than that?

There was an examination of the jobs that came out of the economic recovery program. If this continuing resolution would be enacted into law, will the unemployment rate decrease? Will wages go up for middle class families? Will this continuing resolution help to turn the economy around?

I would think that the majority would welcome the opportunity to verify their claim that the continuing resolution would create jobs. Let's prove us wrong. We believe that it will destroy jobs. Prove us wrong—unless you feel that if jobs are lost, so be it.

So why not have the Bureau of Labor Statistics work on these critical issues? And I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, what are you afraid of?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' The amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chairman, I am prepared to accept your ruling on the point of order, but I would like to make this comment.

And the comment is, Why would you not want to have the information that this amendment would elicit? It's very important information. We all know that our actions have consequences. We all know that the Republican leadership promised us the most transparent Congress in history.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman is not addressing the point of order.

The Chair finds that this amendment imposes new duties. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

□ 1510

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) having assumed the chair, Mrs. CAPITO, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

MAKING IN ORDER FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 92 and the order of the House of February 17, 2011, it shall be in order for the chair or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments specified in the order of the House of February 17 not earlier disposed of, and that amendments so offered shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by said chair and ranking minority member, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. DICKS. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object. This is for the Members who want to voluntarily enter into this arrangement.

Is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DICKS. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 92 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

□ 1510

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) 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, with Mrs. CAPITO (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 336 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 359, line 22.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the chair or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations may offer certain amendments en bloc, to be considered under the terms of that order.

AMENDMENT NO. 414 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by division B of this Act may be used for the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Manhattan, Kansas.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chair, I yield myself 3 minutes.

My amendment is very straightforward. It would simply stipulate that none of the funds available in this act may be used to further the construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Manhattan, Kansas, commonly referred to as NBAF.

NBAF, in my view, is a government boondoggle that anyone concerned about fiscally responsible behavior should want to be stopped. Anyone who is concerned about fiscally responsible behavior should be supporting my amendment.

Here are the facts:

NBAF was originally estimated to cost $451 million. Current estimates are that the cost will be in excess of $915 million.

The Department of Homeland Security has consistently stated that the sale of Plum Island in my district would cover the cost of NBAF. This is not even remotely accurate. Any reasonable estimate of the cost of Plum Island will be no better than $80 million.

Why should the American taxpayer invest $1 billion in this project with hardly any offset for a project that is essentially redundant?

Now my friends from Kansas—and I certainly understand their interest—have criticized this amendment as constituting parochial politics. And I would say, with respect to my friends, that I don't see anything parochial about trying to shield the American taxpayer from an investment of $1 billion in a facility that we do not need.

So I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I would urge my colleagues who are concerned about spending—and every one of us in this Chamber is concerned about spending—here's an opportunity to cut spending that we simply do not need.

Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman form North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I commend the gentleman from New York for raising this issue, and I thank him for the time.

As he knows, I've had a longstanding concern about the decision to relocate the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility to the mainland without a comprehensive and validated strategy to prevent the release of harmful pathogens into the community.

When I was chairman of the subcommittee overseeing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security, I championed a requirement that prohibited the use of funds in fiscal 2010 for NBAF construction until a site-specific risk assessment was completed and the results were validated by the National Academy of Sciences. This work was completed last November and the results were somewhat disconcerting with respect to the possible release of foot and mouth disease.

Now the Department of Homeland Security believes that this risk is exaggerated and does not take into account planned mitigation strategies. So I appreciate the language in the continuing resolution that requires a revised risk assessment once the facility is 50 percent designed and that this assessment be again reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences. This is good oversight, but this must be done before DHS can responsibly provide construction funding for NBAF.

I would prefer to condition funds on completion of this additional oversight; however, I also recognize that there are no funds in the underlying CR for NBAF in fiscal 2011, making such a conditioning of funds unnecessary. Therefore, I have no objection to my friend from New York's approach.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chairman, there is broad consensus that construction and eventual operation of this facility is crucial to our national security. This language that we have included in the CR will help ensure that we get this project done while existing firm oversight and risk costs are being considered.

We have included rigorous oversight language in the CR requiring the Science and Technology to revise its risk analysis once it has completed 50 percent of the design planning of the facility, at which time it will have fully incorporated the Department's planned biosafety security measures. The CR also provides for the National Academy of Sciences to review the revised analysis.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In 2009, after an exhaustive 3-year review, the Department of Homeland Security chose Manhattan, Kansas, as the site for the new National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility.

NBAF will be a cutting-edge research facility, and it will accelerate our Nation's ability to protect ourselves, our food supply, and our economy from biological threats. It will become the world's premiere animal health research facility and further solidify our Nation's place as the international leader in animal health research.

NBAF has the support of both the Bush and Obama administrations. In fact, this week, President Obama included $150 million in his budget to begin its construction. This inclusion shows a commitment from the President and Secretary Napolitano to see that this cutting-edge facility moves forward as planned so we can safely conduct critical research to develop vaccines and countermeasures in order to protect the public and our livestock from the threats of devastating disease.

Simply put, this debate should be about our national security, not parochial politics. In this age of uncertainty and global threats, conducting vital research to protect our Nation could not be more crucial, and the truth of the matter is we are dangerously underprotected from the threat of a biological attack against our people and food. In fact, the bipartisan Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism recently issued a report card that gave the Federal Government a failing grade for efforts to prevent a biological attack.

We need to protect our food and our families from danger. We need to stay on the cutting edge of this research field. Our security is at risk, and delaying this project further because the gentleman from New York would prefer to preserve a stunningly outdated lab that just happens to be in his district is not an option. We need to move forward and we need NBAF.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this destructive amendment.

□ 1520

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER).

Mr. YODER. I rise today in strong opposition to the Bishop amendment.

Madam Chair, reports indicate that the most imminent, critical threat to our Nation's homeland security is a biological attack that could result in a serious food crisis brought on by disease spread by terrorists hoping to infect cattle and other livestock in the agriculture production in this country. Simply put, the results could be devastating.

The National Bio and Agro Defense facility, a safe, secure agricultural and bio-containment lab, is the proper facility to research and protect American agriculture from the threats that exist, both foreign and abroad, from agriculture bioterrorism.

I ask my colleagues today to join me in an effort to oppose the Bishop amendment, which would turn back the clock in our efforts to combat biological terrorism and which would save

the country no money in the name of stopping this very worthy project.

The facts on NBAF are clear.

The Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission's report, The Clock Is Ticking, indicates that the most imminent threat to our Nation's homeland security is a biological attack.

The same Commission gives our Nation a failing grade in our ability to recognize, respond to and recover from a biological attack.

Current and previous Administrations have affirmed these threats and the need to prepare and respond.

Currently, the Plum Island Animal Disease Center is where much of the Biosafety Level-3 Agricultural research is performed. However, this facility was built in the 1950s, is nearing the end of its lifecycle, and does not contain the necessary biosafety level facilities to meet the NBAF research requirements.

A rigorous, three-year site selection process for the NBAF was conducted by civil servants and independent experts in the Departments of Homeland Security and Agriculture.

Nearly 30 potential locations were reviewed all around the country, including Plum Island. After thorough risk, environmental, and security assessments were completed, Manhattan, Kansas was unanimously selected as the best place on the merits to carry out the NBAF's essential research mission.

NBAF in Manhattan, Kansas will be a state-of-the-art biocontainment facility for the study of foreign animal, emerging and zoonotic (transmitted from animals to humans) diseases that threaten the U.S. animal agriculture and public health.

The selection process was affirmed by the DHS Inspector General, was conducted in accordance with Federal regulations and was fair.

The funding for the NBAF was included in the budget and was not an earmark. The funding will be matched by more than $150 million from the State of Kansas and will also be offset by the sale of the antiquated Plum Island facility. The State of Kansas has already spent $18 million to prepare for the NBAF site.

It is crucial that we do not turn this discussion on the spending reductions our government must take into a debate between states. Funding of NBAF is not a local issue, it is a national issue rooted in our national security.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, let me just say again that there is broad consensus that the construction and eventual operation of this facility are crucial to our national security.

This amendment reflects a well-crafted, stringent oversight requirement that was developed on a bipartisan basis with the ranking member of this subcommittee, so I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 519 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) for the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security is hereby reduced by 3.5 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Madam Chairwoman, Secretary Gates and Secretary Clinton have said that our debt is a national security issue. Indeed, it is. They are correct. When you look at our debt, it is a function of multiple deficits. The largest spending item we have in the Federal Government are the entitlements, but number two is defense.

We cannot reduce our deficit substantially and deal with our debt problem without reducing the costs of our number one and number two expenses. This amendment deals with number two, which are the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security. In the bill before us, those Departments have a roughly 1 percent increase in spending. We are trying to reduce the deficit here, and we have increased Defense and Homeland Security.

What this amendment would do is turn that 1 percent increase into a roughly 2½ percent decrease in spending. Now, it is across the board, although it does not affect overseas contingency operations. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan will be unaffected. However, the opposition will come up in a moment and decry how this is somehow going to devastate the country and make us unable to defend ourselves. I submit that that is not the case, and let me give you a few reasons.

First of all, this funding is 98 percent of last year's funding. Any organization, including the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security, ought to be able to complete their missions and serve their constituencies for 98 percent of last year's costs.

Second, there are 755,000 civilian employees in the Department of Defense. That is one civilian employee for every two uniformed personnel. Do we really need that many civilian employees in the Department of Defense?

Third, there are many weapons systems funded in the Defense Department which the Defense Department does not want. They are there because of influential Members of Congress who have put them in. Defense has always been the most earmarked section of the entire budget.

Fourth, there are many items in Defense that are unrelated to defense. Spenders in this House have figured out that if they put in unrelated spending—environmental spending, medical research, other things in the Department of Defense—it will be shielded from being reduced. That should not be the case.

Fifth, since 2006, defense spending has increased by 32 percent, in a period of almost no inflation, while the war in Iraq was winding down.

We must learn how to defend this country for less, and we can do that. There are plenty of things we can do. We need to defend our country against vulnerabilities; but our debt, which is now 47 percent held by foreigners—and that percentage is increasing—is a greater threat to the security of this country than any aircraft carrier. It is a greater threat than any military force out there. We have to deal with that, but we can't deal with this debt unless we include the large spending in the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security and defend this country for less.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. The CR that we are debating here, and have been for the last couple of days, strikes the right balance between sustaining programs that are crucial to our Nation's security and keeping our discretionary spending in check.

This CR doesn't make a choice between fiscal discipline and security. It supports both, and it does so in a responsible manner. In fact, the CR significantly reduces the funding available to the Department of Homeland Security by more than $1 billion, and it fully pays for FEMA's $1.6 billion disaster relief shortfall.

Madam Chair, this CR attempts to carefully cut the fat out of the Department of Homeland Security and does so in a way that does not harm vital security operations. The gentleman's amendment cuts everything across the Department, and that is both unnecessary and potentially harmful, especially at a time of heightened threats and terrorist activity.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The Department of Defense was not spared from cuts. The bill already slashes $15 billion from the President's request for FY11. This amendment would take it down another $18 billion, or $33 billion in total. I am concerned that the levels of cuts proposed by the gentleman from California go too far and will adversely affect many defense readiness programs. Just as I have said about cuts in other areas, this is not time to take a hatchet to these programs.

The amendment would cause DOD to terminate contracts, which will, in turn, force companies to lay off employees. Defense spending cannot, of course, be justified simply by jobs; but at the same time, the prospect of adding to our unemployment just as we are emerging from the recession should be a consideration.

In total, the Office of Secretary of Defense has identified 124 major acquisition programs that would be significantly disrupted by approaching the FY10 funding levels. Dropping funding by an additional $18 billion to reach the 3.5 percent reduction would seriously disrupt the readiness and safety of our forces.

This is a very bad amendment; and on a bipartisan basis, we should defeat it.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I join with the ranking member in opposing this amendment. The current allocation for defense is already $14.8 billion below the fiscal year 2011 request, an almost 3 percent reduction; and of course our committee wants to help to address the Federal deficit, too, as do other committees. Further, arbitrary reductions, especially of this magnitude of over $23.5 billion, will basically bring the Department of Defense to a grinding halt, perhaps one beyond what is reasonable.

Specifically, the amendment would require reducing and canceling training for returning troops; canceling Navy training exercises; reducing Air Force flight training; delaying or canceling the maintenance of aircraft, ships or vehicles; delaying important safety and quality-of-life repairs to facilities and military barracks.

At a time of war, we should be showing support for our troops and not undercutting them, even though for good reasons, in order to lower the Federal deficit by making reductions of this amount.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the ranking member of the subcommittee on Homeland Security, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which reduces funding for the Department of Homeland Security by 3½ percent. Under the CR, funding for Homeland Security is already 3 percent below the 2010 enacted level.

□ 1530

The $1.56 billion in supplemental disaster needs funded in this bill already cuts deep into Homeland Security programs. An additional 3.5 percent reduction would dangerously weaken our security. If this reduction were adopted, critical programs such as border security, disaster relief, immigration enforcement, and transportation security would no longer be shielded from ill-advised cuts.

The Department would be required to lay off critical staff we have hired over the past 2 years, including Border Patrol agents, CBP officers at the ports of entry, ICE investigators along the southwest border, and the Secret Service agents that respond to heightened threats against the President.

This reduction would mean the Department would need to abandon critical technology procurements that would better protect our aviation and transit system against possible attacks.

In short, Madam Chair, this amendment is ill advised in the extreme. I urge Members to vote ''no.''

Mr. ADERHOLT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Alabama has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

First I would like to commend Chairman ROGERS and his staff, because I am sure they have tried to do as much as they thought they possibly could in what would get through the Senate.

But I rise at this time to especially commend the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for making what I consider to be a very courageous amendment. He knows that this amendment is probably not going to get many votes, but I will tell you, this amendment makes a very important point and sends a very powerful message, and that is that nothing should be left off the table. There should be no sacred cows.

As he has pointed out, as the gentleman from California has pointed out, the Pentagon actually receives an increase under this bill. But we can no longer afford to have higher military spending than all the other nations of the world combined.

We are facing an astounding $1.6 trillion deficit, a $14 trillion debt, and there is no way we can come even anywhere close to doing what we should do if we leave any departments or agencies off or make them not look for savings.

The President's commission on the debt said that very thing. They said that the Pentagon was going to have to look for savings. And as far as Homeland Security, The Wall Street Journal had an editorial that they noticed that we were voting for almost anything and everything if it had the word ''security'' attached, and they said from now on we should give four times the weight and twice the scrutiny to anything that had the word ''security'' in it.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, let me just reiterate again that the gentleman's proposed cuts just go too far. They would undoubtedly cut and harm border security, transportation security, maritime security, cargo security, cybersecurity, immigration enforcement, and disaster preparedness. The list of crucial programs that would be adversely impacted by this across-the-board amendment goes on and on.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 246 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for beach replenishment projects by the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, my amendment would prevent funding of the U.S. Army Corps' beach replenishment program and projects. Authorized at $91 million for 2011, up almost a billion dollars over the next decade, the Army Corps plans to replenish sand at certain beaches to slow the course of erosion.

First and foremost, this is not a proper constitutional function for the Federal Government. Each beach community, along with their local government, should decide how they will best approach erosion. As the primary beneficiaries, they can best decide their needs and financial priorities.

The top-down system currently employed comes from a flawed mindset, a mindset that we must address if we hope to escape our spending crisis, a mindset that the Federal Government does everything for everybody. This is simply Federal spending that we cannot afford and Federal control that we don't need.

I ask that my colleagues support my amendment to defund this now and work with me to strip this and other similar projects from future budgets as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MACK). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's concern over responsible spending and the need to address the Nation's deficit problem. That's why our continuing resolution before us reduces spending by historic proportions.

Where I differ from my colleague is whether there is a Federal interest in beach replenishment projects. Beach replenishment projects aren't just about dumping sand on shores so people can have fun. These projects provide States with protection from coastal storms for individuals and businesses, and these projects must meet the same standards of economic justification and cost benefit ratios as other levee projects and navigation projects.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), former chairman of the committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As much as I admire and respect the introducer of this amendment, I really have to oppose this amendment.

The beaches are an important and a valued asset to the United States of America. Economically, they are a huge economic factor. For protection of properties on land, it is a huge protection device, beaches against the hurricane, the storm surge.

You might get the idea that I represent a district that has a lot of beaches, and I would tell you that this is extremely important to our economy. When the BP oil spill was flowing through the Gulf of Mexico, we worried every day whether that was going to come to our beaches.

In my part of the State it did not, thank God. But we were concerned what that might do to destroy a major part of our economy.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN makes a strong argument, and I thank him for letting me support him in his opposition.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield 1 minute to the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I understand there is a school of thought that we should just let nature take its way. But on the west coast of Washington State, we have from time to time had to come out and put in replenishment projects to save cities and save housing. We have done this with the Corps of Engineers very effectively using the best science.

In Mississippi, they have a big Army Corps center where they study how to do these things. And, it does cost a little bit of money, but we are saving assets, and billions and billions of dollars.

I just think that this is a very unfortunate amendment, and we should, in a bipartisan basis, defeat it and let the Corps do what it has to do to save cities and coastal areas across America.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a fellow member of the committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to say to my friend from Athens, Georgia, where you do not have beaches, you know that the local share, once the Corps of Engineers does a cost-benefit analysis, which it always does, there is a requirement the State and the local government kick in. The State gives a pretty good amount of money. But the reason why they may be more motivated from a economic basis is they directly benefit from the economic impact.

I do agree with you the Federal Government should not be worried about the economic impact, but where the Federal Government is most concerned is in flood control. As you and I know, the more sand you have in between you and the high tide when the hurricane comes, the more protected you are going to be.

And as long as we have FEMA that writes checks after disasters and a National Flood Insurance Program, there is a good reason that the Federal Government is involved with beach renourishment.

□ 1540

It has nothing to do with recreation, really less to do with economics, but a heck of a lot to do with flood protection. And that is why the Federal Government is involved in it. So to my friend from Athens, you are welcome to come down to Tybee Island anytime you want to despite this irresponsible amendment of yours. But I am going to oppose it, and welcome you to come. Bring your own suntan oil.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire about time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield the remaining minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Beach replenishment is an economic engine for shore towns and for the tourism industry. It ultimately creates jobs. And also it's based on an Army Corps cost-benefit analysis that says for every dollar we spend on beach replenishment we save $2 or $3, depending on the cost-benefit analysis, that doesn't have to get paid by the Federal Government during a hurricane or northeaster or other disaster.

So beach replenishment actually saves the Federal Government money. It has to, otherwise the projects are not authorized by the Army Corps of Engineers. In addition to that, there is no way that local municipalities would be able to afford to do this. Many of them are very small; they have a few thousand people. I use my own State of New Jersey as an example. So you would be cutting off any kind of beach replenishment, any kind of protection in the event of a storm. And ultimately having to pay out those dollars in FEMA down the road makes no sense.

This is actually something that will cost the Federal Government money over the long run, and it is very ill-advised for that reason alone.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I love beaches at Tybee Island, and my friend from Florida's beaches, as well as my friend from Washington's beaches, as well as my friend from Oregon's beaches. In these hard economic times, I think it's just absolutely incredible that we are spending this kind of money, almost a billion dollars over the next 10 years, just for beach replenishment.

I yield 1 minute to my friend from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this underappreciated subject. He is raising an issue that I think is sensitive and frankly deserves far more consideration than it has been given by Congress.

There is great debate, frankly, about the science of artificial beach construction. Part of the concern about the cycle of the Federal Government routinely bailing people out is, in fact some locational decisions in the first place. The cost allocation can be quite variable. There have been real questions about some of the projects that have been dictated. In fact, in one instance actually a Corps of Engineers item on artificial beach replacement embedded in a reauthorization was one of the biggest public works projects over the course of 50 years, and really didn't get appropriate scrutiny.

Now, whether you think extreme weather events are part of climate change caused by humans or whether it's part of a natural cycle of weather, the gentleman is spotlighting a very significant long-term area of Federal responsibility.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. And if we're not careful, the taxpayer could be on the hook for a great deal more money. There are some cases that the beaches in question aren't even available to the public. And the concern about some of the artificial beach construction techniques, of fortification and putting additional sand, actually deflects the problems further up along the coast. This can create more problems in other places and make them more severe.

So I appreciate the gentleman putting the spotlight on this question. I think it is important that every Member of Congress look at the history of

these projects, the long-term obligations, and look for ways that we might be able to do this in a way that's more fiscally responsible and environmentally sensitive. And I thank him for the time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for weighing in on this. Certainly the science is questionable, as a lot of science is questionable on the policy that we generate; but it's also fiscally irresponsible I think to spend this kind of money. And so I hope that my colleagues will support this commonsense, fiscally responsible amendment and vote for my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 263 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay any dues to the United Nations.

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of House proceedings.

Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

558. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sodium and Potassium salts of N-alkyl (C8-C18)-beta-iminodipropionic acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0098; FRL-8861-9] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

559. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0982; FRL-8859-6] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

560. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — n-Octyl alcohol and n-Decyl alcohol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0181; FRL-8860-7] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

561. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — (S,S)-Ethylenediamine Disuccinic Acid Trisodium Salt; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0733; FRL-8860-6] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

562. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyprodinil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0385; FRL-8860-3] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

563. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Isobutane; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0676; FRL-8860-4] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

564. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bispyribac-sodium; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0796; FRL-8860-2] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

565. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revocation of Requirements for Full-Size Baby Cribs and Non-Full-Size Baby Cribs received January 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

566. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Additional Air Quality Designations for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards, 110(k)(6) Correction and Technical Correction Related to Prior Designation, and Decisions Related to the 1997 Air Quality Designations and Classifications for the Annual Fine Particles National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2007-0562; EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0163; FRL-9261-3] (RIN: 2060-AQ30) received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

567. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination Of Attainment for PM10; Columbia Falls and Libby Nonattainment Areas, Montana [EPA-R08-OAR-2010-0749; FRL-9260-6] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

568. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revision to Definitions; Construction Permit Program; Regulation 3 [EPA-R08-OAR-2007-1027; FRL-9251-1] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

569. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory, Reasonable Further Progress Plan, Contingency Measures, Reasonably Available Control Measures, and Transportation Conformity Budgets for the Pennsylvania Portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City 1997 8-Hour Moderate Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0552; FRL-9262-7] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

570. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alaska: Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Permitting Authority and Tailoring Rule Revision [EPA-R10-OAR-2010-0921; FRL-9257-1] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

571. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Florida: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R04-RCRA-2010-0810; FRL-9262-2] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

572. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — North Carolina: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R04-RCRA-2009-0962; FRL-9261-9] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 795. A bill to expand small-scale hydropower; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 796. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to ensure that the receipts and disbursements of the Social Security trust funds are not included in a unified Federal budget and to provide that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social

Security solvency by mandating that Trust Fund monies cannot be diverted to create private accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 797. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply payroll taxes to remuneration up to the contribution and benefit base and to remuneration in excess of $250,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CRITZ, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey):

H.R. 798. A bill to require the establishment of a Consumer Price Index for Elderly Consumers to compute cost-of-living increases for Social Security and Medicare benefits under titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AUSTRIA (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 799. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Colonel Charles Young Home in Xenia, Ohio as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. SHULER, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 800. A bill to make the E-verify program permanent, and to provide for penalties to enforce compliance with the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and the Judiciary, 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. CRAVAACK (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 801. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to vehicle weight limitations applicable to the Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 802. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a VetStar Award Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 803. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase vocational rehabilitation and employment assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 804. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of certain veterans who serve in support of Operation New Dawn for hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 805. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to educate certain staff of the Department of Veterans Affairs and to inform veterans about the Injured and Amputee Veterans Bill of Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 806. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the services provided for homeless veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 807. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal the prohibition on collective bargaining with respect to matters and questions regarding compensation of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs other than rates of basic pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POLIS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FARR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 808. A bill to establish a Department of Peace; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 809. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to display in each facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs a Women Veterans Bill of Rights; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 810. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the tolling of the timing of review for appeals of final decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 811. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reimburse certain volunteers who provide funeral honors details at the funerals of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 812. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 813. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the period of time for which a veteran must be totally disabled before the veteran's survivors are eligible for the benefits provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for survivors of certain veterans rated totally disabled at time of death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 814. A bill to provide Medicare payments to Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities for items and services provided to Medicare-eligible veterans for non-service-connected conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 815. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 816. A bill to prevent the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act from establishing health care provider standards of care in medical malpractice or medical product liability cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. HERGER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 817. A bill to amend the Antiquities Act of 1906 to place additional requirements on the establishment of national monuments under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 818. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Uintah Water Conservancy District; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 819. A bill to prohibit Members of Congress and the President from receiving pay during Government shutdowns; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on 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. PAYNE (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. POLIS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 820. A bill to aid and support pediatric involvement in reading and education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROSS of Florida:

H.R. 821. A bill to require zero-based budgeting for departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 822. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. DENT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. LONG, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BONNER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. GERLACH):

H.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants from the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry and Standards of Performance for Portland Cement Plants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. DICKS):

H.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. WU, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. HOLT):

H. Res. 104. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Res. 105. A resolution congratulating Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc., on the historic milestone of 100 years of serving local and international communities, maintaining a commitment to the betterment of mankind, and enriching the lives of collegiate men throughout the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H. Res. 106. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that defense systems, including the helicopter fleet used to transport the President of the United States, should not be procured, directly or indirectly, from an entity controlled, directed, or influenced by the Government of China; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H. Res. 107. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Education and the Workforce in the One Hundred Twelfth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. PELOSI:

H.R. 823. A bill for the relief of Maria Carmen Castro Ramirez and J. Refugio Carreno Rojas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 824. A bill for the relief of Daniel Wachira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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.

[Omitted from the Record of February, 14, 2011]

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 685.

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

Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

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. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 795.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 796.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power . . . To borrow Money on the credit of the United States.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 797.

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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 798.

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. AUSTRIA:

H.R. 799.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 800.

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

Article I, Section 8: To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. CRAVAACK:

H.R. 801.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 802.

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

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 803.

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

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 804.

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

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

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 805.

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

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

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 806.

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

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

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 807.

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

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

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 809.

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

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

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 810.

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

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

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 811.

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

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

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 812.

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

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

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 813.

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

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

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 814.

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

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

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 815.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 816.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, Congress has power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers'' when the need exists to clarify existing law.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 817.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 818.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 819.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 and

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 820.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROSS of Florida:

H.R. 821.

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

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 822.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, Commerce Clause

By Ms. PELOSI:

H.R. 823.

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

Article I, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to ''establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization''. The Supreme Court has long found that this provision of the Constitution grants Congress plenary power over immigration policy. As the Court found in Galvan v. Press, 347 U.S. 522, 531 (1954), ''that the formulation of policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and their right to remain here] is entrusted exclusively to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government.'' And, as the Court found in Kleindienst v. Mandel, 408 U.S. 753, 766 (1972) (quoting Boutilier v. INS, 387 U.S. 118, 123 (1967)), ''[t]he Court without exception has sustained Congress' 'plenary power to make rules for the admission of aliens and to exclude those who possess those characteristics which Congress has forbidden.' ''

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 824.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 42.

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

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

By Ms. PELOSI:

H.J. Res. 43.

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

The principle 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 I 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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 4: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 5: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 10: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 24: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 27: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. WU, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COHEN, Mr. REYES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 73: Mr. CANSECO, Mr. REYES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. STARK, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. CHU, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 96: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Mr. CRAVAACK.

H.R. 104: Mr. UPTON and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 140: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 150: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 191: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 198: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 217: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 218: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 238: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 263: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 280: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 308: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 324: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 360: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 401: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 412: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 436: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 440: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 450: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 452: Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 456: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 458: Mr. STARK and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 459: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 484: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 509: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 535: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.

H.R. 539: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 546: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ISSA, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 567: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 609: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 613: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 651: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 659: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 674: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 675: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 688: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 689: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 690: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 694: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 704: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 709: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 718: Mr. OWENS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 729: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 736: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 740: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 758: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 780: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 782: Mr. CRAVAACK.
H.R. 783. Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 793: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. TIPTON, and Ms. BUERKLE.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. HECK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. BUERKLE, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.J. Res. 37: Mr. BOREN and Mr. PETERSON.
H. Res. 25: Mr. HECK, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H. Res. 60: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H. Res. 81: Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 88: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WELCH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. SIRES, Mr. REYES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FARR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. WU, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ISSA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H. Res. 90: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BACA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CANSECO, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. LEVIN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, after four years of complete neglect by the Democratic majority, the San Joaquin Valley of California is in utter shambles. The previous Congress inexplicably and utterly failed to comprehend that shutting off the water supply to an agricultural economy would create economic devastation. As a result, unemployment rates rose to 20% and are as high as 40% in some parts of the Valley.

For the past several years, I have fought to restore the water flow and bring back the lost jobs. Every attempt I made to offer legislation was rebuffed by the Democrat majority. Instead, they chose poverty over prosperity and environmental activists over farm workers. The message sent to families in the San Joaquin Valley was that Congress doesn't care that hungry people stand for hours in food lines. It was more important to nourish a fish than nourish a child. In a final insult to the people of the San Joaquin Valley, carrots from China were among the food products provided in those lines.

Those dark days are coming to an end. A new dawn has come in the House of Representatives—one that will bring jobs and water back to the parched San Joaquin Valley. The bill before us today is the first step in that direction.

Over the last three years, the San Joaquin Valley has seen water supply cuts imposed and justified by draconian biological opinions on the delta smelt and salmon developed by the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS). The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California has held that these opinions are unlawful and illogical; the National Academy of Sciences has said those opinions are not supported by science.

With respect to the delta smelt biological opinion issued by the FWS on December 15, 2008, it has been remanded to the agency for preparation of a new biological opinion. The Court's December 14, 2010 decision identified an overarching legal flaw in the "reasonable and prudent alternative actions" proposed by FWS. Specifically, the Court found that the FWS failed to comply with its own regulations that govern the development and evaluation of reasonable and prudent alternatives. The Court held that "the RPA Actions manifestly interdict the water supply for domestic human consumption and agricultural use for over twenty million people who depend on the Projects for their water supply," and commented that, "'Trust us' is not acceptable. FWS has shown no inclination to fully and honestly address water supply needs beyond the species, despite the fact that its own regulation requires such consideration."

The language that was included in Section 1475 of the bill (H.R. 1) before the House today was specifically addressed by the Court. The Court found that the delta smelt reasonable and prudent alternative Actions 1, 2 and 3 are scientifically flawed because of FWS's use of raw salvage numbers without accounting for changes in population abundance across years, was "scientifically inappropriate." The Court further found that "the PTM study does not justify the imposition of −5,000 cfs as an upper limit in Actions 1, 2, or 3," and directed FWS "to perform an accurate scientific analysis and justify its ultimate decision regarding the imposition of a water flow ceiling."

Additionally, the Court found that FWS's finding that project pumping reduces delta smelt prey, despite serious criticism of the underlying analysis by FWS's own peer review panel "suggests another unlawful, results-driven choice, ignoring best available science." The Court said that FWS's attempt to blame the Central Valley Project and State Water Project for essentially all other stressors on the delta smelt population "has not been justified, nor is it logical or explained by any science." The Court also said the entire modeling method employed by FWS in the delta smelt biological opinion was flawed, arbitrary and capricious, and ignored the best available science, all of which indicated that "a bias was present." The Court concluded that because "the impacts of regulating Project Operations are so consequential, such unsupported attributions (a result in search of a rationale) are unconscionable."

With respect to the salmon biological opinion issued by the NMFS, on June 4, 2009, the Court granted a preliminary injunction against implementation of reasonable and prudent alternative Actions IV.2.1 and IV.2.3—both of which are addressed in Section 1475 of H.R. 1. In its May 18, 2010 findings, the Court declared "there is little to no justification in the record for the exact flow ratios chosen for RPA Action IV.2.1." It explained that "the record does not support a finding that the specific Vernalis flow to export ratios imposed by Action IV.2.1. . . . are necessary to avoid jeopardy and/or adverse modification to any of the Listed Species."

In addressing Action IV.2.3, the Court found "NMFS did not address relative population impacts in developing or explaining RPA Action IV.2.3." The Court ruled that "salvage data was not scaled for population size, which any prudent and competent fish biologist and statistician would have done, making NMFS' reliance on the salvage data scientifically erroneous." Also, the Court found that "[t]here are serious questions whether there is support in the record for the general proposition that exports reduce survival of salmonids in the interior Delta."

Last year, the National Academy of Science (NAS) issued a report on both of these biological opinions, including the reasonable and prudent alternatives imposed by each; the report was titled a "Scientific Assessment of Alternatives for Reducing Water Management Effects on Threatened and Endangered Fishes in California's Bay Delta." In particular, regarding the delta smelt biological opinion, the NAS found that "there is substantial uncertainty regarding the amount of flow that should trigger a reduction in exports." It also found "the historical distribution of smelt on which the relationship with OMR flows was established no longer exists. Delta smelt are now sparsely distributed in the central and southern delta . . . and pump salvage has been extremely low, less than four percent of the 50-year average index."

Regarding Action IV.2.3 in the salmon biological opinion, the report concluded that "the threshold levels needed to protect fish is not definitively established." The report counseled that "[u]ncertainty in the effect of the flow triggers needs to be reduced, and more flexible triggers that might require less water should be evaluated." The report also found that "there is little direct evidence to support the position that this action alone will benefit the San Joaquin salmon" absent increased San Joaquin River flows. In reference to Action IV.2.1, the report found that while flows may help out migration, reducing the "effectiveness of reducing exports to improve steelhead smolt survival is less certain," and that there is a "weak influence of exports in all survival relationships."

As a final criticism of the reasonable and prudent alternatives in the two biological opinions, the report decried the lack of a "quantitative analytical framework that ties them together within species, between smelt and salmonid species, and across the watershed. This type of systematic, formalized analysis is necessary to provide an objective determination of the net effect of the actions on the listed species and on water users." The report found the lack of any such analysis to be "a serious deficiency." As the NAS report observed, "[t]his issue has been raised repeatedly in peer reviews, but still has not been incorporated in the NMFS and FWS analyses."

Despite what the opponents of turning on the pumps say, Section 1475 of H.R. 1 will not prevent the Bureau of Reclamation from complying with the Endangered Species Act in carrying out its vital function to deliver water supplies. Instead, Section 1475 is intended to enable the Central Valley Project to operate unencumbered by the proposed agency alternatives that the Court has already found do not comply with law and therefore should not be enforced.

Furthermore, the bill will ban federal funding for the restoration of the San Joaquin River during the 2011 fiscal year. This is the first step in efforts to replace the flawed billion dollar salmon run. It also demonstrates Congressional intent to suspend restoration flows for

2011, thereby keeping the water on the east side of the valley. Through the replacement of the existing restoration plan, we will be able to establish both an environmentally and economically responsible San Joaquin River restoration. This will include a year-round, live river on the San Joaquin but will also ensure a robust east side agriculture economy.

I call on my colleagues to support this bill and these vital provisions which will ensure that farmers in the San Joaquin Valley have water to irrigate their fields, grow crops that feed this nation, and put thousands of people back to work.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chair, I am deeply troubled by the latest attacks on healthcare organizations such as Planned Parenthood that provide preventive and family planning care for millions of women and men across this country.

These centers play key roles in the lives of many who cannot always acquire preventive services elsewhere.

At a time when Americans continue to struggle to afford basic healthcare, eliminating Title X funding would have a devastating impact on women, men and teens in our communities.

As one of the nation's leading advocates for reproductive health, providing access to contraception to breast and cervical cancer screenings, Planned Parenthood serves a very important purpose. I vow to continue my strong support for these vital healthcare services.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to language in H.R. 1 that would prevent the Department of Housing and Urban Development from spending money on the Sustainable Communities Initiative. The language in the bill is short-sighted and represents a missed opportunity for communities around the country. Not only will it end a very successful HUD program that has helped communities large and small plan for growth and coordinate economic development investments, but it could halt a very successful partnership between HUD, the Department of Transportation, and the Environmental Protection Agency that promotes interagency coordination.

Despite the obvious connections between housing, transportation, and land use, these three agencies have not always worked well together in the past. But Secretaries Donovan, LaHood, and Administrator Jackson and their agencies have spent the last year cutting down red tape and coordinating investments to meet multiple economic, environmental, and community objectives.

These efforts not only save money, but they make government more efficient and ensure that the federal government is a better partner to local communities. As we reduce federal investments and watch our communities struggle, this seems like something all members of the House can get behind.

The Sustainable Communities Initiative at HUD provides resources to help communities realize their own visions for more economically competitive communities that generate more jobs, lower housing and transportation costs, and use limited public funds more wisely. Another important function of the Sustainable Communities Initiative at HUD is to provide competitive grant funding. Working with the DOT and EPA, the Initiative offers grants to communities to integrate transportation, housing, land use and energy planning using state of the art data and tools.

These grants go to communities all around the country, large and small, urban and rural. The interest in these has been extraordinary. In 2010, when HUD announced the challenge grants, a total of 630 communities requested $1.2 billion in funding. HUD was only able to award 61 grants worth $69 million. HUD's sustainable communities regional planning grants were as popular: 225 regions applied for $450 million, and HUD was able to award 45 regions a total of $98 million. This funding is helping to create jobs, drive economic development, provide housing and transportation choices, increase walkability, and improve quality of life.

Eliminating the Sustainable Communities Initiative will deprive the communities who weren't awarded funding in the last round from the opportunity to have their projects funded next time. Because the bill also rescinds unobligated funds, projects that were awarded grants and are already in the pipeline could be cancelled. Even though the grants have been awarded, many of the final contracts have not been signed.

I'd like to highlight a number of the 2010 Community Challenge Planning Grant projects that could be threatened as a result of the bill we have on the Floor today.

The City of Augusta, GA, Augusta State University, and other partners will be awarded $1.8 million for the Augusta Sustainable Development Implementation Program, which will help plan the redevelopment of the Priority Development Corridor, a 4.5 mile north-south "spine" in the core of Augusta. The project will include a multi-modal transportation corridor; a revision of current codes to facilitate a vibrant, mixed-use, mixed-income development; and a plan for green, affordable housing in Georgia's second-largest city.

The City of Covington, KY, will be awarded $359,000 to create a Downtown Action Plan with the active involvement of citizens and stakeholders. Among other things, the plan will increase the number of workers who live downtown near jobs, decreasing traffic and pollution. Partners in the project include the National Development Council, Northern Kentucky University Center for Economic Analysis and Development, Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky, Ohio Kentucky Indiana Regional Council of Governments, Northern Kentucky Area Planning Council and the Covington Business Council.

The City of Flint, MI will be awarded $1.5 million to replace its existing city master plan with an integrated plan for sustainable development. The outreach process will include neighborhood-level discussion about residents' vision for the plan. Among others, project partners include the Genesee County Chamber of Commerce, University of Michigan-Flint, Hurley Medical Center, and the Community Foundation of Greater Flint.

If this language passes, Grand Traverse County, MI could lose a $400,000 grant to create a Housing Inventory and Assessment, a County Master Plan, neighborhood revitalization, and affordable housing. The City of Hattiesburg, MS could lose $150,000 for a plan to lay the foundation for a commercial and residential mixed-use, mixed-income housing district. The City of Claremont, NH could lose $58,000 to undertake a comprehensive zoning analysis that will identify tools to maintain its historic cityscape, encourage development to maximize use of existing infrastructure, drive private investment and economic development to downtown, and improve the quantity and quality of housing. Oklahoma City could lose $500,000 to develop a plan that provides an inventory and analysis of existing land availability, identify additional lands that may be designated for industrial use, assess infrastructure needs of that land, set priorities to help guide investment, and facilitate new industrial development.

Many more communities, which I don't have time to list now, have received funding and assistance from the Sustainable Communities Initiatives.

Keep in mind that this is a voluntary grant program. These communities have approached HUD to seek funding to support their own visions for economic revitalization. The grant applications are created from the ground up by local governments in partnership with community and business organizations. An important aspect of each of these projects is citizen outreach and public engagement.

I hope my colleagues will join me in rejecting this short-sighted proposal.

INTRODUCING THE INVESTING IN OUR FUTURE ACT

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Investing in Our Future Act. This bill will discourage speculation in the financial markets, help us shrink the deficit, and help create a better world for future generations.

Today is the Global Day of Action when hundreds of organizations are calling on the world's governments to create financial transactions taxes to generate billions of dollars to

help battle the problems that threaten the planet.

Our deficit is now a record $1.5 trillion. Most suggestions about how to reduce the deficit require cutting government programs and discretionary spending. These kinds of cuts hurt American families and don't stimulate our economy. I propose that we instead shrink our deficit by looking to the currency market.

Every day $4 trillion in currency is traded by the world's largest financial institutions in the foreign exchange markets. U.S. banks generated $7 billion in foreign exchange trading revenue in the first three quarters of 2010. Much of this trading is purely speculative. The banks attempt to outguess the market and in turn, destabilize the economy.

The Investing in Our Future Act will place a microtax of just 0.005 percent on the currency trades conducted on or on behalf of U.S. financial institutions. This small tax would not be enough to disrupt the larger currency market but it could decrease speculative trades by as much as 14 percent.

The billions generated by this tax will be divided between deficit reduction and causes that will help us build a better world. Forty percent of revenues would be reserved for deficit reduction.

Ten percent of revenues will go into a Child Care Assistance Trust Fund. These funds will be used for subsidized child care here in the United States, where six out of seven children who qualify for subsidized care do not receive it.

Fifty percent of revenues will be evenly divided between the fight against climate change and world poverty. The Global Change Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation Trust Fund will receive 25 percent of all revenues. Climate change destabilizes our world because it contributes to extreme weather, food shortages, and poverty. The other 25 percent will go into a Multilateral Global Health Trust Fund. This trust fund will support programs in poor countries that lack adequate medical infrastructure to treat and prevent diseases like malaria, HIV/AIDs and tuberculosis.

By contributing the revenues from this bill toward these causes, we will be investing in a stable and healthy future for our own country and others across the globe. I urge my colleagues to support the Investing in Our Future Act.

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA GAINING A PERMANENT SEAT ON THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a resolution in support of the Republic of India gaining a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council. Addressing a joint session of India's Parliament this past November 8, President Obama said that "the United States not only welcomes India as a rising global power, we fervently support it." I could not agree more. In recent years India has proven to be a solid and supportive ally of the United States. As the international community looks to reform the policies and procedures of the Security Council, no nation deserves a seat at the table more than India.

As the world's most populous democracy—and second most-populous nation—India is an increasingly influential power, not only in its neighborhood in South Asia but also on the world's stage. India is one of the fastest-growing economies in the world, enjoys the second-largest labor force, and is rapidly becoming a major hub for high-tech industry, telecommunications, and automobile manufacturing. As a major export/import nation, India is an important trading partner for dozens of countries around the world.

India has a strategic role in addressing major global security issues, makes its participation in international decisions essential. Having already provided tens of thousands of troops for dozens of UN peacekeeping missions around the world, India has earned a permanent role for itself in security decision-making, global conflict resolution, and questions of war and peace. As a nation which has suffered more casualties from terrorism than almost any other, India's commitment to effective counterterrorism measures is aligned with the United States' goals, and India has proved an indispensible ally with respect to our efforts in South Asia.

Finally, India regularly participates in numerous regional and international organizations, including the G20, the World Trade Organization, the East Asian Summit, and the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation. India has thus demonstrated a commitment to international dialogue and constructive engagement, and, indeed, enjoys good relations with most countries around the world.

Mr. Speaker, India is already a nation of great influence, respect, ambition, and ability, and a trusted member of the international community. An overwhelming majority of the United Nations General Assembly recently elected India to serve as the Asian regional representative to the Security Council. The permanent membership of the Security Council reflects the reality of global power in the immediate aftermath of World War Two—not today's 21st century reality of rising powers. As President Obama and many other world leaders have pointed out, India deserves a permanent seat on a reformed Security Council, where its voice and clout will be a much-welcomed and much-needed addition to the global security regime. I strongly applaud this effort and urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

HONORING BENEDICT COZZI ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the many family, friends, and colleagues who have gathered to congratulate Benedict Cozzi as he retires after a career as an operating engineer and union leader that has spanned more than four decades. Ben has been a remarkable presence in Connecticut's labor movement and I, like so many others, consider myself fortunate to have benefitted from his knowledge and friendship.

A native of New Haven, Connecticut, Ben entered Boston University after graduating from high school, but it would be the employment he found during his breaks from school where he would find his calling as an operating engineer and a member of the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 478. He soon left Boston University and spent the next twenty years operating the heavy machinery of the trade—bulldozers, backhoes, graders, loaders, combination machines, and cranes on construction sites throughout Connecticut. It was hard but honest work that Ben enjoyed and he also became increasingly involved with Local 478, serving as the steward on many jobs.

Ben has served on Local 478's Governing Board for more thirty years. He held the positions of Treasurer, Secretary, Referral Manager, and Business Agent for New Haven and Middlesex Counties before being elected Business Manager—the union's highest elected office and a position which he has held for the last decade. Through it all, and particularly as Business Manager, Ben has fought for the rights of thousands of Connecticut operating engineers, ensuring that they had jobs to go to, fair wages, safe work environments, and secure retirement benefits. His work has held to secure the economic viability of his members and their families.

Ben's leadership in the labor movement extends far beyond Local 478. He has also served as President of both the Connecticut State Building and Construction Trades Council and the Building Construction Trades Council of New Haven as well as Co-Chair of the Connecticut Construction Labor-Management Council, and Vice President of the Connecticut AFL–CIO. His expertise has also been sought out by community boards that directly impact his ,membership including the New Haven Workforce Alliance and the Construction Workforce Initiative. Ben was also asked to sit on two state boards the Workers' Compensation Advisory Board and the Second Injury Fund Advisory Board.

Ben has also dedicated countless hours to community service, volunteering his time and energies on behalf of a multitude of service organizations in our community. He has served as Chairman of the Board of Easter Seals Goodwill Industries, a Board Member of the Advocacy Council of Yale-New Haven Hospital as well as the Connecticut Yankee Council of the Boy Scouts of America. When a project needs a hands-on approach, Ben is the person you turn to. He assembled a team of 300 to participate in a walk to benefit the American Heart Association, volunteers to build Hannah's Dream—a playground for children with special needs, and has been responsible for coordinating Building Trades volunteers to construct the annual Easter Seal's Fantasy of Lights at Light House Point during the Christmas season. The impact of his community service on the lives of others is incalculable and we cannot thank him enough for all of the generosity and compassion he has shown to those in need.

It is difficult to imagine what Local 478, the Building Trades, and our community will be like without Ben Cozzi. He has been a fixture in the labor movement and in our community for decades. Today, as he celebrates his retirement, I am proud to have this opportunity

to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to him for all of his good work. I have no doubt that even in his retirement, Ben Cozzi will continue to stay involved and make a difference. I extend my very best wishes to him, his wife, Elizabeth; his children, Jennifer and Christopher; as well as their grandchildren, John, Isabelle, and Diego for many more years of health and happiness.

REMEMBERING FRED FOSTER

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House the recent passing of an outstanding public servant, civic leader, and local business owner in Front Royal, Virginia. Frederick P. "Fred" Foster died February 7 at age 74.

I had the pleasure of working with Fred on the redevelopment of the Avtex Superfund site in Front Royal. He was a tireless and passionate advocate for his hometown and county and will be greatly missed.

Mr. Speaker, I submit an article from the Northern Virginia Daily about the life of Fred Foster.

[From the nvdaily.com, Feb. 10, 2011]

FOSTER ACTIVE PART OF SOCIETY

(By Ben Orcutt)

FRONT ROYAL.—Frederick P. ''Fred'' Foster was remembered on Wednesday as a man who got things done.

Foster, 74, died on Monday at Winchester Medical Center. A jewelry store owner, former town councilman and civic leader, Foster was noted for his ability to tackle issues and see them through.

''Just his determination and vision,'' said his son, Philip T. ''Phil'' Foster. ''When he saw something that he needed to do or that thought that needed to be done or identified a problem, he had the tenaciousness to see it through.''

Phil Foster, 51, said his father had been ill for the past four years and was on dialysis daily. Foster said his father had chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and most likely died of a heart-related ailment.

''We haven't seen a death certificate or anything,'' Phil Foster said.

Fred Foster opened Fosters Jewelers at 130 E. Main St. in Front Royal in 1984. Phil Foster said he and his father were partners and they opened a second store in Winchester in 1987.

''We're going to miss him,'' Phil Foster said.

Others said Wednesday they will miss him as well.

Marvin ''Cotton'' Owens, 72, graduated from Warren County High School in 1956 with Fred Foster. Owens said the two were like brothers for a time and that Fred Foster gave him his first job as a teenager.

