United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 2011 No. 37

Senate

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

House of Representatives

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:

From the depths, O Lord, You call out for us to be one in mind and one in heart. In an ever-changing world, the focus of our prayer, our energies, and our concern can easily shift day by day. With all our diversity, even united we stand before You very vulnerable.

Today, we pray for our families, friends, and constituents out in the Pacific and its surrounding coasts. Be with these island people who touch the Members and Delegates of this Congress who have represented them always, even in their hour of need.

From our depths, O Lord, we cry out: Have mercy, O Lord. Have mercy.

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 Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia 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 from each side of the aisle.

FOREIGN KILLERS DON'T GO HOME

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Ashton Cline-McMurry, a 16-year-old kid with cerebral palsy, was walking home from a football game in Massachusetts when he was ambushed, beaten, stabbed, and murdered.

One of the killers, Loeun Heng, an illegal from Cambodia, was sent to prison. Ashton's family was promised this murderer would then be deported back to Cambodia after serving his sentence. But he never was. Why? Because Cambodia and other nations refuse to take back their convicted felons from the United States. So the assassin, by U.S. law, has been released on the streets of America. He is still illegally here.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 140,000 criminal