''He was one of the leaders in retail in Front Royal for many a year,'' Owens said of Foster. ''There's so many memories. I guess his personality, his good humor. He thought a lot of this town. I don't know how many people knew it. He really thought a lot of Front Royal and wanted to do everything he could to promote Front Royal and make it a better place, especially for businesses.''

William P. ''Bill'' Barnett will second that. Barnett said Foster was an integral part of the Citizens Economic Development Action Committee that tried to help turn around the economy of Warren County years ago.

Foster also was one of the main catalysts behind the redevelopment of the Avtex Superfund site, now known as Royal Phoenix, Barnett said.

''Fred was passionate about Front Royal and Warren County,'' Barnett said. ''His passion was very [infectious]. His enthusiasm and his persistence were very instrumental in making an impact on the community, whether it was while he served on the Town Council or the redevelopment committee. When he decided to get involved in something, he got involved in it 100 percent and just gave everything he had. . . . We're going to miss Fred.''

Craig Laird, owner of Royal Oak Computers on Main Street in Front Royal, agreed.

''Fred was a mainstay of Main Street,'' Laird said. ''During the reconstruction of downtown in the mid 1980s, he was affectionately called the mayor of Main Street. He was a dear, dear friend and he will be greatly missed.''

As president of Save Our Gateway, Laird also recalled when Foster was a member of the council in 2003 and deliberately missed meetings to help prevent the panel from having a quorum on a vote on Wal-Mart's commercial rezoning request on Strasburg Road.

''His bravery at standing up for his principles will also be remembered,'' Laird said.

Even though they were on opposite sides of the Wal-Mart issue, Councilman Hollis L. Tharpe, who served on the panel with Foster for two years, spoke highly of him.

''He was for the citizens,'' Tharpe said. ''I don't think personally he ever had anything on his agenda, but every vote that he took, he took it the way he thought that the citizens would be best served. He was always available to talk to, whether it was town business or personal. He always had that big smile on his face even when he didn't like voting for something that he did.''

Jean Plauger, owner of Jean's Jewelers on Main Street, also agreed about Foster's contributions, especially downtown. ''A lot of things got done down here definitely because of Fred,'' she said.

''They call him the godfather of Main, the mayor of Main Street,'' she said. ''Fred had a presence down here.''

HONORING TWIN SISTERS HELEN ASHE AND ELLEN TURNER

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to honor two of the most beloved people in my District.

Twin sisters Helen Ashe and Ellen Turner have been serving the homeless and winning over hearts in the City of Knoxville since they founded the Love Kitchen in 1986.

The Love Kitchen served just 22 meals the day it opened, but 25 years later, it now serves more than 2,000 meals each week to the homeless and homebound.

I have known Helen and Ellen for many years, and they are the kindest, most gracious and selfless people I know.

They live their life by the Love Kitchen's slogan: "Everybody is God's Somebody."

Over the years, their hard work and devotion to the less fortunate stoked the volunteer spirit of one of this Nation's great cities and turned the pair into local celebrities.

As the holidays near, it has become tradition to see Helen and Ellen on local television pleading for help so that no one in need is turned away. And the good people of East Tennessee always deliver, donating supplies and offering volunteers in droves.

In fact, a few years ago my wife Lynn volunteered at the Love Kitchen, and she will never forget the experience.

Helen and Ellen always exercise a remarkable humility, redirecting any deserved attention showered on them back to the Love Kitchen and those it serves.

Today, they were guests on The Oprah Winfrey Show, and I am so thrilled and thankful that Ms. Winfrey took notice of these extraordinary sisters. Now, millions more outside of Tennessee have been touched and hopefully moved to similar community service by their story.

Reflecting on her upbringing as the daughter of a share cropper, Helen told the Knoxville News Sentinel in 2008, "The three truths daddy taught us were: There is but one Father, and that is the Father in heaven. There is but one race, and that is the human race, and he taught us not to take the last piece of bread from the table, because somebody may come by that is hungry."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Colleagues and other readers of the RECORD to join me in recognizing Helen Ashe and Ellen Turner for their compassionate, life-long devotion to community service and unwavering faith in God.

On the occasion of their appearance on The Oprah Winfrey Show, I request that the Knoxville News Sentinel article celebrating their service to Knoxville be reprinted in the RECORD below.

[From the Knoxville News Sentinel, Dec. 31, 2008]

DRINNEN: ''EVERYBODY IS GOD'S SOMEBODY'' AT THE LOVE KITCHEN

(By Beth Drinnen)

''Everybody is God's Somebody.'' That's the slogan at The Love Kitchen in East Knoxville, and from the moment you walk in the building, you start to feel it. Complete strangers greeted me with smiles and a couple of ''good morning, honey's,'' as I was wrapped in warm, welcoming hugs by both Helen Ashe and her twin sister, Ellen Turner, founders of The Love Kitchen.

Helen and Ellen were born in Abbeville, S.C. Their parents were share croppers. ''We've been working since we were 8 years old,'' said Helen proudly. ''My sister and I used to wash dishes for a contractor. He built a little step so that we could reach the sink easier. We made 50 cents a week,'' she said as she looked at Ellen and smiled.

The sisters moved to Knoxville in 1946 when they were 18 years old. ''That's what our parents gave us as a graduation gift,'' said Ellen. ''Our parents saved up a little bit of money and we were to choose where we wanted to live.'' They chose Knoxville because their favorite aunt, one of their father's sisters, Eva Icem, lived here.

''The three truths that my Daddy taught us were: There is but one Father, and that is the Father in Heaven. There is but one race, and that is the human race, and he taught us not to take the last piece of bread from the table, because somebody may come by that is hungry,'' said Helen.

People going hungry had always weighed on Helen's mind. ''Every single day I would tell Ellen, 'One day, I'm going to do something about it.' '' Ellen nodded her head.

''One night,'' Helen began, ''I had a dream . . .''

Ellen quickly interrupted. ''No, you let me tell that,'' she said, her eyes shining. ''We

got a phone call early one morning,'' Ellen continued, ''And my husband and I were still in bed. He said, 'Honey, Helen's on the phone and I can't understand a word she's saying.' I got on the phone and it was Helen, and honey, she was just babbling away. I said 'Honey, is Al okay?' Al was her husband, and I thought he was dead the way she was carrying on. I said, 'Helen, calm down.' And she said, 'Sis, I had an encounter with God last night. And I'm going to have that feeding program; I'm going to have a place where people can come and get something to eat.' ''

Ellen looked proudly at her sister. ''And she does,'' she grinned.

The Love Kitchen first opened its doors in 1986 in the basement of a local church. They eventually moved out of that space and into several more before moving into their current location at 2418 Martin Luther King Jr. Ave., in 1994.

The bulk of their ministry involves delivering food to homebound people. The Love Kitchen delivers food each Thursday to approximately 2,200 homes. In addition to the meals they deliver, The Love Kitchen serves breakfast on Wednesday and lunch on Thursday to approximately 40 to 110 people each day. Wednesday afternoons are dedicated to handing out anywhere from 60 to 150 food bags to the homeless or needy in the community. The bags usually contain enough food to last the recipients a week. They also hand out hygiene bags to new patrons at the Kitchen, and recently handed out approximately 300 blankets to the homeless.

If Helen and Ellen are the heart of The Love Kitchen, the volunteers are the lifeblood. Most begin volunteering because they want to help the less fortunate, but wind up staying because they love Helen and Ellen so much. The University of Tennessee's chapter of Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity has been sending volunteers to help pack food bags for the past fifteen years. ''It's good to come here and . . . do something nice for someone less fortunate,'' said volunteer and Phi Gamma Delta Tyler Bowland.

''I like to come to see Helen and Ellen,'' said volunteer and Phi Gamma Delta Matt Baumgartner, then he laughed. ''Seeing what they do here everyday, I think it's a good thing to come and help her out!'' He smiled, ''They have been a blessing to a lot of people.''

RE-INTRODUCTION OF THE EQUITABLE TREATMENT OF INVESTORS ACT

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, late in the 111th Congress, I introduced, with co-sponsors, Mr. KING of New York and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida, the Equitable Treatment of Investors Act (H.R. 6531). This bill reaffirmed and clarified the key protections for securities investors intended by Congress in the 1970 enactment of the Securities Investor Protection Act (SIPA) and major amendments to that Act in 1978.

Today I reintroduce that legislation with clarifying amendments. The central purpose of the legislation is to reaffirm the original Congressional intent on two key aspects of the administration of SIPA in the liquidation of a bankrupt broker-dealer firm. First, as a general matter, the determination of customer ''net equity'' shall rely on the final account statement received from the debtor prior to closing, plus any additional supporting documents, such as trade confirmations. Second, and again as a general matter, avoidance actions, or ''clawbacks'', to recover property transferred to the customer prior to closing shall be prohibited. While I emphasize these clarifications simply reaffirm current law, the actions and interpretations of SIPA being made by the Securities Investor Protection Corporation (SIPC) and the Trustee appointed for the Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC (BLMIS) liquidation proceeding make the passage of this legislation important and necessary.

In this legislation, there are important exceptions to those two general customer protections that deny that beneficial treatment to any customer who knew of or was complicit in the fraudulent activity of the debtor and to any customer who, as a registered professional in the securities markets, with the requisite knowledge of these matters, knew or should have known of the debtor's fraudulent activities and failed to notify appropriate regulatory authorities. This portion of the bill's language is meant to assure that SIPC and the receivership Trustee have fully adequate legal powers to act against customers undeserving of SIPA's investor protections.

While this clarifying legislation is intended to have general application to all broker-dealer bankruptcies involving debtor fraud, introduction at this time is directly related to the failure of SIPC and its Trustee to fairly and adequately act to provide statutorily mandated and intended SIPA protections to the several thousand innocent customers defrauded by Bernard Madoff in the operations of his investment advisory and broker-dealer firm, BLMIS. Compounding the grievous shortcomings of SIPC to respond promptly and usefully to these customers' financial plight is the well-documented failures by the SEC and FINRA, the regulatory overseers of BLMIS, to detect and end the Madoff fraud over a period of 25 or more years.

Given the colossal regulatory oversight failure and SIPC neglect in assessing broker-dealer firms at a level commensurate with the dramatic growth of the securities markets and the participating broker-dealer firms, it would be reasonable to expect that SIPC and the SEC would have made exceptional efforts to make a rapid and comprehensive response to the financial needs of the Madoff victims. That has not been the case. Quite the contrary, in fact, has occurred. SIPC has denied protection to over half the accounts at closing, in direct violation of the legal mandates of SIPA as currently in affect; provided full protection to only 25% of accounts; taken nearly two years to pay advances to the limited group deemed eligible; and threatened to claw back funds from roughly 1000 innocent customers.

So that my colleagues may judge for themselves the urgent need for this Congressional intervention, let me highlight key factors supporting this need for action.

The legislative record surrounding the enactments of the 1970 Act and the 1978 amendments is replete with statements from the legislative floor managers, active supporters, committee reports, the Treasury, the SEC, and securities industry spokespeople likening the intended SIPC protection to the bank customer protection offered by the FDIC. Likewise, the legislative history emphasizes protection of all innocent customers from brokerage failure, with particular mention of small, unsophisticated customers, and the need for prompt action by SIPC in payment of advances for relief of individuals, understandably devastated by the sudden loss of key financial assets.

Critically, Congress recognized the need for restoring investor confidence in the financial markets at a time when the financial industry was under tremendous duress and overwhelmed by the paperwork crunch caused by the processing of physical securities. Theft and misplacement of securities, failures of trade executions, and insolvencies were commonplace. Amidst the backdrop of several popular Ponzi schemes and brokerage failures was SIPC born.

For the customer of a bankrupt broker-dealer firm to qualify for SIPC protection, it is necessary for the customer's account at closing to have a positive ''net equity'' determined by subtracting any outstanding obligation of the customer to the firm from the amount the firm ''owed'' the customer. For the forty years of SIPC's existence, it has been the standard practice in making that simple calculation to use the firm's most recent account statement to the customer, usually supported by trade confirmations, if any, relevant to the final statement's presentation of holdings and values. Not surprisingly, this is the outcome required by law. Under the legal regime governing the relationship between brokers and customers, it is indisputable that the broker owes the customer the amount reflected on the customer's account statement. Indeed, in a world where customers and, generally speaking, brokers do not hold physical securities, it could not be any other way.

Given the move away from the possession and trading ownership of actual securities to a ''book entry'' system based on the essential trust of validity of those account statements, no customer would, therefore, have any reason to believe they would not be protected based upon their account statements and confirmations. In the SIPC receivership for the Madoff firm, however, the practices have been inconsistent with the law and quite different and contrary to the repeated assertions of SIPC and its Trustee, never to the ultimate benefit of the innocent individual customer.

Rather than using the customer's final account statement—consistent with ''reasonable expectations'' of a customer—the SIPC Trustee has ignored the statutory requirement of SIPA and has devised a ''cash-in/cash-out'' formulation (CICO) to determine a customer's ''net equity''. To suggest that the Securities Investor Protection Act would have the effect of denying customers their legal right to rely on their account statement is counterintuitive. This formulation was developed from a position of hindsight once the Trustee, his lawyers, and forensic accountants were inside the Madoff firm and learned that no trades had been made by the firm for customers.

Even though customers had regularly received monthly account statements showing trades and holdings in ''real securities'' (often blue chips in the Dow 100) that were supported periodically by trade confirmations in those stocks, the Trustee declared that all transactions were ''fictitious'' and that statutory words such as ''owed'' and ''positions'' had no meaning. He further has asserted that in a Ponzi scheme the customer has no basis for ''reasonable expectation''—a public utterance which will destroy the public's confidence in

our securities markets at odds with SIPA's primary policy objective.

To execute the Trustee's CICO formulation it is necessary to examine every customer account over the entire term of the relationship (for many spanning 20 to 30 years) to sum up total deposits and total withdrawals (without providing any return on investment—even a standard rate). If deposits exceed withdrawals the customer has a ''net equity'' and qualifies for SIPC protection under CICO. If withdrawals exceed deposits over the life of the relationship, the customer is declared ineligible for SIPC relief and may be targeted for ''clawback'' of the net withdrawals.

How, you may ask, could the Trustee ignore the SIPA definition of ''net equity'' and proceed to institute ''clawback'' actions? The answer lies in SIPA's incorporation by reference of provisions and powers under the Federal Bankruptcy Code. However, the Bankruptcy Code does not permit ''clawbacks'' of amounts paid by a broker to a customer to satisfy the broker's legal obligations to the customer—our securities system could not work any other way. Again, SIPC and the Trustee are disregarding the clear body of law to further harm the Madoff victims.

Let us now examine the results of this receivership to date to determine just how equitable its performance has been.

At closing, the approximately 4900 accounts of BLMIS that have filed claims for relief with SIPC had aggregate final statement values of roughly $57 Billion. Of that 4900, well less than half of those accounts (2053) have been determined eligible for SIPA protection under the Trustee's CICO formulation. Only 1207 of those eligible accounts will receive full SIPA relief benefits—advance payment of $500,000 and a priority status to the distribution of recovered ''customer funds'' up to the remaining balance of the CICO-approved claim. 846 of the approved claims will receive advance payments averaging $200,000; and because the advances fully satisfy the CICO claim these accounts have no priority status with respect to customer funds. 2728 accounts receive no relief (advances or priority status) under SIPA.

These numbers, derived from SIPC responses to the House Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets, portray an outcome distressingly out of step with Congress' intent for SIPA protection.

The overall record of performance in providing investment protection in this case is even worse. The bulk of advance payments to eligible accountholders were distributed in the last quarter of 2010, fully two years after the closing of BLMIS. There is absolutely no way to square that performance with the clear mandate in Section 9(a) of SIPA for ''prompt payment'' of advances—a mandate which recognized that most customers, victimized by bankruptcy of their broker-dealer, will be in dire need of urgent financial relief.

Now let us turn our attention to the ''clawback'' suits against innocent customers who over the course of their investment relationship withdrew what they rightly believed to be earnings for normal real life purposes—income to support retirement, payment of Federal, State, and local taxes, helping a child with a home purchase, assisting a grandchild with college costs etc.—only now to find the Trustee demanding a return of some of those disbursements.

What the Trustee now suggests as relief for all the Madoff victims, those who have received no SIPA financial protection (over half) and those receiving inadequate and dilatory relief, is the opportunity to file fraud claims against the ''general'' bankruptcy estate, when and if assets are assigned to it. For most of the innocent customers, now in desperate financial condition and fraught with daily anxiety, such relief is temporally distant with challenging prospects for success. In a general bankruptcy proceeding these individuals, many of them aged, will be competing with claimants (financial institutions and the like) with far greater resources and top-line legal representation.

To his credit, the Trustee, with aid provided by the U.S. Attorney's office, has assembled some significant assets from parties complicit with the debtor. The innocent customers of Madoff should without question have the first and priority claim for relief in the distribution of those assets. That is the clear intent of SIPA in establishing claims to ''customer funds'' before assets move into the general bankruptcy estate. Had the Trustee, at the outset of this receivership, followed historic SIPC practices using customer final statements to determine ''net equity'', then all of these innocent customers would now be eligible for the distribution of ''customer funds'' under some equitable plan devised by the Trustee with the approval of the Bankruptcy Court. Moreover, they would be protected and assisted in their distress by full advances from the SIPC Fund, which has the resources to provide such relief.

Two additional matters need to be understood by my colleagues. Because the use of the CICO methodology reduced dramatically the number of customers qualifying for advances from the SIPC Fund (an entity funded by the broker-dealer community and expressly established for the early relief of customers), that Fund has benefited by a savings of over $1 billion. To make this outcome more unacceptable, the failure to distribute those funds means that customer refund claims to the IRS for ''theft losses'' will be increased by some $300 million. Thus the broker-dealer community's responsibility gets passed on to the American taxpayer.

The conduct of this receivership has been pitifully inadequate in fulfilling the protections of the Madoff victims contemplated by Congress in 1970 and 1978. The processes employed by the Trustee, from the standpoint of the typical customer, have been needlessly time consuming and remarkably expensive. In its most recent response to the Capital Markets Subcommittee, SIPC advises that the Trustee, his law firm, and other consultants have been paid some $288 million over two years and contemplate billing for another $1 billion over the next four years. All the while, many Madoff victims are scrambling to exist.

It is my earnest hope that an overwhelming majority of my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation, which is so important, not only for the protection of many innocent investors, but also for encouraging investment going forward, which is critical to the economic renewal our country needs.

BAD LANGUAGE: ENGLISH-ONLY BILLS ONCE AGAIN ATTEMPT TO PENALIZE IMMIGRANTS

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following editorial:

BAD LANGUAGE: ENGLISH-ONLY BILLS ONCE AGAIN ATTEMPT TO PENALIZE IMMIGRANTS

[From the Brownsville Herald, Feb. 13, 2011]

Among the various bills offered in Washington and Austin are new efforts to force every US. resident to speak English.

U.S. Rep. Steve King, R–Iowa, has pledged to file an English-only bill in Congress. Similar bills have already been filed in the Texas Legislature.

State Rep. Dennis Bonnen, R–Angleton, has filed legislation to make English the official state language and require that all official business be conducted in that language. Rep. Tim Kleinschmidt, R–Lexington, has offered a bill mandating that driving tests be given only in English.

We doubt that such bills would pass constitutional muster. The First Amendment clearly states that ''Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech. . . .'' That should include laws limiting the language that people choose to speak.

The nativists who support such legislation forget this country's honorable history of accepting troubled refugees, such from Cuba in 1980, Indochina in the 1970s and various defectors from the Soviet bloc countries throughout the Cold War. It's unreasonable and cruel to accept these people, only to impose our oppressive rules on their behavior.

Language restrictions on driver's tests make little sense, especially in a border state like Texas. Many foreign nationals spend significant amounts of time in this state, whether on business or on vacation. Many of them drive on our streets when they're here. With trade pacts calling for greater access to shipments from other countries, we should encourage people to show proficiency and knowledge of our traffic laws; language restrictions will only discourage people from working to get those licenses.

The ability to conduct business in other languages should be evident to all state lawmakers. More than $150 billion in goods are traded between Texas and Mexico each year alone. Greater investment and trade coming from Japan, China, and other countries should inspire officials to expand rather than restrict languages that are accepted for legal documents.

Language is not a major problem for this country. Many immigrants come here unable to speak English but, more than 80 percent of their children are fluent in the language. English is the primary language of some 94 percent of their grandchildren.

However, such bills send a clear message to people in other countries: We don't want you here. As America continues to fall behind other countries academically and is losing trade and commerce to other countries, we might be convincing some of the brightest minds to stay home, and benefit their home countries, not the U.S.

We trust majorities of lawmakers will see the folly in these bills.

HONORING P. MICHAEL FREEMAN, FIRE CHIEF OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to honor P. Michael Freeman, our good friend and long time Fire Chief of Los Angeles County. Chief Freeman is retiring after 22 years of service as the Fire Chief and 47 years as a firefighter. His commitment to the Los Angeles community, dedication to his employees, and strong leadership of the department will be greatly missed.

Chief Freeman was born and raised in Los Angeles County. He moved to Dallas and had a 25-year career with the Dallas Fire Department eventually rising to the rank of Acting Fire Chief. During that time, he served our nation honorably in the Army Reserve. It was in 1989 that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors made the wise decision to bring Chief Freeman home and make him the eighth Fire Chief of Los Angeles County.

Chief Freeman has been one of the most respected and longest serving public servants in the history of Los Angeles County. He has steadfastly faced the many challenges that come with running a fire department in a county of 10.5 million people, 4,000 square miles, 88 cities, 70 miles of coastline, dense urban areas, towering mountain ranges and deep forests. He has effectively led the fire department through the annual wildfire seasons, overseeing and containing some of the worst wildfires in the history of California in 2003 and 2009. He coordinated the response with other government agencies to the Northridge earthquake and the many other earthquakes that have rocked Los Angeles over the years. He has expertly overseen the daily operations of the department in responding to the multitude of emergencies that arise in an urban environment.

Chief Freeman has improved the department's emergency response capabilities and has been a strong advocate for the department with the federal government. He has worked with Members of Congress to ensure the first responder community has access to the federal resources they need for fire prevention programs, emergency response equipment, and natural disaster preparedness training. He has organized and led the effort to implement a new Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications System (LA–RICS). This system will allow first responders throughout the county to communicate effectively on solutions to emergencies ranging from major disasters to day-to-day events.

Chief Freeman has volunteered in numerous roles with the federal government to lend his expertise to improving emergency response services across the nation. He served as chairman of the board of FIRESCOPE and as a member of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) Advisory Committee. In 2003, he was selected by Secretary Tom Ridge to serve as a member of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's emergency responder advisory committee. He also served as chairman of the International Association of Fire Chiefs Terrorism Task Force.

As the economy has weakened and the County has faced major budget challenges, Chief Freeman has done an outstanding job of maintaining the proper staffing, professional service and quick response times that our residents have come to expect. He has managed the many facets of the department well, from emergency medical services to hazardous materials response to the lifeguarding of our many beaches. He has strengthened the department's cooperation and coordination with regional, state and federal emergency response partners. Additionally, Chief Freeman has continuously worked to improve the diversity of the department by hiring more female and minority firefighters.

Chief Freeman implemented many important life safety response programs that are integral to the department's operations today. These include Urban Search and Rescue (USAR), the Canine Search Program, a 24-hour Health Hazardous Materials Division, and the Firehawk Helicopter Program.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of the Los Angeles County delegation, we would like to personally acknowledge and commend P. Michael Freeman for his dedication to the people of Los Angeles. He is a model of the brave, honorable and selfless public servant that is displayed every day by the men and women of the Los Angeles County Fire Department. We are privileged to have worked with Chief Freeman. We ask the House to join us in congratulating Chief Freeman on his many years of service and wish him much success in his future endeavors.

Members who signed: GRACE F. NAPOLITANO, KAREN BASS, HOWARD L. BERMAN, JANE HARMAN, HOWARD P. MCKEON, LAURA RICHARDSON, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, ADAM B. SCHIFF, MAXINE WATERS, DAVID DREIER, XAVIER BECERRA, JUDY CHU, KEVIN MCCARTHY, GARY G. MILLER, DANA ROHRABACHER, LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ, BRAD SHERMAN, HENRY A. WAXMAN.

HONORING R.C. ALEXANDER

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, business leader Peter Drucker believes, "whenever you see a successful business, someone once made a courageous decision." Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell you of one successful businessman who lived Drucker's mantra. Born on a working farm in Williamson County, Alexander built an automotive empire in Middle Tennessee. Through humble beginnings to a sprinting end, R.C. Alexander spent his life developing a strong sense of business, family, and community.

Starting with nine employees and single gas station in Murfreesboro, TN, R.C. Alexander grew Alexander Automotive into 22 locations throughout Franklin, Columbia, Murfreesboro, Dickson, and Cookeville. Built upon the tenants of hard work, dedication to community, and straightforward business models, Alexander Automotive maintained almost 1,000 employees at the time of R.C. Alexander's death. He led not only generations of his own family to excellence, but taught those in his influence of the straightforward business practices that brought him success.

Through service to his community, fidelity to his mission, and dedication to his family, Alexander leaves a behind a lasting tribute to his ideals. I ask my colleagues to join with me in celebrating the legacy of Mr. R.C. Alexander.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today our national debt is $14,129,889,690,377.50.

On January 6, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was $10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by $3,491,463,944,083.70 since then.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

TRAGEDY IN KHOJALY, AZERBAIJAN

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, as the Co-Chairman of the House Azerbaijan Caucus, I rise today to bring attention to the tragedy that took place in Khojaly, Azerbaijan, a town and townspeople that were destroyed on February 26, 1992.

Sadly, today there is little attention or interest paid to the plight of Khojaly outside of Azerbaijan. However, one of our greatest strengths as elected officials is the opportunity to bring to light truths that are little known and command recognition. As a friend of Azerbaijan, I am proud to remind my colleagues that we must never forget the tragedy that took place at Khojaly.

At the time, the Khojaly tragedy was widely covered by the international media, including the Boston Globe, Washington Post, New York Times, Financial Times, and many other European and Russian news agencies.

Khojaly, a town in the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan, now under the control of Armenian forces, was the site of the largest killing of ethnic Azerbaijani civilians. With a population of approximately 7,000, Khojaly was one of the largest urban settlements of the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan.

According to Human Rights Watch and other international observers the massacre was committed by the ethnic Armenian armed forces, reportedly with the help of the Russian 366th Motor Rifle Regiment. Human Rights Watch described the Khojaly Massacre as "the largest massacre to date in the conflict" over Nagorna-Karabakh. In a 1993 report, the watchdog group stated "there are no exact figures for the number of Azeri civilians killed because Karabakh Armenian forces gained control of the area after the massacre" and "while it is widely accepted that 200 Azeris were murdered, as many as 500–1,000 may have died."

Newsweek Magazine reported: "Azerbaijan was a charnel house again last week: a place of mourning refugees and dozens of mangled corpses dragged to a makeshift morgue behind the mosque. They were ordinary Azerbaijani men, women and children of Khojaly, a small village in war-torn Nagorno-Karabakh overrun by Armenian forces on 25–26 February. Many were killed at close range while trying to flee; some had their faces mutilated, others were scalped."

Time Magazine stated "While the details are argued, this much is plain: something grim and unconscionable happened in the Azerbaijani town of Khojaly two weeks ago. So far, some 200 dead Azerbaijanis, many of them mutilated, have been transported out of the town tucked inside the Armenian-dominated enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh for burial in neighboring Azerbaijan. The total number of deaths—the Azerbaijanis claim 1,324 civilians have been slaughtered, most of them women and children—is unknown."

Azerbaijan has been a strong strategic partner and friend of the United States. The tragedy of Khojaly was a crime against humanity and I urge my colleagues to join me in standing with Azerbaijanis as they commemorate this tragedy.

HONORING SYD BYKOFSKY

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to congratulate Syd Bykofsky on his 95th birthday. Born in New York City, Syd has dedicated his life to helping others, and to being a loud and commanding voice for workers' rights.

Syd began his political activism at the age of 14. When he was just 18 years old, Syd solidified his activism by advocating for a 40 hour work week and picketing on behalf of Laundry Workers, Taxi Drivers, and Millinery Workers, to ensure a better work environment for future generations. In his 20s, Syd joined the Workmen's Circle and served locally and nationally in many leadership positions. Since 1993, Syd has been an active member of the Workmen's Circle Florida Regional Board.

Syd continued his political and social activism and in 1965 he marched on Washington with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Syd continued his fight for equal opportunity when he participated in the Selma to Montgomery March for Civil Rights; and, by demonstrating for Memphis Garbage Workers and Nurses in Atlanta, Georgia, Syd's contributions to workers rights expanded over the years.

Even though Syd maintained a busy schedule as a community activist, he always made time to be involved in the life of his family. Having been the President of both the PTA and the Father's Club of his children's public school, he was a proud and dedicated father to his children. His commitment to his children and the community continued as he became the Vice President of the 61st Precinct Community Council Day Camp. Syd helped organize Marlboro Houses Day Camp, served on the local school board of District 21K in Brooklyn and assisted in opening John Dewey High School for Special Education.

Today, Syd continues to be a part of his family's lives not only with his grandchildren, but also with his great-grandchildren. Syd's activism is sustained by serving on the Executive Board of the Florida Alliance for Retired Americans and as the Director of Brittany C. Kings Point in Florida. This is a wonderful opportunity to honor Syd for his lifetime of activism, and I join his family and friends in congratulating him on this joyous occasion.

Congratulations to Syd and his entire family on his 95th birthday.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CAPTAIN GEORGE MASON WALKER

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, Captain George Mason Walker, 82, of Fort McCoy, Florida died Saturday, January 22, 2011. A native of Jacksonville, he lived most of his life in Putnam and Marion Counties.

George M. Walker served his country in both the U.S. Navy during World War II and the U.S. Merchant Marines during peacetime and the Vietnam War. He also served for 15 years as a ship pilot in the Panama Canal.

Captain Walker was a member of First Baptist Church of Orange Springs, Florida. Before his health became frail, he twice weekly could be found walking the Right to Life Abortion Line in Ocala, Florida.

Captain Walker was a Mason, a Shriner and a member of the International Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots Association.

I commend Captain George M. Walker for his patriotism to his country, devoted service to his church, impressive career history, and life of love and caring concern for his family and fellow man.

IN SUPPORT OF BASIC FREEDOMS AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN THAILAND

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last November, the Helsinki Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe extended an invitation to the former Prime Minister of Thailand Thaksin Shinawatra and a representative from the current Thai government to present testimony at a briefing on the alleged human rights violations that took place in Thailand back in March 2010 at a legal demonstration resulting in the deaths of at least 80 Thai civilians and the imprisonment of at least 350 other civilians.

Unfortunately, this briefing was postponed until the new Congress convened and a new commission chairman was appointed. Now that the new Congress is here, I hope the Helsinki Commission will re-issue the invitations. I am personally traveling to Thailand next week with my colleague Congressman DANA ROHRABACHER from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to look into the extent of the alleged human rights violations, including the detainment of over 350 demonstrators by the current Thai government.

It is our intention to meet with representatives from the Thai Government and with opposition leaders to study the current situation. But it is clear that in the wake of the worst violence in decades, the Thai Government needs to hold free and fair elections.

With the recent uprising in Egypt and other parts of the Middle East and Asia by individuals who demand their freedom, Congress needs to be clear that it stands for the basic freedoms and rights of people around the world.

RECOGNIZING U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT SPECIAL AGENTS ZAPATA AND AVILA

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to express my sincere condolences about a reprehensible attack on two U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers earlier this week in Mexico, while driving between Mexico City and Monterrey, Mexico.

I honor the sacrifice of Special Agent Jaime J. Zapata, who lost his life and Special Agent Victor Avila, who is continuing to recover from injuries sustained during the attack.

In 2006, Special Agent Zapata began his career with ICE in Laredo, Texas as part of the Human Smuggling and Trafficking Unit and as a member of the Border Enforcement Security Task Force. At the time of his death, he was detailed to ICE's Attaché office in Mexico City.

Special Agent Zapata began his tenure at the Department of Homeland Security as a U.S. Border Patrol Agent in Yuma, Arizona. Law enforcement and border security were early passions for this Brownsville, Texas native, as he graduated from the University of Texas at Brownsville in 2005 with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Criminal Justice.

I understand that his fellow agent, Special Agent Victor Avila, was injured in the attack and is now recovering in his home. My thoughts and prayers are with Special Agent Victor Avila, and I am hoping and praying for his healthy recovery.

These agents were two of the hundreds of ICE personnel around the globe. Every day, committed agents like Special Agents Zapata and Avila collaborate with their foreign counterparts to dismantle criminal organizations that pose a border security and law enforcement threat to the United States.

Our Nation is fortunate to have the men and women of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement keeping us safe and secure. Their bravery and dedication serve as a fine example for all Americans.

I know the Department of Homeland Security and other law enforcement groups are working closely with the authorities in Mexico to ensure that the perpetrators of this attack are identified and brought to justice.

To the family of Special Agent Zapata as well as his ICE brothers and sisters, I offer my deepest sympathies. His sacrifice in service for our country and your family's enormous loss are not, and will not, be forgotten.

And to Special Agent Avila, I join with my colleagues at the Committee on Homeland Security, to express my sincere wish for a full recovery and appreciation for your service to our country.

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA, ON ITS CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a resolution commemorating Fort Lauderdale, Florida, on its centennial anniversary. The city was incorporated on March 27, 1911, but in fact Fort Lauderdale's history goes back much further.

Thousands of years ago the Glades Culture and Tequesta people settled in the area, although the modern history of the area began in the early 1800s with the Seminole Indian Tribe settlements. Conflict arose between the Native Americans and local white planters, leading to a series of wars over several decades. It was during the Second Seminole War, in the 1830s and 1840s, that Major William Lauderdale commanded a detachment of soldiers who built a fort along the New River, forever imprinting his name on the area.

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as regional investments in rail, water, and road transportation took off, trading posts and residential neighborhoods grew up in the area, until Fort Lauderdale became a city in 1911. Four years later the city became the seat in the newly-created Broward County.

By World War Two Fort Lauderdale had become a major resort town, shipping port, and military base, where pilots and submarines did battle with German U-boats off the coast of Florida. The postwar period saw Broward become the second largest county in the State, and turned Fort Lauderdale into a major metropolis, commercial hub, and tourist destination.

Today, Fort Lauderdale has over 180,000 residents and ten million annual visitors. Nearby Port Everglades is the third busiest cruise port in the United States, and the city is a global center for yachting, with over 100 marinas and 42,000 yachts. The city's International Boat Show is the third largest in the world.

From pristine beaches and entertainment centers to its economic vitality and transportation network, Fort Lauderdale is a vibrant and livable destination city. The past hundred years have seen unprecedented growth and civic betterment, the outgrowth of suburbs and the rising of skyscrapers. I know that the next hundred years will mark great new achievements in urban development and economic prosperity. I offer my congratulations to the city and its residents on the occasion of Fort Lauderdale's centennial anniversary.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE START OF CIVIL WAR AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the 150th anniversary of the start of the Civil War and the contributions of African Americans in abolishing slavery.

The Association for the Study of African American Life and History, ASALH, selected "African Americans and the Civil War" as its 2011 National Black History theme to show appreciation for the successful efforts of free and enslaved African Americans, during the Civil War, to end slavery. ASALH has issued a statement, which I bring to the Floor:

In 1861, as the United States stood at the brink of Civil War, people of African descent, both enslaved and free persons, waited with a watchful eye. They understood that a war between the North and the South might bring about jubilee—the destruction of slavery and universal freedom. When the Confederacy fired upon Fort Sumter and war ensued, President Abraham Lincoln maintained that the paramount cause was to preserve the Union, not end slavery. Frederick Douglass, the most prominent black leader, opined that regardless of intentions, the war would bring an end to slavery, America's "peculiar institution."

Over the course of the war, the 4 million people of African descent in the United States proved Douglass right. Free and enslaved blacks rallied around the Union flag in the cause of freedom. From the cotton and tobacco fields of the South to the small towns and big cities of the North, nearly 200,000 joined the Grand Army of the Republic and took up arms to destroy the Confederacy. They served as recruiters, soldiers, nurses, and spies, and endured unequal treatment, massacres, and riots as they pursued their quest for freedom and equality. Their record of service speaks for itself, and Americans have never fully realized how their efforts saved the Union.

In honor of the efforts of people of African descent to destroy slavery and inaugurate universal freedom in the United States, the Association for the Study of African American Life and History has selected "African Americans and the Civil War" as the 2011 National Black History Theme. We urge all Americans to study and reflect on the value of their contributions to the nation."

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the 150th Anniversary of the Civil War, and applauding African Americans for their work to abolish slavery and for their contributions toward the equalization among American races.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATION ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chair, I am pleased that Mr. AKIN plans to withdraw his amendment #181 to defund the bipartisan indoor lighting provision of the historic Energy Independence and Security Act, which President Bush signed into law in 2007.

Let me underscore a few facts:

First, Chairman UPTON plans to hold an oversight hearing on this provision in the near future—so action today would have been premature.

Second, the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, which represents the domestic manufacturers of light bulbs and includes GE, Sylvania and Phillips, urges a "no" vote.

Third, the law does not ban incandescent light bulbs, or force Americans to buy Chinese-made compact fluorescent bulbs that contain small traces of mercury.

Fourth, what the law does is set a glide path to US manufacture of more efficient light bulbs—which are already saving consumers an average of $200 per family per year. Manufacturing facilities in Pennsylvania, Ohio, North Carolina, Florida and Torrance, CA—in my district—are creating thousands of new jobs right now.

Finally, when the law passed by a strong bipartisan vote my co-author Rep. UPTON said: ". . . it is a bipartisan effort in every way . . . this is where we need to be . . . where the world needs to be."

And then-Ranking Member on Energy and Commerce Rep. BARTON added: ". . . this is one of the few areas where there has been constructive dialogue and bipartisanship . . ."

Withdrawing this amendment is the proper thing to do and I commend Rep. AKIN for doing so.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Chu amendment, and for the 19,000 students in Hawaii who rely on Pell grants to pay for college.

That's 22 percent of the student body at Maui College. 30 percent at the University of

Hawaii at Hilo. 17 percent at UH Manoa. 18 percent at UH West Oahu. 22 percent at Chaminade. 13 percent at Hawaii Pacific University.

The underlying bill turns a blind eye to these 19,000 students in Hawaii, and 9 million students nationwide. H.R. 1 would slash Pell grants by more than 15 percent, the largest cut in the program's history.

Investing in education is an investment in our future. Employees with a bachelor's degree earn more than $20,000 per year more than those without a degree, and in turn contribute more to the economy in taxes and spending. For low-income families struggling to make ends meet, Pell grants are a lifeline to help students pay for college.

Meanwhile, Pell grants have not kept pace with rising tuition costs. In 1979, Pell grants helped low-income students at four-year public colleges pay for 77 percent of their tuition, fees, room, and board. Today, the grant covers less than half that—just 34 percent of college expenses.

In this difficult economy, slashing investments in education like Pell is exactly the wrong move to make. The Chu amendment would restore full funding to the Pell grant program, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to Section 2226 of the bill, which will cut funding for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program from the current level $3.948 billion to $1.5 billion, a 62 percent decrease.

This drastic reduction would have a devastating impact on communities all across America, including my district, and hinder our ability to continue doing our part in aiding the Nation's economic recovery.

CDBG works. In Los Angeles County, for example, CDBG funding has provided a direct benefit to low- and moderate-income residents and their neighborhoods, something that simply would not have been possible without this federal-local partnership.

Over the past five years, Los Angeles County's CDBG program has accomplished the following: 1. created or retained 1,109 jobs; 2. provided loans and technical assistance to over 14,000 businesses; 3. provided assistance to over four million individuals in unincorporated areas and participating cities in Los Angeles County; 4. preserved 6,217 housing units; 5. provided improvements to almost 23,000 facilities; and 6. removed over 28 million square feet of graffiti.

Mr. Chair, reducing CDBG funding would mean curtailing or cancelling the following types of activities in my district and countless others across the Nation: 1. Housing Rehabilitation Loans and Grants for families the elderly and disabled persons; 2. Commercial Facade Improvements in distressed areas; 3. Youth Programs providing afterschool, child care, gang prevention, and intervention services; 4. Senior Programs that offer meals, housing placement, and recreation; 5. Construction and improvement of critical public facilities and infrastructure; and 6. Business Loan Programs to bring development and jobs into our communities.

Mr. Chair, the federal budget is not merely a ledger documenting receipts and expenditures but a reflection of our national values. And certainly nothing is more central to our national character than its strong, healthy, and vibrant local communities. The CDBG program is indispensable if we are to continue the important community and economic development initiatives needed to revitalize our economy, create jobs, and put people back to work in homes they own and can afford.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

The Continuing Resolution on the floor today makes irresponsible and dangerous cuts in transportation and development, doing harm to a construction sector already facing 20 percent unemployment and delaying the investments needed to bring our nation's infrastructure into a state of good repair. These cuts, which are opposed by our business community, come with a price—lost productivity, less safety, and a higher cost for repairs later as our system continues to deteriorate.

Eliminating funding for DC Metro is just one example of the Republicans' penny-wise, pound-foolish approach to deficit reduction. The Federal Government relies on the Metro system to bring thousands of employees to work every day—to the Pentagon, to the Department of Homeland Security, to all the Federal agencies that help provide services to the American people. More than half of Metrorail stations serve Federal facilities. When the Metro does not work, the government cannot work.

This $150 million investment makes the capital improvements that are necessary to make the system safe and reliable. And every dollar is matched by our local partners in Maryland, DC, and Virginia. These funds are budgeted to make critical safety improvements, replace aging rail cars, and rebuild miles of track. Without them, we will see reduced reliability and degraded customer service.

Mr. Chair, short-sighted cuts to infrastructure eliminate home-grown jobs and delay critical improvements that would make transportation safer and more efficient. If we do not make these investments now, we will certainly pay more later. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and oppose these reckless, job-killing cuts to critical infrastructure programs.

HONORING MARVIN MANNING

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my friend, Marvin Manning, for his 85th birthday. Born in Ohio, Marvin valiantly served his country during World War II in the United States Navy. Upon returning from his service, Marvin used the G.I. Bill to graduate from The Ohio State University.

In 1987, after serving for years as the Chief Financial Officer for a jewelry company, Marvin retired to South Florida. After the move, Marvin quickly became involved in politics and in the community. Marvin chaired the Dade County Community Coalition, was the Chief Community Advisor for Congressman Bill Lehman, and worked for Senator BILL NELSON's 1990 gubernatorial campaign.

In 1997, Marvin moved from Dade County into Florida's 19th Congressional district. Here, he continued his volunteerism where he has served as President of the Century Village Democratic Club, President of the Century of Boca Raton Umbrella Association, COBRUA, as President of the Yarmouth Association, was on the Half Penney Board, and serves on the Executive Board of the West Boca Community Council.

I, along with much of the South Florida community, am most grateful for Marvin's close work and relationships with our local elected officials. When Hurricane Wilma devastated South Florida, Marvin's hard work, along with the help of former Congressman Robert Wexler, Commissioner Burt Aaronson, and other local officials led to a speedy response which guaranteed that Century Village got the assistance it needed in the aftermath of the storm.

It has been an honor to count Marvin as a colleague, an advisor, and most of all a friend. I would like to congratulate Marvin and his family on his 85th birthday, and I look forward to many more years of working together with Marvin to better the South Florida community.

HONORING ZELPHA (ZEP) MONTGOMERY-WHATLEY THE BUILDER OF ''MISS BERNICE'S HOUSE''

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Zelpha (Zep) Montgomery-Whatley, The Builder of "Miss Bernice's House." The Northside Haven Association, Inc., and Miss Bernice's House exist today, primarily because of two women—two Black women of Holmes County, Mississippi. One had great spiritual wisdom, strength and

focus; the other, unwavering faith and a strong belief in the power and purpose of God. Their names: Mrs. Bernice Patton Montgomery-Johnson (Miss Bernice) and her elder daughter, Zelpha la'Marr Montgomery-Whatley, who is just called, Zep.

Zep caught her mother's dream to build a house—a great house for people who are sick, homeless, in need of housing and gentle personal care. Zep gave up her life's work of public service where she lived ''up North'' and having been accepted to the Peace Corps to work in West Africa.

Instead and as God would have it, Zep packed up and moved back home to Holmes County, Mississippi, breaking a long standing vow never to return to Mississippi again! She moved back home, she thought, to help her mother, Miss Bernice, to fulfill a dream to build ''a house of help'' for poor senior citizens of Holmes County and Mississippi. Miss Bernice convinced her daughter that ''back home'' was her ''Peace Corps'' and her ''West Africa.'' Zep said, ''Yes,'' to her mother and has since proclaimed that this is the best, most challenging and rewarding work God has ever assigned to her hands. Her boldness for the ''street work'' of God—''helping hurting people,'' is unmatched!

To know Zep Montgomery—to really know her, is to know that she rarely considers the word, ''No'' as a final answer to any unsolved problem. She says her daddy taught her to ''just look for another way.'' She will push herself and she will push and pull others until ''the way is found.'' This attitude is testimony to the mere existence of Miss Bernice's House—a Personal care/Assisted Living facility, Holmes County's first and only one. When she was told ''No,'' by her local and State governments, she turned to Washington, D.C., and her Congressman. It was understood that ''No'' was not an answer, nor was it an option. The Federal government responded with an $800,000 dollar, loan/grant package to build the house envisioned by her mother, who on the day of approval went home to be with the Lord!

Additionally, Zep knew when the mailman had trouble delivering the mail on the wet, muddy road where she lived, she put on her rubber boots and went to see the Holmes County Board of Supervisors. They said it couldn't be done; the road couldn't be built and probably wouldn't be built during the next 20 years! Within 2 years a new paved road was built, including two new concrete bridges for approximately $500,000 dollars! Again, when the current water system could not accommodate Miss Bernice's House and her community, Zep requested assistance from the local water authority and was told, ''No, it couldn't be done.'' Today, a $550,000 dollar new water system has been installed for her community and Miss Bernice's House as a direct result of Zep's faith, her tenacity and her hard work.

Zelpha is a professional helper. She believes there is no greater reason for any human being to get up in the morning other than to help another human-being.

Zep proclaims, ''I'm in business to help people.''

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1.

This deeply flawed bill does nothing to create jobs or promote economic growth. In fact, it actually undercut these critical priorities, threatening to destabilize our fragile economic recovery.

The bill cuts billions of dollars from programs that increase transportation and housing choices, reduce traffic on our highways, and lower energy costs for American families. It cuts Community Development Block Grants that empower local cities and counties to prioritize the housing and infrastructure projects that make the most sense for them. And it eliminates funding for the Sustainable Communities Initiative—a program that strengthens local economic competitiveness and reduces commutes to jobs, shops and schools.

These proven programs are already creating jobs and stimulating economic growth. They help local communities attract new businesses and jumpstart their economies. They help improve local business districts and provide affordable housing options nearby. And rather than build expensive new roads and highways, these programs focus on fixing what we already have.

In short, these programs create jobs. High tech jobs. Clean energy jobs. Construction jobs. High quality, local jobs that pay well and can't be shipped overseas.

Rather than enhancing these proven job creators, the Majority is eliminating them. The irrational spending cuts in this bill completely undermine these proven programs and threaten to cripple our fragile economic recovery. It makes no sense.

But I suppose we shouldn't be surprised, given the Majority's record on the issue. It's been nearly two months and we have not voted on a single bill to create jobs or promote economic growth. Not one.

Mr. Chair, we can't simply cut our way to economic prosperity.

This CR is nothing more than a negligent political gimmick. But this gimmick has real consequences. Real consequences for our local communities whose crumbling infrastructure will only deteriorate further; real consequences for the millions of unemployed Americans whose search for a job will only get longer; and real consequences for Middle Class families whose struggle to stay afloat will only get tougher.

It's time this Congress starts doing what our constituents sent us here to do—create jobs. I urge my colleagues to support jobs creation and oppose H.R. 1.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER MAINTENANCE

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a matter of vital importance to our Nation's business and economic recovery. I am extremely concerned about recent actions by the Army Corps of Engineers and its failure to maintain the Lower Mississippi River deep draft navigation channel. Approximately 60 percent of all U.S. grain exports are shipped from the Mississippi River, and 25 percent of all large commercial bulk ships that arrive in the U.S. come through the mouth of the Mississippi River. U.S. Customs and Border Protection estimates that the river system facilitates between $85 billion and $104 billion annually in foreign trade through its district on the Lower Mississippi River. Without immediate maintenance dredging of that channel, domestic transportation costs will significantly increase for a wide range of U.S. products and goods, and many businesses will be placed at a competitive disadvantage for participation in the Nation's export trade.

At this time, the Corps is not meeting navigation channel maintenance requirements, and as a result, the width and depth of the channel has been reduced because of silting in the lower stretches of the river. The maritime transportation capabilities of the waterway are deteriorating rapidly, and river pilots now have imposed operating restrictions on commercial vessels transiting the mouth of the Mississippi River, restrictions that will significantly add costs and delays in the export of American products to international markets. Therefore, I urge the Corps of Engineers to maintain the Lower Mississippi River deep draft navigation channel at a depth and width that will not inhibit transportation on this vital waterway.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER MAINTENANCE

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address concerns that many of my colleagues have expressed to me regarding maintenance to the Lower Mississippi River deep draft navigation channel. As the Chairman of the House Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, I am well aware of the economic benefits provided by the Mississippi River system that connects approximately 30 States in our Nation's heartland with international markets. Accordingly, the Subcommittee works hard to ensure that the Lower Mississippi River deep draft navigation channel is maintained by the Corps to meet export and import trade and other domestic transportation needs.

As Congress considers the Continuing Resolution for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2011, I want to assure my colleagues that I have provided sufficient flexibility within the $2,361,000,000 in the operation and maintenance account for the Corps to maintain the

Lower Mississippi River deep draft navigation channel to adequately meet our transportation needs. It is our intent that the Corps recognizes the economic importance of navigation on the Lower Mississippi River when allocating these funds.

HONORING BESSIE BAKER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Bessie Baker. Could you honestly say that ''My house is your house?'' Could you honestly say that ''I will help you when you need me?'' Are you willing to ''be there when your neighbor needs you?'' Are you willing to ''set aside your time to do for others in any situation?'' Are you willing to ''feed a stranger?''

At the young age of 50, Bessie L. Baker has 3 adult children and 2 teenage children. She continues to make silent sacrifices for others within the community by being reliable, caring, and passionate about those in need. She is always willing to put one foot in front of the other, despite personal struggles and situations that we all face day-to-day. Bessie continues to be involved not only within her family's lives, but also in the lives of others. She is the epitome of selflessness in society as a whole not just today, but everyday.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF CLARENCE HARPER

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Clarence Dominic Harper and in honor of his commitment to family, community, and country.

Clarence spent his entire life devoted to his community. In 1930 he was born in Richfield, Ohio, where he would remain and serve for the rest of his life. He left a profound mark on those with whom he lived. The denizens of Richfield will remember Clarence fondly due to his constant support and devotion to the community. Clarence had a great admiration for the natural beauty of Ohio. In fact, during his life he became a self-taught expert on animals native to Northeast Ohio.

Clarence also possessed a strong, vital love for his country. In fact, this Nation will forever be in debt to the years he devoted to serving his Nation during the Korean War.

Most importantly, Clarence was a family man. He spent 55 years of his life with his loving wife Helene. He was an active role model for his children, Stacy, Gregory, and Mary, for whom he was always a loving and caring father.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in remembering Clarence Dominic Harper whose legacy of commitment towards community, country and family is an inspiration. I extend my sincere condolences to his wife, his three children and three grandchildren.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this bill's elimination of funding for Title X family planning services.

This extremely successful program helps both men and women access lifesaving preventative healthcare, including breast exams, cancer screenings, and HIV tests.

The proposed cuts in H.R. 1 would eliminate these, which is unconscionable.

If my colleagues across the aisle really want to reduce the number of abortions in this country, they should support Title X funding which helps prevent unintended pregnancies through education and access to contraception.

In my home state of California, Title X helps more than 200,000 women avoid unintended pregnancies.

The birth rate among California teenagers has decreased by more than half since 1992. Without Title X funding it would be 37 percent higher!

Eliminating the $2.2 million in Title X funds that San Diego County receives every year will mean taking away care in a state already struggling with limited resources.

I will not let San Diego families lose these valuable health services.

When women have better access to family planning, it leads to healthier outcomes for both mother and child.

Leadership proposes these cuts under the guise of being ''fiscally responsible,'' but that is far from reality, particularly for states that are in budget crises like California.

The contraceptive and other reproductive health services provided at Title X—supported centers in my state saved $581,890,000 in public funds in 2008 alone.

Cutting family planning is fiscally irresponsible.

Eliminating it doesn't save taxpayers any money; in fact, it puts their health and potentially their lives at risk. That is a cost we cannot afford.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. JEFF DUNCAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, with the federal budget deficit soaring past $1.5 trillion dollars, our national debt is no longer simply a pressing economic problem. It is a looming catastrophe. If we do not reduce government spending immediately and by massive amounts America will never recover. The annual deficit alone equates to nearly $5,000 for every man woman and child. That means we are spending $5,000 per person more than we take in each year. The amount of total debt our government has accumulated is much too great for our citizens to even fathom at $14 trillion.

I agree with the nonpartisan Eagle Forum citizen advocacy group which recently stated that if we do not drastically reduce spending now, the problem won't simply be that our children and grandchildren will be saddled with debt. Our currency will become worthless, economic growth will become nearly impossible and our nation will be plunged into a modern equivalent of the dark ages. Our only choice is to drastically reduce the size and cost of our government. It is not possible to raise taxes high enough to pay for all the spending the President wants. Despite the tremendous work ethic and resourcefulness of the American people, it is no longer even possible for the United States to grow our way out of this mess. Freezing spending is not enough. Merely trimming spending is not enough. We need to cut and cut deeply. Representatives JIM JORDAN and SCOTT GARRETT and Senator JIM DEMINT have proposed $173 billion of discretionary spending cuts over the next two years, $16.1 billion in cuts to Medicaid, ending the ''stimulus'' program which will save $45 billion, and ending government ownership of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, saving another $30 billion. This proposal is an excellent start. It is necessary. And it may be America's only hope if we wish to avoid an economic calamity.

HONORING MARY FRANCES MOORE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the long and distinguished life of Ms. Mary Frances Moore.

For more than twenty years she spent numerous hours campaigning for the person she thought was the best candidate for political position. Whether it was going door to door collecting absentee ballots or campaign at the polls, she was always there. She campaigned for offices of President, Representatives, Supervisors, Mayors and numerous others. If there is ever a political rally, you can count on her to be there.

She represents the many voices, faces and ideas that we may never hear, see, or even understand. She knows what is most beneficial for our town, state and country. She takes her political experience and uses it in a positive manner and that is to provide our citizens the opportunity to be heard by a ballot cast.

To know her is to love her and to be on the opposing side, well, you are in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Mary Frances Moore for her role in the political arena.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chair, this week, the House is debating a Continuing Resolution (H.R. 1) that includes the dangerous elimination of funding to a key organization, UNFPA, that provides life-saving services to women, children and families around the world in over 150 countries—more than any other organization in the world.

The work UNFPA does recognizes that there is a direct connection between a woman's ability to plan her family, space her pregnancies, and give birth safely and her ability to get an education, work outside the home, support her family, and participate fully in her community. UNFPA knows that when we ignore the health of women, there is a measurable cost in terms of lost productivity, lost resources, and lost lives. The CR works against these efforts which is why I urge you to vote against it.

Recent natural disasters remind us that the needs of women must not be forgotten in times of emergency. The devastating earthquake in Haiti did not stop the need for access to good maternal health care. Haiti already had the highest rate of maternal death in the Western Hemisphere before the earthquake, with the lifetime risk of dying in childbirth equaling 1 in 47.

Since the earthquake, UNFPA has delivered reproductive health supplies, including clean delivery kits and other maternal and neonatal health care products.

UNFPA helps to ensure women and their health care needs are not ignored in the wake of a disaster. But we can't wait until times of emergency to act. Each year more than 536,000 women die due to complications developed during pregnancy and childbirth, and another 10 million suffer debilitating illnesses and lifelong disabilities and UNFPA works to help prevent these deaths and complications.

Every step of the way, UNFPA is working to help women, prevent death, and support healthy families. This bill will cut funding to the basic work UNFPA does as well as the work in does in times of emergency, including Haiti, the Southeast Asia tsunami in 2004, and Afghanistan in 2001, among other times.

For this, and scores of other reasons, I encourage you to vote "no" on H.R. 1.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the amendment to H.R. 1 that would prohibit the U.S. Department of Education from implementing its misguided Gainful Employment rule.

Since the Department of Education issued this rule, I have written numerous times, and have spoken directly with Secretary Duncan to express my strong opposition to this rule. Career colleges serve millions of non-traditional students across the country—including a significant number of minorities and single parents.

In my own district, many well-respected career colleges are helping my constituents realize the dream of better careers and higher salaries. Yet, the Department's rule will disproportionately harm these non-traditional and lower-income students who rely on these institutions for quality education to improve their prospects for better careers.

I oppose this rule and I support this amendment because I do not believe that we should use the actions of a few institutions to paint the entire career college industry with one negative brush. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment, which is a vote for opportunity for millions of Americans across this country.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Cleveland Chapter of the Lithuanian American Community's commemoration of the anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, and the re-establishment of their independence.

On February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania declared their independence to the world as a distinct country of its own culture and traditions. The state was founded on democratic principles and declared its independence in a peaceful manner. However, Lithuania's freedom was short-lived, as the country and its people were subjected to foreign occupation and conquest by the Nazi Germany regime and the U.S.S.R. during World War II. In 1940, the Soviet Union took control of Lithuania, without the people's consent. This unjust control of a free people lasted for 50 years. On March 11, 1990, upon the fall of the Soviet Union, the people of Lithuania re-established their independence, and once again, became a sovereign, free state.

The Lithuanian-American Community's Cleveland Chapter has worked to connect the people of Cleveland of Lithuanian descent and to share their rich and vibrant culture with the community. I offer my best wishes for the upcoming celebration of their heritage and their independence.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in commemorating the independence of Lithuania and, in wishing the country and its people continued freedom and success.

HONORING MRS. ODA LUE SANDERS GILMORE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the long and distinguished life of Mrs. Oda Lue Sanders Gilmore. Mrs. Oda Lue Sanders Gilmore was born in 1914 in Leake County to Velmon and Maggie Crouther Sanders. Being the eldest of three children, her parents instilled in her the importance of education and having family values, in which she carried and followed throughout her life. She built her life on being a role model to her students by never meeting a stranger and always having an open door to assist anyone. Her motto was "Always walk like you have a purpose in life."

Mrs. Gilmore received her junior high and high school education at Mary Holmes Seminary for Girls in West Point, MS and continued her education at Jackson State College, now Jackson State University, where she received her B.S. in elementary education. Mrs. Gilmore began her teaching career in the rural school system of Leake County, teaching in Tribulation, Pilgrim Rest, Wesley Chapel, and O.E. Jordan Elementary Schools. After teaching the students of Leake County Schools for 46 years, she finally retired in 1978 from Carthage Elementary School. Mrs. Oda married Hollis "Lanky" Gilmore in 1935, in which she joined Wesley Chapel UMC, where she remains a faithful member to date. She has served in many capacities within the church, including secretary, treasurer, nominating committee and Sunday School Teacher. In the United Methodist Women, she has served in various offices, such as President, Vice-President, Treasurer, and secretary on the local, sub-district, and district levels. Mrs. Gilmore served as a delegate to the Mississippi Methodist Conference and, later the Mississippi United Methodist Conference, for over 40 years.

She has also attended national and jurisdictional United Methodist Women conferences in Cincinnati, OH; Raleigh, NC; Philadelphia, PA; and Kansas City, Missouri. Throughout the years, she has received distinguished awards and accolades from various associations and organizations, with the most recent being a 96th birthday card from President Barack and First Lady Michelle Obama.

VETO ANTI-ISRAEL UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on the Administration to stand with Israel and veto the proposed anti-Israel United Nations Security Council resolution. Any compromise in our support for the State of Israel would be detrimental to efforts to bring peace and prosperity to the Middle East. The United States should veto any resolution that endangers our allies in the region and threatens the

future of the peace process. We must stand with Israel and veto this resolution in the United Nations Security Council.

CONGRATULATING KIRK WHALUM FOR RECEIVING THE 2011 GRAMMY AWARD FOR BEST GOSPEL SONG

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate jazz saxophonist Kirk Whalum for receiving the 2011 Grammy Award from The Recording Academy for Best Gospel Song. The award winning song, "It's What I Do," is from his album, The Gospel According to Jazz Chapter III. Kirk Whalum, a Memphian, is the son of the late Reverend Kenneth Whalum, Sr., and Dr. Rosie Whalum. The Whalum family is known for their musical, spiritual and community involvement in the Memphis area. In addition to receiving the Grammy Award, Mr. Whalum was named the President and Chief Financial Officer of the Memphis-based Soulsville Foundation in April of 2010.

Mr. Whalum has been part of the music community for many years, and it is great to see him be recognized for his tremendous talents. Over the years, he has received multiple Grammy nominations and has won many other awards. He has received two Dove Award nominations, a NAACP Image Awards nomination and has won two Stellar Awards. In addition to his awards, Mr. Whalum has worked with impressive musical artists including Barbara Streisand, Al Jarreau, Luther Vandross, Larry Carlton, Quincy Jones and Whitney Houston.

Kirk Whalum and the Whalum family are no strangers when it comes to community service and musical talent. His father was a prominent minister at Memphis's Olivet Baptist Church and also served two terms on the Memphis City Council. Kirk Whalum's brother, Reverend Kenneth Whalum, Jr., took over their father's post at the Memphis church and is also the father of recognized saxophonist, Kenneth T. Whalum III. Kevin Whalum, the third Whalum brother, is known for his talents as a jazz vocalist. Kirk Whalum's uncle, Hugh "Peanuts" Whalum, is a recognized singer, composer and multi-instrumentalist.

Kirk Whalum is a true ambassador of the city of Memphis. He is doing great things with his new post at the Soulsville Foundation, which oversees the Stax Museum of American Soul Music, the Stax Music Academy and The Soulsville Charter School. Through the Soulsville Foundation, he is able to further enrich the musical talents of the youth in Memphis and serve as a mentor to budding musicians. His dedication to music and musical talent has led him to receive not only many awards but has earned him much deserved accolades from the music community. Mister Speaker, I ask the House to join me in congratulating Kirk Whalum for receiving the 2011 Grammy Award for Best Gospel Song.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on February 16, 2011. If I were present, I would have voted for the following: Lummis (WY) amendment (No. 193)—rollcall No. 61: no; Moran (VA) amendment (No. 338)—rollcall No. 62: no; Flake (AZ) amendment (No. 376)—rollcall No. 63: no; Pompeo (KS) amendment (No. 376)—rollcall No. 64: no; Reed (NY) amendment (No. 379)—rollcall No. 65: no.

HONORING ROBERT "BOB" WOODSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Robert "Bob" Woodson, the eighth of nine children, was born in Carroll County, Mississippi, to the late Mamie Dixon Woodson and John Woodson.

During his infant years, Bob's family relocated to Yazoo County, Mississippi. His dad being a sharecropper, Bob was raised on a plantation.

Bob attended a one-room country school from first through eighth grade, then was bused more than 70 miles, one way, to attend high school in Yazoo City. Although a high school was closer to where he lived, busing was used to maintain segregation. After graduating from high school in 1956, Bob was ordered to report for induction into the United States Armed Forces. However, being the only son at home to assist his dad with farming, the plantation owner was able to secure a permanent deferment.

Because of Bob's father's failing health, the family gave up farming to relocate to Jackson in the late 50's. Migrating from an agricultural to an industrial society, his first work experience was a carpenter's helper. Being impatient and discontent, Bob shortly thereafter obtained a job with Swift & Company, where he got his first exposure to the labor movement when he joined the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workers, AFL–CIO.

Because of seasonal work, in July 1959, Bob became employed at Mississippi Products, a furniture manufacture facility, as a finish sprayer. At the time of employment, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners (UBCJ of A) of the AFL–CIO was in its initial stages of trying to implement a union organizing campaign. Due to the vicious anti-union climate, Bob became quietly involved trying to convince his fellow workers of the advantages of labor unions.

After 3 years of much agony and frustration to overcome racial hatred promoted by company management, and then Mississippi's Governor Ross Barnett and the entire business community to keep the work force divided; finally in 1963, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America won an election at Mississippi Products and was certified as bargaining agent for the plant by the National Labor Relations Board, NLRB.

After negotiating a contract, workers were afraid to become union members. Due to the lack of participation within the union by employees, in September of 1965, Bob became employed full-time for the Union for the sole purpose of recruiting workers to become union members. During the first year of his activity, door to door soliciting increased the membership from 20 percent to over 60 percent. For the next 17 years, Bob held the combined positions of vice-president and business agent; and president and business agent of the Local Union. This was the beginning of many firsts for Bob Woodson.

In 1966, Bob was the first black elected to the executive board of the Mississippi AFL–CIO. He participated in civil rights marches, "not out front," but concentrating more on voter registration.

In 1968, Bob was a "Loyalist" delegate to the Democratic National Convention. In 1972, Bob organized the Mississippi A. Philip Randolph Institute, and was named chairman. In 1974, Bob was a delegate to the Historical National Democratic Charter Convention in Kansas City, Kansas. In 1975, Bob was the first black named to the "Regular" Hinds County Democratic Executive Committee. In May 1983, Bob continued his services as an International Representative traveling many thousands of miles on job assignments in several states, including: DC, Georgia, Tennessee, Florida, Arkansas, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Illinois, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

During Bob's career of more than 30 years as a full-time Union Representative, he received many hours of specialized academic training provided by the National Labor Relations Board in the George Meany Center for Labor Studies, in the area of contract negotiations, grievance and arbitrations, handling unfair labor practice proceedings and many other labor management relations.

Some of Bob's experiences include: Head Negotiator, Administrator, Fiscal Officer, Labor Management Specialist, OIC Board Chairman, Director of Minority Affairs of Mississippi AFL–CIO for 12 years, president of Mississippi A. Philip Randolph Institute 1972–1979 Program and Evaluation Committee for Jackson Manpower Planning Council, and the list goes on.

Bob was very active and influential in many political campaigns; and has received certificates of appreciation and recognition and several awards for his outstanding services, leadership and contributions to help improve working conditions for all people.

Bob retired in May 1996, as a full-time Union Representative, after more than 30 years of service.

CONGRATULATING MYASIA BURNS AND CHARLES ORGBON III

HON. ROB WOODALL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I proudly submit this statement congratulating two young people from my district, Miss Myasia Burns and Mr. Charles Orgbon III, who were recently chosen as being among the top youth volunteers in the State of Georgia for 2011 in the

16th annual Prudential Spirit of Community Awards Program.

The Prudential Spirit of Community Program is an annual honor conferred on the most impressive volunteers in each State and the District of Columbia.

Miss Burns, age 17, of Monroe, Georgia, was nominated by her school, Monroe Area High School, for her work in raising more than $16,000 for the American Cancer Society through the ''Team Burns Charitable Foundation,'' an organization started in memory of Miss Burns' father.

Mr. Orgbon, age 15, of Dacula, Georgia, was nominated by Mill Creek High School for founding ''Greening Forward,'' a national environmental awareness campaign, which he started in 2008.

Both of these individuals possess a servant's heart and a leader's mind. Ms. Burns and Mr. Orgbon should be proud to have been singled out from close to 29,000 volunteers who participated in this year's program. They are not only making a positive impact on our communities, but they are setting the standard for their peers and for future generations of young Americans.

HONORING PATRICK RINEY, SR.

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the extraordinary life of Patrick Riney, Sr. and to mourn upon his passing at the age of 73.

Born on April 9, 1937, Patrick Riney, Sr. was a man dedicated to his family, his community and his country. He admirably served as a defender of this great nation as a member of the United States Navy.

Regrettably, on February 14, 2011, Patrick Riney, Sr. passed from this earthly world to his eternal reward. He leaves to celebrate his life his beloved wife of more than 48 years, Patricia. Patrick is survived by his children Patrick, Jr., Shaun, Kelly and Kevin and also leaves the legacy of 12 grandchildren. As he departs this life to join his brothers, the late Raymond and the late Tom in eternity, Patrick Riney, Sr. will deeply missed by his treasured sister Joan. A benevolent and honorable man, Patrick leaves a lasting imprint on the lives he has touched.

Mr. Speaker, Patrick Riney, Sr. is remembered as a compassionate father, a dedicated husband, an author, a soldier and a friend. Patrick was a man who deeply treasured his family, friends, community and his country. Today, as we bid Patrick Riney, Sr. farewell, I ask my colleagues to join me in mourning his passing and honoring his unwavering commitment to his family and his legendary service to our country and community.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the cuts to the Agriculture and FDA budget in H.R. 1. They are rashly made, and they will endanger both our food supply and our families.

During my time as Chair of this subcommittee, we worked hard to provide the resources to better improve the safety of food, drugs and devices. We expanded access to fundamental nutrition and hunger programs. And we invested wisely in key areas like conservation and rural development. This continuing resolution threatens to undo all of our hard work.

Instead of cutting special interest waste, like the subsidies that go to high-income farmers and corporate farms, this continuing resolution hurts everyone else. It hurts the economy, will cost us jobs, and it threatens the middle-class and working families we were elected to represent.

We are already playing a dangerous game in terms of food safety—Far too many of the dishes on our kitchen table get there uninspected. But under this continuing resolution, there would be 2000 fewer firm inspections—and 10,000 fewer import inspections—conducted by the FDA.

In fact, both the FDA and USDA would have to furlough thousands of inspectors under this plan. That is more than just a food safety problem. It means the nearly 6,300 meat and poultry plants across America would be legally required to stop operating—costing approximately $11 billion. And it would mean, by the basic principles of the market, that the price of meat and poultry would increase for every single family in America.

In addition, this CR rolls back the budget of the Farm Service Agency—forcing a 40 day furlough of all employees and meaning long delays and less help for farmers and ranchers.

In cuts food aid to the lowest it has been in a decade, 15 million people would lose desperately-needed emergency food assistance, which will endanger our war efforts and the security of our troops in Afghanistan. And 2.5 million more women and children lose the vital aid provided by McGovern-Dole, a program with long bipartisan support.

There are many terrible ideas in this CR, but perhaps the unkindest cut of all is what will be done to the Commodity Supplemental Food Program and the Women with Infant Children feeding program. Instead of slashing subsidies for oil companies and saving $40 billion, the majority has decided to deny over 100,000 low-income seniors from receiving food packages, and cut almost $750 million from WIC, a program serving our most vulnerable citizens.

They are quite literally taking food from hungry seniors and children's mouths, and giving it to the special interests—corporate farms and oil companies—who write their checks. It is unconscionable.

I urge my colleagues to vote against these reckless and irresponsible cuts, and to work together on a budget that better reflects our priorities as a nation.

HONORING MERDIS ANDERSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Merdis Anderson is a native of Amite County, Gloster, Mississippi, where she was reared by her maternal Grandmother, the late Mrs. Mary B. Spears. She is the devoted and caring wife of Mr. Samuel Charlie Anderson of Lexington, Mississippi, and the proud mother of 2 sons, Shawn Christopher Anderson and Kevin Keith Anderson. She is also the proud grandmother of 6 grandchildren. She is a member of Lebanon Missionary Baptist Church under the Pastorship of Reverend Walter Eskridge Jr., where she serves as Usher Board Leader.

Upon graduating from Amite County Training School In Gloster, Mississippi, Mrs. Anderson attended Mississippi Valley State College, presently, Mississippi Valley State University, where she majored in Social Science with emphasis on Sociology.

After graduating from Mississippi Valley State College in 1970, she worked in the public schools of Amite County for one semester and one summer, where she taught Social Studies and English. In August of 1971, she moved to Detroit, Michigan and worked as a secretary/typist for Ford Motor Company.

Realizing that her calling was to teach, mold, and shape the minds of boys and girls to new heights in the field of education, Mrs. Anderson moved back to Mississippi in June of 1974, and was employed with the Holmes County School District as a full time teacher in September of 1975, at Mileston Elementary School. At Mileston Elementary School, she worked and served in numerous capacities for 15 years before being transferred to Lexington Elementary School, where she taught first grade, fourth grade, and in 1999, she became Lead Teacher where she dedicated her services until October of 2004 after which she left to work at the Holmes County Vocational-Technical Center.

Mrs. Anderson is presently employed at the Holmes County Vocational Technical Center, where she works diligently with the Staff Development Activities, serves as the Student Incentive Chairperson, Character Education Chairperson, Monthly Bulletin Board Chairperson, Black History Month Activities Chairperson, and Public Relations Coordinator for the center.

Realizing that she could do more to help the boys and girls in Holmes County reach new heights in education and become productive citizens in a global society, she was instrumental in being hired in 2009 by the aggressive, Mrs. Beulah Greer, Director of the Community Learning Center, and Mr. Leslie Greer, CEO of the center, as an English teacher, to work with students in the Summer Camp Program, where learning takes place on a daily

basis. Mrs. Anderson sees the Summer Camp Program as a program where the teachers instill in students that, they are somebody, they have a sense of pride, and they can become critical and logical thinkers as they grow into adulthood, facing the challenges that await them in a world of uncertainty. She has worked as a volunteer with the center for almost 2 years.

Mrs. Anderson has taught boys and girls for almost 38 years in the field of education, not for the money that the job brings, but because teaching has given her rewards that cannot be calculated on an adding machine, nor deposited in a bank, but it gives her tangible awards, such as the countenance on a child's face that has learned under her guidance, a pat on the shoulder, and the knowledge of knowing that those vibrant children are enjoying themselves and learning because of her efforts and carefully daily planning.

Her philosophy of teaching is that it takes a special group of people with special skills and dedication to focus on the strengths of children and not their weaknesses. She is a firm believer that all children can learn regardless of their background, and socio-economic status, whether it be by visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, or some other means.

To her family, community and friends, she gives thanks for believing in her, understanding her, and encouraging her in her endeavors as an educator.

''To God be the glory for all that He has done.''

NORTHERN NIGHTHAWKS RULE NORTH CAROLINA

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that the ''third time's the charm,'' and that can be applied to Northern Guilford High School, located in the Sixth District of North Carolina, for winning our state's 3–AA State Football Championship in only its third year of existence. The Northern Nighthawks celebrated their first state title when their opponent, Boling Springs Crest, missed a game-tying extra point with 15 seconds remaining, allowing Northern Guilford to escape with a thrilling 21–20 victory.

Northern Guilford survived two second-half goal line stands to capture the state crown. ''It was like something you see in a movie,'' Nighthawks senior quarterback Rocco Scarfone told the (Greensboro) News & Record. ''They could make a movie off this game. It was just surreal how it happened. I couldn't believe it.''

One reason it all happened, Mr. Speaker, was the dedication of all involved in the football program and that included the fans and the band. The Northern Nighthawks made it difficult for any team to defeat them this season, thanks in large part to the more than 3,000 fans who packed in to see every home game this past season on the way to a 14–2 record. Many also traveled to distant away games. The team band was also an important part of their championship season, and was affectionately known as the 12th man. Nighthawk Nation followed their team throughout the playoff run, often traveling more than an hour to get to each game.

The Nighthawks were lead by captains Maurice Harris, Alan Hart, Rocco Scarfone, and Stephen Machanic. Along with their teammates Tre' Purcell, Mohamed Khellah, Austin Hoke, Daniel Downing, TJ Logan, Justin Wallace, Nick Jones, Mark Mitchell, Shaheen Lashani, Shaquille Fields, Max Heavner, Burney Sindab, Scooter Mooney, Chris Ripberger, Austin Cooper, Robert Willcox, Rory Bergen, Kyle Wilhelm, Bernard Sindab, TJ Ruff, Austin Coltrane, Alex Hasler, Trevon Cooper, Earl Smith, WadeWilliam Churchill, Jordan Williams, Trevor Mckee, Austin Simmons, Ryan Johnston, Bob Hicks, Drew Milot, Max Klietsch, Colin Beairsto, Kamen Smith, Chris Forlano, Sam Parker, Jacob Roberts, Eric Hayes, Brian Iddings, Garrison O'Bryant, Taylor Rumley, Carlos Williams, Josh Moore and Kris Gafford.

Of course, Northern Guilford could not have achieved its state championship without an outstanding coaching staff led by Head Coach Johnny Roscoe and his assistant coaches Brian Thomas, Todd Sharp, Richard Burton, JR Troutman, Ben Hepler, Dovonte Edwards, Chris Shaffer, Justin Davis, and Justin Ollis. Others who were also instrumental in the championship included Jane Roscoe (Mrs. Coach), Kirstin Shepperson (Team Physician), Jan Wyrick (Women's Order Director), Team Managers Chelsea Ray, Taylor Phillips, Sydney Monroe, and Mercedes Wigglesworth, along with film editor Jenna Livingston. Male Manager Perry Johnson and Ball Boy Britt Thomas also contributed to the title.

Congratulations are also warranted for all of those who supported the football program at Northern Guilford High School. Principal Will Laine, Assistant Principals Doug Foutty, Angela Graves and Kris Vecchione, and Athletic Director Brian Thomas all can take pride in the state title.

Again on behalf of the citizens of the Sixth District of North Carolina, we congratulate Northern Guilford High School football team, along with the faculty, staff and excellent fans for their championship season. This team will be remembered for many years as football fans will say, ''remember when the Northern Nighthawks made the saying 'the third time's the charm' come true.''

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE FOR OFFICIAL TRAVEL

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the official U.S. House calendar indicating that last votes for today would conclude at 3 p.m. I committed to travel to Sana'a, Yemen at the invitation of the National Defense University's Near East South Asia Center for Strategic Studies to address a conference of senior officials of the Government of Yemen on the subject of establishing a national security strategy. The Department of Defense is paying for my travel to this official event. I have attached the letter of invitation for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My absence means I will not be present to vote on H.R. 1, the continuing resolution that will fund the federal government through September 30, 2011. My opposition to H.R. 1 has been very public and it was my intention to vote against the harmful and ill advised bill that hurts communities, families, and puts America's most vulnerable at even greater risk.

With regard to my amendment to H.R. 1 to prohibit Department of Defense sponsorship of NASCAR, I would have voted in favor.

NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY,
NEAR EAST SOUTH ASIA CENTER
FOR STRATEGIC STUDIES,
Washington, DC, January 25, 2010.

Hon. BETTY MCCOLLUM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MCCOLLUM: Following up on our fruitful conversation the other day, I would like to invite you to participate as a speaker at a Near East South Asia (NESA) Center for Strategic Studies sponsored National Security Seminar to be held in Sana'a, Yemen on Saturday February 19, 2011.

The seminar will bring together up to 800 Yemeni officials, from ministries of the Yemeni government. In addition, members of the Yemeni parliament will attend and you will be introduced by a senior parliamentarian. Military students from the Military High Academy, a Yemeni version of our National Defense University will also attend. The purpose of the Seminar is to help build strategic capacity on a whole of government basis within the Yemeni government.

As we discussed, I would ask that you participate in a session on bilateral Yemen-U.S. relations. This session will follow remarks by U.S. Ambassador Gerald Feierstein. The Yemeni Bi-Lateral speaker is Dr. Hussein Al-Amri who is a former Yemeni Ambassador to the United Kingdom (1994–2001), a current member of the Shura Council since 2001 and a Professor of modern and contemporary history at Sana'a University. You will have approximately 15 minutes for remarks.

DoD regulation permits us to offer you coach fare air travel, per diem and lodging. The NESA Center contact for support is my Executive Assistant, Ms. Kelly Cure at (202) 685–4127 or curek@ndu.edu.

Your knowledge and insights as a member of Congress and your interest in Yemen will add great value to this important event. I thank you for your willingness to participate.

Sincerely,

AMBASSADOR JAMES A. LAROCCO,
Director, NESA Center.

HONORING WILLIE STEEN BATTLE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Willie Steen Battle. Ms. Battle, born April 17, 1945 to the late Thomas and Virginia Ellis in Flora, Mississippi graduated from East Flora High School in 1964 and furthered her education with an Associate Degree from Hinds Community College.

She is an active member of Fearns Chapel Free Will Baptist Church where she serves on the Mother Board. She is President of Flora Community for Progress where she volunteers her time with organizing food drives to give baskets to the elderly and disabled during the

holidays. She also assists with giving benefit programs to people in the community whose homes have been destroyed by fire. Willie Steen is the mother of three: Tony, Erik and Michael.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I wish to express my strong support for the Sustainable Communities Initiative and oppose any cuts to this important economic development program in H.R. 1.

The Sustainable Communities Initiative illustrates a successful partnership among government agencies to invest in our local economies. At a time when there's so much talk of making government work better, this initiative is a shining example of cutting red tape and fostering collaboration among similar community interests.

Through this initiative, the Departments of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and the Environmental Protection Agency award competitive grants to communities for innovative projects that connect the creation of good jobs, sustainable housing and efficient modes of transportation.

In just the short time that this initiative has been in existence, it has awarded numerous competitive grants to communities across the country.

In 2010, a total of 630 communities requested $1.2 billion in finding and HUD awarded 61 grants worth $69 million. Clearly, communities see the great potential benefits for the projects funded by this unique initiative.

Although my hometown of Worcester, Massachusetts was not a grantee in the last round of awards, it earned the designation of ''preferred sustainability status.'' Eliminating funding for the Sustainable Communities Initiative would prevent Worcester and dozens of communities across the country from having the opportunity to receive grants to meet their multiple economic, environmental and community needs.

Furthermore, language in H.R. 1 to rescind unobligated funds would threaten projects in communities that were recently awarded grants.

Mr. Chair, cutting funding for the Sustainable Communities Initiative would be harmful to job creation efforts and would take away a vital tool to help communities transition to a 21st century economy.

I urge my colleagues to support the Sustainable Communities Initiative and oppose any cuts to this program.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the C.R. put forward by my Republican colleagues, and specifically to the defunding of Title X family planning programs authorized under the Public Health Service Act.

Begun in 1970 by President Nixon, Title X funding provides for voluntary family planning projects, and is essential to protecting women's health services. Currently, Title X is our Nation's only program dedicated to providing low-income Americans with family planning and reproductive health services.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are attempting to misconstrue Title X as federal subsidizing of abortion. However, Title X does not provide for abortion services. But it does cover essential health care for millions of families and women. From birth control to cancer screenings, approximately five million Americans rely upon Title X programs every year.

We simply cannot afford to cut lifesaving and preventive care services for those who would not otherwise have access to such care, especially in our current economic climate.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the defunding of these vital health programs contained in Title X by voting against the C.R.

HONORING FLORA BUSH STIGLER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the long and distinguished life of Mrs. Flora Bush Stigler. Born June 28, 1935, in Carroll County, Mississippi she was the 9th of 10 children born to the late Charlie and Susie Bush. She attended-Ware school in Carroll County and Knox High School in Winona, MS. Upon completing her studies she received a music scholarship in choir from Rust College in Holly Springs, Mississippi. While at Rust College, she majored in education, with a concentration in history. She also did further studies at Mississippi State University. She taught one year in Pelahatchie, MS and twenty-nine years at J. Z. George High School. She retired in 1986. While at J. Z. George, she taught 7th grade history and later taught 11 grade history. Of course, she was known for her no-nonsense atmosphere in the classroom. She carefully cultivated her students' natural abilities while demanding and commanding discipline. She ensured and assured each child that education is and would be the key to success. She retired from education after 30 years of service.

As a member of Helm Chapel Church, she serves diligently as Director of Christian Education and Music Director for both the adult and the youth choir. She also served many years as director of Prater Day Care Center of Helm Chapel CME Church, the first day care center in our area.

In April 2008, she received her Golden Degree from Rust College. She is politically active, serving as County Coordinator for Congressman BENNIE G. THOMPSON, and treasurer of the Carroll County Voters' League. Currently at age 75, she is still working with people in the community by way of managing a state program known as ''Meals on Wheels'' for seven counties, (Attala, Carroll, Grenada, Holmes, Leflore, Montgomery and Yalobusha) through North Central Planning and Development District.

She is the mother of three daughters, a grandmother of 6, a great grandmother of 7 and a person who never meets a stranger. Today, as in past years, she is known for her community service. She is an ''active'' and vocal member of the PTO at J. Z. George High School.

RECOGNIZING H. DOUGLAS CHAFFIN AS THE MICHIGAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION 2011 BANKER OF THE YEAR

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize H. Douglas Chaffin's being named the Michigan Bankers Association (MBA) 2011 Banker of the Year. Doug serves as the President and CEO of Monroe Bank and Trust (MBT), a locally owned and operated community bank headquartered in Monroe, Michigan. He has been with Monroe Bank and Trust since 2001 and assumed the role of CEO in 2004.

Doug has guided Monroe Bank and Trust with a steady hand through the turmoil of the current recession. In a time of great uncertainty and anxiety, he has led the bank with dignity and grace. Due to his keen instincts, high character and responsible management, Monroe Bank and Trust not only has weathered the financial maelstrom but, unlike its national counterparts, continued without interruption to lend to a community in dire need. Doug's vast knowledge of the financial industry and sage counsel have helped inform me for years, and his expert testimony to the House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Financial Services in November 2009 helped bring a community bank's valuable perspective to the financial regulatory reform debate.

Doug's role in the community extends far beyond the walls of his bank. He is a community leader in every sense. Doug has served as the past chairman of the Michigan Bankers Association. He also serves on the board of directors for the Monroe County Industrial Development Corporation, City of Monroe Downtown Development Authority, The Foundation at Monroe County Community College, and Mercy Memorial Hospital System.

Mr. Speaker, Doug Chaffin has served his bank and his community with distinction and honor. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating him on this well deserved recognition.

RECOGNIZING ''AMERICAN HEART MONTH''

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring awareness of the increase in cardiovascular diseases in the United States. Since 1963, to urge Americans to join the battle against these diseases, Congress has requested that the President issue an annual proclamation designating February as ''American Heart Month.'' Throughout this month, volunteers, educators, health professionals, community leaders and others will devote time to increase awareness about the number one killer of Americans: Cardiovascular disease. Since 1900 cardiovascular disease has accounted for more deaths than any other major cause of death in the U.S., 1 out of every 3. Every 25 seconds someone has a coronary event and every 40 seconds someone has a stroke. According to the American Heart Association Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics 2010 Update, the estimated direct and indirect costs of CVD for 2010 totaled $503.2 billion.

Heart disease impacts all ethnic groups, men and women, young and old. Strokes occur more often in women and twice as often in African Americans. Just reported this month at the American Stroke Association conference were statistics showing a 51% increase in strokes in 15–34 year old men and a 17% increase in 15–34 year old women. The average age of a person having a first heart attack is 64.5 for men and 70.3 for women. As overweight and obesity—believed to be the major reasons for these alarming statistics—become more prevalent in our society, the risk of CVD and stroke begins to occur at younger ages.

There are 9 modifiable risk factors for heart disease, 5 of which are related to diet. These include hypertension, abnormal blood lipids, abdominal obesity, diabetes, decreased intake of fruits and vegetables and overconsumption of alcoholic beverages. All of these risk factors could be controlled with healthy eating habits and an active lifestyle.

I am pleased to have the headquarters for the American Dietetic Association (ADA) in my Congressional District. The ADA is the foremost authority in providing nutrition counseling throughout the country. In fact, the more than 71,000 registered dietitians and nutrition professionals who are members support the 'eat right' campaign targeted toward all Americans—young and old. The work that they are doing is making a difference in the fight against heart disease and stroke and is improving the health of our citizens.

Having Medical Nutrition Therapy (MNT) covered by Medicare for beneficiaries diagnosed with hypertension and abnormal blood lipids must happen if we are to have any impact at conquering CVD and its associated deaths. Medical Nutrition Therapy provided by a registered dietitian has been shown to effectively aid in normalizing blood pressure, blood sugar and serum cholesterol levels, while also promoting any necessary weight loss. The lifestyle changes needed to provide the improvements in these risk factors cannot be made by most Americans without the vital assistance of the registered dietitian. By helping people eliminate or improve these risk factors, Medicare will avoid paying for the expensive treatments, procedures and hospitalizations that occur due to a cardiovascular event, thus creating a shift from health ''care'' to health ''prevention''.

I commend the American Heart Association and the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI) for their numerous programs and educational materials made available to the public to help them adapt a healthier lifestyle. Many employers and churches are participating in programs which encourage them to create a culture of physical activity and healthy eating to live longer, heart-healthy lives through walking. The NHLBI program ''Healthy Hearts, Healthy Homes'', presents important information about a specific risk factor for heart disease, high blood pressure, in a user-friendly and clear manner for Latinos. Several Point-of-Purchase food labeling programs are being used by various grocery stores to help their customers make the healthiest choices.

The 2020 Impact Goal of the American Heart Association states: By 2020, to improve the cardiovascular health of all Americans by 20% while reducing death from cardiovascular diseases and stroke by 20%. It will take all of us working together, encouraging our friends, families and co-workers, to live a healthier lifestyle in order to make this become a reality.

HONORING VONNIE WARE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant Mr. Vonnie Ware. Mr. Ware owns and operates his own cook syrup farm and has raised cattle for the past twenty years. His parents W.H. and Lovie Dier-Ware had nine children. His father was a Blacksmith who owned his own land.

His wife's father, Samuel Mallet, owned and operated his own farm in the Thomastown community where they could hear the bells ringing on the plantation two miles away. His father shoed horses for twenty-five cents (.25) a head. The children that lived on the plantation never went to school until it rained. He says, ''That's why I say we are just one step from the plantation, because I still meet the same men today who can't read or write.''

Out of all the injustice they endured, Vonnie's parents never taught them to hate anyone because of his skin color. His grandparents were Will and Lizer Griffin-Dier. He considered his grandfather his greatest hero and stayed with him when he was a small boy.

Vonnie's grandfather was a Deacon in his church and owned and operated his own farm. He was also a syrup cooker. His grandfather wasn't allowed any kind of benefits because he owned his own land. Vonnie followed in his grandfather's footsteps.

His Aunt Frances Dier taught school 40 years in Leake County. She walked for miles to school since she could not ride the bus because she was black. One day, the bus passed and splashed mud on her; she stepped in the ditch and prayed that one day her people would be able to ride the bus like the white people.

Today, Vonnie Ware is a past TAC (Thomastown Attendance Center) Booster club President of four years. He was also a trustee at Leake Memorial Hospital for two years. He is an active member of the Leake County Voters League.

Vonnie Ware speaks from his heart when he says: ''We are thankful for the old freedom fighters that humbled themselves and denied themselves of speaking like they were men or women. They knew what the blacks knew. It was difficult to see ''white only'' signs up everywhere you go. This hurts my soul to write anymore about it In order for a young man to succeed, he must do these three things: Believe in God, vote, and know how to spend his money. We have come a long way BUT we still have a long way to go. We must press on.''

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATION ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, Congressman FRANK and Congressman HOLT offered amendments reducing funding for the Internal Revenue Service, and increasing funding for the SEC and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, respectively.

I do not support a reduction in the budget of the Internal Revenue Service, nor do I support the rather modest cut to the General Services Administration included in the Frank Amendment

I believe that if the House adopts the Frank and Holt Amendments that the Senate will provide the funds to the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau indicated in those amendments, and will also restore the funds to the IRS and the GSA. Accordingly, I did not vote for these amendments as if they were the last word that Congress would utter regarding the funding of the SEC, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the IRS, and the GSA. Rather, I believe that in the Senate, and in the Conference committee, the support registered for the Frank and Holt Amendments will bolster the claim of those trying to provide adequate funding for the SEC and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, but will not undercut those of us seeking adequate funding for the IRS and GSA.

My support for IRS funding does not mean that I do not think that there needs to be significant reform of the IRS, its operations, and

in some hopefully rare cases, the manner in which it treats tax payers.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. PEDRO R. PIERLUISI

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to the Continuing Resolution, which would make devastating cuts to vital programs that can help America win the future.

I recognize the need to reduce our nation's deficit in a thoughtful and deliberate manner. But, as a recent editorial stated, ''these are the wrong cuts, to the wrong programs, at the wrong time.'' To sharply scale back or to eliminate programs that are critical to our nation's future in an effort to achieve an arbitrary level of deficit reduction is unwise. Although I disagree with many of the cuts included in this bill, I will focus my remarks on three programs whose long-term benefits far outweigh their short-term costs: the Pell Grant Program, COPS funding, and the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds.

Pell Grants give nearly ten million disadvantaged students, who might otherwise be unable to afford college, the ability to obtain a university education. As the cost of college rises, and economic challenges persist, many more families are struggling to pay their child's tuition bill. Yet, the legislation we are considering today would reduce annual Pell Grant funding for students by nearly $690 on average—and by nearly $720 in my district, Puerto Rico. Many students who are currently attending college with the help of a Pell Grant, or who plan to attend college with the help of a Pell Grant, will be unable to do so if this cut is implemented.

Whatever one's political affiliation, it should be clear that a college education opens doors for our young men and women that would otherwise remain sealed shut. College graduates earn significantly more than those without college degrees and have a broader range of career options available to them. And when our students are better educated, our economy is more prosperous and our nation is more competitive. Our nation will not be able to keep pace with China and other countries if we do not increase the number of Americans who graduate from college. To decrease Pell Grants in the present environment is not just bitter medicine; it is bad medicine.

Another proposed funding cut that would cost our country dearly in the long term is the bill's elimination of the COPS Hiring Program. This program puts officers on the streets, protects communities, and saves lives. No matter what part of the country you are from, you deserve to feel secure in your home. As Attorney General of Puerto Rico in the 1990s, I worked with the Clinton Administration to help secure passage of the bill that created the COPS program. Since the mid-1990s, Puerto Rico has received over $160 million in COPS grants. This funding has translated into over 3,500 new police officers in our communities. I can attest that programs funded by COPS have been a key ingredient in Puerto Rico's fight against crime. If the COPS Hiring Program is eliminated and crime increases, it will produce economic and emotional costs that far exceed the investment we could make to COPS today. To propose the elimination of the COPS Hiring Program—especially at a time when states and territories are least able to find the funding necessary to safeguard their citizens—is profoundly irresponsible.

Finally, I have deep concerns about proposed cuts to air and water quality improvement programs administered by the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The proposed reductions to the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds will be especially difficult to bear on water and wastewater systems across the country. Reliable 24-hour delivery of safe drinking water is essential to the public health, economic opportunity, and quality of life of my constituents and all Americans. The state and tribal grants administered by the Environmental Protection Agency through these revolving funds are important investments in this infrastructure nationwide.

I am concerned not only with these reductions, but also with reductions to the part of the agency that addresses air quality. As a result of action late in the 111th Congress, Puerto Rico and the territories are—for the first time—eligible for the Diesel Emissions Reduction grants program. The program, however, would be sliced in half by this bill, limiting its reach and effect toward reducing harmful particulate matter emissions. Puerto Rico is challenged with poor air quality, and I am concerned with its linkage to asthma and other chronic respiratory illnesses. We cannot make progress toward improving respiratory health without proper funding for air quality programs.

Because H.R. 1 proposes cuts to these and many other important programs, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

COMMEMORATING THE 19TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KHOJALY MASSACRE

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 19th anniversary of the Khojaly massacre by Armenian forces on February 25–26, 1992 in the town of Khojaly in the Nagorno Karabagh region of Azerbaijan. Khojaly, now under the occupation of Armenian forces, was the site of the largest killing of ethnic Azerbaijani civilians. Khojaly, once the home to 7,000 people, was completely destroyed. Six hundred thirteen people were killed, of which 106 were women, 83 were children and 56 were purported to have been killed with extreme cruelty and torture. In addition, 1,275 people were taken hostage, 150 went missing and 487 people became disabled. Also in the records maintained, 76 of the victims were teenagers, 8 families were wiped out and 25 children lost both of their parents while 130 lost one of their parents. According to Human Rights Watch and other international observers, the Armenian armed forces were reportedly aided by the Russian 366th Motor Rifle Regiment.

At the time, Newsweek magazine reported: ''Azerbaijan was a charnel house again last week: a place of mourning refugees and dozens of mangled corpses dragged to a makeshift morgue behind the mosque. They were ordinary Azerbaijani men, women and children of Khojaly, a small village in war-torn Nagorno-Karabakh overrun by Armenian forces on 25–26 February. Many were killed at close range while trying to flee; some had their faces mutilated, others were scalped.''

As part of the Khojaly population that tried to escape, they encountered violent ambushes that led to abuses, torture, mutilation and death. The Russian organization, Memorial, stated that 200 Azerbaijani corpses were brought from Khojaly to Agdam within four days.

Time magazine published the following description: ''While the details are argued, this much is plain: something grim and unconscionable happened in the Azerbaijani town of Khojaly 2 weeks ago. So far, some 200 dead Azerbaijanis, many of them mutilated, have been transported out of the town tucked inside the Armenian-dominated enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh for burial in neighboring Azerbaijan. The total number of deaths—the Azerbaijanis claim 1,324 civilians have been slaughtered, most of them women and children—is unknown.''

The extent of the cruelty of this massacre against women, children and the elderly was unfathomable. Mr. Speaker, Azerbaijan is a strong ally of the United States in an important and complex region of the world. I ask my colleagues to join me and our Azerbaijani friends in commemorating the tragedy that occurred in the town of Khojaly.

HONORING WILLIE BUNTON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Willie Bunton, a very instrumental person in the Mayersville community.

Mr. Bunton, Jr. was born on April 29, 1935 to Bertha and Willie Bunton, Sr. He was the son of a sharecropper who left school at the age of 15 to take care of his family because of the death of his father. Mr. Bunton worked tirelessly during the Civil Rights Era to register citizens to vote. He was also instrumental in integrating the schools in Rolling Fork and Mayersville. He met Louise Matthews, who later became his wife, and to this union were born 14 children. He and his wife owned and operated 14 & 1 Quick Stop for several years.

Prior to opening his own business, Mr. Bunton worked with the Delta Opportunity Corporation where he was a job developer and recruiter fulfilling the capacity of job placement for the unemployed. Around this time, Mr. Bunton gained an interest in politics, and then ran for Supervisor-at-Large of District 3 in Issaquena County unsuccessfully. He then

filed suit to bring the elections back to the district rather than at-large, and won. He then ran again in a special election in 1972 and won. Mr. Bunton was the 7th black supervisor elected in the state of Mississippi, Mr. Bunton served on the board for 12 years with WWISCAA, served on the board of MACE for 4 years, and was also a member of the Freedom Democratic Party, which was formed because black democrats were not accepted by the regular Democratic Party, which defeated the regular Democratic Party and was seated at the National Democratic Convention. Mr. Bunton also helped to get sufficient water and sewer for the Town of Mayersville, and also had involvement with the corporation of the town. Mr. Bunton was also seriously involved in the Issaquena County Backwater Project.

TRIBUTE TO DON ROBERTSON

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Don Robertson of Marietta, Georgia. For over 26 years, Don has been headmaster of The Walker School. Prior to becoming a leader in Marietta, Don had been Assistant Headmaster at a school in Princeton, New Jersey, but we are lucky that he and his family came to Cobb County and for the tremendous assets they have been to our community.

When Don first came to Walker in 1985, the school had 450 students and one building. Today, he leaves the school with a student population of 1,040, 34 acres of land, and more than 1 million square feet of teaching space.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in thanking Don Robertson for his commitment to the education of our Nation's future leaders and the betterment of his community. Don, I wish you the best in the next chapter of your life.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. COLLEEN W. HANABUSA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

This amendment proposes to cut all funding for the East-West Center—a shortsighted and impulsive measure that takes away from a program that has done so much on behalf of our Nation.

Due to its strategic location half way between the continental U.S. and Asia, the East-West Center has served as an unparalleled resource; a bridge between the United States and our allies in the Pacific.

For more than 50 years, it has been working to further diplomatic efforts between China, Japan, and other Asian countries through collaborations on education and research.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that one of America's biggest opportunities will be culminating later this year with the Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation Leaders Meeting. The East-West Center will serve as the anchor to this meeting.

For the first time since 1993, the United States will be hosting leaders of 20 other member economies. At this event, our Nation is poised to showcase our best and brightest, illustrating President Obama's goal to out-innovate, out-build, and out-educate our competitors. This is our chance to show the world what Americans are capable of.

I believe that there is no better place in America for this than the East-West Center. However, if we decide to eliminate this center for collaboration between the U.S and Asia, if we take away the mere $10 million that they require; we are sending a message that rejects our diplomatic relationships with Asia, rejects our strides in innovation, and rejects our ability to be capable hosts at one of the most important meetings of the next 10 years.

IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT 64 TO H.R. 1, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Amendment 64 offered by my friend, Mr. THOMPSON of California.

This amendment would require Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to adopt standards consistent with the Property Assessed Clean Energy Program of the Department of Energy.

In my hometown of Sacramento, our economy is struggling with unacceptably high unemployment, and furloughs of State employees have erased tens of millions of dollars from the economy.

Since July 6 of last year, I have worked diligently with my colleagues, specifically Representatives THOMPSON, ISRAEL, PERLMUTTER, and SARBANES, to restore the promise of the job creation program known as PACE.

The PACE program is an extremely important component in our nation's transition to a clean energy economy. It would upgrade thousands of homes with energy efficiency products, and create thousands of jobs in California alone.

Unfortunately, our efforts to expand and support the PACE program have been extremely difficult because Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and the Federal Housing Finance Agency, are not holding up their end of the bargain.

I have heard from clean tech and business leaders about the importance of the PACE program for economic growth, achieving energy independence, and reducing our emissions. One company CEO told me that, "The only thing worse than absence of jobs, is the illusion of jobs."And that is exactly what has happened as a result of the inaction of Fannie and Freddie Mac, and the ill-advised actions from Federal Housing Finance Agency.

Today's amendment can once again make those jobs a reality.

We have seen the job creation benefits from the PACE programs in Sonoma and Placer County, and I know my hometown of Sacramento is eager to take advantage of the program.

I am pleased to support my colleague's amendment to require the reinstatement of the program as intended.

I will continue to fight for the PACE program, which will reduce energy bills, promote a cleaner environment, and put hard-working Americans back to work. It is important for Sacramento, and for our economy as a whole.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of Amendment 64.

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW MIROLLI

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Andrew Mirolli, a young student from Acworth, Georgia, who has been awarded the 2011 Prudential Spirit of Community Award. Andrew's efforts in combating poverty, both in our community and around the world, are truly deserving of this great honor.

Mr. Speaker, Andrew is working to raise money for a local food pantry and a project in Uganda to rebuild a girls' dormitory. So far, he has raised $12,480. The world is made a better place by selfless service like Andrew has exemplified.

With his receipt of the Prudential Spirit of Community Award, Andrew has been named one of the top youth volunteers in the State of Georgia. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this young man on his achievements.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 2011, I missed a vote on the Amendment by Representative POMPEO of Kansas, Number 84.

I would have voted "yea."

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk briefly about the amendment number 260, offered by my friend from Ohio, Mr. LATTA.

This amendment would cut $10 million from the construction budget of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

NIST's buildings were constructed in the 1950s and 1960s, and are no longer adequate for the research needed to support U.S. innovation and industrial competitiveness, particularly in emerging technology areas like nanotechnology and biotechnology.

Independent analysis of NIST's maintenance needs recommends an annual investment target of $70 to $80 million to address critical deferred maintenance and bring the NIST facilities to fair condition.

The CR already slashes NIST's construction budget to $58 million. This is an $89 million reduction (60%) below the FY 2010 enacted level and significantly below what NIST requires.

Further cuts to the construction budget as proposed by the Latta amendment will erode basic repair and maintenance capability and hamstring NIST's ability to deal with emergencies like water or gas line breaks, storm damage, and power outages.

Improving and maintaining its laboratory facilities is critical for NIST to continue to engage in cutting edge research, delivering high quality science and research to foster innovation and technological advancement for the benefit of U.S. industry.

For these reasons, I must oppose this amendment and urge its defeat.

TRIBUTE TO MARK WILSON

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in celebration of Black History Month, I want to continue recognizing African Americans from throughout Georgia's 11th Congressional District who have a major impact on their community. Today, I rise to recognize Mark Wilson of Kennesaw, Georgia, who is the founder and CEO of Ryla, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, Ryla is a leading call center solutions provider with expertise in customer contact solutions and business process outsourcing. As owner, Mark utilizes a ''Small Yet Big'' approach to managing his clients giving each of them the attention a small company can yield yet consistently delivering the results of a larger organization.

I have visited the call center on many occasions and one thing that consistently stands out is that I always see the employees wearing a smile on their faces. It is a credit to Mark that he has created the type of environment that brings out the best in his employees.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in thanking Mark Wilson for his contributions to his community.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, a strong definition for gainful employment is vital to protect vulnerable borrowers from unmanageable debts incurred from heavily overpriced programs. The failure of the regulatory agency to define gainful employment up to this point has left open an avenue by which bad actors have taken advantage of the lack of regulation and created a number of overpriced programs of dubious academic quality targeted at underserved communities, people of color, and low-income students who have not been adequately prepared for a form of employment that will make it possible for those students to pay their loans back.

This amendment stops this process in its tracks. A student who borrows large amounts of money to pay for a higher education should have a reasonable expectation that the degree or certificate she is working for will qualify her for employment at a job that will allow her to repay those loans at a manageable rate.

The vast majority of programs around the country subject to this definition, whether public or private, for-profit or not-for-profit, are doing a good job of providing quality education and training at a reasonable price. Those schools and programs that are doing an effective job have every reason to distance themselves from the ones taking advantage of a lack of oversight, who make the entire industry look bad.

This definition will not impede access to federal aid for any of these programs. In fact, if the rule were to be implemented in its current form, it would affect very few programs and many bad actors who are not concerned about the debts their students will be saddled with will continue to qualify.

It's incredible to me that this amendment is being sold as a move to protect minority students. I, myself, cannot fathom how low-income people of color are protected by being tied to unmanageable and unforgiveable debts from federal loans that don't require a shred of evidence that the program will lead to any form of gainful employment for the borrower.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to the CR put forward by my Republican colleagues, and specifically to the amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey and Mr. MACK of Florida, and a separate amendment by Mr. WALBERG of Michigan, which would either eliminate or drastically reduce funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

In tough economic times, funding for the arts may appear to be an easy area to cut. But we cannot forget that the arts industry is an active and crucial part of the American economy.

The non-profit arts industry generates $166.2 billion annually, and supports 5.7 million full-time jobs across the United States. Spending in the arts stimulates local economies, creates attractive communities, and supports tourism. Cultural tourism alone contributes $192 billion annually to our country's economy.

And the federal government is not the lone supporter of these projects, but the federal funding is critical to leveraging local, state and private dollars. The direct grants from the National Endowment for the Arts that reach each and every congressional district around the country are often matched by other resources.

In my hometown of Sacramento, California, NEA funding is helping to support a thriving arts scene that is putting our city on the map. In addition to bringing intellectual diversity to the region, it is helping to support young artists, smaller museums, and cultural programs. NEA funding supports galleries and exhibits that are part an extended classroom for our students.

As a former docent of the Crocker Art Museum, I can tell you firsthand the effect that an individual piece of art, or a trip to a museum, can have on a child. Many children would never have the opportunity otherwise to participate in these inspiring experiences.

And the commitment of federal funding for our local artists and art venues sends a strong signal that we are a nation that thinks art is important, and that symbol's influence cannot be overstated.

We must make tough choices. But the question is where. I do not believe gutting our nation's cultural institutions is the place to do so. We cannot afford to stifle the creativity of our students and our citizens.

I urge my colleagues to vote against these harmful amendments and against this CR.

TRIBUTE TO MASTER SERGEANT STERLING T. WIMBERLY

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in celebration of Black History Month, I want to continue recognizing African Americans from throughout Georgia's 11th Congressional District who have had a major impact on their community. Today, I rise to recognize Master Sergeant Sterling T. Wimberly of Dallas, Georgia. MSG Wimberly is currently serving in an Active Guard Reserve role as the Senior Supply NCO for the 78th Aviation Troop Command.

There are over 700 soldiers in this command and because of MSG Wimberly's efforts, expertise, and dedication to Georgia Army National Guard Aviation, all units either passed or exceeded standards this past spring during the Forces Command Aviation Resource Management Survey inspection.

MSG Wimberly has also completed a tour in Afghanistan with a Georgia ARNG Infantry Embedded Training Team. Through this experience—and by participating in pre-mobilization validation training exercises—MSG Wimberly has developed an advanced ability to plan, coordinate, and execute complex logistic/supply operations.

He is an invaluable professional soldier whose dedication to mission accomplishment makes him worthy of recognition as a leader in the community, the National Guard, and our great nation.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Master Sergeant Sterling T. Wimberly for his service and his commitment to the betterment of his community.

OPPOSITION TO UNITED NATIONS CRITICISM OF ISRAEL

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I am emphatically opposed to using the U.N. to single out Israel for criticism on the issue of settlements, whether that criticism is in the form of a resolution or a statement. Should a resolution criticizing Israel come before the Security Council, the United States should clearly veto it. To the extent that we have disagreements with Israel on policy matters, we should find a way to express those differences in private, just as we would with our other close allies. The Administration has to understand that we stand by our friends through thick and thin.

Let's be clear; the issue isn't settlements; the issue is negotiations. Israel froze settlement construction for ten months last year. Israel has shown it is ready to take risks for peace. The onus is on the Palestinian Authority. If Palestinians object to settlements or oppose building permits—negotiate.

Israel, a friend and ally of the United States, is located in a dangerous neighborhood. Anyone who has recently watched the news or read a newspaper has seen the collapse of multilateral talks on Iran's nuclear weapons program, Hezballah's successful effort to topple the government of Lebanon, and a wave of unrest spreading throughout the Middle East. Given the threats facing Israel, the long friendship between our two nations, and Israel's strategic importance to the United States, it is critical that the U.S.-Israel relationship is strong at all levels of our government.

The United States is in the middle of a ten-year commitment of military aid to Israel and I hope that the long tradition of strong bipartisan support in Congress to fully fund this commitment, even at a time of fiscal constraint, continues.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I would like to talk briefly about the amendment offered by my friend from New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL.

The Pascrell amendment would restore funding to the fire grant programs which was cut by the Republicans in the CR. I wholeheartedly support the notion of restoring this funding. However, I must oppose this amendment because it restores the fire grant funding by cutting an equal amount from the Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Directorate.

The proposed $510 million cut to the Science & Technology Directorate is on top of an $85 million cut already proposed in the CR. If this amendment is adopted, the budget for the Science and Technology Directorate will fall to $410 million from $1.005 billion in FY 2010. This would be a 59 percent cut from FY 2010 levels. The magnitude of this cut would cripple the DHS Science and Technology Directorate. Some of the specific effects of this cut include:

Elimination of all border security and maritime security research and development which includes cargo security research and development;

Termination of all first responder research and development;

Termination of all cyber security research and development;

Termination of all non-aviation explosives research and development;

Elimination of all human factors research and development including all biometric identification work;

Elimination of all infrastructure and geophysical research and development including first responder monitoring and tracking work;

Significant cuts to chemical and biological research and development;

Significant cuts to radiological and nuclear research and development;

Elimination of all university programs including the Minority Serving Institution program.

While the Republican cuts to the fire grants program in the CR are devastating, I cannot support solving one problem by creating an equally devastating one. And make no mistake, these cuts to the S&T Directorate will cripple our nation's ability to respond to future threats. As terrorists evolve and adapt, we must do so as well, and the S&T Directorate is at the forefront of this effort.

For these reasons, I must reluctantly oppose the Pascrell amendment, and urge a "no" vote on its adoption.

TRIBUTE TO FITZ JOHNSON

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in celebration of Black History Month, I want to recognize African Americans from throughout Georgia's 11th Congressional District who have a major impact on their community. Today, I rise to recognize Fitz Johnson of Marietta, Georgia, the owner of Atlanta's professional women's soccer team, the Atlanta Beat.

Already an accomplished businessman and influential Georgian, Fitz brought women's professional soccer to Atlanta in 2010. Mr. Speaker, the hard work and passion that made Fitz a successful business owner are fueling his drive to make the Beat a successful franchise.

Not only did he help Kennesaw State University build the only women's specific soccer stadium in the United States, he is working 15-hour days doing everything from handling ticket sales to janitorial services to build a winner in Atlanta.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in thanking Fitz Johnson for his contributions to his community, and wish him all the best with the Atlanta Beat.

ON THE BIRTH OF GENEVIEVE FRANCES DALTON

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to congratulate Sean Dalton and his wife Kathryn Howell Dalton on the birth of their new baby girl, Genevieve Frances Dalton, who was born on Friday, February 4, 2011, at 7:59 p.m. in Alexandria, Virginia. Genevieve was 7 pounds, 10 ounces, and 19 inches long.

I am so excited for this new blessing to the Dalton family and wish them all the best. I want to also congratulate Genevieve's grandparents Brenda and Larry Dalton of Cary, North Carolina, and Dorothy and Stan Howell of Charlotte, North Carolina, on this wonderful new addition to their family.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chair, I rise to express my opposition and urge my colleagues to oppose

Amendment 338, which would zero out funding for the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act, also known as "DERA."

Studies have shown that diesel emissions are one of the most significant threats to public health. In order to address this problem in a manner that is both responsible to businesses reliant upon diesel engines, and to protect the general public from further exposure to the damaging emission from diesel engines, Congress enacted DERA.

This voluntary program provided federal and state grant funding to retrofit diesel engines to reduce emissions. It has been endorsed by over 500 public health, environmental and industry supporters, including the American Lung Association, Caterpillar, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Retrofitting provides enormous environmental, and therefore health, benefits, but before this program was implemented, there was little economic benefit for vehicle and equipment owners to do so. It is estimated that DERA could reduce particulate matter emissions by 70,000 tons, generate nearly $20 billion in economic benefit, and return $13 of benefit for every one dollar invested.

The incentives provided by DERA support voluntary rather than regulatory efforts to assist states meet air quality standards. Zeroing out funding for this program would effectively kill those efforts. It would hamper the development and demand of "clean diesel" technology as well as put a further strain on those workers who manufacture, sell, repair, or retrofit diesel vehicles. This program has great support on both sides of the aisle and should not be eliminated here today.

For those reasons I again urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

TRIBUTE TO TECHNICAL SERGEANT CHARLES SIMPSON

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in celebration of Black History Month, I want to continue recognizing African Americans from throughout Georgia's 11th Congressional District who have a major impact on their community. Today, I rise today to recognize Technical Sergeant Charles Simpson of Marietta, Georgia.

Entering service with the Georgia Air National Guard in 2000, TSgt Simpson has held positions as Security Forces Fire Team leader, Radio Transmission Officer, Squad Leader, and as a Drug Demand Reduction Non-Commissioned Officer with the Georgia Counterdrug Task Force. This program educates children in grades K–12 on the dangers of drug use, and I am proud of the work TSgt Simpson has done in affecting the futures of over 55,000 young students in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, TSgt Simpson has deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and four times to Afghanistan in support of Enduring Freedom. He has been awarded two Air Force Commendation medals, three Air Force Achievement Medals, the Army Achievement Medal, and has recently been selected to advance to the grade of Master Sergeant.

TSgt Simpson displays a "can-do" attitude in his daily duties and is considered by his superiors and peers to be one of the bright stars of the Georgia Air Force National Guard.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in thanking Technical Sergeant Charles Simpson for his service to our nation and his commitment to the betterment of his community.

CONGRATULATING CONGREGATION NER TAMID ON THE 50th ANNIVERSARY OF THEIR FOUNDING

HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, 2011 marks the 50th Anniversary of the Founding of Congregation Ner Tamid of South Bay in my congressional district. People of all faiths from throughout the South Bay area of Los Angeles are conveying heartfelt congratulations to all the members and friends of Congregation Ner Tamid on this most auspicious occasion. For five decades Congregation Ner Tamid has upheld a faith-inspired tradition of service in both the South Bay region and beyond. The Congregation's programs for youth, families and seniors cast a bright light of human dignity and compassion across our community.

I also offer a special expression of our esteem to those being honored for their unique and sustaining contributions to Ner Tamid's work in our communities. The people of the South Bay are indebted to the distinguished 50th Anniversary honorees; Ruth & Leo David, Sheil Poucher, Mark Simon and Norm Lefkowich. Each of them deservedly receives the profoundly meaningful recognition of a grateful synagogue family and the community of which Congregation Ner Tamid is such an important part.

The dedicated social responsibility these honorees exemplify is replicated in a hundred programs and projects the rest of the temple members pursue. That is why Congregation Ner Tamid enjoys a valued and respected place in the life and culture of the South Bay region we are fortunate enough to call home.

So, it is with our best wishes that Congregation Ner Tamid of South Bay celebrates their 50th anniversary on March 12, 2011. I am sure the great legacy they have created in these first 50 years will only be stronger and more enduring on the occasion of the Congregation's 100th anniversary!

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise to reluctantly speak against the amendment offered by my friend from New York, Mr. WEINER.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would cut $298 million from NASA and increase the COPS program by a corresponding amount. While I wholeheartedly support the COPS program, and would like to work with the gentleman to find ways to restore the COPS funding, which was so irresponsibly slashed in the Republican CR, taking this money from NASA would do serious damage to NASA's ability to carry out its programs.

Specifically, the amendment would cut NASA's Cross Agency Support (CAS) account, which funds operations and maintenance of NASA's 9 Centers, component facilities and headquarters, including agency-wide management functions, and safety and reliability activities to assure safety and mission success.

This account also funds the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and the Small Business Technology Transfer (STIR) programs at NASA. Cuts proposed by the Weiner amendment would cut the SBIR/STTR program and reduce the number of grants awarded to small businesses. A reduction of $298M in CAS would represent 10% reduction to the CAS account—equivalent to shutting two of NASA's smaller Centers, for example, Dryden Flight Research Center, Stennis Space Center, or Ames Research Center.

The resulting budget after a $298M reduction would not be sufficient to provide the minimum Center support required to safely implement NASA's mission. As these reductions would occur so late in the operating year, they would result in thousands of layoffs to on-site contractors, with 50 percent of the contractor workforce at risk. This equates to over 4,500 layoffs across all of NASA Centers.

As I said before, I am an ardent supporter of the COPS program. I am appalled that the Republican Majority has chosen to address deficit reduction by making our communities less safe by cutting the number of police officers on the street. However, I simply cannot support righting that wrong by creating another. At a time when our nation's economic competitiveness is being seriously challenged by our foreign competitors, it would be irresponsible to make further cuts to one of our nation's great innovative research and development agencies.

For these reasons, I must oppose this amendment and urge its defeat.

TRIBUTE TO SHAN COOPER

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in celebration of Black History Month, I want to recognize African Americans from throughout Georgia's 11th Congressional District who have a major impact on their community. Today, I rise to recognize Shan Cooper of Marietta, Georgia. Shan serves as the Vice President of Lockheed Martin Aeronautics and General Manager of Lockheed Martin's Marietta facility.

She previously served as the Vice President of Human Resources for Lockheed Martin Information Systems & Global Solutions in Gaithersburg, Maryland and oversees the 8,000 Lockheed employees in Marietta.

Mr. Speaker, Shan has long been an integral part of the Lockheed Martin team, holding various positions in Mississippi, West Virginia, Maryland, and Georgia. We welcome her to Cobb County, and look forward to her contributions to our community.

IN SUPPORT OF TITLE X FUNDING

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Lowey amendment which restores lifesaving medical services to millions of young and low-income women and men who receive their basic health care through the 4,400 clinics nationwide receiving Title X funds. Let's be very clear about what services Title X family planning programs do and do not provide. First off and very importantly, federal law prohibits any Title X money from being used for abortion care. Plain and simple.

Instead, these monies go toward breast and cervical cancer screenings, hypertension and blood pressure measurement, prenatal, postpartum and well-baby care, birth control and abstinence education.

The statistics speak for themselves: contraceptive services at Title X centers annually prevent 973,000 unintended pregnancies, which would result in 433,000 unplanned births, 406,000 abortions, and 134,000 miscarriages. Slashing this funding actually has the opposite effect of the so-called ''pro-life'' majority. Not only would the number of abortions rise by 40% if these funds are cut, defunding Title X jeopardizes the millions of women and their babies who benefit from these clinics.

Given the objective benefits of this program which include annual savings of $3.4 billion, it is unclear how the anti-choice, Republican majority concludes that attacking and eliminating women's basic health care will improve our economy, erase our deficit, or create one single job. Once again, the message this majority is sending to women across this country is clear: They do not trust you to make your own decisions about your own body and will cut or eliminate programs that help you do so.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this continuing resolution, which endangers our fragile economic recovery by throwing more Americans out of jobs. Rather than focusing on the creation and retention of jobs, this bill gives the pink slip to hundreds of thousands of Americans. Who's getting the pink slip? Nurses, teachers, police officers, and firefighters, among others. At the same time, states and counties are having to lay off these essential personnel as they struggle to balance their budgets. How will putting more people in the unemployment line create jobs? These job cuts strike at the heart of the middle class in America.

At a recent press conference in Washington DC, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER's response to the job losses (later estimated at nearly 1 million jobs) caused by the bill was, ''So be it,'' in apparent resignation or indifference to the pain these cuts will cause to individuals and communities across our country.

In addition to increasing the ranks of the unemployed, the Republican leadership is making the cuts on the backs of the most vulnerable among us. At the same time, they are damaging our nation's long-term economic prospects by cutting needed investments in education, innovation, and infrastructure.

No vulnerable group is safe from the Republican cuts. Head Start is slashed by $1 billion and child care by $39 million, ending at least 50,000 jobs nationwide and ending services to more than 200,000 children. In Hawaii, newly opened Head Start classrooms serving 700 children would need to close their doors, giving these children no place to go for quality early education to prepare for success in school and in life.

This bill cuts basic K–12 education services for all low-income schools by $700 million nationwide and cuts after-school programs by $100 million. This anti-education bill also bursts students' dreams of college success, reducing Pell grants by an average of $700 for some 19,000 low-income college students in Hawaii, and Direct Loans to 30,000 Hawaii college students.

The Republicans' budget cuts would completely eliminate all Native Hawaiian Education programs. I joined with Representative DON YOUNG of Alaska to offer an amendment to reinstate funding eligibility for Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian education programs. We worked hard to explain the importance of these programs to our colleagues, and the Young-Hirono Amendment passed 331 to 117.

In fact, this bill as introduced reflects a particular bias against Native Hawaiians in that it also eliminates funding for Native Hawaiian health care and Native Hawaiian housing programs.

The backbone of our health care system is dismantled by drastically cutting funding for community health centers. These centers, which serve the most vulnerable in our population, are cut by $1.3 billion. In my rural district, spread over 7 inhabited islands, community health centers are used by everyone in the community due to the shortage of primary care physicians. In Hawaii our network of community health centers serve nearly 127,000 patients, one-third of whom are Medicaid eligible.

H.R. 1 threatens women's health by eliminating a safety net program that provides family planning services and lifesaving preventive care to 3 million Americans every year. By eliminating funding for the Title X Family Planning Program, the only dedicated sexual and reproductive health clinic on Hawaii Island may have to close its doors. The Planned Parenthood health centers on Oahu and Maui would be forced to reduce their clinic hours.

I hope seniors in our country are taking note. This bill dramatically cuts funding available to the Social Security Administration by $1.7 billion below what they need to maintain promised service levels. Social Security already operates at very low cost. Overhead is less than 2 percent of the total budget for Social Security. The bill eliminates 3,500 jobs in the Social Security Administration and delays payment of earned benefits for hundreds of thousands of retirees, survivors, and disabled workers.

I've heard Democrats and Republicans alike acknowledge their support for infrastructure spending. Yet this Republican bill cuts funding for transportation infrastructure and housing by 24 percent compared with the President's budget. These cuts to infrastructure are the largest cuts on a percentage basis in the bill—cuts to programs that we know create jobs and improve the quality of life in our communities. These short-sighted, short-term deficits cuts will lead to long-term continuing deterioration of our infrastructure, which will cost us more to fix down the road.

Under this bill, Hawaii would lose $11 million in desperately needed funding to upgrade our sewers and wastewater treatment plants. Hawaii would also lose $5 million for new energy-efficient circulator buses recently awarded by the Federal Transit Administration.

These deep cuts in infrastructure funding are opposed by groups as diverse as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL–CIO. The Republican majority hasn't brought a single measure to the floor this Congress that will help create jobs. Instead they are focused on cutting jobs. When you cut billions from programs, you are cutting jobs. No amount of rhetoric will cover up that fact.

We should be eliminating billions in tax breaks for the oil and gas industries. Instead, the Republican Majority has cut research in energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. And because many on the other side of the aisle choose to ignore science that contradicts their preferred view of the world, the bill makes radical cuts to funding for entities such as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's climate and ocean monitoring programs.

The bill also cuts funding for medical research and for small business and economic development assistance programs. These cuts will stifle innovation, limit job creation, and threaten our competitiveness in the global economy.

I've only cited a few of the short-sighted, anti-middle class, anti-senior, anti-woman, and anti-education provisions in the bill. I'll be voting no, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same. We need to focus on creating, not eliminating, jobs; on sparking, not depressing, innovation; and on investing, not disinvesting, in education for our next generation.

TRIBUTE TO SIDNEY FORD

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in celebration of Black History Month, I want to continue recognizing African Americans from throughout Georgia's 11th Congressional District who have a major impact on their community. Today, I rise to recognize Sidney Ford—who hails from Rome, Georgia—for his work as the Senior Pastor of St. Luke's Ministries, located in Cedartown, Georgia. Pastor Ford is a great asset not only to St. Luke's but also to the greater community where he is a mentor and a person who embodies the sentiment of ''giving back.''

Recently, Pastor Ford led efforts to improve the community by cleaning up Turner Street Park and turning it into a family friendly zone. Today, the park is a place where friends and neighbors can gather in peace. His dedication not only to his congregation but also to his community is one that deserves recognition and should be emulated.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in thanking Pastor Sidney Ford for his service and his commitment to the betterment of his community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE THOMASINA E. JORDAN INDIAN TRIBES OF VIRGINIA FEDERAL RECOGNITION ACT

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act. This is the sixth time I have introduced legislation that would grant federal recognition to six Indian tribes in Virginia: the Chickahominy, the Eastern Chickahominy, the Upper Mattaponi, the Rappahannock, the Monacan, and the Nansemond.

Similar measures passed the House and the Senate Indian Affairs Committee during the 110th and 111th Sessions of Congress. Unfortunately, both measures were ultimately defeated when the objections of a few Senators were not overridden.

The impasse in Congress and the demeaning and dysfunctional acknowledgement process at the Bureau of Indian Affairs only compound the grave injustices this legislation seeks to redress. It also compels me to continue this cause and reintroduce this legislation today. The injustices extend back in time for hundreds of years, back to the establishment of the first permanent English settlement in America at Jamestown. For the Members of these tribes are the descendents of the great Powhatan Confederacy who greeted the English and provided food and assistance that ensured the settlers' early survival.

Four years ago, America celebrated the 400th anniversary of the settlement of Jamestown. But it was not a celebration for Native American descendents of Pocahontas, for they have yet to be recognized by our federal government. Unlike most Native American tribes that were officially recognized when they signed peace treaties with the federal government, Virginia's six Native American tribes made their peace with the Kings of England. Most notable among these was the Treaty of 1677 between these tribes and King Charles II. This treaty has been recognized by the Commonwealth of Virginia every year for the past 334 years when the Governor accepts tribute from the tribes in a ceremony now celebrated at the Commonwealth Capitol. I had the honor of attending the one of what I understand is the longest celebrated treaty recognition ceremony in the United States.

The forefathers of the tribal leaders who gather on Thanksgiving in Richmond were the first to welcome the English, and during the first few years of settlement, ensured their survival. Had the tribes not assisted those early settlers, they would not have survived. Time has not been kind to the tribes, however. As was the case for most Native American tribes, as the settlement prospered and grew, the tribes suffered. Those who resisted quickly became subdued, were pushed off their historic lands, and, up through much of the 20th Century, were denied full rights as U.S. citizens. Despite their devastating loss of land and population, the Virginia tribes survived, preserving their heritage and their identity. Their story of survival spans four centuries of racial hostility and coercive state and state-sanctioned actions.

The Virginia tribes' history, however, diverges from that of most Native Americans in two unique ways. The first explains why the Virginia tribes were never recognized by the federal government; the second explains why congressional action is needed today. First, by the time the federal government was established in 1789, the Virginia tribes were in no position to seek recognition. They had already lost control of their land, withdrawn into isolated communities and stripped of most of their rights. Lacking even the rights granted by the English Kings, and our own Bill of Rights, federal recognition was nowhere within their reach.

The second unique circumstance for the Virginia tribes is what they experienced at the hands of the Commonwealth government during the first half of the 20th Century. It has been called "paper genocide." At a time when the federal government granted Native Americans the right to vote, Virginia's elected officials adopted racially hostile laws targeted at those classes of people who did not fit into the dominant white society, and with fanatical efficiency, altered and destroyed the records of Virginia's Native Americans. Virginia's political elite sought to expunge the records of anyone other than themselves who could hold the claim that they were the descendent of Pocahontas. Pocahontas' marriage to John Rolfe created an uncomfortable circumstance for John Rolfe's descendents who populated Virginia's aristocratic elite and who maintained that all non-whites were part of "the inferior Negroid race."

With great hypocrisy, Virginia's ruling elite pushed policies that culminated with the enactment of the Racial Integrity Act of 1924. This act directed Commonwealth officials, and zealots like Walter Plecker, to destroy Commonwealth and local courthouse records and reclassify in Orwellian fashion all non-whites as "colored." It targeted Native Americans with a vengeance, denying Native Americans in Virginia their identity.

To call oneself a "Native American" in Virginia was to risk a jail sentence of up to one year. In defiance of the law, members of Virginia's tribes traveled out of state to obtain marriage licenses or to serve their country in wartime. The law remained in effect until it was struck down in federal court in 1967. In that intervening period between 1924 and 1967, Commonwealth officials waged a war to destroy all public and many private records that affirmed the existence of Native Americans in Virginia. Historians have affirmed that no other state compares to Virginia's efforts to eradicate its citizens' Indian identity.

All of Virginia's state-recognized tribes have filed petitions with the Bureau of Acknowledgment seeking federal recognition. But it is a very heavy burden the Virginia tribes will have to overcome, and one fraught with complications that officials from the bureau have acknowledged may never be resolved in their lifetime. The acknowledgment process is already expensive, subject to unreasonable delays, and lacking in dignity. Virginia's paper genocide only further complicates these tribes' quest for federal recognition, making it difficult to furnish corroborating state and official documents and aggravating the injustice already visited upon them.

It was not until 1997, when Governor George Allen signed legislation directing Commonwealth agencies to correct their records, that the tribes were given the opportunity to correct official Commonwealth documents that had deliberately been altered to list them as "colored." The law allows living members of the tribes to correct their records, but the law cannot correct the damage done to past generations or to recover documents that were purposely destroyed during the "Plecker Era."

In 1999, the Virginia General Assembly adopted a resolution calling upon Congress to enact legislation recognizing the Virginia tribes. I am pleased to have honored that request, and beginning in 2000 and in subsequent sessions, Virginia's Senators and I have introduced legislation to recognize the Virginia tribes.

There is no doubt that the Chickahominy, the Eastern Chickahominy, the Monacan, the Nansemond, the Rappahannock and the Upper Mattaponi tribes exist. These tribes have existed on a continuous basis since before the first European settlers stepped foot in America. They are here with us today. But the federal government continues to act as if they do not.

I know there is resistance in Congress to grant any Native American tribe federal recognition. And I can appreciate how the issue of gambling and its economic and moral dimensions has influenced many Members' perspectives on tribal recognition issues. The six Virginia tribes are not seeking federal legislation so that they can build casinos. Under this legislation they cannot engage in gaming. The bill prohibits gambling on their lands. They find gambling offensive to their moral beliefs. They are seeking federal recognition because it is an urgent matter of justice and because elder members of their tribes, who were denied a public education and the economic opportunities available to most Americans, are suffering and should be entitled to the federal health and housing assistance available to federally recognized tribes.

To underscore this point, the legislation includes language that would prevent the tribes from engaging in gaming on their federal land even if everyone else in Virginia were allowed to engage in Class III casino-type gaming.

In the name of decency, fairness and humanity, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and bring closure to centuries of injustice Virginia's Native American tribes have experienced.

TRIBUTE TO SHELIA ROBINSON

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in celebration of Black History Month, I want to

continue recognizing African Americans from throughout Georgia's 11th Congressional District who have had a major impact on their community. Today, I rise to recognize Shelia Robinson of Marietta, Georgia.

Between active duty and service in the Georgia Army National Guard, Shelia spent more than 22 years serving our country and the State of Georgia. From 1995–2005 while in the Guard as a Master Sergeant, she worked in the Counterdrug Program and helped manage an annual budget of $3 million.

Upon retiring from Active Federal military service, Ms. Robinson worked as the Administrative Assistant for the Director of Georgia's Office of Homeland Security where she gained the respect of numerous state agency heads for her professionalism, courtesy, and overall knowledge.

After three years with Homeland Security, Ms. Robinson returned to the Georgia National Guard in the capacity of Office Manager for the Adjutant General of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in thanking Shelia Robinson for her service to our nation and the people of Cobb County.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE QUAYLE-BROUN AMENDMENT (#224) TO H.R. 1 AND IN SUPPORT OF DAVIS-BACON PREVAILING WAGE PROTECTION

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Quayle-Broun amendment.

This amendment would strip away Davis-Bacon wage protections in Hawaii and nationwide.

Enacted in 1931, the Davis-Bacon Act ensures that workers on federal construction contracts receive at least the prevailing wage for construction jobs.

The Davis-Bacon Act ensures projects are built by skilled and experienced workers who know what they're doing. Prevailing wages and higher-skilled work result in greater productivity and lower cost.

In industries without Davis-Bacon protections, we have seen unscrupulous contractors engage in a "race to the bottom," trying to undercut each other to perform shoddy work, with less-skilled workers, at sub-par wages. These projects often end up costing more in the long-run due to repairs, revisions, and delays.

Some claim that Davis-Bacon costs the federal government more. On the contrary, studies show that higher-wage workers are more productive, saving hundreds of millions of dollars in the long run.

Construction workers who build highways, homes, or buildings should be able to earn enough to feed their families, put a roof over their heads, and send their kids to college. Beyond just helping workers and their families, prevailing wages improve local economies. Workers spend their income in local businesses and pay local taxes.

Workers participate in building trades training programs and health care programs and are not dependent on benefits from other social programs. One study found that local prevailing wage law generated 2.4 times the economic benefit of the cost of the construction project.

I strongly support Davis-Bacon protections and oppose this misguided amendment. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

IN OPPOSITION TO AMENDMENT 450 TO H.R. 1, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the C.R. put forward by my Republican colleagues, and specifically to Amendment 450, offered by Mr. MACK of Florida. This amendment and the C.R. would eliminate funding for the Corporation for National and Community Service and all of the programs it supports.

As Americans, we share a common belief that volunteerism and community service make our country stronger. But we cannot be a leader in the world, if we are not leaders in our own communities.

And as we speak, tens of thousands of Americans are involved in service projects across the country through one of several AmeriCorps programs. These volunteers are building houses, helping young people learn to read, collecting food and clothing, and much, much more.

Through programs such as Learn and Serve, VISTA, Teach for America, Experience Corps, Youth Build, Habitat for Humanity, City Year, and Jumpstart, volunteers are using evidence-based research to make a tremendous impact in their communities.

But federal funding for each one of these programs would be shut down if Amendment 450 and this C.R. were to be enacted.

In my district of Sacramento, California—home to the NCCC Pacific Region—300 AmeriCorps*NCCC volunteers would be sent home. Although these volunteers have already committed to a year of service—and they have all already been deployed—this amendment would require the Corporation for National and Community Service to buy their plane tickets home. That process alone would make this a deficient program, and leave the federal government liable for the costs.

Put simply: Amendment 450 and the cuts for AmeriCorps in the C.R. are ill-conceived.

We see an enormous return in our investments in our national service programs. For every volunteer we help to support, we recruit another 10 volunteers. And for every dollar the federal government invests, the organizations are able to leverage a matching dollar through local and private funding.

IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT 132 TO H.R. 1, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. MATSUI. I rise today in opposition to the CR put forward by my Republican colleagues, and in support of the amendment offered by Ms. CHU of California, which would restore full funding to the Pell Grant program.

H.R. 1 makes severe cuts to student aid programs in a time of tuition increases and tough economic standings. These cuts will impose an even heavier burden on many students and families. Specifically, this bill makes the largest cut the Pell Grant program, more than 15 percent.

The Federal Pell Grant program provides much needed financial support for more than nine million students nationwide and makes. This amendment would specifically maintain the maximum award level for Pell Grants at $5,550.

Pell Grant are solely based on an individual's financial needs and are not required to be paid back. They are an effective mechanism to help students offset the expensive costs of text books, room and board, and school supplies.

For many, this grant makes the difference between attending college or dropping out because they don't have the money to afford tuition or books. Yet we know that access to higher education is critical to our nation's economic competitiveness.

We need to do be more to encourage students to pursue education. Unfortunately, this legislation will only set us backwards.

This funding is crucial for students in my district and these drastic cuts will have an adverse affect on our nation's ability to be an economic leader. Maintaining access to quality and affordable education is a vital priority.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment and against this C.R.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently voted "no" on the Price Amendment (#514) to H.R. 1. I meant to vote "yes" for the amendment, which continues waiver provisions enacted for FY2009 and 2010 that enable local communities impacted by the economic downturn to use SAFER grant funds to maintain existing firefighters, re-hire laid off firefighters, and eliminate the local match requirement. I am grateful that it passed by a strong margin despite my error.

IN OPPOSITION TO AMENDMENT 468 TO H.R. 1, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, under current law, the Lifeline program provides Americans struggling to climb out of poverty and get back on their feet a choice to receive a landline phone or a mobile phone subsidized by the Universal Service Fund. In my district of Sacramento, we have 25,000, and in the State of California we have approximately 2 million, residents who benefit from this service.

Low income people use Lifeline service to look for a job, call their doctors, reach their child care providers, or contact their family in an emergency.

But Amendment No. 468 would eliminate USF funding for mobile phone service for the poorest Americans, and maintain it only for landline phones, forcing poor people to stay at home waiting for important calls, rather than getting out of their homes to look for a job.

I have heard from many of my constituents in Sacramento who are concerned about the high costs of services, and would be impacted by these cuts to Lifeline services.

I have heard from a woman who is living off a fixed income and is counting her pennies each month to make ends meet. If her bill goes up "by one cent", she says she will have to drop her service. The Lifeline program allows her to stay connected in an increasingly connected society.

Another one of my constituents, who is disabled, can't afford in-home broadband services, and is forced to commute miles to the nearest library to access the Internet. But these all day excursions means that he misses important calls, and if something were to happen to him while he was out without a mobile phone, he would have no ability to call a friend, family member, or 911 for help. This Amendment would take that cell phone away.

Moreover, this Amendment would not return any monies to the U.S. Treasury. The Universal Service Fund is supported entirely by telephone users—not taxpayers.

In short, this Amendment picks technological winners and losers. It ignores input from legislators who have expertise on these issues. The House Energy and Commerce Committee plans to hold hearings on the Universal Service Fund this year, and the Federal Communications Commission announced its intention to review the Lifeline program.

Finally, the amendment limits both economic opportunity and discourages employment security. Studies by the Opinion Research Corporation and MIT have found that cell phones are extremely important to an individual's economic productivity and earning power. Having access to a cell phone in order to get a "call back" is essential for Americans who are out of work. When the rest of America is cutting their landlines, this amendment is forcing the poorest among us to rely on a dying technology, which the free market has rejected.

We should be expanding the lifeline program to broadband and mobile phones, technologies that are in high demand, and empower consumers to pursue a job, an education, or new career training.

For all of these reasons, I strongly oppose this Amendment, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT 325 TO H.R. 1, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express support for Amendment 325, offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER, to restore funding to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support as well.

Recently, I spoke to one of my constituents who expressed his sorrow to me at the prospect of losing public broadcasting services. As he put it, he pays less than two dollars a year in taxes for the service, but it brightens his day every morning that he listens to his favorite public radio shows. To him, it was a simple equation of value for money.

He specifically voiced his support for National Public Radio (NPR) and Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). NPR is a public-private membership media organization that syndicates programming for hundreds of public radio stations across the country. Individual member stations, such as local university stations are required to be non-commercial, and educational in nature, and are not required to broadcast all NPR programming.

And despite what I have heard from my colleagues, the truth is that only about two percent of NPR funding is directly provided by the federal government, under the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), which also funds PBS. The reality is that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting receives around .0001% of the annual federal budget. Eliminating that funding would save Americans less than half a cent a day, and in doing so, eliminate a valuable educational, cultural, and community resource.

But the value of the services are unending. As a former board chair of my district's local PBS TV station, I can attest to the value local programming offers to my constituents. I hear from families, seniors, and everyday commuters who use public broadcasting to get local news, to learn something new about the world, and teachers who use its educational programming in their classrooms.

Moreover, public TV and radio stations employ over 17,000 people across the country—jobs that no one can afford to lose—and especially not now.

M. Chair, the number of listeners and viewers speak for themselves. Every month, over 170 million Americans use public media—through 368 public television stations, 934 public radio stations, hundreds of online services, education services, and in-person events and activities. Every month over half of all Americans use public media.

Defunding public broadcasting would be a deep and misguided error, and would lose our country a great resource.

Maintaining support for public, educational, and government channels and networks is necessary to facilitate communication, and I am dedicated to ensuring that citizens have access to tools that inform, educate, and encourage interest in local activities.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on Amendment 325, and to uphold the legacy of American public broadcasting.

HONORING LORRAINE BOCCIO FOR HER OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO HUNTINGTON STATION, NY

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor someone in my district who has given much to those in need. Lorraine Boccio of Huntington Station, NY, has recently been diagnosed with stage 3 pancreatic cancer and I'd like to take a moment to share some of the good work she has done.

Lorraine works in customer service at a local supermarket but spends her spare time committed to service as well. Every year she collects and mails packages to troops overseas and holds annual events for veterans on Memorial Day and Veterans Day. These events bring out hundreds of veterans and Lorraine conducts the fundraising, planning, and execution of these events. She also attends funerals and wakes of fallen troops on Long Island and collects cards from schoolchildren in the South Huntington School District for veterans.

Lorraine is also fiercely supportive of her local police and fire departments. For the holidays in December 2001, Lorraine collected and distributed food, clothing and toys to all of the children in Huntington who lost a loved one in the September 11 attacks. She takes every opportunity to honor her local police, fire, and EMS workers, including organizing fundraisers, visiting those who are injured, and paying tribute to those who served in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks.

Finally, throughout the year Lorraine organizes food drives, "adopts" families with troubles such as a child with an illness or a house fire, and donates food and supplies to Huntington's Little Animal Shelter.

Lorraine brightens the lives of her neighbors every day while working in customer service at her day job and helps anyone and everyone in need in her community. I wish her all the best for a speedy recovery and hope that the community to which she has given so much supports her in the fight of her life.

SETH KING TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand and pay sincere tribute to the life of Seth King. Sadly the city of Pueblo, Colorado, will have to continue on without the talents and gifts of the revered local legend. Mr. King was a barber and clinical chemist by trade, but he represented much more to the Pueblo community.

The owner and operator of King's Barber shop, Seth King cut hair for 45 years and had a positive effect on the lives of countless individuals. Mr. King moved to Pueblo as a young

man from the still segregated south. He wanted to pursue his dream of becoming a clinical chemist, and achieved that goal as he worked for The Colorado Mental Health Institute for 35 years. Mr. King was also a staunch supporter of the Republican Party, and was the first black man to run for the state senate in 1968. Seth King was also an active member of the Catholic Church and The Knights of Columbus. Whether cheering a customer up at the barbershop, or giving his time in faith-based outreach, he spent his lifetime improving the lives of those around him.

Mr. Speaker, Pueblo may have lost a wonderful member of their community, but there is no doubt that the spirit of Seth King's life still reverberates throughout the city. It has been a privilege to stand and pay tribute to Mr. Seth King's accomplished life.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. SHELLEY BERKLEY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Pence Amendment.

Rep. PENCE's amendment would prohibit Planned Parenthood from receiving any federal funds, including Medicaid reimbursement for family planning services, funding for HIV testing and counseling, funding for programs to prevent infertility, breast and cervical cancer screening funds, and funding to provide evidenced-based sex education, including information about abstinence. This amendment would have a devastating impact on communities like Las Vegas.

In my district, Planned Parenthood's Flamingo Health Center is an essential community provider and one of only three Title X facilities in Clark County. In FY 2010, 27 percent of their clients were at or below 100 percent of Federal Poverty Level (FPL) and an additional 39 percent were between 100 percent and 250 percent of FPL. Planned Parenthood provides access for many low-income women to basic and preventive healthcare, often serving as a primary care provider. In FY2010, Planned Parenthood provided basic healthcare services to more than 18,000 Nevadans.

Rep. PENCE's amendment will result in 1.4 million Medicaid patients—predominately women—losing access to their health care provider. This attack on Medicaid patients' access to their local provider occurs at the same time that the Medicaid program desperately needs more doctors and nurses to participate in the program. Existing access issues will only become exacerbated as a result of the Medicaid expansion to 133 percent of the Federal Poverty Level under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA).

Federal law already requires health care providers to demonstrate that federal funds are not used for abortion care, so this amendment is a clear attempt to cut funding for cancer screenings and contraception for low-income women at Planned Parenthood health centers. Rep. PENCE's amendment has one goal—to undermine women's access to basic, preventive healthcare and the women's health providers they rely on in their communities. I oppose this amendment and efforts to deprive women access to essential healthcare services.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 84, I missed the vote due to a previously scheduled satellite interview in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING THE LACEY TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM OF LANOKA HARBOR, NEW JERSEY

HON. JON RUNYAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 2010 New Jersey State Athletic Association's South Jersey Group III Champions: the Lacey Township High School Football Team of Lanoka Harbor, New Jersey.

On December 4, 2010, by an impressive score of 56 to 7, Lacey Township High School defeated Delsea Regional High School in the South Jersey Group III Championship football game. This marks the fourth time in school history that they are the South Jersey Group III Football Champions.

During the championship game, the Lacey Township Lions were able to score seven touchdowns, resulting in 49 points. Senior running back, Jacob Dabal, scored three touchdowns, while senior quarterback, Craig Cicardo, and senior running back, Jarrod Molzon, each scored two touchdowns. The outstanding offensive output of these three young student-athletes helped pave the way to a Lacey Township victory.

Equally extraordinary was the defensive efforts of the Lacey Township Lions. In the championship game, the Lions' defense forced eight turnovers, consisting of three interceptions and five fumbles. One of those fumbles resulted in a touchdown by senior defensive back, Zach Torrell.

The Lacey Township Lions finished their 2010 football season with an undefeated record of 12 wins and 0 loses, its third undefeated season in school history.

I would like to congratulate Lacey Township High School's football coach of 30 years, Coach Lou Vircillo, and his entire coaching staff. Through their inspiration and motivation, they enabled these young men to achieve an amazing accomplishment.

I would also like to thank the senior members of the Lacey Township High School Football Team. Their incredible leadership of the Lions this year not only led to another championship title, but also to another undefeated season.

Mister Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in celebrating the achievement of the Lacey Township High School Football Team in capturing the 2010 NJSIAA South Jersey Group III championship and finishing the year undefeated.

I ask you to join me in celebration with the coaches, players, and student body of Lacey Township High School, as well as the teachers, parents and community members who all made this victory a reality. Finally, I ask you to wish the Lacey Lions continued success in next year's football season.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, today I rise to oppose the reckless Republican proposal to eliminate funding for the Title X Family Planning Program. This cut is a legislative assault on women's health and a failure of House Republicans to strengthen American families. Instead of focusing on issues Americans are most concerned about, like creating jobs, House Republicans have decided to target women's health programs and women's health providers under the guise of deficit reduction.

Since 1970, Title X Family Planning Program has been a critical component of our nation's health care infrastructure and an essential vehicle in preventing unintended pregnancies and providing basic primary and preventive health care, including annual exams lifesaving screenings for illnesses like breast cancer, cervical cancer and HIV. If these cuts are allowed to become law, 5 million Americans will lose these services and women's access to health care will be severely restricted.

House Republicans are using this legislation to mislead the American people by suggesting that federal funds are being used to pay for abortions. This is flatly untrue, since federal law has already banned Title X funds from being used for abortion services. Moreover, in 2008 Title X supported services prevented 973,000 unintended pregnancies which resulted in thousands of fewer abortions. However, if Title X Family Planning Programs are eliminated more women will experience unintended pregnancies and face potentially life-threatening cancer and other diseases that could have been prevented.

Preventing women's health centers from receiving this critical funding stream is not the answer and the majority of Americans do not support this proposal. According to a January 2011 CBS/New York Times survey found that by a margin of 67 percent to 27 percent, Americans oppose cuts for health care and education as a means of reducing the deficit. Instead, the American people want Congress

to work together to address their top priority, which is creating jobs and strengthening middle class families, not imposing new restrictions to legal health services and screenings and eliminating critical programs. Eliminating Title X funding does not create jobs or help our economy. In fact, family planning programs like Title X save money because every $1 spent on family planning results in a $4 savings to Medicaid. House Republicans proposal to eliminate Title X Family Planning goes too far and is bad policy, bad politics, and is flat out immoral. I ask that my colleagues join me in opposing cuts to Title X Family Planning Program.

CHARLES ELLIOTT TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, it brings me great satisfaction to rise and pay tribute to a man whose youthful spirit and exuberance proves that age is just a number. Charles Elliott, of the San Luis Valley, will be inducted into the 2011 class of the Colorado Ski and Snowboard Hall of Fame.

Mr. Elliot began skiing in the early 1930s on a pair of homemade wooden skis he and a friend took to Wolf Creek Pass. From the mid 1930s to the mid 1940s Charles Elliot was a major catalyst and pioneer in the rapid growth of skiing in southwestern Colorado. After serving his country in the U.S. Army Air Corps as a weatherman from 1942–1946, Mr. Elliot returned to skiing in the State he loves, and restarted Wolf Creek Pass skiing operations which had been shut down due to World War II. Charles Elliot then served as ski patrolman and performed that duty so well that he was given the lifetime badge from the National Ski Patrol. The 98-year-old is now the ranking member of the Grey Wolf Ski Club. Charles Elliot has now been skiing for over 75 years, and at the age of 93, he recorded over 50 days on the slopes. Mr. Elliot's passion for skiing is only matched by his dedication to cultivate the continued growth of his sport.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to stand and recognize Mr. Charles Elliot on his induction into the 2011 class of the Colorado Ski and Snowboard Hall of Fame.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE WEST BLOOMFIELD PUBLIC LIBRARY RECEIVING A NATIONAL MEDAL FOR MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICE

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the West Bloomfield Township Library as it is honored by the Institute of Museum and Library Services with a National Medal for Museum and Library Service.

This medal, which was presented to just five libraries nationally in 2010, recognizes the exceptional contributions the West Bloomfield Public Library has made to its surrounding communities. Founded in 1934 as a project of the Keego-Cass Women's Club, the Library's main branch has expanded into a 63,000 square foot state-of-the-art facility with computer access for community residents and public meeting spaces, in addition to an expanded youth area which has allowed the Library to strengthen the depth and breadth of its youth-focused programming.

The National Medal recognized libraries that demonstrate innovative approaches to providing their services to the public, and whose programming focuses on expanding cross-cultural awareness and dialogue. Particularly recognized were two of the Library's programs, the "Grow Up Reading" program and the "Help is Here" initiative. Focused on youth, the "Grow Up Reading" promotes parental involvement in childhood development through development reading skills from birth through third grade, helping children build good fundamental reading comprehension and critical thinking skills. On the adult end of the Library's programming spectrum, the "Help is Here" initiative brings counselors from Oakland Community College and professionals from Jewish Vocational Services together to provide resume critiquing services to community members.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the outstanding service the West Bloomfield Public Library provides to its community and congratulating the Library staff on receiving the National Medal for Museum and Library Service.

TRIBUTE TO CORPORAL NATHAN B. CARSE

HON. JIM JORDAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a brave Ohio soldier, Corporal Nathan B. Carse, who on February 8 was killed in action near Kandahar Province in Afghanistan.

Nathan was the pride of Allen East High School in Lima, Ohio. He earned degrees from Louisiana State University and Capital University, where he was a standout linebacker for the Capital Crusaders.

Serving a critical role in post-Katrina New Orleans, Nathan left his career in engineering and volunteered to serve his country, entering active military duty in February 2010. He deployed to Afghanistan with the 2nd Engineer Battalion, 176th Engineer Brigade in September 2010.

Nathan is survived by a loving family, including his mom, Janis; his sisters, Kristin and Megan; and four dear nephews.

Those who knew Nathan best described him as a happy, generous, hardworking man whose optimistic attitude brought a smile to people's faces and had a positive impact on their lives.

He courageously served in defense of his family, his community, his state, and his nation. Every American family lives under the blanket of safety he helped provide. For this, our nation owes him and his family a great debt of gratitude.

Nathan will be deeply missed. But the strength of his character, and the courage he demonstrated through his service, will live on.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise today to oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from Indiana, Mr. PENCE to H.R. 1, the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act.

Mr. PENCE's amendment would deny any federal funding to Planned Parenthood health facilities throughout the country. As a supporter of Planned Parenthood and the services that it offers to my constituents in my central New Jersey district, I firmly oppose this purely political amendment.

This should not be a pro-life or pro-choice debate about one of the many services that Planned Parenthood provides. In fact, under current law no federal funds can be used for abortion services. Less than three percent of the services provided by Planned Parenthood are abortion related. The Pence amendment is in fact a fundamental attack on our nation's oldest and most respected reproductive healthcare provider, the over 5 million men and women that visit Planned Parenthood annually, and the one in five American women who will visit a Planned Parenthood center in their lifetime.

Disqualifying Planned Parenthood from receiving federal funds would disproportionately affect health-care services that prevent unintended pregnancy and reduce the need for abortion. The vast majority of Planned Parenthood's medical services are related to contraception, testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections; cancer screening, and other services like pregnancy tests and infertility treatment. Despite any claims to the contrary, the Pence amendment is clearly a direct attack on prevention services, and would increase the number of unwanted pregnancies.

More than 90 percent of the care that Planned Parenthood health centers provide every day is primary and preventive, including wellness exams, cancer screenings, immunizations, contraception and STD testing and treatment. For many women, the only doctor or nurse they see is one they visit at a women's health center. In fact, more than 6 in 10 patients who receive care at a women's health center like Planned Parenthood consider it their primary source of health care.

The 28 Planned Parenthood health centers in New Jersey serve over 90,000 patients per year for a wide range of primary and reproductive health services. In 2009 alone, these centers performed almost 45 thousand cervical screening tests that detected over 2 thousand abnormal results and 27 thousand breast exams that detected over 800 abnormal results. Taking away funds from Planned Parenthood would deny women life saving medical testing, increase unwanted pregnancies, and deny primary care services to millions of women throughout the country.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Pence amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the RECORD show that I mistakenly voted in favor of amendment number 192 to H.R. 1 offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois, Mrs. BIGGERT. I am a strong supporter of the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, and I oppose efforts to defund the program.

MAJOR WILLIAM EDWARD ADAMS TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere honor to stand and pay tribute to a heroic American who was awarded our nation's highest honor for his conspicuous gallantry in the Kontum Province in the Central Highlands of Vietnam. Major William Edward Adams is an inspiration to every citizen of our great nation, and a reminder to all Americans that some will sacrifice everything to preserve our way of life.

Maj. Adams was born in Casper, Wyoming, and raised in Craig, Colorado. He went to high school in Missouri at the Wentworth Military Academy. He graduated from Colorado State University, where he also met his future wife Sandra Adams. Upon graduation he joined the United States Army. Major Adams was deployed to Vietnam in 1970.

On May 25th, 1971, Maj. Adams willingly volunteered for a helicopter rescue mission that would undoubtedly endanger his lightly armored aircraft and his life. The mission was to fly into a remote fire base that was under heavy attack to pick up three critically wounded soldiers. Maj. Adams was fully aware of the advantageous position of the enemy's formidable anti-aircraft guns; as well as the clear skies that would provide no cover from the imminent barrage. While directing and coordinating fire support from other attack helicopters, Major Adams landed his aircraft and picked up the three wounded soldiers. As he began his return flight, Maj. Adams' helicopter was bombarded with enemy rocket and gunfire. He calmly regained control of the aircraft, and prepared to make an emergency landing, but the helicopter exploded before Maj. Adams could touch down. For these actions, Major William Edward Adams posthumously received the Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pride to know that I have fellow countrymen who are capable of such selfless feats of bravery. It has been a true privilege to rise and pay tribute to Maj. William Edward Adams.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICK MULVANEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 87, I inadvertently missed the two-minute rollcall No. 87 on February 17, 2011. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

NETWORKS WIN LAP DOG AWARD FOR IGNORING CORRUPTION AT LIBERAL GROUP

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ABC, CBS, and NBC are the winners of this week's Media Fairness Caucus "Lap Dog Award" for biased news coverage.

Undercover videos released earlier this month show employees of Planned Parenthood, a taxpayer-funded liberal group, giving advice on how to obtain abortions for underage girls and circumvent sex crime laws.

All three television networks ignored the controversy for an entire week. ABC and NBC still have not devoted any coverage to the story, according to a Lexis-Nexis search.

Can you imagine if it were discovered that a conservative group was willing to aid and abet the sexual exploitation of minors? It would be all over the news.

The national media should give Americans the facts, not ignore them.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chair, this bipartisan amendment places a reasonable limit on the Government's ability to spy on American citizens using Patriot Act powers, by narrowly targeting the Patriot Act provision which allows the Government to seize library or bookstore records to determine what Americans are reading and thinking. Protection against this type of intrusion into our thoughts and minds is at the heart of our most fundamental freedoms and what it means to be an American. For these reasons, I vote in favor of the Nadler/Conyers amendment.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

I rise today in strong opposition to the Pence Amendment to the Republican Continuing Resolution which would eliminate all federal funding to Planned Parenthood facilities across the country.

Planned Parenthood has been a vital healthcare provider for low and moderate income women since its formation in 1916. It is one of the largest providers of basic healthcare in the country offering a variety of services including cancer screenings, HIV/AIDS testing, blood pressure examinations and general reproductive care for more than 3 million patients annually.

If passed, this amendment would have a detrimental impact on women's access to basic healthcare services and would severely limit a woman's right to control her own reproductive health.

Over 90% of the services Planned Parenthood administers are preventative care services that keep low and moderate income women healthy. Planned Parenthood also gives women access to contraception and important family planning services.

6 in 10 women who receive healthcare from women's health centers such as Planned Parenthood consider these facilities to be their primary source of basic, preventative care. Taking away these options for millions of women is not acceptable.

Research has shown that every dollar invested in family planning programs saves American taxpayers $4. Clearly, the goal of this amendment is not to reduce the deficit but to restrict women's access to basic healthcare services.

In the long-term, the preventative care services that Planned Parenthood offers will certainly save millions of dollars for the American taxpayer who would otherwise be forced to foot the medical bills of patients who had been denied access to preventative care services as a result of this amendment.

The Republicans claim that this Continuing Resolution is about cutting the deficit. However, this amendment is inconsistent with that objective. Instead of focusing on creating jobs, an issue that is at the center of the American people's mind, the Republicans are focusing on eliminating funding to health centers that actually save the American taxpayers money.

In these tough economic times, women who rely on health centers such as Planned Parenthood for basic care may not have any other options for seeking treatment if funding for these facilities were to disappear.

This amendment does not reduce the deficit, it does not create jobs and it severely hinders women's right to affordable, basic healthcare.

Thank you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 85, I missed the vote due to a previously scheduled satellite interview in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

A FAREWELL TO THE HOUSE

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, my congressional career will close on February 28th, so that the constitutionally required special election to replace me can coincide with a statewide referendum Governor Brown intends to hold later this year. This will save taxpayer money, assure a higher turnout, and most quickly fill the vacancy created by my resignation.

The messages that have flooded my offices since I announced my departure have touched me deeply. The extraordinary honor of a congratulatory statement by President Obama was completely unexpected and absolutely thrilling. But the message I may treasure most came from one of my children. It said, simply: Hon. "Brave Mama."

For 17 years, I have worked my heart out for the people of California's 36th congressional district. I cast votes with which some strongly disagreed—but I have always tried my best to listen, and to lead.

The opportunity awaiting me at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars is enormous. It is truly a center of excellence, and a place where I believe I can add real value to bipartisan scholarship and policymaking.

But nothing—and I mean nothing—will ever replace the two-decade long journey I have just completed as I sought and won a seat in Congress—my first and only elected office.

I have worked closely with so many of you in committees, in caucuses like the Blue Dogs and New Democrats, and on legislation.

With some here I have visited garden spots like North Korea, Libya, Syria, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Yemen to assess the threats we face. Such foreign travel is, I believe, a wonderful way to build personal, bipartisan friendships—something dearly needed in Congress.

As a lifelong, passionate, bipartisan-in-my-bones Democrat I have been criticized by both sides. But the center is where, in my view, most Americans are—and where, in many cases, the best policy answers are. I will bring that perspective with me to my new post at the Wilson Center.

Let me make two final points. First, over the years I have worked hard to hire and train the best staff on the planet. We call ourselves "Team Harman" and at annual reunions I marvel at how they and their families have grown. I truly love them, and know how their extraordinary efforts are appreciated by my constituents and other offices.

But second, I always say that I represent the smartest constituents on earth. This is not a joke: they have helped me enormously to do my job well. Sidney and I and our ever-growing family thank them for the milestones and the memories. I may be changing my day job, but not my residence—or my heart.

So, as I conclude my final statement on the floor of this House, I depart with great affection and gratitude to wonderful colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, who have also become wonderful friends.

SAM McBURNEY TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, it brings me great pride to stand and recognize the courageous and patriotic actions of young Sam McBurney. In a display of conviction and principle that was far beyond his years, this 13 year old boy took it upon himself to make sure his Fruita, Colorado, middle school recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Sam realized that the Pledge of Allegiance was not being said at the start of each school day, and this did not sit well with him. Being the son of a former Marine, Sam has always possessed a profound respect for our nation, and the knowledge that you must stand up for what you believe in. With his beliefs in line, Sam organized events and created a petition to ensure that the Pledge of Allegiance was recited at least once a week at his middle school. After months of hard work and determination, Sam finally gathered enough signatures to convince the school district that our nation's Pledge of Allegiance was a necessary and important part of the school day.

Mr. Speaker, it warms my heart to know that there are young, concerned citizens of our nation that will go to great lengths in an effort to make sure our flag, and all that it stands for, receive its due respect. It has been an honor to rise and pay tribute to Sam McBurney.

IN SUPPORT OF H. RES. 91, CELEBRATING AND ENCOURAGING DIVERSITY IN STEM AND RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR WOMEN IN SCIENCE

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H. Res. 91, a resolution celebrating and encouraging diversity in Science, Technology, Education and Mathematics (STEM), and recognizing the 40th anniversary of the Association for Women in Science (AWIS).

Science, Technology, Engineering and Math education is vital to our nation's ability to compete in the global marketplace, and ultimately fulfill goals set forth in this Congress and recently outlined by President Obama in his State of the Union Address. In our pursuit to win the future, we must not only ensure that our schools promote math and science, but that all students, especially those from traditionally underrepresented populations, engage in STEM education.

Our nation will continue to require highly educated, well trained professionals to take on the careers of tomorrow, and we must strive to encourage diversity in STEM. America has been at the forefront of the world's technological advances for the last century; contributing to breakthroughs in medicine, engineering, mathematics, chemistry, and numerous other fields. By helping foster a new generation of doctors, nurses, engineers, scientific researchers, and mathematicians, we can continue to contribute to this legacy to the world for generations to come.

Encouraging further investment in STEM education is essential. Over the past year, I have hosted two events that have encouraged women and minorities to consider careers within STEM education. We live in a world of opportunity and America has been at the root of the world's technological and scientific advances for the past century. By helping to foster a new generation of scientists, technologists, engineers and mathematicians, we can continue our legacy for the next hundred years.

The Association for Women in Science has, for 40 years, ensured diversity in STEM, promoting equality for the ever increasing number of women beyond our nation's classrooms; those in the professional STEM workforce. According to the National Science Foundation, in 2006 women accounted for just 23 percent of graduate students in engineering, and made up about 34 percent of the engineering workforce. The Association plays a vital role in inspiring women, ensuring diversity in STEM.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support this resolution, to further diversity in STEM, and to recognize the Association for Women in Science for its continued contributions to our nation's future.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of this amendment to prevent federal funds from being used to open the Chicago area locks to protect the Great Lakes from the threat of Asian Carp.

The Great Lakes are among our nation's most precious natural resources. They provide recreation and enjoyment for countless families in our region, and support more than $7 billion in fishing and approximately 800,000 jobs.

Mr. Chair, this important resource is currently under great threat. The dangerously invasive Asian Carp is moving quickly towards the Great Lakes. These ravenous fish can grow as large as 100 pounds, will eat nearly everything in their path and have no known

natural predators. If these fish are not stopped, we are risking the destruction of the delicate ecosystem of the Great Lakes and the countless industries and communities that rely upon them.

Mr. Chair, current efforts to stop the Asian Carp are not getting the job done. Indeed, last year a live Carp was found well beyond the electronic barriers and only 6 miles from Lake Michigan. Despite the imminent threat, the Supreme Court has refused to consider Michigan's request to close the Chicago locks. Congress must act now; there is no time to lose. The Chicago-area locks must be kept closed to protect our region from this grave danger.

I commend my colleague Congressman CAMP for introducing this important amendment to keep the Chicago area locks closed and protect our Great Lakes. I urge my colleagues to join us in protecting these great bodies of water. We cannot allow the Great Lakes to become a smorgasbord for the Asian Carp. We must act now so that our communities and industries can continue to rely on these great bodies for generations to come.

WESTMONT LIONS CLUB 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the members of the Westmont Lions Club as they celebrate the club's 75th year of service in the Village of Westmont.

Chartered on January 8, 1936, the Lions Club is the oldest and one of the most dedicated service organizations in Westmont. Over the past 75 years, the Westmont Lions Club has risen to Helen Keller's challenge to become the "knights of the blind" by setting up several scholarship programs, as well as by hosting such fundraising events as A Magical Vision Fundraiser.

They have worked very hard to become a pillar of service in my congressional district. I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating the Westmont Lions Club for its 75 years of service to the Village of Westmont and wish them the best in their future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 86 I missed the vote due to a previously scheduled satellite interview in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING MRS. ELLEN WILLIAMS RAGLAND

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant Mrs. Ellen Williams Ragland. Mrs. Ragland got her start in 1929. She grew up in a small rural community in Humphreys County, MS, where she witnessed the implementation of the civil rights movement and watched it unfold victoriously.

Mrs. Ragland married Adam Ragland in 1947. They later moved to Silver City, MS, and had five children. They were black farmers and owners of Semicko's Record Shop.

Mrs. Ragland was hired as a nurse assistant for the black schools in Humphreys County before integration. She picked-up the sick children from school and took them to the doctor in Belzoni, MS. She also worked for Friends of Children of Mississippi as a teacher assistant in 1968.

After the schools were integrated, Mrs. Ragland was hired as a teacher assistant in Humphreys County Public School in 1970. She worked for Humphreys County School District until she retired in 1990.

In 1991, Mrs. Ragland began working as an Entitlement Aid for National Caucus for Black Age. She was very passionate about her job and the people she served, where she often went beyond the call of duty to service their needs. Mrs. Ragland is well respected in the community. She has a pleasant personality that makes people feel comfortable going to her for help.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Ellen Williams Ragland for her dedication to serving others in need.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Kline/Foxx/Hastings/McCarthy/Payne amendment which will block the administration from using any funds to implement the gainful employment regulations.

The overbearing regulations the Department of Education promulgated deny students a choice in their educational program and would require the federal government to approve new educational programs being offered at proprietary schools. This is another attack by an administration that is more intent on exerting more government control than expanding job creation in America.

For-profit schools perform a crucial role in higher education; they fill a void in providing college education that traditional universities cannot meet. Traditional public universities are tightening their belts both financially and in terms of the number of students entering their programs. For-profit schools are capable of being flexible enough to meet the demands of students and businesses looking for qualified candidates. This regulation stands to destroy that relationship between the needs of the market and the dreams of students.

After hearing the arguments put forward by the Department of Education several times, I remain completely unconvinced. After receiving over 90,000 comments in the public comment period on the proposed rule, the Department has largely ignored the chorus of opposition to the rule. The process is flawed, the logic at the department is flawed, and the administration's approach on higher education is flawed. Therefore, I strongly support this amendment to ensure that the Department of Education cannot move forward on the gainful employment regulation.

COMMEMORATING THE SUMGAIT POGROMS AGAINST AZERBAIJANI ARMENIANS

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, the 26th and 27th of February mark the 23rd anniversary of a violent and horrific attack against Azerbaijani citizens of Armenian descent. The 1988 attacks occurred in the town of Sumgait in Soviet Azerbaijan. Dozens of Armenians were killed, and hundreds more were wounded. During the pogrom, Armenian women and children were raped and people were set on fire and beaten to death while police stood by, unwilling or unable to intervene.

The violence touched off a broader attack against Azerbaijan's ethnic Armenians, ultimately resulting in a war with Nagorno-Karabakh in which tens of thousands of people were killed. The conflict persists and remains unresolved today, as does the military blockade of the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic. The pogroms precipitated a massive refugee situation displacing hundreds of thousands of people, virtually eliminating Azerbaijan's once-significant Armenian population.

Mr. Speaker, as people of conscience, this is a remembrance we must all engage in. For me, it is also a very personal remembrance. My own family members fled the slaughter of the Armenian Genocide under the Ottomans, and when we learned of the massacres against Armenians in 1988, we saw history repeating itself. These vicious acts of murder, targeted at ethnic groups, must be forcefully condemned whenever and wherever we see them. Yet 96 years after the slaughter, Congress has yet to officially recognize the Armenian genocide.

Without our recognition and our forceful condemnation, the cycle of violence will continue. Even today, Christians and other minority groups are being driven from Iraq by extremists, and the once large and diverse ethnic mosaic there is all but eradicated. Without our attention and action by the world community, there is no end in sight.

Today, Mr. Speaker, let us remember the Armenians who lost their lives in Azerbaijan 23 years ago. And then let us take up the work that our principles demand of us, standing united against ethnic violence, discrimination, extremism and brutality, wherever we find them.

MOFFAT COUNTY TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Moffat County, located in Northwestern Colorado. The historic county celebrates its 100th anniversary this month. It stands as a reminder of the pioneering spirit that drove westward expansion and made this country great. It's roughly 14,000 residents are proud to call Moffat home and eagerly await February 27th, when the county officially celebrates its centennial.

Moffat County is known best for its open space and fossil discoveries, but has a history rooted in western railroad expansion. David Moffat, the man after whom the county was named, made it a point to run his railroad through Craig, the county seat, on its way to Salt Lake City. The railroad became the backbone of the county's economy. It made the area ideal for farming and ranching. Craig, in fact, became the world's largest shipping point for wool in the 1950s. Not long after, oil and natural gas supplies were discovered and further drove growth in both the economy and population of the area.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to represent a proud and historic community like that of Moffat County, Colorado. It is no surprise that the hardworking and self-reliant residents of the area have maintained a strong county for 100 years. There is no doubt that those same people will ensure Moffat County survives for another 100 years.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the FY 2011 Continuing Resolution, which severely cuts critical funding for State and USAID and, if enacted would severely undermine U.S. development programs in Africa, U.S. National Security, and our domestic economy. The House bill provides State and USAID $43.2 billion.

Development and diplomacy are the United States' first line of defense. Stable democracies and prosperous communities are less likely to pose a threat to their neighbors or to the United States.

State and USAID work to help countries and communities in Africa and across the world to become more stable, democratic, and prosperous. When conflicts do arise, State and USAID work to transition countries from violence to stability to long-term development and to prevent struggling states from becoming failed states. Doing so reduces the burden on our military and enhances our diplomacy.

The House bill would cut humanitarian assistance accounts by more than 40 percent below 2010 levels, devastating our ability to help victims of natural disasters and undermining U.S. leadership around the world.

The International Disaster Assistance account allows us to respond to international disasters like the earthquake in Haiti and the flood in Pakistan. The House bill provides $429 million, taking this account back to 2008 levels—a 50 percent reduction to the 2010 level. This significant reduction will severely limit our ability to respond to natural disasters; we will simply be unable to respond to earthquakes and other disasters the way we did in Haiti.

In Sudan, more than 1.6 million Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in Darfur would not receive critical health care, access to water, or support with livelihood activities. Instead of reintegrating approximately 300,000 returnees to South Sudan in the wake of the referendum, USAID would be able to assist fewer than 150,000.

In West Africa, proposed budget cuts would significantly hamper efforts to reduce and maintain acute malnutrition rates below emergency levels in drought-affected areas of Burkina Faso and Niger.

The House mark will also end a cost-effective local and regional purchase program which enables the U.S. to feed hungry people by purchasing food locally at a significantly lower cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

U.S. food aid continues to plays a critical role by helping people in need and supporting broader U.S. national security objectives by demonstrating the goodwill of the United States, especially in Afghanistan and Pakistan. U.S. food aid also supports domestic interests by the purchase of agricultural commodities from American farmers and the shipping of commodities abroad on U.S. ships.

Reducing Title II food aid from the FY 2011 request of $1.690 billion to $1.003 billion forces dramatic cuts in food aid programs around the world, as well as decreasing purchases from U.S. farmers and the use of U.S. ships.

This cut would require reductions in the largest emergency food aid programs, to include Sudan, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Given the average cost of emergency food aid of $44 per beneficiary, this would mean up to 15 million people might not receive such life-saving assistance due to the proposed reduction.

The bill reduces funding for refugee relief by $670 million or 40 percent below 2010 levels, representing a shift in U.S. policy of historical, unprecedented and devastating proportions. This reduction will drastically reduce the U.S. ability to protect and assist refugees in places of critical national security, such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq and the Horn of Africa.

For example, a reduction of this magnitude jeopardizes U.S. support for 1.6 million Afghan refugees living in Pakistan and another 100,000 Afghan refugees returning to Afghanistan this year alone. Also, some 230,000 Burmese refugees in Thailand, Malaysia, Bangladesh and India would be at risk. And, security in the Horn of Africa and supporting peace in Sudan would also be at risk as some 3,000–5,000 Somalis are fleeing into Kenya each month and 270,000 Darfuris in Sudan and Chad will go largely unassisted.

The House proposal also makes deep cuts in Global Health programs and Development Assistance. Disease knows no borders. As such, USAID's programs to prevent and treat infectious diseases not only benefit the most vulnerable overseas, but also protect American citizens at home. Moreover, this Continuing Resolution would disproportionately cut programs that help the neediest people around the world by 25 percent versus an 11 percent reduction overall.

The proposed CR level cuts the Global Health Initiative by $834 million from 2010 levels. While these cuts would have miniscule value in the goal of balancing the budget, they will have real, immediate, and devastating impact on the poorest.

I am deeply disappointed by the Appropriators' choice to step away from America's long-term humanitarian interests in improving and preserving lives around the world by helping people lift themselves out of poverty. There is living proof across the world that less than 1 percent of the total federal budget has helped poor farmers learn to grow more food more efficiently, provided a lifeline to millions with HIV—including pregnant women whose babies can now be born HIV-free—put millions of children under malaria-fighting bed nets by night and into schools by day, and strengthened America's friendships with millions of people, thus strengthening our own national security.

The cut to the PEPFAR program is $513 million below 2010, a 10 percent reduction. At this level, the U.S. will be unable to provide treatment to more than 700,000 people in desperate need of life-saving HIV/AIDS treatment.

The House bill cuts USAID health programs by $320 million (−13 percent) from 2010 levels and nearly 30 percent below the 2011 request. Reducing the USAID Global Health and Child Survival by this magnitude will have devastating effects on men, women, and children worldwide.

Under the proposed CR levels, 5 million children and family members will be denied treatment or preventative interventions for malaria, leaving millions to die. Moreover, 43,000 children and family members with tuberculosis will be denied treatment, of which 12,000 will likely die.

More than 16 million persons will be denied treatment for such debilitating conditions as blinding trachoma and onchocerciasisis. Efforts would be scaled back in at least 10 countries where we were on track to interrupt transmission within five years of up to four of the NTDs. USAID will be forced to sever agreements with four major pharmaceutical companies that donate hundreds of millions worth of drugs for NTD treatment programs.

The bill would force USAID to scale back efforts in the 24 countries which collectively account for approximately one-half of all maternal and child deaths. 3,500 mothers will die, and more than 40,000 children under five—of which 16,000 are newborns—will perish in the absence of highly effective child survival interventions.

More than 500 thousand undernourished children will be deprived of highly effective nutrition interventions (e.g., community management of acute malnutrition, micronutrient supplementation, and nutrition education leading to dietary diversity).

Placing an all-account ceiling of $440 million on family planning and reproductive health in 2011 amounts to a 32 percent cut from FY 2010 levels. This would result in 1.2 million

more abortions, 28,000 additional newborn deaths, and 4,000 additional maternal deaths—all stemming from denying 8.5 million women access to family planning services and by extension, 2.5 million additional unintended pregnancies.

The House FY 2011 Continuing Resolution would reduce the Development Assistance account by nearly $750 million from 2010 levels, a 30 percent reduction, and $1.2 billion from the 2011 request (−40 percent).

Absent deep cuts to other ongoing programs, in areas such as education, microfinance, and water, the House bill would virtually eliminate funding for the Feed the Future Initiative and the Global Climate Change Initiative.

With world food prices at their highest since the 2007/2008 global food riots, and in view of the political volatility that food prices recently helped spark in the Middle East, it is more important than ever that the U.S. engage to improve long-term food security, and assist countries to avert short-term food crises. The recent events in Egypt that continue throughout the Middle East are a stark example of food insecurity's effect on stability.

Decimating the President's Feed the Future (FtF) Initiative will mean that more than 4 million women, children, and family members—most small farmers—will go hungry this year, remaining desperately mired in poverty. More than 18 million will be at risk of chronic hunger over a five-year period. Ending funding for research and development under FtF will expose wheat crops—including here in the United States, and in Afghanistan and Pakistan—to the threats of U.G. 99 wheat stem rust strain.

In just five out of our 20 focus countries, nearly 6.5 million small farmers, mostly poor and mostly women, will remain in the grips of hunger and poverty, unable to grow enough food to feed themselves and their families.

Alternatively, spreading the 30 percent reduction across the Development Assistance Account would have significant negative effects on many congressional priorities including interventions in basic and higher education, microfinance, rule of law and governance, trade, and financial sector reform.

Microfinance institutions in nearly 30 countries around the world will be forced to significantly scale back operations or shut their doors as funding dries up, resulting in 600,000 fewer women accessing financial services to sustain their businesses and contribute to the economic livelihoods of their families and communities.

Over 20,000 Afghans will no longer have the tools they need to begin or sustain a microenterprise in the midst of the conflict, increasing the risk that they will turn to other, illicit economic livelihoods, like poppy production, to feed their families.

As many as 300,000 rural microenterprises and over 600,000 smallholder farmers will no longer be able to access the vital services and growing markets they need to generate cash income, break the cycle of subsistence agriculture, and chart a pathway out of poverty.

A 30 percent cut in Development Assistance for water would mean that than 700,000 persons will be deprived access to clean drinking water and sanitation which, according to WHO, is one of the largest causes of mortality in the world—diarrhea-related disease kills nearly 2 million every year, 90 percent of whom are children under 5.

Out of the approximately 64 million children benefitting from our education assistance worldwide, over 19 million will lose access to schooling opportunities. 10 million girls will be deprived access to basic education, causing further social and financial marginalization.

I urge my colleagues to vote NO on the Continuing Resolution and any amendments that would strip critical and life saving programs in Africa and the developing world.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF GWENDOLYN ''GWEN'' APPELQUIST MAY

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to rise today to recognize the life of northwest Florida's beloved Gwen Appelquist May.

Mrs. Appelquist was a pioneer in the local business community who used her success and acumen to help support numerous charities and service organizations in the Pensacola community. Mrs. Appelquist worked for nearly 40 years in the real estate business in northwest Florida. She formed her own company, Appelquist and Associates, in 1977, and her tireless work ethic was the key to her success. She was noted for being the first one in the office, often beginning work at 5:00 a.m., and the last to leave.

Her leadership in the business community was unquestioned. She was highly respected and, in 1993, was chosen as chairwoman of the Pensacola Bay Area Chamber of Commerce. The Pensacola Bay Area Chamber of Commerce also awarded her with the Business Leader of the Year Award. She served in leadership positions at a number of local organizations, including co-chairwoman at Covenant Hospice and president of United Way of Escambia County. She also served as a board member for Baptist Hospital and the Council on Aging Foundation.

Mrs. Appelquist was noted for her dedication to her clients; however, her commitment and hard work were best personified by her support for charitable organizations in the northwest Florida community. Retirement was never one of Mrs. Appelquist's goals. Following her career in real estate, Mrs. Appelquist joined the Studer Group, a health care consulting organization, where she worked as Executive Director of charitable giving.

To some, Gwen Appelquist May will be remembered as a leader in the business community. To others, she will be remembered for her charitable work northwest Florida. To her family, she will always be remembered as a loving and devoted mother and spouse. She was an inspiration to those who knew her, and her service to the Pensacola community is her lasting legacy.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it gives me great pride to honor the life of Gwen Appelquist May. My wife Vicki and I offer our continued prayers for her entire family.

RECOGNIZING ESTELLE WALLINGFORD

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize someone who has been a valuable asset during her time as an intern in my office, Estelle Wallingford.

Estelle came to my office from Australia as a participant in the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Programme. Already an accomplished student at the University of Melbourne where she studies Political Science and Philosophy, as well as Economics, she left the Australian summer to join us in DC as winter set in this January. During her time in my office, Estelle has been a quick learner, picking up and understanding the similarities and differences between our U.S. Congress and Australia's Parliament. At the same time, she has excitedly shared her knowledge and culture with my staff, leading them in their first ever celebration of Australia Day.

Estelle's love of Australia and desire to share it with others in the United States was exemplified by her efforts to revive the House's Friends of Australia Caucus. During a project to update a listing of Congressional Member Organizations for my office, she realized that there are caucuses fostering friendship between the United States and a number of other nations, but not one for Australia. I am proud to report that through her efforts to reach out to other Members of Congress and her own embassy, Estelle's vision of the Friends of Australia Caucus is already taking shape.

I join my colleagues in congratulating Estelle Wallingford on her accomplishments during her time in the United States and thank her for her hard work and knowledge she has imparted to me and my staff. I wish her the best in her future endeavors as she returns home, to Australia.

IN RECOGNITION OF WILLIAM T. SKOWRONSKI

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize William T. Skowronski, the Chief of the Northeast District Office of the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency. Bill is retiring on February 24 after 39 years with the OEPA.

Bill Skowronski graduated from Cleveland State University in 1972 with a degree in Mechanical Engineering. He became a Registered Professional Engineer and went on to become District Engineer in the Public Wastewater Control Group; a Supervisor in the Industrial Wastewater Pollution Control Group; and the Manager of the Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste Management, before becoming the District Chief in 1987.

In his long and distinguished career, Bill Skowronski has served on many boards and committees and has received numerous awards for his service. He is an ex officio member of the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency, Northeast Ohio's Metropolitan Planning Organization; a member of the

Greater Cleveland Clean Air Campaign; the Cleveland Harbor Dredge Task Force; the Environmental Health and Safety Technology Advisory Committee of Cuyahoga Community College; and the Advisory Committee for Master of Arts in Environmental Studies at Cleveland State University's Levin College of Urban Affairs, among other boards. He is also a past member of the Greater Cleveland Growth Association's Water/Environmental Committee; Case Western Reserve University's Advisory Committee for the Regional Priorities Project; the St. Clair Superior Neighborhood Development Association Environmental Justice Committee; and the Earth Day Coalition's Sustainable Cleveland Neighborhood Committee, among others. In 1991 Bill received the OEPA Senior Manager of the Year Award and in 2005 received the OEPA George B. Garrett Professionalism Award.

Professional duties aside, Bill is a dedicated sports fan and family man. He plays basketball, soccer, tennis and golf and umpires elementary through high school baseball leagues. He is an avid fan of all Cleveland's professional sports teams and the Ohio State University Buckeyes. In his retirement, Bill looks forward to spending more time with his wife Debra, who recently retired from the North Royalton Board of Education, his three children Keith, Kevin and Kristen, his granddaughter Abigail, and a grandchild on the way.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in wishing Bill Skowronski the best in his much deserved retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, while I am adamantly opposed to the EPA moving forward with regulations on large utilities and refineries in our country, I believe that the Congress should be the decision maker on carbon control issues. That is why I have cosponsored Rep. CAPITO's bill that would prohibit the EPA from issuing any greenhouse gas emission-related rules or regulations for two years so that the Congress has time to address this issue. A solution can be found for controlling carbon emissions by using nuclear and natural gas to generate electricity and I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will work with me on this to give industry the certainty they need.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 87, I missed the vote due to a previously scheduled satellite interview in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING SPECIAL AGENT JAIME J. ZAPATA

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my deepest sorrow about a tragic attack on American law enforcement that happened earlier this week in Mexico.

On Tuesday afternoon, two agents from U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement were attacked by unknown individuals while driving between Mexico City and Monterrey, Mexico. Today, I honor the incredible sacrifice of Special Agent Jaime J. Zapata, who lost his life in service of our country.

Special Agent Zapata joined ICE in 2006. He joined one of ICE's offices in Laredo, Texas, where he served on the Human Smuggling and Trafficking Unit, as well as the Border Enforcement Security Task Force. He was most recently detailed to ICE's Attaché office in Mexico City. He began his federal law enforcement career with the Department of Homeland Security as a member of the U.S. Border Patrol in Yuma, Arizona. A native of Brownsville, Texas, Special Agent Zapata graduated from the University of Texas at Brownsville in 2005 with a Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice.

A second agent who was injured in the attack remains in stable condition. My thoughts and prayers are with him.

These two brave agents gave their all to shield others from harm. They worked tirelessly against dangerous criminal elements. They bravely took dangerous assignments, ultimately making a profound sacrifice.

They were two of the hundreds of ICE personnel around the globe. Honorable agents like these two individuals collaborate with their counterparts in joint efforts to dismantle transnational criminal organizations. Agents like them give their all day in and day out on fighting money laundering, contraband smuggling, weapons proliferation, forced child labor, human rights violations, intellectual property violations, child exploitation, and human smuggling and trafficking.

An incident like this serves to remind us, as a Nation, how grateful we are for the sacrifices made by these brave men and women every day. The work they do serves to make the public safe and protect the Nation's security.

I know that law enforcement is working closely with the authorities in Mexico to ensure that the perpetrators of this horrible attack are brought to justice as quickly as possible.

In the meantime, I offer my deepest condolences to the family of Special Agent Zapata. He died for a just cause and will forever be remembered as a man of courage and honor.

And a message for the second injured agent: I think I speak for a Nation when I say that I hope, and pray, for your recovery. Words cannot express our thanks for your service.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues Congressman DON YOUNG and Congresswoman MAZIE HIRONO.

This amendment removes the current language in H.R. 1 that prohibits the Department of Education from funding the Alaska Native Education Equity Act and the Native Hawaiian Education Program. No additional funds are added to the underlying bill.

Alaska and Hawaiian natives historically have had lower student achievement levels due to high rates of poverty and the lack of resources available to them. Investment in Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian programs have decreased student dropout rates and improved student achievement. These programs provide students a quality education while also recognizing and building upon their unique cultural backgrounds.

As a member of the Native American Caucus, I have worked with my colleagues in Congress to address the needs of all Native Americans, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians. I will continue to advocate on behalf of all of our native populations and work to ensure that they have equal opportunities to succeed.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably detained and missed roll call vote 81. If present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 81.

RECOGNIZING DR. LEROY HOOD, RECIPIENT OF THE FRITZ J. AND DOLORES H. RUSS PRIZE

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Leroy Hood, recipient of the Fritz J. and Dolores H. Russ Prize from the National Academy of Engineering. The Fritz J. and Dolores H. Russ Prize is a prestigious engineering award which was established in 1999 in tribute to the contributions of esteemed engineer Fritz Russ and his wife Dolores Russ. The National Academy of Engineering presents this award every two years

to recognize the outstanding achievements made in bioengineering that significantly improve the human condition.

As co-founder of several biotechnology companies in the Puget Sound Region, Dr. Hood advanced research and methods in biology and developed new DNA technologies for biomedicine and forensic science. His groundbreaking work in automation of DNA sequencing earned him this biennium's Fritz J. and Dolores H. Russ Prize. Dr. Hood is a leading scientist in the fields of molecular biotechnology and genomics where his approach to biomedicine has been utilized internationally. He has received many of the foremost awards in his field including the 2004 Biotechnology Heritage Award for his significant contributions to biotechnology through discovery, innovation, commercialization, and increasing public understanding of biology.

A pioneer of techniques that initiated the Human Genome Project, Dr. Hood is admired for his scientific innovations, his entrepreneurship, and the quality and volume of his research. Having earned his M.D. at Johns Hopkins University, and his Ph.D. at the California Institute of Technology, Dr. Hood inspires young people to follow in his footsteps and study science.

The Seattle Community is exceedingly proud to be home to Dr. Leroy Hood and the Institute for Systems Biology, a pioneering research facility that is doing critical work at the very forefront of biological science.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives please join me in honoring Dr. Leroy Hood, recipient of the Fritz J. and Dolores H. Russ Prize for his achievements in advancing genetic science.

IN HONOR AND REMEMBRANCE OF MERCEDES HELEN SPOTTS

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Mercedes Helen Spotts, a loving mother, grandmother, sister and friend. Mrs. Spotts' devotion to public service, and her passionate love for her family and children, has left a lasting impression on countless lives.

Born in Cleveland, Ohio to Helen and John Karpinski, Mrs. Spotts graduated from Notre Dame Academy, and earned associates and bachelor's degrees at Notre Dame College. She also earned her master's and law degrees at Cleveland State University. She was awarded an honorary doctorate from her alma mater, Notre Dame College.

Mrs. Spotts has the honor of being the first female deputy bailiff at the Cleveland Municipal Court. Throughout her career she also served as an appeals court administrator, the second female President of the Cuyahoga County Bar Association, co-founder of the East Side Catholic Shelter and the founding President of Mental Health Services. Because of her dedication, Mrs. Spotts was the recipient of three awards from the Cuyahoga County Bar Association, including the first ''Day Weiner'' award for public service.

In addition to her formal role as deputy bailiff, Mrs. Spotts was known around the community as the organizer of the annual International Folk Festival in Playhouse Square. She was also an active member of the Dimpled Darlings of Ireland, a tap-dance group that performed for nursing homes and hospitals. Mrs. Spotts was named a ''Grand Lady of Pulaski'' by the Polonia Foundation and received its annual Heritage Award. She also received the Ellis Island Medal of Honor in 2005.

Mrs. Spotts is survived by her two sons, David and John, her grandson David, and sister, the Honorable Diane Karpinski.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in remembering Mercedes Helen Spotts, whose legacy of professionalism and service to others will not be forgotten.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HAROLD BROCK

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work and generosity of the late Harold Brock of Waterloo, Iowa.

In January, Harold passed away at the age of 96. For decades he was a leader and innovator in the Cedar Valley and State of Iowa. Harold began his career as an engineering apprentice at Ford Motor Company working alongside Henry Ford. He headed tractor engineering at Ford for 20 years, before moving to Iowa to work for John Deere in 1959. Harold became the company's first worldwide director of tractor engineering. Throughout his career he supported multiple community programs including Junior Achievement, Cedar Valley Hospice, and the Grout Museum.

One of his greatest contributions was helping establish the Hawkeye Institute of Technology, which we now know as Hawkeye Community College. Harold's vision, energy, and intelligence enabled Hawkeye to become the premier institution it is today. Thousands of students, families, and businesses are stronger now because of Harold's leadership.

A few months before his death, Harold was featured in the Waterloo Cedar Falls Courier for his work and generosity. In that story he stated he was grateful for the opportunity ''to build a better world for people.'' He wanted to be remembered for contributing to the success of people and the community.

Mr. Speaker, Harold Brock will be remembered for a long and productive life where he truly helped build a better world for people. I rise today to honor his memory and the legacy he's left.

MOVEMENT IS LIFE

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, arthritis is the number one cause of disability, according to the Centers for Disease Control, CDC, and among the leading reasons for doctor visits and missed work. In addition, the CDC finds that arthritis costs $128 billion annually in medical costs and lost wages. In September 2010, a national summit on arthritis and musculoskeletal health disparities, ''Movement is Life,'' was held in Bethesda, Maryland. The summit facilitated a national dialogue about musculoskeletal health disparities among women and the largest racial/ethnic minority groups, African Americans and Latinos. The findings of ''Movement is Life'' show that women, African Americans, and Latinos face more severe osteoarthritis and disability but receive less than optimal access to diagnostic, medical, and surgical intervention than other demographic groups. These disadvantaged communities also face significant health disparities in chronic diseases such as diabetes, obesity, and heart disease. By promoting early intervention, ''Movement is Life'' hopes to slow musculoskeletal disease progression, reduce disability, and encourage physical activity and daily movement to improve the overall health of the Nation.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. CONNELLY of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise to strike the last word. This Continuing Resolution would cripple our Nation's transportation infrastructure and terminate crucial investments in public safety. It also would close down community health centers across America, leaving many children and the elderly without vital health care. For example, in my district this proposed cut could close the Prince William Community Health Center. That would eliminate necessary health care for 19,000 of my constituents. In Louisa County, Virginia, which is represented by the new Majority Leader, this proposal could close the lone health facility where residents can receive care. Statewide, 93,000 Virginians would lose health care while 163 employees of community health clinics would lose their jobs. These clinics do not provide optional or cosmetic care. They offer the most basic services necessary for survival. These clinics, which serve virtually every Congressional district, serve some of the hardest working Americans who have been victims of long-term increases in health insurance premiums, which have put affordable care out of their reach.

This Continuing Resolution demonstrates extraordinary callousness and hypocrisy on the part of the Republican leadership. They claim to be interested in the sanctity of human life while cutting off the only source of health care for tens of thousands of Virginians. Incredibly, the Republican leadership blocked an amendment by Representative BALDWIN which would have restored $1 billion in funding for community health centers.

I urge my colleagues to reject the unconscionable cuts in community health center funding and defeat this Continuing Resolution.

JAMES J. HAGGERTY

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of James J. Haggerty, known affectionately to many of us as ''The Big Fella.'' He was the beloved husband to his cherished Cecelia and proud father of seven: Jeanie, Mauri, James Jr., Matthew, Cecelia, Daniel, and Katie. And he was the doting grandfather to 18.

Jim's life motto was ''to those whom much is given, much is expected.'' He believed strongly in public service, through which he knew he could help people. When his close and dear friend, Bob Casey, became Governor of Pennsylvania, Jim served in his cabinet as Secretary of the Commonwealth and later as his General Counsel.

Jim's life was made full by his big family and many friends. He adored his wife, and he died just 11 days before their 45th wedding anniversary. He was strengthened by his abiding Catholic faith, loved his Irish heritage, and was a loyal Dunmorean.

Jim supported many worthy causes, serving as chairman of the board of the University of Scranton, a member of the board of Scranton Preparatory School, and a staunch champion of the United Way of Lackawanna County. His good works strengthened northeast Pennsylvania.

At his funeral mass, Monsignor Joseph Quinn said of Jim to an overflowing and loving crowd: ''God used him to build many bridges along the way, bridges that connect lives.''

His grandson, James, called him a man of courage and generosity, saying: ''He has taught me the importance of giving back.''

As the Scranton Times-Tribune reported, James Jr. said his father epitomized ''honesty, integrity, and love'' to his family. And he closed with a poem read by Robert F. Kennedy in Lackawanna County in 1964, about Irish freedom fighter Owen Roe O'Neill:

''We're sheep without a shepherd, when the snow shuts out the sky. Oh! Why did you leave us, Owen? Why did you die?''

My husband Paul and I were proud to call the Haggertys our friends for nearly 50 years, and are deeply saddened by Jim's passing. It is a source of great happiness to us that our children and grandchildren are loving friends.

Indeed, so many were proud to call Jim their friend: last Sunday, in Scranton, a line of those who had come to pay their respects to Jim stretched for blocks. As they waited in line for hours, they shared their stories of how Jim Haggerty helped them.

I hope it is a comfort to the Haggerty family, to Celia and to their children and grandchildren, that so many grieve their loss and are praying for them in this sad time.

CONGRATULATING KATHY STEINHOFF

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kathy Steinhoff, a math teacher at Jefferson Junior High School in Columbia for receiving the NEA Member Benefits Award for Teaching Excellence on February 11, 2011.

Ms. Steinhoff should be commended for her hard work and dedication to the students in her school district and her community. The NEA Member Benefits Award for Teaching Excellence is a prestigious award, and we are proud she is representing our great state of Missouri and the 9th district. Advancement in the fields of mathematics is integral to the development and competitiveness of America in the future, and I am honored to congratulate Ms. Steinhoff on her outstanding achievement.

Ms. Steinhoff was selected from five finalists to receive the NEA Member Benefits Award for Teaching Excellence. The award recognizes effective teaching skills and advocacy for the educational profession.

Steinhoff won the award for her unique teaching style and the use of technology in her lessons, such as interactive SMART Boards and clickers, to help her eighth- and ninth-grade students. She also uploads podcasts, which record her teaching difficult math problems, so that her students can revisit her lessons later to study. Her innovative teaching style has made her a favorite among students and a leader among her peers.

It is critical for the future of our country that students have access to a quality education. Without excellent teachers, our schools fail our students and communities. Ms. Steinhoff exemplifies what it means to be an excellent teacher, and her dedication to her students and community is worthy of high praise.

I ask that you join me in recognizing Kathy Steinhoff for her excellence in the field of education.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE KHOJALY TRAGEDY

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to recognize the estimated 1,000 civilians who on February 26, 1992 were indiscriminately scalped, tortured, and killed in the town of Khojaly, an Azerbaijani-populated town in Nagorno-Karabakh. Many of us know that post-Soviet conflicts in Eastern Europe and Central Asia led to brutal ethnic cleansing, but few have heard of the people of Khojaly, who were massacred by Armenian militants. The ethnic cleansing was successful, and the town no longer exists. Although the tragedy received widespread media coverage, since then it has largely been forgotten. I hope that now and every year after this atrocity, we can pray for the victims.

Azerbaijan's Muslim, Christian, and Jewish communities come together against ethnic cleansing at this time of the year, commemorating the lives of the Khojaly victims and calling on the international community to condemn the bloodshed. Their pleas do not fall on deaf ears.

There are still victims of the conflict in the region of Nagorno-Karabakh. Hundreds of thousands of people are displaced, and ethnic cleansing has continued even after 1992.

I have met victims of the Rwandan genocide, who are still healing to this day. I went to Bosnia shortly after the war and saw the effect of ethnic cleansing there. I know what a detrimental effect this can have to a region, in this case even wiping a small town off the map. I recognize that even now, atrocities are occurring in Kashmir and Darfur, and innocent civilians are paying the price while we in the international community have more to do.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Azerbaijan and Armenia can come to a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh, and I hope that the civilians suffering right now will soon see an end to ethnic cleansing. The memories of the women, men, and children of Khojaly should propel us to condemn such practices.

RECOGNIZING THE DES MOINES SOCIAL CLUB

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Des Moines Social Club, a not-for-profit venture formed in Iowa around the idea that art can be accessible to everyone.

Since its founding in 2008, the Des Moines Social Club has become a source for art and art education through the Instinct Art Gallery, showcasing local, national and international artists, many educational classes, and weekly programs. They have provided the staff and resources to host public events educating Iowans of all ages about music, dance, theater, and the visual arts.

The folks of the Des Moines Social Club have been strong supporters of projects that benefit the entire community. In the past year, they have expanded to provide just under 300 hours of classes for over 500 students. The fact that nearly 100 volunteers have put in close to 5,000 hours of service, is a true testament to the leadership of the organization and their dedication to fulfill their mission of using the arts as a catalyst for community engagement.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of what the Des Moines Social Club has done to further the arts. This group of leaders is making the State of Iowa a more vibrant and diverse community.

SUPPORT THE HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY FUND

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose amendment #380, proposed by our colleagues Mr. REED and Mr. GRAVES, which eliminate the State Department Democracy Fund and the Human Rights and Democracy Fund (HRDF).

The Human Rights and Democracy Fund funded by the Democracy Fund appropriation, finances innovative projects across the world to support the long-standing bipartisan U.S. foreign policy goals of defending human rights and advancing democratic values. Continued HRDF programming is vital to U.S. national

security because democratic governance fosters more stable countries and regions, and free nations are more peaceful towards other democracies. Democracy promotion funding, started under President Reagan, has grown to its current consistent level of $70 million. Sustained congressional support for HRDF is critical.

Promoting democracy and human rights is a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy goals and the advancement of our national interests because it is the most effective long-term way to strengthen international stability. By reducing regional conflicts, countering terrorism and terror-supporting extremism, and extending peace and prosperity, the U.S. protects liberty and justice and the non-negotiable demands of human dignity.

The Human Rights and Democracy Fund is the foundation for U.S. support for democracy and human rights across the globe. With HRDF, the U.S. addresses the most egregious of human rights abuses, open political space in struggling and nascent democracies and authoritarian regimes, promote religious freedom and tolerance, support civil society, protect at risk populations, and further global internet freedom and corporate social responsibility throughout the world. With HRDF, the United States was able to help counter extremism by supporting at risk populations in the Middle East, thereby reducing breeding grounds of future terrorists. DRL was able to provide thousands of Haitians with internet and radio access in the immediate aftermath of the Hurricane there.

The Human Rights and Democracy Fund is enabling the U.S. to implement innovative programs across Africa. In Morocco, the Democracy Fund supports justice sector institutions to develop alternatives to pre-trial detention of youth offenders that enable rehabilitation outside of prison. To stem gender-based violence (GBV) in the war-torn region of eastern Congo, the State Department's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL) initiative provided legal assistance to victims of sexual violence. As a result, 296 GBV survivors received legal counseling and 212 survivors received psychological counseling; 98 criminal complaints were filed against suspected perpetrators; and an unprecedented 25 rape convictions were secured. In Sudan, in response to widespread violence against women in Darfur, DRL used Democracy Fund appropriations to provide critical services and community outreach to survivors of gender-based violence. Through the establishment of women centers, tens of thousands of women received an array of services, including literacy classes, health education, income-generating activities and treatment for sexual violence including medical, psychosocial, and case management services.

Without HRDF, victims will lose valuable avenues for recourse, civil society activists will become increasingly isolated, women will become more vulnerable, and truth-telling journalists will be quieted. DRL would not be able to support efforts to push the Chinese government to more actively disclose food and drug safety information that directly affects the well-being of the American public; foster critical advances in the rule law, including criminal justice reform; support the growth of the NGO sector and its advocacy on behalf of the marginalized in society; or widen space for religious freedom. Without HRDF, DRL would not be able to help male civic and religious leaders be a powerful voice for the rights of women in Afghanistan.

I urge my colleagues to support democracy and human rights in the developing world by voting NO on the Reed/Graves amendment #380.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1, the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011. This ill conceived bill imposes draconian spending cuts that harm working families and, if implemented, could cause 1 million Americans to lose their jobs. Even worse, this bill hampers our country's ability to compete with other rising world powers, like China and India, by imposing draconian cuts to education, research, and infrastructure investments.

At a time when education is critical to thriving in our global economy, the Republican led House is undermining America's future. Specifically, today's legislation would reduce the Pell Grants award by $845, causing over 9.4 million college students to suffer from increased levels of educational debt. Additionally, 218,000 children will be immediately dropped from Head Start program and 7,000 special education teachers will lose their jobs. House Republicans also want to reduce job training programs by $3.6 billion, cutting training for more the 200,000 Americans who lost their jobs in this ''Great Recession.''

H.R. 1 will cut $740 million in WIC nutrition assistance and thus cause thousands of low-income children to lose access to nutritional foods and health coverage. During one of the coldest winters in memory, Republicans propose to cut $400 million to the low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program—literally leaving many of our fellow citizens out in the cold. They also would abolish Title X funding, thus cutting life-saving health services such as HIV testing, cancer screening, blood-pressure testing, and contraceptive services to more than five million low-income women, the majority of whom are uninsured. $1.3 billion is cut from Community Health Centers, which would deny care to over 3.2 million Americans. Lastly, 75,000 homeless veterans would lose their housing vouchers under this bill.

With the passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the Democrats boldly showed that investing in America's infrastructure could put America to work, while laying the groundwork for future private sector investment. With this measure, Republicans would seek to undo that commitment and move our country backwards with billions in cuts to transportation funding. H.R. 1 would cut $2.5 from high speed rail projects that have been already awarded and eliminate funding for High Speed Rail Corridors. It would also eliminate 750 fewer wastewater and drinking water projects. 25,000 TIGER Surface Transportation Projects would be terminated.

During the Great Depression, conservatives advocated for reduced spending at a time when the government needed greater investments in job creation. This unfortunate decision prolonged that economic malaise and resulted in untold levels of human suffering by millions of Americans. With H.R. 1, today's conservatives are simply repeating these failed economic policies. We cannot allow this. Republican ''No Jobs Agenda'' to succeed. I encourage my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

TWENTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE SUMGAIT MASSACRE

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, next week marks the twenty-third anniversary of the Sumgait massacre. I stand today to recognize the massacres in Sumgait, Azerbaijan, and the continued Turkish and Azeri aggression against the Armenian people.

In late February of 1988, during what was supposed to be a period of glasnost and perestroika within the Soviet Union, Armenians, who had been the target of genocide in the early part of the 20th century by the Ottoman government, were under assault by the Azeri authorities in the town of Sumgait in Azerbaijan. This three-day rampage left dozens dead and hundreds injured, many burned alive. Women and minors were abused, scores of apartments were robbed, shops and kiosks were demolished, and thousands of people became refugees.

The Sumgait massacre is but one example in a long line of Azerbaijan's aggression and hostility against the Armenian people. Just two years later, the disappearance of a 450,000 strong Armenian community in Azerbaijan was witnessed. While Azerbaijan claims that events in Baku were about the liberation of Azerbaijani people from the Soviet occupation, the truth is that Mikhail Gorbachev had to send Soviet troops to the Azerbaijani capital to stop the mass killings and deportations of Armenians organized by the Government of Azerbaijan. The unfortunate fact is that the Azerbaijani Government was successful in ethnic cleansing and the mass deportation of the entire Armenian population of Baku.

Despite the attempt by the Government of Azerbaijan to cover up the crimes of Sumgait and Baku, enough brave witnesses came forward to give an accurate account of the offenses. Having survived near annihilation at the hands of the Ottoman Turkish authorities, it is a testament to the indomitable spirit of the Armenian people that they were able to endure and overcome another genocide campaign during the pogroms that took place throughout Azerbaijan, including in its capital city of Baku.

Many Armenians have marked the anniversary of the Sumgait massacre by organizing a march here in Washington from the Embassy of Turkey to the Embassy of Azerbaijan in

order to highlight the continued Turkish and Azeri aggression toward the Armenian people. This anniversary reminds us yet again of the historical injustices the Armenian people have faced, and the need for strong U.S. engagement in the region to safeguard Armenia against the aggressive tactics of its neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues stand with me in recognizing this tragic moment in history. Through recognizing the atrocities of the past, we can build a more peaceful future.

IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose Rep. SCOTT GARRETT's amendment to the FY2011 Continuing Resolution. His proposal to erase funding for the Institute of Museum and Library Services will effectively eliminate all specific federal funding for libraries. Doing so would cut off access to information for millions of Americans.

I believe our government needs to be more fiscally responsible, but as the son a librarian, I know the high cost these cuts will have in the long term. If we are serious about competing in a global economy, we must provide our children with the tools and resources to succeed, and cutting funds for our libraries will only hinder our chance to win the future.

As a nation, we cannot afford to cut ourselves off from such necessary tools for economic recovery as books, periodicals, newspapers, the internet, and the bevy of information our public libraries provide. If funding for public libraries is removed, the Georgia Public Library Service will no longer be able to provide the following:

The statewide network of high-speed Internet data lines providing access to all 400+ libraries in Georgia

The award-winning, nationally-recognized PINES network and statewide library card system, which is used by more than 2.4 million Georgians and provides statewide lending via a shared database of more than 10 million items

A Statewide daily courier service for interlibrary loans to the headquarters of all 61 public library systems in Georgia—nearly 1 million books shared in this way

''Talking book'' library services for the blind and other Georgians whose physical abilities require the use of books and magazines in audio format or in Braille—encompassing more than 1 million annual circulations

The GALILEO online databases, which contain essential quality digital resources for students (kindergarten through higher education), teachers, professors and public library users

The statewide Summer Reading Program, which served approximately 450,000 children in 2010—an increase of more than 10 percent from 2009

Shared services that provide necessary OCLC cataloging information and interlibrary loan access to every library in the state

Continuing education programs and training for library staff who work in all types of libraries—public, university, K–12 and specialized—and for trustees

Consulting services to assist in improving local library operations in technology, governance, services to children, and other areas.

As we bounce back from the recession, it is clear that more Georgians are turning to our public libraries for informational and educational needs. Libraries play a critical role in workforce recovery and economic development throughout our state. These funds allow Georgia's libraries to take advantage of economies of scale that benefit all libraries. The loss of these critical funds would force the elimination of services essential to Georgia residents of all ages—and this, Mr. Speaker, is at a cost we cannot afford!

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I've come to the floor today to talk about a crisis our country is facing. I'm not here to talk about the deficit, which is also a problem, but one which pales in importance to the crisis of America's declining economic competitiveness.

I say that the deficit problem pales in comparison to our declining competitiveness because without a robust and innovative economy, it will be next to impossible to ever truly reduce our national deficit.

For some time, important leaders in our business and academic community have warned us about this crisis.

In 2005, a National Academies panel chaired by former Lockheed Martin CEO Norm Augustine released the report, ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm.''

This report warned that without a focused effort by the Federal Government, the future of American competitiveness was bleak.

It recommended increased efforts in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education, also referred to as STEM education, and increased federal investment in research and development.

It's not a mystery why that distinguished group made those recommendations: it has long been clear that technological innovation creates jobs, and that Federal investments in R&D have had a major positive impact on innovation in this country.

Our economic rivals understand all too well that America's great economic success has been a direct result of our innovation. And these competitors have begun to pour their resources into research and development and into STEM education.

Those investments are bearing fruit:

In 2004 China overtook the United States to become the world's leading exporter of information and communications technology goods.

China, Japan, India, and South Korea all graduate more engineers each year than the United States.

U.S. student scores in STEM achievement continue to decline in worldwide comparisons.

So what do we do about it? Once the problem was identified, the Democratically-controlled Congress immediately focused on coming up with solutions.

Over the past four years, we passed bills like the America COMPETES Act, which put NSF, NIST, and the Department of Energy's Office of Science on a doubling path.

We've been changing the way America's children are taught science and math by putting in classrooms teachers who actually have a background and training in those fields, and we've been working to increase opportunities for minorities to contribute their talents to our scientific and technological initiatives.

And we've been investing in clean energy technology development so that America can one day be an energy exporter instead of an energy importer.

Unfortunately, all that work, and all that progress in keeping America competitive is about to be undone. My Republican colleagues have proposed a budget for the rest of 2011 which will severely wound our country's research and development capabilities, and stifle our innovation engine.

Let me cite just a few of the consequences that would flow from enactment of this ill-considered CR:

At the Department of Energy:

Cuts to the Department of Energy will slow down the progress the country has made in demonstrating and deploying carbon capture and sequestration technologies, solar energy and cost-saving energy efficiency technologies.

The cuts in the CR will force a number of world-class labs, which undertake research on cutting edge energy technologies to solve economic and environmental problems, to shut down.

Thousands of scientific and technical staff at the national labs, universities and companies will be laid off, or worse, go to our competitors for support.

This could lead to the United States being even more dependent on other countries for clean energy technologies.

STEM education programs will be cut or eliminated at a time when China is graduating six engineers for every one of ours. We need to capitalize on the interests of our students who are ready and willing to solve our country's energy and environment problems.

At the EPA:

A reduction on the order of $3 billion to EPA's science programs will negatively impact our ability to find new and innovative solutions to 21st century environmental and public health challenges.

The proposed water research reductions will impact EPA's ability to ensure the Nation's water infrastructure is capable of the sustained delivery of safe water as well as the safe and sustainable removal and treatment of waste water.

At NOAA:

NOAA's weather satellite programs are already in trouble during this difficult economic time.

Without proper additional funding of our satellite programs, we will be faced with less accurate and timely weather predictions. We are not just talking about taking our country back to 2008. We are talking about rewinding the clock two decades. We could soon be relying

on 20 year ago weather forecasting capabilities.

I think we are all very well aware that over 70 percent of airplane flight delays are caused by weather. If FAA doesn't have the weather information it needs to safely and efficiently control the nation's air traffic, we face both increased delays and risks to the flying public.

We are potentially putting our lives, property, and critical infrastructure in danger. Without accurate and timely information, we would no longer see the 2–3 day advance warnings of extreme weather events on which we depend.

This will also make it extremely difficult to conduct safe and strategic evacuations of American people during extreme weather events, which have been faced by many regions of our country in recent years.

I could go on and on and cite some of the adverse consequences to each of our agencies and to vital governmental activities that will occur if this CR is adopted, but I think Members now have an idea of what is at stake.

And make no mistake, this is job-killing CR.

What makes this bill so dangerous is that it won't just kill jobs today. It won't just kill jobs this year. These cuts to our research and development funding will kill jobs for years to come.

As President Obama noted in his State of the Union address, if an airplane is overloaded, you don't lighten the load by cutting off the engines.

That's exactly what this Republican budget plan does: it cuts the engine off of our economy.

Unfortunately, our children and our grandchildren will be the ones who ultimately pay the price for these efforts when they inherit an America that is no longer the world leader in innovation.

I urge my colleagues to reject the cuts being proposed in the Republican CR. We can do better.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 88, I missed the vote due to a previously scheduled satellite interview in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

OPPOSITION TO McCLINTOCK AMENDMENT #287, TO ELIMINATE FUNDING TO INTER AMERICAN FOUNDATION (IAF)

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to amendment #287, introduced by our colleague Rep. MCCLINTOCK of California. Amendment #287 would eliminate all funding for the Inter American Foundation in the proposed FY2011 Continuing Resolution. This devastating cut would have severe immediate and long term impacts on the most vulnerable communities who share the same hemisphere as the United States.

The United States has a vested interest in assuring that the poorest communities have the resources to organize, develop, and advance. The IAF works to promote economic opportunity, reduce poverty and foster civic and social inclusion in Latin America and the Caribbean, consistent with U.S. foreign policy and national security interests.

Without such proactive measures in international economic opportunity and development, the United States would cripple its own internal interest in the areas of drug trafficking, immigration, and maintaining its role as a promoter of democracy globally. There are many adverse consequences if programs like IAF ceases to exist. Studies show that farmers and agricultural workers of poverty-stricken communities migrate far from their families to make a living, and in many Latin American countries, like Colombia, this often means driving small farmers into illicit coca cultivation. Cutting IAF funds will aid in forcing men and women into the dangerous, yet lucrative work of narcotics production just to provide basic needs for their families.

There is a myth that foreign assistance using public funds is ineffective and inefficient. That is farther from the truth. IAF is a conduit to creating future allies; future business partners, and future collaborators. Investing in self-help solutions which enable the poor to help themselves ultimately creates an intimate bond between nations. As our world becomes more competitive in everything from education to science to defense, we must not cut ourselves off from future relationships by cutting developing countries off from aid today.

One of the many countries that would be affected by this cut is Haiti. Haiti is a nation that suffered one of the greatest devastations in history, with a 7.4 magnitude earthquake that killed over 200,000 people, affected over 2 million Haitians, and destroyed their capitol, Port au Prince. While much aid has gone towards immediate disaster relief, the United States seeks to gain enormously by supporting sustainable solutions that IAF currently helps fund.

IAF provides grants for the Haitian Partners for Christian Development—an organization that continues its services as a business incubator, which includes reaching women entrepreneurs and supporting them with business endeavors. Such seed money literally produces economic leaders which are necessary to shape the Haiti of tomorrow.

Through a single grant, IAF also has a project which provides farmers displaced by the 2010 earthquake with agricultural training and technical assistance, as well as give education scholarships to 100 displaced children, and distributes food to another 150 quake victims.

With all the tremors the people of Haiti still are enduring, IAF is essential to ensuring these survivors do not experience a social aftershock due to cutting funding that ultimately has long-term benefits for both Haiti and the United States.

Being the leaders in international economic empowerment today is a wise investment for tomorrow.

I urge you to join me in opposing this amendment.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 1 GARRETT AMENDMENT 34

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the amendments offered by Representative GARRETT to eliminate funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, as well as the amendments by Representatives WALBERG and CANSECO to decrease such funding.

As a member of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I believe that the arts play a crucial role in our society, enhancing our creativity, promoting critical aspects of education, and providing Americans with the opportunity to view works of beauty and personal expression. Furthermore, the arts inspire our children to explore their own creativity and encourage positive development in the course of their educational careers. The arts are a fundamental component of our society and warrant federal funding.

As noted by Americans for the Arts in its report Arts and Economic Prosperity III, across the county "nonprofit arts and culture industry generates $166.2 billion in economic activity every year." The report also details that the arts support 5.7 million jobs and generate $29.6 billion in government revenue. In my district in New Jersey alone, as of January 2010, there were 1,841 arts-related businesses employing almost 10,000 people. So not only are the arts good for our cultural development as a society, they are good for our economic development as well.

I have heard from hundreds of my constituents on this matter, and nearly every one has pleaded with me to preserve as much funding as possible for the arts. As one of them said, poignantly, "a nation without culture is a nation without a soul."

I strongly oppose any cuts to the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendments offered by Representatives GARRETT, WALBERG and CANSECO on this subject.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chair, I along with Representative GWEN MOORE from Wisconsin, submit the following statement on H.R. 1, the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act for 2011.

As Co-Chairs of the bipartisan Women's Caucus, the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)

is important to us. It is a program that has and continues to serve over 9 million women, infants, and children monthly, providing food, education and access to health care. Many of the women and children who use these services are at-risk for poor nutritional diets and WIC provides them with greater access to nutritious foods as well as preventative services to improve their families' health over the long-term.

At caucus meetings, we have discussed this program and the impact of reduced spending on women across the nation. It is important for this Congress to advance ways in the upcoming budget that can ensure benefits are provided to constituencies with the greatest need.

WIC is the largest discretionary program under the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), and as such has been targeted for cuts in the continuing resolution. For the pregnant, postpartum and breast-feeding women who participate in WIC, as well as for their under-five children, we look forward to working together on solutions acceptable to both sides of the aisle.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 89, I missed the vote due to a previously scheduled satellite interview in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

BARLETTA AMENDMENTS AND WEINER-CHAFFETZ-CRAVAACK AMENDMENT

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. PAYNE. I rise today to oppose the Barletta amendments and the Weiner-Chaffetz-Cravaack amendment to eliminate funding for the U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP), should they be offered during floor consideration of H.R. 1.

The elimination of USIP would have strong, adverse impact on America's security interests. USIP is an important national security actor. The U.S. Government must have options for resolving international conflict other than military action. USIP—created by Congress and signed into law by President Ronald Reagan—is the only independent U.S. Government actor that is dedicated solely to conflict prevention and resolution.

USIP is the critical bridge between governmental and non-governmental actors to promote peace in volatile conflicts. Their Center for Mediation and Conflict Resolution conducts work in a number of critical conflict zones in Africa, Middle East, and across the globe:

USIP is addressing a series of challenges and opportunities facing the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, with a focus on institutional capacity to make compromises, the capacity of the Israeli and Palestinian publics to build consensus and support for a negotiated agreement, and the role of U.S. policymakers in encouraging and supporting these efforts toward a peaceful resolution.

USIP is addressing several issues in Nigeria, a country rife with conflicts over petroleum resources and religion. Amidst this situation, the Center is working on peace efforts for the Niger Delta region, including working collaboratively with local governments, oil companies, and Nigerian NGOs.

For nearly two decades, the United States Institute of Peace has been working in Sudan on peace processes. Its knowledge and expertise has helped shape the environment that has contributed, so far, to a relatively peaceful outcome of the referendum. USIP's work on prevention, power-sharing, constitutional reform and natural resources has made a critical difference in the country's local capacity.

USIP produces timely expert analysis on issues critical to policymakers and conflict prevention practitioners. Just last week USIP published the attached PEACE Brief report on the political stalemate in Côte d'Ivoire following the November 28, 2010 election and the broader issue of preventing electoral violence in Africa.

USIP is a small, agile center of innovation in support of America's national security interests in supporting peace and democracy in Africa and across the globe. USIP has been a very useful resource to policymakers for decades, we can not eliminate this critical institution.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on these amendments.

[From the PeaceBrief—United States Institute of Peace, Feb. 7, 2011]

CÔTE D'IVOIRE'S POLITICAL STALEMATE: A SYMPTOM OF AFRICA'S WEAK ELECTORAL INSTITUTIONS

(By Dorina Bekoe)

SUMMARY

The political stalemate in Côte d'Ivoire following the November 28, 2010, presidential election continues. The majority of the international community recognizes Alassane Ouattara as the winner, but Laurent Gbagbo, the sitting president, insists he won. Financial and diplomatic sanctions imposed on the Gbagbo administration have thus far not forced Gbagbo from power.

Maintaining international pressure and focus is critical to resolving the Ivorian crisis, but African states are increasingly divided on how to proceed.

The power-sharing arrangement settled on by five African nations in recent elections sets a dangerous precedent. Losers with a strong militia may find it easier to use threats of violence or actual violence to retain a critical power role, thus subverting the intent of the election.

African states will continue to experience violence during elections until the security sector is reformed, states refrain from holding elections while militias remain mobilized and armed, elections can be clearly and independently verified, institutions are politically independent, and policies exist to discourage the violent acquisition of power.

Following the November 28, 2010, presidential runoff election, the United Nations, charged with validating the electoral process, along with the Independent Electoral Commission, proclaimed Alassane Ouattara the winner, with 54.1 percent of the vote, over Laurent Gbagbo, the sitting president, who had received 45.9 percent of the vote. However, the Constitutional Council, headed by a Gbagbo supporter, annulled results in 13 departments, alleging fraud, and proclaimed Gbagbo the winner, with 51.4 percent of the vote; Ouattara was given 48.5 percent.[1] Both Ouattara and Gbagbo were sworn in as president by their supporters.

Most in the international and regional communities recognized Ouattara as the winner, and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the African Union (AU) suspended Côte d'Ivoire from membership. Gbagbo's calls to investigate election fraud, recount the ballots, and craft a power-sharing arrangement have been rejected by the international and regional institutions. Instead, ECOWAS and AU envoys have urged Gbagbo to step down, financial and travel sanctions have been placed on him and his associates, and ECOWAS threatened military intervention.[2] With the military and the Young Patriots militia supporting Gbagbo and the Forces Nouvelles rebels supporting Ouattara, many fear that the failure of diplomacy and sanctions will reignite the 2002 civil war. While the central conundrum is how to convince Gbagbo to leave office, larger questions loom about the role of elections, the state of democratization, and the strength of institutions in Africa.

POWER SHARING IN RESPONSE TO ELECTORAL VIOLENCE

In 2010, opposition candidates claimed electoral fraud and irregularities in every presidential election in Africa—in Guinea, Togo, Sudan, Burundi, Burkina Faso, Egypt, Comoros, Tanzania, and Rwanda. Historically, in many cases of electoral fraud, the challenger urges demonstrations or refuses to recognize the results. In prolonged and violent standoffs mediators have been dispatched, as occurred in Guinea 2010, or a power-sharing agreement has been negotiated, as occurred in Kenya and Zimbabwe in 2008, in Togo in 2005, in Madagascar in 2002, and in Zanzibar in 2001.

While the power-sharing arrangements in those five cases aimed to stop the violence and address some of its underlying causes, such arrangements could have longlasting implications, and shorter, transitional measures might be considered instead. Granted, an electorate can vote for a power-sharing or proportionally representative government. The problems arise when power sharing is imposed as a solution when there is a clear winner (it weakens the purpose of an election), when the winner cannot be determined (it can encourage fraud and other obfuscation), or when there is postelection violence (it may demonstrate that violence pays). In this sense, Gbagbo's power-sharing proposal is troubling and presents a critical philosophical decision for Africa's institutions: how to react to candidates who respond violently to election results. More broadly, how can leaders be encouraged to accept defeat? How should the international community respond to leaders who use violence to hold on to power? For the remainder of 2011, Africa faces nearly 40 elections and referenda in 23 countries, including some that have a history of violence and weak democratic institutions, such as Nigeria, Zimbabwe, and the Democratic Republic of Congo. A power-sharing norm, in the event of violently contested election results, will be a dangerous precedent.

LESSONS FROM MADAGASCAR AND TOGO

In 2003, a disputed first-run election left Madagascar divided between the supporters of incumbent president Didier Ratsiraka and challenger Marc Ravalomanana. The Organization of African Unity brokered the Dakar Agreement to pave the way for a resolution.[3] But when Ratsiraka refused to concede, confrontations between the two escalated, and Ratsiraka fled to France.[4] Six years later the mayor of Antananarivo, Andry Rajoelina, accused Ravalomanana's administration of corruption and mismanagement and, with the military's backing, assumed the presidency. Ravalomanana fled to South

Africa. Despite the absence of both Ratsiraka and Ravalomanana, the political situation in Madagascar remains unresolved. Efforts at resolution have floundered as the international community, once united in bringing Rajoelina and the former presidents together, has splintered, with different countries considering their own national and regional interests. Resolving the crisis is made more difficult as the efforts of mediators are uncoordinated and therefore weakened.[5]

The response in Togo differed markedly. After long-serving Gnassingbé Eyadéma died in 2005, the parliament swore in his son, Faure Gnassingbé, contravening the constitution. ECOWAS and the International Organization of the Francophonie suspended Togo. After an enormous amount of international pressure and mediation, Gnassingbé stepped aside to allow elections, as required by the constitution. In this case, the concerted pressure of the international and regional communities provided space for the resolution of the crisis.

The Ivorian situation must not slip from international attention. The financial and travel sanctions have begun to constrain Gbagbo and his administration, but he remains in place. Only resolute diplomatic pressure and adherence to sanctions will eventually dislodge Gbagbo and avert conflict. Yet the AU's reversal on military intervention, the refusal by Ghana and South Africa to take a stance for one candidate or the other, and Uganda's Yoweri Museveni's statement that the votes should be investigated show a divided region. Furthermore, other African countries are receiving Gbagbo's representatives, in a break with the initial practice of recognizing only Ouattara's representatives; they were recently in Kenya to explain their reasons for rejecting Ouattara's victory claims. These developments threaten a swift resolution to this stalemate and portend a long period of instability.

THE ROLE OF IVORIAN CIVIL SOCIETY IN REDUCING TENSION

Political and geographic divisions make it difficult for Ivoirian civil society to act as a joint force for peace. Moderate voices, willing to bridge regional and political divides, are not being heard.[6] It is important to note that Ouattara did not obtain a landslide victory. A substantial number of voters, nearly 46 percent, supported Gbagbo. Their reasons for supporting Gbagbo reflect the existing regional, ethnic, and religious divisions in Côte d'Ivoire. Whether Gbagbo or Ouattara emerges as winner from the current stalemate, the next president will face a sharply divided electorate that challenges his rule. Thus, this election, which was meant to repair the divisions between the north and the south, will have failed to do so. At the very least, a key ingredient for avoiding war in Côte d'Ivoire is to reconcile these divided communities. Civil society's moderate voices can play a critical role in starting the reconciliation process.[7] Moderates can also make joint statements and appearances and participate in the current mediation process between Gbagbo and Ouattara. The international community should help by emphasizing the importance of moderates and building their capacity and infrastructure to succeed.

PREVENTING VIOLENCE IN ELECTORAL DISPUTES

Côte d'Ivoire's crisis, as well as others, could have been avoided if the militias had demobilized and if clear rules for the security services had existed, methods for verifying elections were clear and disputes could have been credibly resolved, and Africa's institutions had implementable tools for discouraging electoral violence.

THE ROLE OF THE SECURITY FORCES

In many countries, security services remain politicized and are used to crush demonstrations and intimidate the opposition. This was clearly seen in the postelection demonstrations in Ethiopia in 2005, where approximately 30,000 opposition members were arrested.[8] In Côte d'Ivoire as many as 30 demonstrators died at the hands of state security services during a public demonstration.[9] Reform and depoliticization of the security forces would reduce the chances of violence.

DISARMAMENT AND DEMOBILIZATION OF MILITIAS

Repeated attempts to disarm the militia ahead of the elections in Côte d'Ivoire failed. The program was poorly funded, and there were identifiable security, financial, and political benefits for the militia to remain intact. Removing those incentives would have spurred demobilization. Now, with Ouattara and Gbagbo in control of arms, the prospect of violence increases dramatically should diplomacy fail. A similar outcome occurred in the Republic of Congo after the 1993 parliamentary elections when the three political party leaders each claimed victory while still in charge of their respective militias. The clashes in the ensuing several months left 2,000 dead.[10] Elections should not proceed while candidates remain in control of militias.

CLEAR, INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION OF RESULTS

The UN Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (ONUCI) was charged with certifying the electoral process. It was to ''ensure that all stages of the electoral process are carried out in accordance with recognized standards . . . [and] not allow the results to be contested in a non-democratic way or to be compromised.''[11] This language left room for contestation, which is exactly what happened, when the electoral commission, which is charged with announcing the provisional results, and the Constitutional Council, which is charged with verifying the electoral commission's results, disagreed. ONUCI's role as certifier does not explicitly state that its judgment is final. This ambiguity has been exploited in the Ivorian crisis. Similarly, in Kenya the procedures in place could not determine which candidate had won or whether the electoral process had been fair, fueling the tension. Strengthening and clarifying the processes and institutions that verify an election will greatly reduce the chances and claims of fraud.

FAIR HEARINGS FOR GRIEVANCES

Credible means of assessing an election should be buttressed by independent institutions for addressing grievances. Côte d'Ivoire's politically biased institutions do not foster this confidence. In Kenya's 2007 elections and Togo's 2010 elections, opposition leaders refused to use existing institutions, which they deemed biased, to resolve their grievances, opting instead for street protests. Without independent institutions, public protests will increase the chances of violence, especially when security forces are politicized.

SANCTIONS FOR VIOLENCE IN ELECTORAL DISPUTES

There is currently no continental stance or policy on discouraging electoral violence. Politicians in Kenya, Zimbabwe, Togo, and Zanzibar were all rewarded with power-sharing agreements when they contested elections violently. Elsewhere, violent perpetrators were not prosecuted when the country returned to political normalcy. This sends a message that violence is costless and sometimes pays. Africa's institutions must develop clear and implementable sanctions against politicians who use violence to secure elections.

CONCLUSION

Other, country-specific ways to increase an election's credibility and transparency certainly exist. However, basic measures such as depoliticizing the security services, disarming militias, clearly and independently verifying elections, establishing independent institutions for redressing grievances, and discouraging the use of violence in elections can help prevent violent responses to electoral results. Côte d'Ivoire had none of these measures in place. Now, with the threat of violence looming, the international and regional communities must remain unified in their approach and push for the inclusion of moderate civil society voices to ensure the resolution of the crisis.

ENDNOTES

[1] West Africa Network for Peacebuilding—Côte d'Ivoire, ''Troisième Rapport de l'Observatoire de la Vie Politique et des Medias en Période Electorale'' (Abidjan: WANEP—Côte d'Ivoire, January 8, 2011).

[2] This threat was reversed at the African Union's summit on January 28–31, 2011.

[3] Dakar Agreement, http://www.afrol.com/Countries/Madagascar/documents/accord__dakar.htm.

[4] Ofeibea Quist-Arcton, ''Africa: OAU Stands Aloof on Madagascar, Despite Departure of Ratsiraka,'' Allafrica.com, July 5, 2002, http://allafrica.com/stories/200207050825.html.

[5] International Crisis Group, ''Madagascar: Le Crise a un Tournant Critique?,'' Africa Report 166, November 18, 2010, 4–6.

[6] ''Côte d'Ivoire: Voices of Reason Sidelined in the Crisis,'' IRINNews.org, January 26, 2011, http://www.irinnews.org/report.spx?ReportID=91733.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Lahra Smith, ''Political Violence and Uncertainty In Ethiopia,'' U.S. Institute of Peace Special Report no. 192 (Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, August 2007), 7.

[9] Amnesty International, ''Côte d'Ivoire: Injured Protestors Denied Medical Care,'' Allafrica.com, December 20, 2010, http://allafrica.com/stories/201012200899.html.

[10] U.S. Department of State, ''Congo Human Rights Practices, 1994'' (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State, February 1995), sect. 1(a), http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/erc/democracy/1994__hrp__report/94hrp__report__africa/Congo.html.

[11] UN Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (ONUCI), ''The Certification of Elections in Côte d'Ivoire,'' Resolution 1765, adopted by the UN Security Council on July 16, 2007, http://www.onuci.org/pdf/faqcertificationen.pdf.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chair, both supporters and opponents of H.R. 1 claim that is a serious attempt to reduce federal spending, however, an

examination of the details of the bill call that claim into question. For one thing, the often-cited assertion that H.R. 1 reduces spending by $99 billion is misleading as the $99 billion figure represents the amount that H.R. 1 reduces spending from the President's proposed Fiscal Year 2011 budget, not reductions in actual spending. Trying to claim credit for a reduction in spending based on cuts in proposed spending is like claiming someone is following a diet because he had 5 pieces of pizza when he intended to have 10 pieces.

In fact, H.R. 1 reduces federal spending by $66 billion. This may seem like a lot to the average American but in the context of an overwhelming trillion-dollar budget and a national debt that could exceed 100 percent of GNP in September, this cut is barely even a drop in the bucket.

One reason that H.R. 1 does not cut spending enough is that too many fiscal conservatives continue to embrace the fallacy that we can balance the budget without reducing spending on militarism. Until Congress realizes the folly of spending trillions in a futile attempt to impose democracy on the world we will never be able to seriously reduce spending.

Congress must not only reject the warfare state, it must also reject the welfare state. H.R. 1 is more aggressive in ending domestic spending than foreign spending, and does zero out some objectionable federal programs such as AmeriCorps. However, H.R. 1 leaves most of the current functions of the federal government undisturbed. This bill thus continues the delusion that we can have a fiscally responsible and efficient welfare state.

Mr. Chair, the failure to even attempt to address the serious threat the welfare-warfare state poses to American liberty and prosperity is the main reason why supporters of limited government and individual liberty should ultimately find H.R. 1 unsatisfactory. Only a rejection of the view that Congress can run the economy, run our lives, and run the world will allow us to make the spending reductions necessary to avert a serious financial crisis. This does not mean we should not prioritize and discuss how to gradually transition away from the welfare state in a manner that does not harm those currently relying on these programs. However, we must go beyond balancing the budget to transitioning back to a free society, and that means eventually placing responsibility for social welfare back in the hands of individuals and private institutions. Despite the overheated rhetoric heard during the debate, H.R. 1 is a diversion from the difficult task of restoring constitutional government and a free economy and society.

CONGRATULATIONS GORDY FAMILY

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to congratulate my good friend, Thomas Gordy and his wife, Theresa on the birth of their daughter, Trenton Talmadge Gordy. Trenton was born on Tuesday, February 15, 2011, in Manassas, Virginia. She is welcomed home by her sister, Sarah Gordy.

Trenton Talmadge Gordy is seven pounds and one ounce of pride and joy to her loving grandparents, Timmy and Kay Gordy of Monroe, Louisiana, Toni and Michael LeBlanc of Shreveport, Louisiana, and Canoy and Lynn Mayo of West Monroe, Louisiana.

I am so excited for this new blessing to the Gordy family and wish them all the best.

CONGRATULATING THE WINNERS OF THE MEDAL OF FREEDOM

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor this week's recipients of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, our nation's highest civilian honor. All of the honorees have led extraordinary lives and made enormous contributions in their fields. They come from a range of backgrounds—arts, sports, public service—and have enriched our nation and improved our world.

I particularly want to recognize my friend, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, who received this honor. JOHN has given a lifetime of service to this nation, from his leadership in the Civil Rights Movement to his 26 years as the "Conscience of the Congress." A few years ago, I had the privilege to join JOHN on a trip to Alabama, where we retraced the steps of the courageous civil rights activists who changed the face of America. JOHN's passion has never wavered and he remains a voice for the voiceless—strongly advocating for opportunity for all Americans. I congratulate him on this much-deserved honor and look forward to working with him for many years to come.

OPPOSITION TO AMENDMENT NO. 262

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. PAYNE. I rise today in opposition to Amendment No. 262, introduced by our colleague Representative LATTA of Ohio, should it be offered during floor consideration of H.R. 1. Amendment No. 262 would eliminate all funding for international family planning programs in the proposed FY 2011 Continuing Resolution. This devastating cut would have severe immediate and long term impacts on women and their families in the world's poorest countries.

Contrary to the rhetoric we are hearing from some of our colleagues, U.S. international family planning assistance in fact helps to reduce unintended pregnancies and abortions in the developing world. According to Population Action International, cutting this funding would result in: 7.8 million more unintended pregnancies; 3.7 million more abortions; 87,000 additional newborn deaths; and 12,000 additional maternal deaths.

Moreover, this amendment would turn back the clock on U.S. investments in the global fight against HIV/AIDS. The integration of family planning and HIV/AIDS services is a vital and cost-effective way to prevent HIV infection, including through mother-to-child transmission. At the same cost, family planning services can avert nearly 30 percent more HIV-positive births than use of the nevirapine prophylaxis by HIV-positive pregnant women. A recent study found that, although PEPFAR has been associated with a reduction in HIV-related deaths, trends of increasing adult prevalence rates continue unabated. However, preventing unintended pregnancies, which is an international pillar of preventing mother to child transmission (PMTCT) programming, continues to receive insufficient attention in AIDS programs. The Guttmacher Institute noted in their report Hiding in Plain Sight: The Role of Contraception in Preventing HIV that helping HIV-positive women avoid unwanted pregnancies not only lowers the rate of new infections, but does so at a relatively low cost.

I hope that you will join me in opposing this amendment, should it be offered.

[From the Guttmacher Policy Review, Winter 2008]

HIDING IN PLAIN SIGHT: THE ROLE OF CONTRACEPTION IN PREVENTING HIV

(By Susan A. Cohen)

As Congress embarks on the process of reauthorizing the U.S. program to fight HIV and AIDS, and as other global donors recalibrate levels and allocations of funding for HIV/AIDS programs, prevention seems to be making a comeback. At the inception of the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) five years ago, both the funding and the programmatic emphasis tilted heavily toward treatment. Yet, the rate of new HIV infection continues to outpace the world's ability to deliver antiretroviral therapy, despite recent advances in access to such medications. A public health consensus is emerging, therefore, in favor of realigning the balance between treatment and prevention efforts.

Refocusing the priority on prevention is long overdue, as is an acknowledgment, especially within Congress, that HIV prevention cannot be accomplished with a disproportionate emphasis on abstinence. Indeed, preventing the sexual transmission of HIV requires going beyond the necessary but hardly sufficient strategy of ABC: abstain, be faithful, use condoms. It also requires increasing AIDS awareness through counseling and testing programs, investing in programs promoting the empowerment of women and girls, and increasing access to male circumcision. Other critical prevention interventions include ensuring a clean blood supply and clean medical injections, needle exchange programs for intravenous drug users and preventing the "vertical" transmission of HIV from a pregnant woman to her newborn infant.

Largely overlooked as an HIV prevention strategy, however, is the simple and low-cost act of helping HIV-positive women who do not want to have a child to avoid an unintended pregnancy through increased access to contraceptive services. Ward Cates, president for research of Family Health International (FHI), has dubbed contraception the "best-kept secret in HIV prevention," and certainly, the significant contribution of unintended pregnancy prevention toward reducing the perinatal transmission of HIV has gone virtually unrecognized. Yet, a revitalized and more robust effort focused on HIV prevention cannot afford not to fully capitalize on the critical role of contraceptive services in fighting AIDS.

THE NEED FOR PROGRESS ON PREVENTION

Women of reproductive age comprise more than half of the 33 million people currently living with HIV around the world. The vast

majority of these women live in Sub-Saharan Africa, and thus, it is not surprising that 90% of the 2.5 million children younger than 15 living with HIV live there as well. Almost all of these children became infected through their mothers during pregnancy, birth or breastfeeding.

An HIV-positive woman about to give birth can dramatically reduce the likelihood of transmitting the virus to her newborn by delivering in a hospital or a primary care setting where she and her infant can receive even a single dose of the anti-retroviral drug nevirapine. However, the challenges to delivering even this seemingly simple prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT) service are substantial, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa. Pregnancy itself does not usually drive women, especially those in rural areas, to facilities where they could receive pre-natal care and, potentially, an HIV test. In addition, many pregnant women may not want to know their HIV status for fear of public disclosure and the stigma that often results. Considering the difficulties of delivering services to HIV-positive pregnant women, and the simple fact that most women who are HIV-positive do not know it, it is not entirely surprising that only 11% of all theoretically eligible women in poor countries are benefiting from any PMTCT intervention. And without intervention, about one-third of babies born to HIV-positive women likely will become infected.

A long-standing goal of global prevention efforts, therefore, is to ramp up PMTCT efforts so that more pregnant women are tested and that those who are positive receive the treatment that they and their infant will need. PMTCT programs justifiably enjoy broad political support and are certain to continue to be a funding priority within the U.S. global AIDS effort.

The United States does recognize the importance of at least establishing linkages between PMTCT and family planning programs, since PEPFAR requires family planning counseling and referral as one of four elements comprising the minimum package of services for preventing mother-to-child transmission. However, a high-level consultation sponsored by the World Health Organization (WHO} and the United Nations Population Fund in 2004 went considerably further, concluding that investing solely in narrowly defined PMTCT programs will not succeed in dramatically reducing the incidence of perinatal transmission. Rather, the Glion [Switzerland] Call to Action on Family Planning and HIV/AIDS in Women and Children emphasized that all four elements of the WHO approach to preventing HIV infection in infants are essential. PMTCT programs are key, but so are primary prevention of HIV infection in women; the provision of care, treatment and support for women living with HIV and their families; and prevention of unintended pregnancies among women living with HIV. Of these, the significant role that unintended pregnancy prevention already plays—and the much greater role it potentially could play—in averting new cases of HIV has been least recognized and supported.

According to a 2007 Guttmacher Institute study, one in four married women in Sub-Saharan Africa is sexually active and does not want to have a child or another child in the next two years, but is not using any method of contraception. As a result, unintended births are common, and occur in the very countries that are a focus of PEPFAR—countries in which HIV prevalence is high and 60% of all adults living with HIV are women (see table).

Indeed, research into the HIV/AIDS health care system reveals that the unmet need for contraception among HIV-positive women and women at high risk of HIV is even greater than among women in the general population. According to a study published in JAMA in 2006, 84% of the pregnancies among women in three PMTCT programs in South Africa were unintended. Similarly, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported earlier this year that 93% of the pregnancies among pregnant women receiving antiretroviral therapy in Uganda were unintended. And according to FHI research from 2006 of women in HIV counseling and testing clinics (where most women are HIV-negative but are at high risk for HIV), substantial majorities in Kenya (59%), Tanzania (66%), Zimbabwe (77%) and Haiti

HIV AND UNINTENDED PREGNANCY

[In PEPFAR countries, high HIV/AIDS rates coexist with a high unmet need for contraceptive services and a high incidence of unplanned births.]

PEPFAR Focus Countries (selected)	Unmet Need for Contraception, Married Women	Unplanned Births (as % of total births)	HIV/AIDS Prevalence (ages 15–49)
Cote d'Ivoire	28	28	7
Ethiopia	34	35	1–3
Kenya	25	44	6
Mozambique	18	19	16
Namibia	22	45	20
Nigeria	17	14	4
Rwanda	38	39	3
South Africa	15	53	19
Tanzania	22	22	7
Uganda	35	38	7
Zambia	27	39	17

Source: Guttmacher Institute, 2007, and PEPFAR, 2007.

(92%) said they did not want another child in the next two years.

CONTRACEPTION AS HIV PREVENTION

To be sure, many women living with HIV do want to have a child or another child, notwithstanding pressure to forego childbearing from family members, people in their community and health care providers. And, in fact, HIV-positive women are likely to be able to sustain a healthy pregnancy and safely deliver a healthy baby if they can avail themselves of appropriate therapy (related article, Fall 2006, page 17). Nonetheless, many HIV-positive women who know their HIV status seek out contraceptive services specifically because of their status—because they fear infecting their baby if they become pregnant or leaving behind children, whether HIV-positive or not, as orphans. And many more women seeking contraceptives services are, in fact, HIV-positive but do not know it.

FHI researchers estimate that if the HIV-positive women in Sub-Saharan Africa who are currently using modern contraceptive methods to prevent unintended pregnancy were not able to do so, the number of HIV-positive births in the region would be 31% higher than it is now. This would translate to 153,000 more HIV-infected unplanned births each year—or 419 more per day. Researchers at the Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health and WHO published an analysis in AIDS in 2004 demonstrating that even a modest decline in the number of unintended pregnancies among HIV-positive women in Botswana, Cote d'lvoire, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe could lead to the prevention of the same number of births of HIV-positive infants as prevented by the current PMTCT programs in these countries. ''It is clear from this analysis,'' they wrote, ''that only a combined approach utilizing all three intervention components simultaneously [reducing HIV infection among women, reducing unintended pregnancy and increasing the reach of PMTCT programs] will result in significant reductions'' in new HIV infections among infants.

Helping HIV-positive women avoid unwanted pregnancies not only lowers the rate of new infections, but does so at a relatively low cost. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) examined PMTCT programs in the 14 countries comprising the Bush administration's original initiative starting in 2002 aimed at preventing mother-to-child transmission. USAID projected that over a five-year period, adding family planning services to PMTCT programs could prevent almost twice the number of infections to children, and nearly four times the number of deaths to children, as PMTCT alone could prevent (see chart). In addition, a 2006 analysis by FHI concluded that for the same cost, voluntary family planning services can avert not nearly 30% more HIV-positive births—that would have been unintended—than averted by identifying HIV-positive women during their pregnancy and providing nevirapine.

Greater access to contraceptive services then—whether among women in HIV treatment programs, PMTCT programs or counseling and testing programs, or among women in traditional family planning programs in high-HIV-prevelence countries—is a ''win-win-win situation.'' it increases the chances that women living with HIV can prevent future pregnancies they do not want, thereby reducing the incidence of perinatal transmission and the number of potential child deaths, and it achieves these humanitarian ends in a highly cost-effective way.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PREVENTION POLICY

Outside the context of HIV prevention, it is indisputable that the health, social and economic benefits of investing in contraceptive services—for women, their families and their communities—are multiple and varied. By preventing pregnancies that are too early, too late or too closely spaced, contraception reduces the likelihood of infant mortality. And by helping women to avoid high-risk pregnancies and the need for unsafe abortions, it decreases the risk of maternal death or disability. A woman who can determine the timing and spacing of her children increases her own and her existing family's opportunities for educational, social and economic advancement. Moreover, the evidence is compelling that increasing access to family planning programs also amplifies the overall effort to slow the rate of new HIV infection.

Yet, despite the ever-rising demand for contraceptive services and the fact that a woman's ability to control her own fertility is integrally linked to almost all other aspects of health and development, U.S. funding for family planning has been lagging. Funding for family planning programs in developing countries through USAID peaked at about $550 million at the time of the international Conference on Population and Development in Cairo in 1994 and early 1995. It dropped precipitously in 1997, after control of Congress shifted to lawmakers hostile to sexual and reproductive health programs, plummeting to below $400 million. By 2001, the final year of the Clinton administration, funding had regained some ground ($446 million), but that level has remained essentially constant ever since.

Clearly, USAID funding for family planning programs should be increased—both on their traditional merits and, in high-prevalence countries, as an HIV strategy. At the same time, as global donors to the fight against AIDS reconsider the new priority emphasis on prevention, particularly the United States through the reauthorization of PEPFAR, it would be an opportune moment to legitimize contraceptive services as the core HIV prevention intervention they are. This would mean ensuring that HIV treatment programs, where women already predominate, also provide contraceptive services directly or by referral to make it easier for HIV-positive women to coordinate their

treatment regimen with their pregnancy prevention goals. Similarly, it would mean making family planning services more widely available through PMTCT programs, because many HIV-positive new mothers wish to delay or prevent a subsequent pregnancy. Finally, in high-prevalence countries, it would mean promoting greater integration of HIV counseling and testing services into family planning programs, so that more sexually active women at risk of HIV are likely to be tested and to receive appropriate counseling and treatment.

These strategies are more than academic. The Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation, the largest provider of PMTCT services under PEPFAR, has been striving to incorporate contraceptive services into its programs because ''care and treatment staff members are uniquely positioned to address HIV-positive women's needs concerning future pregnancy plans and counsel them based on their social circumstances, health status, and ART regimen.'' Indeed, as negotiations in Congress got underway last month to reauthorize PEPFAR, the Foundation wrote to the House Foreign Affairs Committee to urge broadening the use of PEPFAR funds in order to support these ''essential prevention services. . . . As implementers, we cannot overstate the importance of [integration] to the work we do on the ground to prevent the spread of HIV.''

For individual women who live where HIV is rampant, the interrelatedness of HIV prevention and unintended pregnancy prevention is a practical reality. Yet most international program donors, including the United States government, have viewed them as complementary goals but separate and unrelated outcomes. All along, the fact of contraception as HIV prevention has been hiding in plain sight. It is time to seek it.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

I rise to oppose any effort, including the Paul Amendment (No. 523), which would terminate International Security Assistance Funding. I oppose any such attempt because cutting international security funding is unwise and short-sighted, and would undercut U.S. interests in the Middle East.

Given the turmoil in the Middle East, it is essential that the United States keep its commitment to Israel's security by fully funding the $3 billion in U.S. aid pledged to Israel for Fiscal Years 2011 and 2012.

The dramatic events in Egypt and Tunisia underscore the importance of Israel to the United States and the fragility of Israel's security situation. At a time when Israel is facing increased security threats, cutting U.S. aid to Israel would send exactly the wrong message to Israel and its potential adversaries about the strength and reliability of America's commitment to Israel's security.

Mr. Chair, international security assistance funding is not a ''handout'' or ''giveaway'' to Israel, Egypt, Jordan, or to Pakistan. Rather, this investment provides several tangible benefits to the United States: by helping Israel maintain its qualitative military edge, QME, American assistance has promoted peace with Egypt and Jordan, and made Israel secure enough to make significant concessions in peace agreements with these countries and dramatic peace overtures to the Palestinians and to Syria; Israel's battlefield use of American equipment and shared know-how has helped the United States improve both its equipment and tactics especially while fighting two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; aid to Israel also fuels economic growth here at home since Israel is required to spend 74 percent of U.S. aid in the United States, which helps create American jobs.

Mr. Chair, while other countries in the Middle East wrestle with change and instability, the United States can count on Israel as our trusted, reliable, and democratic ally. Israel in turn must be able to count on the United States. Nothing will send a clearer message to Israel and any potential adversaries of America's unshakeable commitment than defeating any and all attempts to terminate security funding for Israel.

GAO DOCUMENT ON PORT OF BELLINGHAM

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Report for the RECORD which I referenced during debate on my Amendment No. 99 to H.R. 1.

DECISION

Matter of: Port of Bellingham.
File: B–401837.
Date: December 2, 2009.

Lee P. Curtis, Esq., Troy E. Hughes, Esq., and Maggie L Croteau, Esq., Perkins Coie LLP, for the protester.

James H. Roberts, III, Esq., Van Scoyoc Kelly PLLC, for Port of Newport, an intervenor.

Mark Langstein, Esq., Lynn W. Flanagan, Esq., and Diane M. Canzano, Esq., Department of Commerce, for the agency.

Glenn G. Wolcott, Esq., and Ralph O. White, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

1. Agency had no reasonable basis to determine that awardee's proposed pier was located outside a designated floodplain area and therefore complied with the solicitation's limitations regarding lease of property located within a base floodplain.

2. Where awardee's proposed pier construction was within a designated floodplain area, agency failed to properly consider whether there was any practicable alternative to selecting awardee's proposal, as was required by the terms of the solicitation.

DECISION

Port of Bellingham, of Bellingham, Washington, protests the award of a lease by the Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), to Port of Newport, of Newport, Oregon, pursuant to solicitation for offers (SFO) No. 09WSA0200C to provide office, warehouse, and related space for NOAA's Marine Operations Center-Pacific (MOC–P).

We sustain the protest.

BACKGROUND

The SFO at issue here was published in November 2008, and contemplated the award of a long-term operating lease to support the activities of NOAA's MOC-P.[1] Among other things, the solicitation sought offers to provide 31,000 square feet of office, warehouse and related space, 1,960 linear feet of pier space, and 20,000 square feet of equipment laydown space. Agency Report (AR), Tab 7, SFO, at 5. The solicitation provided that the lease award would be based on the offer determined to be most advantageous to the government based on application of the following evaluation factors: location of site; site configuration and management; quality of building and pier, availability; past performance and project financing; quality of life; and price. AR, Tab 7, SFO amend. 3, at 2. The solicitation also provided that: ''An award of contract will not be made for a property located within a base flood plain or wetland unless the Government has determined that there is no practicable alternative.'' SFO at 7.

In February 2009, five offers were submitted by four offerors, including Newport and Bellingham.[2] Upon review and evaluation of the offers, the agency determined that four of the five offers were in the competitive range.[3] By letters dated April 20, 2009, the agency advised each of the offerors of their inclusion in the competitive range and identified various issues for discussions.

Concurrent with its ongoing evaluation of proposals, the agency contracted with an engineering firm to perform an environmental assessment (EA) of the various offers, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA).[4] In June 2009, the agency published a draft EA that provided in-depth environmental analysis regarding each of the four offered sites; the final EA was published in July with no substantive changes. Among other things, both the draft and final EA stated, under the heading ''Floodplains,'' as follows:

> [Newport's] proposed dock would be within the 100-year [base] flood plain[5] (Zone A2),[6] and is therefore likely to be impacted by flooding, particularly if the finished level of the dock is below an elevation of nine feet NGVD [National Geodetic Vertical Datum].[7] Additionally, there is some potential for the structure to affect the characteristics of flooding in the area, by trapping debris against the piles of the dock and/or altering the way in which floodwaters circulate/flow within the bay.[8]

AR, Tab 20, Final EA, at 5–96.

During discussions with Newport, the agency brought the floodplain matter to Newport's attention, stating:

> It appears that the offered site and pier are in the 100 year flood plain.[9] This would be all parts of the site lower than 9 feet National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NVGD) . . . are within the 100-year floodplain (Zone A2 on the FEMA map, base flood elevation of 9 feet NVGD). Please confirm in your Final Revised Proposals (FRP's) that the finished site level and structures will be above the 100 year flood plain (see SFO Section 1.7).

AR, Tab 15, Letter from Contracting Officer to Newport, May 14, 2009, at 1.

In response, Newport did not alter the location of its proposed pier, nor did it provide any meaningful explanation as to why the pier should be considered to be outside of the floodplain area.[10] Nonetheless, Newport concluded its response to the agency by stating: ''all proposed facilities and structures will be

designed above the BFE.'' AR, Tab 15, Engineer's Memorandum, May 22, 2009, at 3.

Following submission of final proposals, the agency's source evaluation board (SEB) evaluated the competing offers and concluded: ''As all four offerors met the requirements of the solicitation each offer was analyzed on both its technical and financial merits to determine the awardee of this procurement.'' AR, Tab 22, SEB Final Revised Proposal Summary Report, at 54. With regard to evaluation under the non-price evaluation factors, the SEB concluded that ''Port of Newport's technical proposal was determined to be the most technically sound'' and that ''Port of Bellingham's technical proposal received the second highest ranking.'' *Id*. at 55. With regard to total evaluated price, the agency determined that Bellingham offered an annual lease price that was significantly higher than Newport's annual lease price of $2,533,439. *Id*. at 65. Based on this evaluation, the agency concluded that ''Port of Newport has met all requirements outlined in the solicitation, has been evaluated as the most technically proficient offer, and offers the Government the lowest price.'' *Id*. at 58–59.

Newport's proposal was selected for award on August 4. This protest followed.

DISCUSSION

Bellingham protests that the agency failed to comply with the SFO provision that stated: ''An award of contract will not be made for a property located within a base flood plain or wetland unless the Government has determined that there is no practicable alternative.'' *See* SFO at 7. More specifically, Bellingham protests that Newport's proposed pier was clearly within a designated floodplain area; that the agency had no reasonable basis to conclude otherwise; and that the agency was, therefore, required to make a determination as to whether there was a practicable alternative to Newport's offer.

The agency responds that it ''properly concluded that Newport's offered property is not located within the base floodplain,'' and that, having so concluded, that the agency ''was not required to and properly did not conduct a practicable alternative analysis.'' AR, Tab 2, at 15. In maintaining that Newport did not propose property within the designated floodplain area, the agency refers to the fact that the ''finished level'' of Newport's proposed pier is projected to be higher than 9 feet NGVD (the applicable BFE) asserting: ''[I]f the finished level of the pier were built below 9 NGVD it would be located within the base floodplain and likely impacted by flooding; if it were built above 9 NGVD it would not be in the base floodplain.'' Agency Response to Protester's Comments, Oct. 16, 2009, at 2. The agency also references Newport's conclusory representation, provided in response to the agency's discussion question, quoted above, that ''all proposed facilities and structures will be designed above the BFE.''[11] On this basis, the agency maintains that it reasonably concluded that Newport's proposed pier was outside the designated floodplain area and, accordingly, maintains the agency had no obligation to—and did not—consider whether there was any practicable alternative.

Our Office has previously considered whether, in leasing real property, an agency has properly considered the particular floodplain requirements that are at issue here. *See, e.g., Ronald Brown,* B–292646, Sept. 20, 2003, 2003 CPD ¶170; *Vito J. Gautieri,* B–261707, Sept. 12, 1995, 95–2 CPD ¶131; *Alnasco. Inc.,* B–249863, Dec. 22, 1992, 92–2 CPD ¶1430; *Wise Inv., Inc.,* B–247497, B–247497.2, 92–1 CPD 480; *Oak Street Distribution Ctr., Inc.,* B–243197, July 2, 1991, 91–2 CPD ¶14; *Western Div. Inv.; Columbia Inv. Group,* B–213882, B–213882.2, Sept. 5, 1984, 84–2 CPD ¶258. In this regard, we have noted that the floodplain requirements flow from Executive Order (EO) No. 11988, 42 Fed. Reg. 26,951 (1977), which precludes a federal agency from providing direct or indirect support of flood plain development when there is a practicable alternative. We have further noted that the purpose of EO No. 11988 is to minimize the impact of floods on human health and safety, as well as to minimize the impact on the environment.[12] *See Vito J. Gautieri, supra.,* at 2–3. In considering compliance with these floodplain requirements, we have held that an agency must, at a minimum, consider whether a proposed structure will be located within a designated floodplain area. *See, e.g., Ronald W. Brown, supra.,* at 1–2 (agency reasonably concluded that floodplain provisions did not bar award of lease where proposed building was not located within the floodplain area, even though the periphery of the site was within the floodplain); *see also Oak Street Distribution Ctr., supra.,* at 3–4 (agency properly awarded lease where proposed building was not within floodplain); *cf. Wise Inv.. Inc., supra.,* at 2–4 (award of lease not prohibited where ground level of site had been elevated by filling).

Here, based on the record discussed above, there can be no reasonable doubt that Newport's offer proposed to build its pier structure within the designated floodplain area. Further, as noted above, Newport's construction of the pier was a significant aspect of its offer in that the solicitation required offerors to provide a minimum of 1,950 linear feet of pier space.[13] AR, Tab 7, at 7. Finally, it is clear that the pier structure may have an environmental impact on the floodplain area within which it is to be located.[14]

As discussed above, Newport's proposed pier construction within the designated floodplain area was expressly presented to the agency by the very engineering firm the agency retained to, among other things, inform the agency on floodplain matters.[15] Consistent with that notification, in conducting discussions with Newport, the agency requested that Newport address the floodplain issue in the context of the location of its proposed pier, yet, Newport did not.[16] Finally, the fact that the ''finished level'' of the pier may be above the BFE has no bearing on the clearly apparent fact that the pier structure itself is to be constructed within the designated floodplain area, which will, among other things, require Newport to drive hundreds of concrete piles ''approximately 15 feet below the mudline.''[17] See AR, Tab 20 at 4–18. In this regard, neither Newport's proposal nor the agency's contemporaneous evaluation documents, address the specific environmental issues identified in the EA report, including the potential for debris to be trapped against the concrete pier piles or the pier's alteration of the way floodwaters circulate and flow within the bay.

On this record, there was no reasonable basis for the agency to conclude that Newport's proposal did not fall within the scope of either the solicitation's express floodplain limitations or EO No. 11988's limitations regarding potential environmental impacts. Accordingly, the agency was required to consider the environmental impact of Newport's proposed pier structure and to determine whether there was a practicable alternative to Newport's offer, the record is clear it did not.

The protest is sustained.[18]

RECOMMENDATION

Since the contract award to Newport failed to comply with the solicitation requirements regarding lease of property within a base floodplain, we recommend that the agency comply with those requirements. Specifically, the agency should consider, and document, whether there was a practicable alternative to Newport's offer. In the event the agency's analysis identifies a practicable alternative, as contemplated by the solicitation, we recommend that the agency implement such alternative, if otherwise feasible. In the event the agency's analysis concludes there is no practicable alternative, it should comply with the procedural requirements established in EO No. 11988, as set out above. Further, the agency should provide a copy of its documentation regarding this matter to the parties. Finally, we recommend that the protester be reimbursed its costs of filing and pursuing this protest, including reasonable attorneys' fees. The protester should submit its certified claim for costs, detailing the time expended and costs incurred, directly to the contracting agency within 60 days after the receipt of this decision. 4 C.F.R. §21.8(f)(1) (2009).

LYNN H. GIBSON,
Acting General Counsel.

[1] The MOC–P, which has been located in Seattle, Washington, for more than 60 years, provides centralized management for 10 NOAA ships and is the permanent homeport for 4 of those ships. In July 2006, a fire destroyed a significant portion of MOC-P's facilities, forcing NOAA to reduce the scope of its current lease and distribute some of its ships to alternative locations; what remains of the ongoing lease expires in June 2011.

[2] Bellingham submitted two proposals.

[3] Bellingham's second proposal was excluded from the competitive range.

[4] The agency states that the EA ''was performed by personnel from various technical disciplines including, but not limited to, those with background in port engineering, environmental planning, water resources, wetlands, geology, and marine species and habitats.'' AR, Tab 2, at 15.

[5] The agency explains that a ''base floodplain'' is an area that is likely to be flooded once every 100 years or, described in the alternative, an area that has a 1 percent chance of flooding during a given year. AR, Tab 2, at 16.

[6] The agency further notes that base floodplains are designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as ''Zone A2'' where FEMA has established a ''base flood elevation'' (BFE)—that is, the level of water surface elevation resulting from a 100-year flood. Id.

[7] There is no dispute that the BFE applicable to Newport's proposed site is 9 feet NGVD.

[8] In addition to identifying the location of Newport's proposed pier as being within the designated floodplain area, the EA describes various aspects of Newport's proposed pier structure, stating:

A new pier for NOAA use is to be constructed to the west of where the existing piers are currently situated. . . .

Preliminary conceptual design undertaken by the offeror . . . estimated that the new pier would require the following piles:

70 vertical pier piles (60 edge, 10 middle), which are 18 inch diameter, 0.375 inch ASTM 500, filled with concrete to approximately 15 feet below the mudline.

210 batter pier piles (60 edge, 150 middle), of same construction as the vertical pier piles.

240 fender piles, which are 12.75 inch diameter, 0.5 inch wall

22 vertical small boat mooring piles 16 or 18 inches in diameter, 0.375 inch ASTM 500.

It is anticipated that vibratory methods would be used to drive the new piles, although jetting could used, if allowed by the relevant agencies. . . .

It is anticipated that approximately 42,000 cubic yards would need to be dredged from the proposed pier site. . . .

AR, Tab 20, at 4–18 to 4–19.

[9] In addition to Newport's proposed pier, the EA noted some potential that Newport's proposed buildings containing office and warehouse space might be constructed below the BFE.

[10] In contrast to Newport's failure to provide any meaningful information regarding the apparent location of Newport's proposed pier within the designated floodplain area, Newport's response did address the other structures on its proposed site.

[11] Despite the agency's purported reliance on Newport's conclusory representation, the contracting officer expressly acknowledges that Newport's response provided no meaningful information regarding the location of its pier, summarizing Newport's response as follows:

The Port of Newport provided a response [to the floodplain discussion question] with its FRP that included a statement an[d] analysis dated May 22, 2009, by a professional engineer with KPFF Engineering, that except for the pier, Newport's proposed site was not in a 100-year or base floodplain. [Bold added.]

AR, Tab 1, Contracting Officer's Statement, at 10.

[12] Specifically, EO No. 11988 states:

[I]n order to avoid to the extent possible the long and short term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains and to avoid direct or indirect support of floodplain development whenever there is a practicable alternative, it is hereby ordered as follows:

(1) Before taking an action, each agency shall determine whether the proposed action will occur in a floodplain. . .

(2) If an agency has determined to, or proposes to, conduct, support, or allow an action to be located in a floodplain, the agency shall consider alternatives to avoid adverse effects and incompatible development in the floodplains. If the head of the agency finds that the only practicable alternative consistent with the law and with the policy set forth in this Order requiring siting in a floodplain, the agency shall, prior to taking action, (i) design or modify its action in order to minimize potential harm to or within the floodplain, consistent with regulations issued in accord with Section 2(d) of this Order, and (ii) prepare and circulate a notice containing an explanation of why the action is proposed to be located in the floodplain.

Protesters Comments on Agency Report, exh. 1, at 1–2.

[13] In this regard, in defending against this protest, the contracting officer has stated: ''Pier structures are essential to meet the operational requirements of the Marine Operations Center-Pacific.'' AR, Tab 1, at 11.

[14] As noted above, in addition to concluding that the pier would ''likely be impacted by flooding,'' the EA stated that the pier could potentially affect the area ''by trapping debris against the piles of the dock and/or altering the way in which floodwaters circulate/flow within the bay.'' AR, Tab 20, at 5–96.

[15] As the agency points out, there can be no question as to the qualifications of the personnel that prepared the EA. Specifically, as described by the agency, the EA ''was performed by personnel from various technical disciplines including, but not limited to, those with background in port, engineering, environmental planning, water resources, wetlands, geology, and marine species and habitats.'' AR, Tab 2, at 15.

[16] Indeed, as summarized by the contracting officer, Newport's response to the agency's discussion question regarding the floodplain matter addressed all of Newport's proposed site ''except for the pier.'' AR, Tab 1, at 9.

[17] Although not specifically addressed by the parties, we note that FEMA has discussed this issue in connection with the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). In a booklet titled ''Answer to Questions About the NFIP,'' FEMA has stated:

75. Does elevating a structure on posts or pilings remove a building from the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA)?

Elevating a structure on posts or pilings does not remove a building from the SFHA. If the ground supporting posts or pilings is within a floodplain, the building is still at risk. The structure is considered to be within the floodplain, and flood insurance will be required as a condition of receipt of Federal or Federally related financing for the structure. The reason for this, even in cases where the flood velocity is minimal, is that the hydrostatic effects of flooding can lead to the failure of the structure's posts or pilings foundation. The effects of ground saturation can lead to decreased load bearing capacity of the soil supporting the posts or pilings, which can lead to partial or full collapse of the structure. Even small areas of ponding will be subject to the hydrodynamic effects of flooding; no pond or lake is completely free of water movement or wave action. This movement of water can erode the ground around the posts or pilings and may eventually cause collapse of the structure.

FEMA Internet Website at wwvv.fema.gov/businesss/nfip/fidmanre.shtm.

[18] In defending against this matter, the agency has requested that we dismiss Bellingham's protest for various reasons, including the agency's assertions that it was legally precluded from awarding the lease to Bellingham due to Bellingham's price and/or that Bellingham's proposal should be similarly viewed as offering a structure within a designated floodplain area. We have declined to dismiss the protest based on the agency's post-protest assertions, since it is not clear that, during the acquisition process, the agency considered either of these matters as a mandate for rejecting Bellingham's proposal. While these matters may be proper considerations by the agency in determining if there are practicable alternatives, in the context of the agency's dismissal requests we view the agency's post-protest assertions as being made ''in the heat of litigation,'' and we will not rely on them as bases for dismissing the protest. See Boeing Sikorsky Aircraft Support, B–277263.2, B–277263.3, Sept. 29, 1997, 97–2 ¶ 91 at 15.

TRIBUTE TO REV. SAMUEL R. HARDMAN, SR.

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a patriotic American who loved his country and loved the Lord, and dedicated his life to the service of both.

The Rev. Samuel R. Hardman, Sr. passed away on February 10, 2011, at the age of 85. A native of Zephyrhills, Florida, he was a lifelong resident of Magnolia Springs, Alabama.

To anyone who knew Father Sam, it was clear he was passionate about America. At the young age of 17, as the world was embroiled in the Second World War, he eagerly enlisted in the U.S. Navy. He was commissioned a bomb disposal officer at age 19 and served in the South Pacific as the United States battled the Empire of Japan.

After the war, he returned home to attend the Episcopal Seminary in Sewanee, Tennessee, and was ordained a priest in 1950.

With one war behind him, many would have chosen the more comfortable road of civilian life. Yet, Father Sam elected to take a different path. He chose to serve the Lord while at the same time serving his country. He returned to the Navy as a Chaplain, taking him to battlefronts in Korea and Vietnam. Much of his time in uniform was in the service of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Father Sam retired from the Navy as a Captain in 1975 and moved to Magnolia Springs where he served in the Diocese of the Central Gulf Coast for the next 32 years.

Mr. Speaker, Father Sam's uncommon devotion to America and his faith make him a very special man. However, he is all the more special to me as he presided over the marriage ceremony when my wife, Janee, and I were wed on August 15, 1990. We will be forever grateful for his spiritual and fatherly role in our lives and in the lives of countless others who have been parishioners of St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Mobile.

On behalf of all the people who have been touched by Father Sam's life, I wish to extend condolences to his family, including his sons, William, and Samuel, Jr.; sisters, Alfea Thomas, and Mary Lee; 9 grandchildren; 9 great grandchildren, and a host of nieces and nephews and other relatives. You are all in our thoughts and prayers.

THE THIRD TIME IS AS GOOD AS THE FIRST

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that fans across the country will have their own opinion, but for my money, I have to say that the best high school football team in the country resides in the Sixth District of North Carolina. I have some facts to back up my opinion.

West Rowan High School owns the nation's longest active football winning streak among all high schools. The Falcons won their 46th consecutive game while capturing their third straight North Carolina 3–A high school football championship. West Rowan's last loss was in Week 2 of the 2008 football season.

The Falcons completed their third straight season of perfection on December 11, 2010, when they defeated Eastern Alamance 34–7 at N.C. State's Carter-Finley Stadium. I must also note that the Sixth District was a double winner in this game because the Eastern Alamance Eagles proved to be a worthy opponent. Eastern Alamance also resides in the Sixth District. So, congratulations to the Falcons and the Eagles for a tremendous 2010 football season.

The way that West Rowan captured this title was special because of the obstacles that had to be overcome in the title bout. It has long been said that defense wins championships and the Falcons are a prime example of this philosophy. In the title game, the star quarterback for the Falcons was knocked out of the game with a concussion requiring a full team effort to capture the state crown. West Rowan and Eastern Alamance battled in a great

game, both sides worthy of accolades. The Falcon defense, however, was able to take over in the second half while paving the way for the win. The Falcons define team work and dedication and that starts with the Head Coach Scott Young and all of his assistants.

With many players returning next season, including the offensive and defensive MVPs, the Falcons have vowed to continue their winning streak. On February 3, 2011, I was honored to meet with the team and offer my personal congratulations on another outstanding season.

The players on this championship team are Tyler Stamp, Trey Mashore, Daishon Barger, Odell McBride, Clifford Long, BJ Sherrill, Dinkin Miller, Quentin Sifford, Connor Edwards, Jamarian Mabry, Eric Cowan, Ethan Wansley, Harvey Landy, Taylor Garczynski, Jockaile Burnside, Bertin Suarez, Jarvis Morgan, Domonique Noble, Kendall Hosch, John Dunlap, Darryl Jackson Jr., Andrew Garrison, Trey Cuthbertson, Brandon Ijames, Mack Flanagan, Terence Robinson, Troy Culbertson, Patrick Hampton, Trevor Loudin, Desmond Jackson, Emmanuel Gbunblee, Trey Shepherd, Tacoma McNeely, Cody Eggers, Kiero Cuthbertson, Jacob Tomlin, Logan Stoodley, Jordan Davenport, Terrence Polk, Andre Archie, Matthew Choi, Charles Holloway, Preston Garner, Chad Bailey, Brandon Hansen, Xavier Still, Cody Haire, Hunter Mashburn, Josh Bailey, Jordan Myers, Greg Dixon, Mike Norman, Rashad Sherrill, Zeke Blackwood, Davon Quarles, Jarius Lewis, Louis Kraft, Hobie Proctor, Jalen Morrow, Ahmed Blackwell, Quinton Phifer, Maurice Warren, Kelly Miller, Keyows Weeks, Justin Teeter, Jovani Alviter, Daisean Reddick, Ray Bath, Derrick Fortson, Teoz Mauney, and Michael Pinkston.

Every great team needs a great coaching staff, as well as support from their school community. Plaudits must go to Head Coach Scott Young, Assistant Coaches Ed Bowles, Butch Browning, Durwood Bynum, Jeff Chapman, Tim Dixon, Ralph Ellis, Dave Hunt, Lee Linville, Darrell Misenhiemer, Joe Nixon, Kevin Parks Sr., Stevie Williams, James Collins, Zeb Link, and Mark Young. In addition, it should be noted that Scott Young has been honored as the Associated Press Prep Football Coach of the Year for North Carolina.

In addition, we need to congratulate Head Trainer Amber DeDoming along with student trainers J.J. Pangburn, Ashley Gaston and Nicole Barber. Additionally the cameramen Alan Champion and Jonathan Brown, the ball girls Ally Young, Sarah Day and Mary Sobataka and ball boys Bryant Young, Owen White, Marcus Corry and Brandon Wallace, all deserve to be recognized for the total team effort.

Last, but certainly not least, we offer our congratulations to Athletic Director Todd Bell and Principal Dr. Jamie Durant for their support of a national high school football dynasty.

Again on behalf of the Sixth District of North Carolina, we congratulate the West Rowan High School football team, faculty, staff, students, and fans for another history-making season. This team will be remembered for many years to come for its perfection on the field and resilience in securing a third straight North Carolina 3–A state championship.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chair, under the Higher Education Act, proprietary colleges and universities and career training programs are required to offer programs that lead to gainful employment in a legally recognized occupation in order to participate in the federal student aid programs. In July 2010, the Department of Education published a proposed rule to enforce this statutory requirement. While I share the Department's desire to ensure that federal financial aid dollars are spent wisely and that students are not taken advantage of, my concern is that the proposed rule does not accurately address this purpose and the consequences have not been fully considered.

Rather than using actual measures of educational quality such as job placement and graduation rates, the Department is promulgating a regulation that defines ''gainful employment'' through a complex matrix that examines the student loan debt-to-income ratio of graduates to the student loan repayment rate of graduates in the programs. The proposed rule would also require the US Department of Education to approve every new program created at a proprietary institution prior to the start of the program. This proposed rule needs to be further developed and possible unintended consequences considered.

In the midst of our economic crisis and high national unemployment rate, there remains a group of employers who struggle to find workers with skill sets required for today's changing job market. These employers have, in some cases, partnered with community and career colleges to build a 21st century workforce. Today, more than 6 million non-traditional students—including single parents, displaced workers, and low income individuals—are enrolled in community colleges and another 2.8 million in career colleges to develop the skills necessary to advance in the 21st century workplace.

Yes, there are ''bad apples'' among career preparation programs, who are taking advantage of vulnerable populations. In fact, before coming to Congress, I was at the forefront of an effort to close a beauty school in New Jersey which had done a disservice to students in the area. For this reason, again, I share the concern of many regarding the abuse of Title IV funds as well as any institutional action which would cause a student academic failure or financial harm. However, I also know that many good career colleges and community college programs exist that remain strong partners in the effort to meet the President's goal of leading the world in the percentage of college graduates by 2020.

My concern is that the Department's rule, while addressing poor quality programs, will have a negative impact on high quality programs as well. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment to provide for the reevaluation of the proposed metric system and full consideration of its impact.

RECOGNIZING KATHY ICHTER, DIRECTOR OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION UPON HER RETIREMENT

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Kathy Ichter, the Director of the Fairfax County Department of Transportation for her long and dedicated service to the residents of Fairfax County, Virginia, and to wish her well in her retirement. Ms. Ichter started with the County in 1984, and spent 27 years working tirelessly to improve regional transportation. She began as a Transportation Planner, served for twelve years as the Division Chief of the Department's Transportation Planning and Operations Division, and was subsequently appointed as Director of the entire Department in 2005. I was a Member of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors at that time, and happily supported Ms. Ichter's appointment. Having worked closely with her on many transportation issues over the years, I developed a profound respect for her abilities and dedication.

Ms. Ichter was instrumental in improving all modes of transportation, including roadways, supporting pedestrian and transit opportunities and implementing innovative alternatives such as telework. While no one transportation project will completely eliminate challenges in urbanized areas, Ms. Ichter's wide-ranging focus provided residents with a number of options for their daily commutes. During her time as Director, she facilitated a partnership with the private sector to expand capacity on the Washington Beltway at no cost to taxpayers, oversaw the final planning and start of construction on extending Metrorail to Dulles Airport—one of our region's most significant transportation improvements, and planned redevelopment for the Tysons Corner area to transform the currently gridlocked urban core into a workable community. In addition, she worked diligently with me when I served as Chairman of the Board to enact two Four-Year Transportation Plans, the first such efforts in Fairfax to develop and implement a comprehensive, long-term transportation strategy.

Throughout her years of service, Ms. Ichter received a number of awards recognizing her efforts and leadership, including the Les Dorson Public Leadership Award in 2004 and the A. Heath Onthank Award, the highest honor awarded to Fairfax County government employees, in 2005.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in providing further recognition to Kathy Ichter and thanking her for her years of service to the citizens of Fairfax County and her dedication to improving the National Capital region's transportation challenges.

RECOGNITION OF MR. RAÚL MAGDALENO

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to congratulate one of my constituents who will be honored for his extraordinary volunteerism leadership in the community. Mr. Raúl Magdaleno will be presented with the MillerCoors 2010 Líder of the Year Award at the Latino Cultural Center in Dallas, Texas on Thursday, February 24, 2011.

Raúl Magdaleno was the one among 12 Hispanic leaders chosen for outstanding contributions to his community through volunteerism at Parents Step Ahead/Padres un Paso Adelante. Mr. Magdaleno was selected through an online public voting campaign hosted from September 15 through October 29, 2010. In compliment to his award, Parents Step Ahead will receive a $25,000 grant for a community leadership project in collaboration with MillerCoors. The focus of Parents Step Ahead is to encourage parents to participate in their children's education.

Although this is a prestigious award, this is not the first honor bestowed upon this exceptional Dallasite. Mr. Magdaleno is a 2004 recipient of the United States Congressional Gold Medal for his more than 29,000 hours of community service. He has clearly demonstrated his dedication to the Hispanic community and leadership ability to serve those in need. At present, Mr. Magdaleno oversees the office of Diversity and Community Outreach for Southern Methodist University's Meadows School of the Arts.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Raúl Magdaleno for his remarkable commitment as a servant leader. He is one that our youth across the nation can aspire towards to make this country a better place to live. In his own words, "Perseverance and determination triumphs over any disadvantage life may bring you."

TRIBUTE TO LEONARD METZGER, JR.

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer tribute to Mr. Leonard Metzger, Jr., a beloved and respected member of the South Alabama business community who recently passed away at the age of 81.

To his many friends, Leonard Metzger was a gentleman, an avid outdoorsman, a devoted businessman and booster of the community.

Born in Mobile in 1929, Mr. Metzger graduated from University Military School, UMS, where he was the 1948 Julius Tutwiler Award recipient. He would later serve on the UMS-Wright Board of Directors for 25 years.

He attended the University of Alabama until he was called home to lead the family clothing business, Metzger's, after the death of his father, Leonard Metzger, Sr.

For three decades, Mr. Metzger guided the store and supervised its expansion. He sold his business interest in the early 1980's and turned his attention to local civic activities, including the Alabama Deep Sea Fishing Rodeo and the Junior Miss Pageant.

Mr. Metzger loved fishing, duck hunting and telling humorous stories as much as he loved making friends.

His contributions to our community in business and civic activities are many and he will be sorely missed.

On behalf of the people of South Alabama, I wish to extend condolences to Mildred, his wife of 36 years; his son, Leonard "Lee"; daughters, Nancy, Peggy and Debbie; stepdaughter, Marty; sister, Clare; 6 grandchildren, and extended family and friends. You are all in our thoughts and prayers.

TRIBUTE TO MR. DAVID M. ALTWEGG

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement from the Department of Defense, I wish to recognize Mr. David M. Altwegg, Rear Admiral (RADM) (Retired) for his more than six decades of dedicated military and federal service to the security of our country. In his most recent assignment, he served as Executive Director at the Missile Defense Agency, where he advised the Director on issues related to the management and operations of one of the most dynamic organizations within the Department of Defense. Mr. Altwegg has made an enormous contribution to the successful development and fielding of a defensive system to protect this nation, American troops deployed abroad, and our allies and friends from attack by ballistic missiles.

Mr. Altwegg enlisted in the Navy in 1947 and after attending aviation electronics training, he earned a fleet appointment to the United States Naval Academy, earning his commission in 1952. He rose through the ranks as a Surface Warfare Officer where he led sailors and Marines through three decades of distinguished military service, retiring from active duty in 1985. RADM Altwegg's passion to serve this great country led him to continue his federal government service for another quarter century as part of the Senior Executive Service. It is to this nations' benefit that Mr. Altwegg decided to pursue a post-navy career in civil service.

Mr. Chairmen, very few individuals demonstrate the passion, patriotism, loyalty and dedication to national security as exemplified by Mr. Altwegg. His accomplishments and leadership over the course of his 24 year senior executive career contributed significantly to the Department of Defense in the areas of complex combat systems development, acquisition reform, and the fielding of a ballistic missile defense capability for the Nation. As a senior executive, he served in positions of increasing responsibility in the Naval Sea Systems Command and the Program Executive Office for Theater Air Defense (later renamed Theater Surface Combatants). He served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Theater Combat Systems before being assigned to the newly formed Missile Defense Agency where he rose to the position of Executive Director, the senior civilian in this organization.

Mr. Altwegg has been at the forefront of the Department of Defense efforts to improve and streamline the acquisition of complex combat systems for his entire civilian career, but nowhere has he had more direct impact than in his current Missile Defense Agency assignment. He pioneered the portfolio management concept when MDA was formed in 2002 through the consolidation of all Service ballistic missile defense programs under this new Defense Agency. Concurrent with this effort, he revamped the budget development and oversight process for MDA's $8 billion annual portfolio, and he dramatically improved the detail and applicability of budget documentation for Congress and other national leaders, resulting in bipartisan praise for promoting a much clearer understanding of a very technically complex program of work. His vision for managing disparate systems as a single integrated system, networking air and space surveillance resources to allow the warfighter to take advantage of the full kinematic range of the family of missile defense interceptors, revolutionized the way we think of the DoD Acquisition Model. MDA's early application of spiral development to introduce future capability in blocks became the new lexicon used by the Defense Acquisition University where we train our future acquisition experts.

Mr. Altwegg also championed the reengineering of the agency's management structure to better administer and support a revolutionary approach to developing and fielding missile defense capabilities. He redefined the Executive Management Council organization around the three core executive management functions of the Director (head of agency, acquisition executive and program manager) improving teamwork, increasing the information flow among senior executives and dramatically reducing decision cycle time. His tireless efforts streamlined staff, improved communication among more than 30 departments, and advanced the interests of the Department of Defense and American taxpayers in more efficiently delivering improved ballistic missile defense capabilities.

Consistent with the President's Quality Management Agenda as set forth in 2002, Mr. Altwegg pushed for better metrics and measures to support all aspects of ballistic missile defense acquisition. When the Office of Management and Budget implemented their Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), the MDA was included in the first group of government agencies to be reviewed. The MDA earned an unprecedented score of 75 in the first year. This objective assessment by an outside organization was a direct reflection of Mr. Altwegg's ability to set measurable goals for MDA and to communicate a complex strategy and revolutionary spiral acquisition process.

He was also singularly responsible for the agency's implementation of the President's Management Agenda spotlight activity for Budget-Performance Integration, achieving 100 percent integration of the agency's strategic and budgetary goals. He articulated a recurring strategic rhythm where investment, development, testing and fielding decisions are based on periodic reviews of the maturity, progress and balance of the ballistic missile defense portfolio. Strategic decisions on element progress are based on their ability to

meet predefined knowledge points as they proceed through development and testing. Mr. Altwegg initiated and deployed an array of earned value and life cycle management tools to optimize MDA knowledge-based decision systems and criteria, and he spearheaded efforts to evaluate and make informed senior leader decisions based upon cost, schedule, performance and relative merit criteria and metrics. He developed and managed numerous data generation and evaluation systems—including MDA's Integrated Program Plan and supporting management systems and activities—to more effectively manage system wide and component level costs and schedules, balance development and fielding priorities and successfully meet block development and fielding goals.

He has been the central figure in planning and responding to the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) commission's recommendations to consolidate missile defense development activities at Redstone Arsenal in Alabama. He has collaborated closely with the Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Service and Department of the Army staffs to ensure MDA's requirements are fully considered. He has personally championed open communication with the workforce to survey employee concerns, develop detailed plans for executing the directed realignments and ensure workforce needs are addressed. He has personally met with Huntsville Alabama Chamber of Commerce and coordinated an informative series of presentations to the staff to minimize anxiety and provide information to families, and he established an advanced detachment of support staff to facilitate the transition of services and functions to our new location.

Mr. Altwegg has been a guiding force for the Missile Defense Agency and the prime author of our long-term strategy to strengthen and maximize the flexibility of the nation's missile defense capabilities. He advocated and succeeded in aligning the agencies missile defense programs to achieve a greater degree of mobility through better networked, forward-deployed sensors and interceptors; and additional layers of increasingly capable missile defenses. He stood at the forefront of establishing MDA as a global leader in ballistic missile defense capabilities. In doing so, he has set and enforced an uncompromising standard of excellence and professionalism among the workforce and has created a ''core competency'' for our national security structure.

He has tirelessly advocated for the responsible use of scarce resources as well as for effective care and professional development of the civilian workforce; and his sustained accomplishments are deserving of special recognition. Mr. Altwegg, thank you for your service and God bless.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TRENT FRANKS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall vote 64. If I had been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair. I move to strike the last word.

The cuts contained in these sections to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program—LIHEAP—are dangerous, and I rise to oppose them. The Republican continuing resolution cuts $390.3 million in funding from LIHEAP's emergency contingency fund for the remaining seven months of this fiscal year. Those are cuts that are made on the backs of the low-income residents, like those I represent in the cold and snowy Capital Region of New York, who struggle to pay for the cost of home heating oil and natural gas.

LIHEAP is a widely supported, essential program that delivers short-term aid to our most vulnerable neighbors, including the elderly on fixed incomes. LIHEAP provides a vital safety net, allowing families and seniors to stay healthy and protected from cold winters and hot summers. It keeps those receiving help from having to make the heart-breaking decision about whether to pay to keep the heat on, or to pay for food and prescription drugs.

The numbers of households receiving assistance reached record levels this year, increasing from 7.7 million to 8.8 million. The rise in participation includes only households that are below the maximum income level—$33,525 for a family of four this year. The need for the continued support of LIHEAP is clear—the program was only able to help one in five eligible Americans. Four out of five families in need went without this assistance, and were left out in the cold.

The Republican continuing resolution cuts $390.3 million in funding from LIHEAP's contingency fund.The LIHEAP contingency fund allocates emergency funding to states dealing with emergencies, like cold snaps, heat waves, or spikes in energy prices that force low-income Americans to cut off their heat. So far this year, the Administration has released $200 million in contingency funds, illustrating the need for full funding of the contingency fund. I do not think we can afford to let seven more months pass and risk another blizzard, or another heat wave, and leave our nation's vulnerable citizens out on their own.

In FY 2010, my home state of New York received about $57.8 million in contingency funds, but in FY 2011 the state has only received about $26 million. These CR cuts would mean that New York loses out on about half the contingency fund money it saw during the same period last year. Given the fact that this winter has been comparably cold and seen substantially more snow, my state and my constituents will be losing out tremendously with these cuts.

The continued need for LIHEAP funding is clear to me as I travel around my district and talk to my constituents. Staff in my district offices help connect seniors and low-income families to LIHEAP for desperately needed assistance. Cutting funding for this program is, in my mind, unconscionable. We cannot leave behind our nation's most vulnerable in the dead of winter.

The Majority is lauding the fact that this bill represents the largest spending cut in the history of our country. If they want to cut funding to satisfy their base, fine. But I will not stand for cutting LIHEAP funding. I will not support budget cuts balanced on the backs of seniors on fixed incomes, struggling to make it through this cold winter. Madam Chair, I urge defeat of this bill.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to this legislation. All of us recognize the need for fiscal restraint, but we should not be doing so at the expense of working families.

Governing is about making difficult choices, making wise investments where we can, while recognizing the fiscal pressures our nation faces. This legislation is an abdication of that responsibility. It would harm our most vulnerable citizens, fail to invest in economic recovery and cost American jobs. For our economy to recover over the long term, American workers need training and education that will enable them to compete in a new global economy. However, the Republican spending bill makes drastic cuts to education, putting a college degree out of reach for more working families.

In my district, this bill will deprive 22,000 working families of nearly $1,000 in financial assistance from the Pell Grant program. Many of these New Yorkers will have to pay more in tuition. For some, this shortfall may prevent them from completing their degree, altogether.

The cuts to the Pell program are just one way education suffers. Spread throughout my district, there are thirty-two Head Start centers that offer early education to the children of working families. New York City Head Start will lose almost $30 million in funding. As we look for ways to strengthen our country's economy, cutting services that prepare children for the future seems not just unconscionable, but unwise.

Just as children and young people would be penalized by this legislation, some of our oldest and most vulnerable citizens would be harmed. In the middle of winter, New York City would lose $4.4 million in funding from the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, forcing seniors and working families to choose between keeping the heat on and purchasing groceries.

Meanwhile, important services that help seniors stay in their home would be slashed. Job training for workers dislocated by the recession would face cuts. New York City would see a loss of $14 million in Community Block Service Grants, which fund these valuable initiatives.

In New York, where working families already struggle to make rent, this bill slashes housing services. HUD's public housing capital fund would be reduced by 40%. The New York City Housing Authority relies on this fund for almost three-fourths of its resources. That money ensures elevators work, broken windows get repaired and hallways stay lit. New York City would also lose $129 million in Community Development Funds. As a result of these cuts, the City's Department of Housing, Preservation and Development, which helps ensure housing is safe and livable, would have to let 1,200 hardworking employees go.

Mr. Chair, the American economy is just now turning the corner, showing early signs of resurgence. As recovery takes hold, this is not the time to cause another wave of job losses, with shortsighted cuts. Instead, we should choose wisely, creating jobs now, while investing for the long term.

If we crafted the right spending bill it could accomplish these goals, funding our government in a way that meets our responsibilities, contributes to growth, and reduces the deficit.

This is not that bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

HONORING BRUCE TAYLOR

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Bruce Taylor for receiving a Citizen of the Year Award from the Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce for his contributions to community organizations last year.

Bruce, the founder and CEO of Taylor Farms based in Salinas, contributed to many causes in the Salinas Valley and nationwide, including the Boys & Girls Club of Monterey, Salinas Valley Memorial Hospital, the National Steinbeck Center, and local high schools.

Bruce Taylor is a third generation member of one of the most innovative lettuce grower and producer families in the country. Taylor's father, Ted, successfully implemented novel techniques to wrap and gas lettuce in order to give it a longer shelf life. In 1981, Taylor joined the newest family business, which he later named Fresh Express, and rose through the ranks quickly to become chairman in 1991 where he led the introduction of ''salad in a bag'' in grocery stores across the country.

In 1994, he left to start Taylor Farms, which has become the world leader in the production of ready-made salad fixings for the restaurant industry. His new company, which produces fresh-cut vegetables and salads for large foodservice customers such as McDonald's, Subway, and Red Lobster, has $400 million in annual revenues through nine processing facilities in the United States and Australia.

Lately, Mr. Taylor is repeating his history of renovating landmark business sites in Salinas. With Fresh Express, he helped convert an old Nestle's site into the company's main salad plant. For Taylor Farms, next up is a former Smucker's site. Taylor companies will shortly be operating about 600,000 square feet of commercial space in Salinas. In a time when California is facing high unemployment levels, it is good to see a leader such as Taylor investing in the community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Bruce Taylor on his reception of the Citizen of the Year Award from the Salinas Chamber of Commerce and wishing him the utmost success as he continues to serve his community and our Nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVAN PEARCE

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 83, I was unexpectedly engaged and missed rollcall No. 83.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

TRIBUTE TO ALABAMA AUTHOR WINSTON GROOM

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Winston Francis Groom, a southern gentleman of letters and recipient of the 2011 Harper Lee Award for Alabama's Distinguished Writer of the Year.

Winston Groom has brought much credit to our state's literary tradition as both a popular novelist and a renowned author of history. A native of Mobile and the son of a prominent attorney, Winston Groom attended the University of Alabama, where he discovered his true passion for writing. Pursing a degree in English, he served as editor and contributor to university humor and literary magazines.

Like many young men of his time, he would take a detour after college to serve his country in Vietnam, reaching the rank of Captain in the U.S. Army.

His southern heritage and his war time experiences continue to influence both the topics and flavor of his prolific and distinguished writing career.

After his tour of duty in the Vietnam, Winston Groom chose the path of a journalist, laboring for a brief time at the Washington Star, covering the political and court beat. Encouraged by the newspaper's writer-in-residence, Willie Morris, Mr. Groom relocated to New York to make his name in literature.

After publishing his first novel, Better Times. Than These, in 1978, he followed with As Summers Die, in 1980. In 1983, he co-authored with Duncan Spencer Conversations with the Enemy: The Story of PFC Robert Garwood. One year later he published the novel, Only.

His best known work would be published in 1986, but most of the world would not hear about it until eight years later when Hollywood adapted it to the silver screen. After the movie's 1994 release, Mr. Groom's novel, Forrest Gump, sold well over 2.5 million copies and occupied a spot on the New York Times bestseller list for 21 weeks.

The author of 14 books so far, Mr. Groom's other works include Gone the Sun, 1988; Gumpisms: The Wit and Wisdom of Forrest Gump; and, The Bubba Gump Shrimp Co. Cookbook, both in 1994; Gump & Co. in 1995; Forrest Gump: My Favorite Chocolate Recipes: Mama's Fudge, Cookies, Cakes and Candies, also in 1995. Shrouds of Glory: From Atlanta to Nashville: The Last Great Campaign of the Civil War was also published in 1995. Such a Pretty Girl, published in 1999, was followed by The Crimson Tide: An Illustrated History of Football at the University of Alabama, in 2000.

His more recent works include A Storm in Flanders: The Ypres Salient, 1914–1918, in 2002; 1942, The Year That Tried Men's Souls, in 2005; and Patriotic Fire: Andrew Jackson and Jean Laffite at the Battle of New Orleans, in 2007. His latest work, Vicksburg 1863, was published in 2009.

On behalf of the people of Alabama, I wish to congratulate Mr. Groom on the receipt of the 2011 Harper Lee Award, and I join in thanking him for his continued contributions as a great American writer, and wish all the best to him and his lovely wife, Anne-Clinton, and their daughter, Carolina.

THE BELLS OF BALANGIGA: IT IS TIME TO GO HOME

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently reintroduced my bill, H. Con. Res. 18, which urges the President to authorize the transfer of ownership to the Philippines of the bells taken in 1901 from the town of Balangiga in the Philippines. The bells are currently displayed at F.E. Warren Air Force Base in Cheyenne, Wyoming.

In the 110 years since the taking of the bells occurred, the citizens of the United States and the Philippines have shared many historic and political ties. The Philippines was a staunch ally of the United States during World War II. Brave Filipino soldiers were drafted into service by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, fought side-by-side with American soldiers, and were instrumental in the successful outcome of World War II. Filipino soldiers also fought alongside our soldiers on the battlefields of Korea and Vietnam.

Since the independence of the Philippines in 1946, the U.S.-Philippine relationship has been largely one of friendship and cooperation. The Philippines is a republic patterned basically on our own system of government. The Philippines is a valuable trading partner of the U.S. and an ally in the war against terrorism. Approximately 2.9 million Americans are of Filipino descent and close to 250,000 United States citizens reside in the Philippines. The acts of conflict that surrounded the taking of the bells of Balangiga are not consistent with the friendship that is currently an integral part of the relationship between our two nations.

The Republic of the Philippines has repeatedly requested the return of the bells. They

are an important symbol to the Filipino people, who wish to have them re-installed in the belfry of the Balangiga Church. I believe that it is time to resolve this situation in order to solidify the bonds between our two nations. My resolution would honor and promote the positive relationship our counties enjoy.

As the years pass, I am confident that relations between our two nations will grow even stronger. To that end, the United States Government which has final disposition over the bells of Balangiga should transfer ownership of the bells to the people of the Philippines as a measure of good will and cooperation.

IN SUPPORT OF FOOD FOR PEACE

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Food for Peace. Over the past 50 years, this essential program has fought hunger and offered hope for some 3 billion people in 150 countries. For less than .05% of our total federal budget, Food for Peace is able to provide emergency food relief, combat famine and starvation, and promote much-needed stability in the most poverty-stricken corners of the world. Without question, food security is global security. Struggles to gain access to food can easily erupt in violence, instability, and health epidemics. Food for Peace's small financial investment in hunger security yields tremendous returns in the form of increased stability in fragile areas, reduced dependence on foreign aid, and increased goodwill towards America.

As the Ranking Member on the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, I know that Food for Peace is far more than just a helping hand. This program works with communities to promote agricultural development and access to local markets so that food recipients can transform into food producers. Rather than create enduring reliance on U.S. aid, Food for Peace strengthens communities to provide for themselves. In this tight fiscal climate, what better return on our investment could we ask for than decreased dependence on foreign assistance and increased stability in conflict-prone states?

Yet, my colleagues have made dangerous cuts to this critical capacity-building program. These cuts, which amount to marginal cost-savings, would eliminate support to millions of the world's poorest and hungriest at a time when food prices are rising across the globe. Rather than providing smart investments to uplift these communities, we are ripping away resources and sinking them deeper into an unbreakable cycle of poverty and instability. As our country faces increasing international scrutiny, this is not the face of America that we need to be showing the world.

On behalf of the billions who have been lifted up by Food for Peace and the millions for whom it currently gives hope, I strongly oppose my colleagues' misguided efforts to save a few dollars. America is better than this, and I will never stop fighting to promote our national security through smart international assistance.

SIDING WITH THE PRO-DEMOCRACY MOVEMENT IN IRAN

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently reintroduced H. Res. 94, Siding with the Pro-Democracy Movement in Iran. This resolution addresses Iran's nuclear threat as Tehran seeks a nuclear weapon in violation of UN Security Council resolutions, has started to enrich uranium to 20 percent, and has plans to build 10 additional uranium enrichment facilities. Moreover, Tehran's continued support for terrorism and its suppression of dissidents require the United States to adopt a new approach.

Over the past year, millions of ordinary Iranians have taken to the streets to participate in anti-government demonstrations, despite growing suppression and risk of arrest, imprisonment and execution. The ruling regime, for its part, has resorted to a brutal campaign of murdering protesters such as Neda Agah Soltan in the streets and in its many gallows. My resolution calls on the U.S. government to side with the Iranian people's endeavors by refraining from a selective approach to Iranian opponents who struggle for democracy and human rights. It invites the Secretary of State to join our British and European allies in ending the blacklisting of Iran's main opposition, the People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran (PMOI) by removing them from the list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTO).

Removing the PMOI from the FTO list is not only the right thing to do, but it also sends the right message to Tehran. The Iranian regime and its President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad have rebuffed offers of negotiations, and stepped up their intransigence in very sphere of contention with the United States, including human rights, the nuclear weapons program and support for terrorism in the region.

In November, I sent a joint bi-partisan letter along with a number of my colleagues to Secretary Clinton. In this letter we brought the resolution to the attention of the Secretary of State and stated that over 100 House Members have already urged her to delist the PMOI. In our letter, we noted that "Iranian officials should not be seen as exploiting an unjust US designation to further justify imparting their draconian punishments on prisoners of conscience."

The PMOI's continued designation in the US has deadly consequences. I invite my colleagues to support this resolution and send a message to the world that violations of human rights will not be tolerated!

HONORING THE LIFE AND PASSING OF TY KILLEN

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. MCCARTHY and I rise today to honor the life and passing of Ty Killen, a proud veteran of our nation's Armed Forces and a resident of Lancaster, California. Ty's unwavering commitment to her country began during the height of WWII when at 19 years old she joined the military as a Women Airforce Service Pilot (WASP). During this difficult time in our nation's history, this brave group of women selflessly rose to the occasion and supported the war effort by flying thousands of stateside missions for the United States Armed Services. For her service, Ty was recognized and awarded the Congressional Gold Medal last year by the 111th Congress.

Following the war, Ms. Killen moved back to southern California and continued to serve her community as a school teacher in Lancaster. Retiring after 40 years, Ms. Killen's distinguished career continues to have a lasting effect on the community. Ty will surely be missed, and our thoughts and prayers go out to the family, friends, and students who have been moved and inspired by Ty during her life.

KEEP FAMILIES TOGETHER

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a very important bill that I just reintroduced, the Keeping Families Together Act of 2011 (H.R. 713). This bill would reinstate judicial review to the immigration process, end the practice of automatically detaining productive members of our society for minor crimes they committed years ago and for which they have already served with their sentence, and allow immigrants previously deported to appeal that decision.

This law has allowed stable, long-term families headed by legal immigrants to be torn apart because of minor crimes committed years ago—crimes for which the offender has already served their sentence!

You may recall that a basic legislative attempt to fix this law was passed by the House of Representatives in the 106th Congress, but it was never taken up by the Senate. The time has come to reverse the unfair so-ailed "immigration reforms" instituted by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

Please join me in supporting this critical legislation to restore justice to our immigration process, by co-sponsoring the Keeping Families Together Act of 2011.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) 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:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Kline amendment, which seeks to short circuit the Department of Education's ongoing rulemaking process regarding the Higher Education Act's "gainful employment" requirement for postsecondary programs.

Private sector colleges and universities serve 2.8 million students and receive $32.5 billion in federal student aid. Even more students are enrolled in career training programs at non-profit colleges. These training programs are an important part of our education system and provide a valuable service, particularly to non-traditional students.

Unfortunately, a number of investigations have recently cast light on bad actors in the for-profit sector that have been using deceptive recruiting tactics and inflated job placement and completion rates. All stakeholders in this process—from students seeking a quality education, to citizens insisting their tax dollars are spent responsibly, to the many legitimate programs—have an interest in seeing these abuses stopped.

The Department of Education began a process to define "gainful employment" in 2009 and released a proposed rule in July 2010. The plan has sparked intense debate, with more than 90,000 comments, and I urge the Department to continue to engage with all stakeholders and address legitimate concerns as they refine the rule.

However, this amendment would stop the process altogether, ending the dialogue for the rest of the fiscal year. I am also concerned that this amendment would bar enforcement of new rules that require for-profit schools and non-degree programs to disclose basic program information, like graduation rates, program costs, and median loan debt for graduates, to prospective applicants.

Mr. Chair, if the final rule from the Department of Education does not meet the goal of rooting out bad actors while preserving access to high quality postsecondary education, this body should—and I believe will—step in and make changes. But the Department is attempting to address an important issue: stopping taxpayer funding to sub-par programs that leave students nowhere but deeper in debt. Congress should not cut off that process midway through.

INVEST IN OUR VETERANS

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently learned that the unemployment rate for veterans ages 18–24 in the U.S. is 22 percent, double the rate for civilians, and up from about 14 percent three years ago. This is unacceptable! It is because of this alarming trend that I have recently reintroduced my bill, the Let's Re-Up the Troops-to-Cops Program Act (H.R. 715).

This legislation authorizes grant funds to be used for the Troops-to-Cops Program, a grant program that provides funds to local law enforcement agencies for the hiring of recently separated members of the Armed Forces to serve as law enforcement officers. The Troops-to-Cops program was one of several grant programs available through the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program that was authorized in 1994 under the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 and administered through the U.S. Department of Justice through 1999, when it was disbanded.

Despite an increase in job training programs, employer education efforts and post-9/11 GI Bill improvements, unemployment for veterans is still too high. According to the Department of Veterans Affairs, the root of the problem is lack of experience and ability to effectively translate military skills. Many skills acquired in the military can be transferred to civilian law enforcement and security jobs.

My bill will provide local law enforcement agencies funding to recruit, train and hire honorably discharged members of the Armed Forces to serve as career law enforcement officers. With thousands of troops set to return this year, it is essential that we be prepared to give them an opportunity to serve their communities. I urge all my colleagues to join me in reaffirming our nation's commitment to care for our servicemembers and veterans by supporting this bill.

Our veterans have invested in our country and this legislation invests in our veterans!

HONORING FORTY ACRES AS A NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Forty Acres in Delano, California, as it is designated as a National Historic Landmark on February 21, 2011, in a ceremony that will honor the history of this important site and the thousands of farmworkers who created the farmworker movement in the 1960s.

The national significance of Forty Acres is extraordinary in every facet. Through its association with the farmworker movement, as well as with labor, civil rights, environmental and social reform interests, this land and the buildings that sit upon it helped define an important part of twentieth century American history. Acquired in the spring of 1966 by the National Farm Workers Association, Cesar Chavez had a dream for this forty-acre property. This bleak parcel of land would be transformed into a regional service center for farmworkers and an administrative headquarters for the growing union, United Farm Workers of America, which joined National Farm Workers Association, led by Cesar Chavez, and Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, led by Larry Itliong.

Between 1966 and 1974, farmworkers, aided by an assortment of supporters and volunteers, built four structures on the property: a gasoline station and automotive repair shop, a multi-purpose hall, a health clinic, and a residential building. The structures served not only the needs of the union, but also provided social services for the Chicano and Filipino community—services that were not readily available at that time. Chavez's vision was that Forty Acres would be the first of many service centers where farmworkers would be welcomed and have access to the goods and services that as low-income, migrant workers, they were not always able to receive and obtain. These individuals and their families could purchase gas and food, receive help with automobile repair, banking services, health care, legal assistance, and child care.

Forty Acres was not only the administrative office and the site of the first regional service center of the UFW, but soon after, it also gained a higher level of significance because of two events that received national media attention. In February 1968, in the middle of the Delano Grape Strike, Cesar Chavez announced that he would begin a hunger fast in order to refocus union members on nonviolence efforts. Chavez set up a cot at the service station at Forty Acres and fasted for twenty-five days. He drew national attention with this action, and on March 11, 1968, Robert F. Kennedy flew to Delano to visit Chavez at the service station.

The other significant event took place at Forty Acres on July 29, 1970. The growers met with the union leaders in the multi-purpose hall, and after three days of negotiations, signed union contracts, thereby ending the almost five-year table grape strike and providing basic rights to fair wages and benefits, safer working environments, and job security to more than 70,000 farmworkers. Hundreds of union members, supporters, and journalists were present for the culmination of the hard work and dedication of the farmworker movement.

Forty Acres, with its mission-revival style buildings and beautiful grounds, is a piece of American history. The Roy L. Reuther Memorial Building, where the union contracts were signed; the Rodrigo Terronez Memorial Clinic, where farmworkers and their families received necessary medical services; the Pablo Agbayani Retirement Village, where aging Filipino farmworkers were provided with affordable housing; and the Service Station, where Cesar Chavez began his legendary fast that led to national recognition of the farmworker movement.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to bring to your attention this important dedication. The inclusion of Forty Acres as a National Historic Landmark guarantees that this site will continue to serve as a symbol of the farmworker movement and a lesson of courage, faith and perseverance in our country's history for future generations.

LET'S TRULY BE COMPASSIONATE

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a very important bill that I just reintroduced, the Visitors Interested in Strengthening America (VISA) Act of 2011 (H.R. 714). The bill would grant humanitarian visa waivers to children and their parents for one day in order to attend a medical appointment, an education or cultural event.

In the past, the Port Directors at the border had the authority to grant humanitarian visa waivers to certain children and their accompanying parent. Now, children who come without a visa must be turned away. The fee to enter into the United States for 24 hours is an insurmountable amount of money for these poor children and their families. These children pose no threat to our national security. They are merely trying to receive medical treatment or to enjoy a school field trip to one of our Nation's numerous tourist attractions.

This legislation does not affect the number of legal or illegal immigrants living in the United States—the children and accompanying adults visit for one day and then return to their homes. It gives Port Directors the

authority to use their discretion, and issue waivers to children that pose no security threat to our country.

This is commonsense legislation that allows us to cultivate relations with our Mexican neighbors, while keeping those who would do us harm out of our country. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this critical legislation, by cosponsoring the VISA Act.

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY REMEMBRANCE

HON. RANDY HULTGREN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, three years ago this week, the community of Northern Illinois University was scarred by an act of senseless violence. The NIU family—including the students, faculty, administration, and alumni—has been a model of perseverance and compassion in the wake of this tragedy and I join the people of DeKalb and my whole district in honoring their resilience and courage.

The five victims of the February 14, 2008 shooting demonstrate how terrible it is when lives and the promise of bright futures are cut short.

Ryanne Mace was an excellent student who liked to knit blankets and baby clothing. Her family said ''She was ten thousand times better than the best parts of each of us.''

Gayle Dubowski sang in her high school choir, acted in musicals and loved to draw. ''She went out of her way. She was a really sweet and genuine person,'' said a friend. ''She was so happy, open and serving,'' said another friend, ''I know that she shone so brightly for God on that campus.''

Catalina Garcia was the youngest daughter of immigrants. They believed education was the path to the American dream and Cati, as she was called, hoped to become a teacher.

Dan Parmenter was a gentle giant. He joined the staff of the Northern Star newspaper and worked hard, received recognition, and was experiencing the satisfaction that comes from doing what you love and doing it well.

Julianna Gehant was an Army Reservist and an aspiring teacher. She loved serving her country and had been deployed to Bosnia before coming to NIU. She wanted to continue to serve in the classroom where she could help young people and be closer to her family.

Every death is a loss, but the deaths of these young people are especially tragic; their lives would have touched and impressed so many others. This week, I join the community of North Illinois University in honoring their memory and I will continue, along with the people of the 14th district, to pray for the families and friends of those who died and support the NIU community as they continue to move forward.

THE FIREFIGHTING INVESTMENT, RENEWAL, AND EMPLOYMENT (FIRE) ACT

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently reintroduced the Firefighting Investment, Renewal and Employment (FIRE) Act (H.R. 716). This bill would authorize the Assistance to Firefighters Fire Station Construction Grants for each of the next 5 years, at $210 million per year.

Our firefighters put their lives on the line each and every day without hesitation. And yet in many of our communities, we have outdated and deteriorating fire stations or simply do not have enough fire and emergency facilities as was found in a study of San Diego County. That is why I am reintroducing the FIRE Act. I urge my colleagues join me in standing up for our firefighters by co-sponsoring this critical legislation.

REPUBLICANS FOLLOW THROUGH ON THE PLEDGE TO AMERICA

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Republican House Leadership for following through on the Pledge to America. While the Democratic legislators in Wisconsin are fleeing from their responsibility, Republicans in Washington are working virtually around the clock into the weekend to create jobs by reducing excessive spending.

In these first few weeks of the 112th Congress, Leadership has navigated the House through a flurry of activity. House Republicans have made good on several campaign promises such as: reducing government spending by cutting Congressional office budgets, stopping unnecessary printing, and repealing Obamacare which the NFIB reports will kill 1.6 million jobs. As Molly K. Hooper wrote in The Hill on Friday, ''Democrats like the openness in the GOP House.'' Leadership has done an extraordinary job in accomplishing much in such a short amount of time to live up to promises and reduce government borrowing to promote private sector job creation.

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

HELP OUR BORDER COMMUNITIES

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a very important bill that I just introduced, the Save Our Border Communities Act (H.R. 717). The bill would reimburse police, firefighters and other first responders for services associated with U.S. Ports of Entry.

Local law enforcement and first responders are bearing the brunt of protecting our borders. The Federal Government has not reimbursed border towns for border-related incidents and its drain on local police, firefighters and first responders is increasingly unbearable.

In Imperial County, California, the already strained local police department has announced that due to the high volume of border-related requests, it will no longer respond to most calls from the U.S.-Mexico Port of Entry. The local police department stated they cannot afford to process and transport the numerous individuals with out-of-county misdemeanor warrants to the local jail. Now, instead of being brought to justice, these individuals are set free.

It is about time the Federal Government pays its fair share! I urge my colleagues to join me in ensuring all our border communities are fully reimbursed for protecting our nation's borders by supporting the Save Our Border Communities Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 69, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea''.

JUSTICE FOR A VIETNAM VET

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a private bill (H.R. 730) on behalf of a Vietnam War veteran, Fernando Javier Cervantes.

Mr. Cervantes legally entered the United States when he was only 7 years old and has not lived anywhere else since. He has been a legal resident for over 48 years and is married with two children. In 1972, Mr. Cervantes voluntarily enlisted into the United States Army and honorably served during the Vietnam War, earning a National Defense Service Medal. At the time of enlisting and throughout his service, Fernando was told that he would become a U.S. citizen by serving in the Armed Forces. In July 2008 he was surprised to hear that this was not the case and immediately applied for citizenship. Unfortunately, Femando's application was denied due to a minor drug possession charge that he received during his difficult readjustment period after returning from Vietnam.

Today, Mr. Cervantes is drug-free and is committed to recovery. If deported to Mexico, Mr. Cervantes would not have any familial or community support to recover from his addiction. His entire family resides in the United States as either legal permanent residents or United States citizens. Mr. Cervantes demonstrated permanent allegiance to the United States by voluntarily enlisting into the United States Army and putting his life on the line to make sure we have our freedom. We must

allow him the freedom to live in the country he served.

JUSTICE FOR ALUSIA AND LEDIA

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a private bill (H.R. 731) on behalf of two extraordinary young women, Alusia and Ledia Zace.

Alusia and Ledia were brought here from Albania by their parents in 1996 when they were 8 and 9 years old. Their fathers' legal bid for political asylum was denied in 2004 due to the incompetence of their lawyer and was deported in 2007. This injustice forced the girls and their mother to care for themselves. With no legal representation, the girls face deportation.

The sisters have excelled academically in the U.S. and are attending university in San Diego. They can neither read nor write their native language and would most certainly be condemned to a life without opportunity should they be forced to return to Albania. The U.S. is their home and they should be given an opportunity to finish college and contribute to the only community they know.

IMPROVE ACCESS TO MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced the Huntington's Disease Parity Act of 2011 (H.R. 718), which would direct the Social Security Administration (SSA) to revise outdated, medically inaccurate criteria for determining Social Security Disability and waive the Medicare two-year waiting period for people disabled by Huntington's Disease (HD).

HD is a devastating, hereditary degenerative brain disorder that causes total physical and mental deterioration. Eventually, every person affected by HD becomes completely dependent on others for care. Today, 30,000 Americans are known to have HD and an additional 200,000 have a fifty percent chance of inheriting the disease from an affected parent. The debilitating symptoms make it challenging, if not impossible, for the person with HD to remain employed, resulting in a loss of income and employer-sponsored health insurance benefits.

REVISE OUTDATED CRITERIA TO IMPROVE ACCESS TO DISABILITY BENEFITS

Due to the SSA's dependence on outdated medical guidelines, individuals experience long delays and multiple denials of critical Social Security benefits, forcing patients to wait years for benefits while HD's destructive cognitive, behavioral and physical symptoms rob the person of their ability to work and live independently. The HD Parity Act directs the Commissioner of SSA, in collaboration with the National Institutes of Health and HD experts, to update the agency's guidelines.

ELIMINATE MEDICARE WAITING PERIOD RATHER THAN ACCEPTING IMPASSE

Access to critical health care is often denied in the early stages of disease due to an individual's inability to work, thereby causing the loss of their employer-based insurance. During the required Medicare two year waiting period, individuals with HD see their physical and mental health deteriorate rapidly necessitating more costly care later.

Passing the Huntington's Disease Parity Act of 2011 will direct the SSA to revise the medically inaccurate criteria used to determine Social Security Disability and eliminate the Medicare two-year waiting period. These two critical reforms will directly impact the welfare and lives of individuals and their families impacted by this rare and devastating disease.

Daily Digest

Highlights

The House passed H.R. 1, Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011.

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, February 28, 2011.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 28 public bills, H.R. 795–822; 2 private bills, H.R. 823–824; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 42–43; and H. Res. 104–107 were introduced. **Pages H1249–51**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1252–53**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011: The House passed H.R. 1, making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, by a yea-and-nay vote of 235 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 147. The measure was considered on February 15th, 16th and 17th. **Pages H1202–27, H1227–44, H1244–53**

Rejected the Heinrich motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 146. **(See next issue.)**

Agreed to:

Kline amendment (No. 214 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that prohibits funds for the use of the ''Program Integrity: Gainful Employment-New Programs'' section of the bill (by a recorded vote of 289 ayes to 136 noes with 1 voting ''present'', Roll No. 92); **Pages H1234–35**

Pence amendment (No. 11 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that prohibits the use of funds for Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. (by a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 185 noes with 1 voting ''present'', Roll No. 93); **Page H1235**

Young (AK) amendment (No. 533 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that prohibits the use of funds by the Environmental Appeals Board to consider, review, reject, remand, or otherwise invalidate any permit issued for Outer Continental Shelf sources located offshore of the States along the Arctic Coast under section 328(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7627(a)) (by a recorded vote of 243 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 94); **Pages H1235–36**

Poe (TX) amendment (No. 466 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that seeks to prohibit the use of funds by the EPA to implement, administer, or enforce any statutory or regulatory requirement pertaining to emissions of greenhouse gases (by a recorded vote of 249 ayes to 177 noes, Roll No. 96); **Page H1237**

Rehberg amendment (No. 575 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to pay any employee, officer, contractor, or grantee of any department or agency to implement the provisions of The Patient

Protection and Affordable Care Act or title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 97);

Pages H1202–13, H1237–38

King (IA) amendment (No. 267 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds in H.R. 1 to be used to carry out the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act, or any amendment made by either such Public Law (by a recorded vote of 241 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 98); **Pages H1215–17, H1238–39**

King (IA) amendment (No. 268 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds in H.R. 1 to be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of any Federal department or agency with respect to carrying out the provisions of Public Law 111–148 (Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act), Public Law 111–152 (Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010), or any amendment made by such either Public Law (by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 191 noes, Roll No. 99); **Pages H1217–19, H1239**

Emerson amendment (No. 83 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds in H.R. 1 to be used by the Internal Revenue Service to implement or enforce section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, section 6055 of such Code, section 1502(c) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, or any amendments made by section 1502(b) of such Act (by a recorded vote of 246 ayes to 182 noes, Roll No. 100); **Pages H1219–21, H1239–40**

Forbes amendment (No. 145 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to take any action to effect or implement the disestablishment, closure, or realignment of the United States Joint Forces Command; **(See next issue.)**

Reed amendment (No. 583 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to change any rate of salary or basic pay pursuant to section 1113 of Public Law 111–32; **(See next issue.)**

Matheson amendment (No. 38 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used for the Community Connect broadband grant program administered by the Rural Utilities Service of the Department of Agriculture; **(See next issue.)**

Weiner amendment (No. 126 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to provide assistance to Saudi Arabia; **(See next issue.)**

Weiner amendment (No. 101 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide non-recourse marketing assistance loans for mohair under section 1201 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8731); **(See next issue.)**

Price (GA) amendment (No. 409 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds made available by division B of the Public Health Service Act to implement or enforce section 2718 of the Act (by a recorded vote of 241 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 110); **(See next issue.)**

McClintock amendment (No. 296 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to implement the Klamath Dam Removal and Sedimentation Study (by a recorded vote of 215 ayes to 210 noes, Roll No. 111); **(See next issue.)**

Herger amendment (No. 177 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds for the Secretary of Agriculture to implement or enforce Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule, relating to the designation of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use, in any administrative unit of the National Forest System (by a recorded vote of 227 ayes to 177 noes, Roll No. 113); **(See next issue.)**

Boren amendment (No. 566 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to require a person licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code, to report information to the Department of Justice regarding the sale of multiple rifles or shotguns to the same person (by a recorded vote of 277 ayes to 149 noes, Roll No. 115); **(See next issue.)**

Forbes amendment (No. 146 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds made available by division A of this Act for Department of Defense, Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide from being used for official representation purposes, as defined by Department of Defense Instruction 7250.13, dated June 30, 2009 (by a recorded vote of 241 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 116); **(See next issue.)**

Johnson (OH) amendment (No. 498 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to develop, carry out, implement, or otherwise enforce proposed regulations published June 18, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 34,667) by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement of the Department of the Interior (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 119); **(See next issue.)**

Goodlatte amendment (No. 467 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to develop, promulgate, evaluate, implement, provide oversight to, or backstop total maximum daily loads or watershed implementation plans for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed (by a recorded vote of 230 ayes to 195 noes, Roll No. 120); **(See next issue.)**

Gardner amendment (No. 79 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services who develops or promulgates regulations or guidance with regard to Exchanges under subtitle D of title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (by a recorded vote of 241 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 121); **(See next issue.)**

Rooney amendment (No. 13 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled ''Water Quality Standards for the State of Florida's Lakes and Flowing Waters'' published in the Federal Register by the Environmental Protection Agency on December 6, 2010 (by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 189 noes, Roll No. 123); **(See next issue.)**

Stearns amendment (No. 8 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds for the design, renovation, construction, or rental of any headquarters for the United Nations in any location in the United States (by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 191 noes, Roll No. 124); **(See next issue.)**

Flake amendment (No. 377 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds for the construction of an ethanol blender pump or an ethanol storage facility (by a recorded vote of 261 ayes to 158 noes, Roll No. 125); **(See next issue.)**

Hall amendment (No. 495 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to implement, establish, or create a NOAA Climate Service as described in the ''Draft NOAA Climate Service Strategic Vision and Framework'' published at 75 Fed. Reg. 57739 (by a recorded vote of 233 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 127); **(See next issue.)**

Griffith amendment (No. 109 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to the EPA, the Corps of Engineers, or the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement from being used to carry out, implement, administer, or enforce any policy or procedure set forth in the memorandum issued by the EPA (by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 129); **(See next issue.)**

Jones amendment (No. 548 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds for any fishery under the jurisdiction of the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, New England, or Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council to develop or approve a new limited access privilege program (by a recorded vote of 259 ayes to 159 noes, Roll No. 130); **(See next issue.)**

Luetkemeyer amendment (No. 47 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds for the study of the Missouri River Projects authorized in section 108 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009 (by a recorded vote of 245 ayes to 176 noes, Roll No. 131); **(See next issue.)**

Luetkemeyer amendment (No. 149 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds for contributions to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (by a recorded vote of 244 ayes to 179 noes, Roll No. 132); **(See next issue.)**

Sullivan amendment (No. 94 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to implement the decision of the Administrator of the EPA entitled ''Partial Grant of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy to Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 percent'' (by, a recorded vote of 285 ayes to 136 noes, Roll No. 134); **(See next issue.)**

McKinley amendment (No. 216 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used by the Administrator of the EPA to carry out section 404(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (by a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 182 noes, Roll No. 135); **(See next issue.)**

McKinley amendment (No. 217 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds by EPA to develop, propose, finalize, implement, administer, or enforce any regulation that identifies or lists fossil fuel combustion waste as hazardous waste subject to regulation (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 136); **(See next issue.)**

Pompeo amendment (No. 545 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to carry out any of the activities described in section 6A of the Consumer Product Safety Act (by a recorded vote of 234 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 137); **(See next issue.)**

Burgess amendment (No. 200 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight in the Department of

Health and Human Services (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 182 noes, Roll No. 138); **(See next issue.)**

Noem amendment (No. 563 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to modify the national primary ambient air quality standard or the national secondary ambient air quality standard applicable to coarse particulate matter under section 109 of the Clean Air Act (by a recorded vote of 255 ayes to 168 noes, Roll No. 140); **(See next issue.)**

Pitts amendment (No. 430 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, or the Department of the Treasury who takes any action to specify or define, through regulations, guidelines, or otherwise, essential benefits under section 1302 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 141); **(See next issue.)**

Hayworth amendment (No. 567 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to implement section 1899A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kkk), as added by section 3403 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; and **(See next issue.)**

Burgess amendment (No. 154 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to carry out paragraph (11) of section 101 of Public Law 111–226 (by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 145). **(See next issue.)**

Rejected:

McCollum amendment (No. 50 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that sought to prohibit funds from being used for the Department of Defense sponsorship of NASCAR race cars (by a recorded vote of 148 ayes to 281 noes, Roll No. 90); **Pages H1232–33**

Nadler amendment (No. 232 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that sought to limit the use of funds for the United States military operations in Afghanistan to no more than $10,000,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 98 ayes to 331 noes, Roll No. 91); **Pages H1233–34**

Nadler amendment (No. 524 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that sought to prohibit the use of funds to make an application under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) for an order requiring the production of library circulation records, library patron lists, book sales records, or book customer lists (by a recorded vote of 196 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 95); **Pages H1236–37**

Kind amendment (No. 89 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds in to provide payments (or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to provide payments) to the Brazil Cotton Institute (by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 246 noes, Roll No. 101); **Pages H1222–23, H1240–41**

Kind amendment (No. 88 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds in division A of H.R. 1 to be used to research, develop, or test the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle and the Surface-Launched Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missile program (by a recorded vote of 123 ayes to 306 noes, Roll No. 102); **Pages H1223–24, H1241**

Blackburn amendment (No. 104 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to reduce spending by 5.5% in 8 non-security spending subsections of the bill and reduce Legislative Branch appropriations by 11% (by a recorded vote of 147 ayes to 281 noes, Roll No. 103); **Pages H1226–27, H1227–31, H1241–42**

Matheson amendment (No. 496 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to reduce the total amount of appropriations made available by this Act (other than for the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security) by $600,000,000; **(See next issue.)**

Matheson amendment (No. 497 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to reduce the total amount of appropriations made available by this Act (other than for Department of Defense and the U.S. Postal Service) by $280,000,000; **(See next issue.)**

Bishop (NY) amendment (No. 414 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Manhattan, Kansas (by a recorded vote of 156 ayes to 269 noes, Roll No. 104); **Pages H1245–46, (See next issue.)**

Campbell amendment (No. 519 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to reduce funds by 3.5% for the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security (by a recorded vote of 68 ayes to 357 noes, Roll No. 105); **Pages H1246–47, (See next issue.)**

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 246 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for beach replenishment projects by the Army Corps of Engineers (by a recorded vote of 74 ayes to 348 noes, Roll No. 106); **Pages H1247–49, (See next issue.)**

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 263 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to pay any dues to the United Nations (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 243 noes, Roll No. 107);

Page H1249, (See next issue.)

Wu amendment (No. 526 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to implement, administer, or enforce section 3(e) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(e)) (by a recorded vote of 87 ayes to 338 noes, Roll No. 108); **(See next issue.)**

Markey amendment (No. 27 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to issue any new lease that authorizes production of oil or natural gas under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 251 noes, Roll No. 109); **(See next issue.)**

McDermott amendment (No. 99 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to plan for, begin, continue, finish, process, or approve the relocation of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Marine Operations Center-Pacific from Seattle, Washington, to Newport, Oregon (by a recorded vote of 91 ayes to 333 noes, Roll No. 112); **(See next issue.)**

Blumenauer amendment (No. 323 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide benefits described in section 1001D(b)(1)(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(b)(1)(c)) to a person or legal entity in excess of $250,000 (by a recorded vote of 185 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 114); **(See next issue.)**

Kaptur amendment (No. 333 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to reduce by 75% the amount made available for the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program (by a recorded vote of 32 ayes to 394 noes, Roll No. 117);

(See next issue.)

Polis amendment (No. 46 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to maintain an end strength level of members of the Armed Forces of the United States assigned to permanent duty in Europe in excess of 35,000 members and end strength levels for active duty members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force of 565,275, 328,250, and 329,275, respectively, and the amounts otherwise provided by this Act for ''Military Personnel, Army'', ''Military Personnel, Navy'' and ''Military Personnel, Air Force'' in title I of division A are hereby reduced by $155,914,688, $18,047,700, and $118,488,825, respectively (by a recorded vote of 74 ayes to 351 noes, Roll No. 118); **(See next issue.)**

Neugebauer amendment (No. 151 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for repair, alteration, or improvement of the Executive Residence at the White House (by a recorded vote of 63 ayes to 362 noes, Roll No. 122); **(See next issue.)**

Kucinich amendment (No. 233 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the missile defense program of the Department of Defense;

(See next issue.)

Heller amendment (No. 174 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository; **(See next issue.)**

Guinta amendment (No. 166 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to enter into, after the date of the enactment of this Act, a Government contract that requires a project labor agreement (by a recorded vote of 210 ayes to 210 noes, Roll No. 126); **(See next issue.)**

Lee amendment (No. 141 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for any account of the Department of Defense (other than accounts listed in subsection (b)) in excess of the amount made available for such account for fiscal year 2008 (by a recorded vote of 76 ayes to 344 noes, Roll No. 128);

(See next issue.)

Issa amendment (No. 569 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to fund periodic step increases described in Section 5335 of Title V of the United States Code (by a recorded vote of 191 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 133); **(See next issue.)**

Heller amendment (No. 482 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to prohibit funds from being used to designate monuments under the Act of June 8, 1906, (commonly known as the ''Antiquities Act of 1906''; 16 U.S.C. 431, et seq.) (by a recorded vote of 209 ayes to 213 noes, Roll No. 139); **(See next issue.)**

Carney amendment (No. 241 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the Oil and Gas Research and Development Program of the Department of Energy (by a recorded vote of 121 ayes to 300 noes, Roll No. 142); **(See next issue.)**

Mulvaney amendment (No. 164 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit funds from being used in excess of the amount available for such account during fiscal year 2006 (Defense and Homeland Security funds

are exempt) (by a recorded vote of 93 ayes to 328 noes, Roll No. 143); and **(See next issue.)**

King (IA) amendment (No. 273 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit funds from being used to administer the wage-rate requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, with respect to any project or program funded by this Act (by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 233 noes, Roll No. 144). **(See next issue.)**

Withdrawn:

Polis amendment (No. 48 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited the use of funds to be used to enforce section 75.708 of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations, as it relates to section 5205 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7221d); **Pages H1224–25**

Flake amendment (No. 367 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited the use of funds to pay salaries and expenses of Agriculture Department personnel to provide Food Security Act benefits to a person or legal entity if the average adjusted gross income of the person or legal entity exceeds $250,000; **(See next issue.)**

Bishop (UT) amendment (No. 515 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited the use of funds for the National Landscape Conservation System; **(See next issue.)**

Huelskamp amendment (No. 255 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used by the National Labor Relations Board to certify the results of an election of a labor organization under section 9(c)(1) of the National Labor Relations Act that is not conducted by secret ballot; and **(See next issue.)**

LaTourette amendment (No. 540 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have struck all after the enacting clause and inserted new text. **(See next issue.)**

Point of Order sustained against:

King (IA) amendment (No. 266 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds in H.R. 1 or any previous Act, to be used to carry out the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act, or any amendment made by either such Public Law; **Pages H1213–15**

Schrader amendment (No. 552 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to set new 302(b) limits and appropriate more to Homeland Security; **Pages H1221–22**

Poe (TX) amendment (No. 199 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds by the Department of Justice, or any other Agency, to litigate the continuation of the case United States of America v. the State of Arizona and Janice K. Brewer regarding Arizona law S.B. 1070; **Pages H1231–32**

Bishop (NY) amendment (No. 336 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to require the Director of the Congressional Budget Office and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics to jointly study the effect that this Act will have on job levels and report the findings of the study in the Employment Situation Report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics; **Pages H1243–44**

Clyburn amendment (No. 408 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to require that 10% of the funds made available by this Act, for stated Departments and activities, shall be allocated for assistance in persistent poverty counties; **(See next issue.)**

McMorris Rodgers amendment (No. 274 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit funds from being used to pay any employee, contractor, or grantee of the Internal Revenue Service to implement or enforce the provisions of, or amendments made by, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; and **(See next issue.)**

Kaptur en bloc amendment (consisting of amendments No. 329, 330, and 331 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to eliminate the operation and maintenance accounts of the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration. **(See next issue.)**

H. Res. 92, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on February 15th.

Order of Procedure: Agreed by unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to H. Res. 92 and the order of the House of February 17, 2011, it shall be in order for the chair or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments specified in the order of the House of February 17th not earlier disposed of, and that amendments so offered shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by said chair and ranking member, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the

question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. **Page H1244**

Order of Procedure: Agreed by unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to applicable previous orders of the House, each amendment otherwise debatable for 10 minutes instead be debatable for 6 minutes. **(See next issue.)**

United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Representative David Scott of Georgia (in lieu of Representative Austin Scott of Georgia). **(See next issue.)**

House Democracy Partnership—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Minority Leader, in which she appointed the following Members to the House Democracy Partnership: Representative Susan Davis of California (in lieu of Representative Donald Payne of New Jersey) and Representative Gwen Moore of Wisconsin (in lieu of Representative Allyson Schwartz of Pennsylvania). **(See next issue.)**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H1227.

Senate Referrals: S. 365 was referred to the Committee on Energy and the Workforce; S. 266 was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources; and S. 307 was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. **(See next issue.)**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and fifty-seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1232-33, H1233-34, H1234-35, H1235, H1235-36, H1236-37, H1237, H1237-38, H1238-39, H1239, H1240, H1240-41, H1241, H1242. The rest of the votes appear in next issue. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 4:41 a.m. on Saturday, February 19th, pursuant to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 17, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 28, 2011.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

2 p.m., Monday, February 28, 2011

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senator Isakson will deliver Washington's Farewell Address, to be followed by a period of morning business until 3:30. Following which, Senate will begin consideration of S. 23, Patent Reform Act. At 4:30 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of Amy Totenberg, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, and Steve C. Jones, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, with a voice vote on confirmation of the nomination of Amy Totenberg, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, and a roll call vote on confirmation of the nomination of Steve C. Jones, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

2 p.m., Monday, February 28

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E295
Alexander, Rodney, La., E271
Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E273
Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E295
Berkley, Shelley, Nev., E288
Biggert, Judy, Ill., E292, E314
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E299
Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E267
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E262
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E307, E309, E311
Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E296, E297
Capps, Lois, Calif., E271
Carson, André, Ind., E262
Coble, Howard, N.C., E276, E307
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E267
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E274, E279
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E296, E308
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E288, E298
Costa, Jim, Calif., E313
Crenshaw, Ander, Fla., E268
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E278
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E272
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E263, E275
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E311
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E268, E270
Dingell, John D., Mich., E277
Duncan, Jeff, S.C., E272
Duncan, John J., Tenn., E264
Edwards, Donna F., Md., E296
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E273
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E292
Farenthold, Blake, Tex., E288, E291, E292, E295, E300, E301
Farr, Sam, Calif., E312
Filner, Bob, Calif., E311, E312, E312, E313, E313, E314, E314, E314, E315, E315
Franks, Trent, Ariz., E310
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E271
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E265
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E280, E280, E281, E281, E282, E283, E283, E284, E285
Green, Gene, Tex., E266, E295
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E281
Hanabusa, Colleen W., Hawaii, E280
Harman, Jane, Calif., E269, E291
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E263, E269
Hirono, Mazie K., Hawaii, E269, E284, E286, E286
Holt, Rush D., N.J., E289, E290, E300
Hultgren, Randy, Ill., E314
Israel, Steve, N.Y., E282, E287
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E280, E282, E283, E297, E299, E309
Jordan, Jim, Ohio, E289
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E291
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E272, E273, E294, E296
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E297
Lummis, Cynthia M., Wyo., E300
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E274
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E276
McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E275
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E305
McGovern, James P., Mass., E277
McKeon, Howard P. ''Buck'', Calif., E292, E312
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E273, E284, E290
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E277, E280, E281, E282, E286, E286, E287, E287, E291
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E294
Moran, James P., Va., E285
Mulvaney, Mick, S.C., E290
Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E267
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E269
Nunes, Devin, Calif., E261
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E298
Paul, Ron, Tex., E302
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E293, E297, E300, E301, E303, E308
Pearce, Stevan, N.M., E311
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E297
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E289
Pierluisi, Pedro R., Puerto Rico, E279
Poe, Ted, Tex., E268
Richardson, Laura, Calif., E270, E290, E295, E305
Rohrabacher, Dana, Calif., E283
Runyan, Jon, N.J., E288
Sherman, Brad, Calif., E278
Shimkus, John, Ill., E294
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E267
Smith, Adam, Wash., E295
Smith, Adrian, Nebr., E280
Smith, Lamar, Tex., E290
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E262
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E268, E270, E272, E272, E273, E274, E275, E276, E277, E278, E279, E292
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E287, E289, E290, E291, E293
Tonko, Paul, N.Y., E310
Turner, Michael R., Ohio, E309
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E270, E303, E312
Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E310
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E282, E303, E314
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E264
Woodall, Rob, Ga., E274

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.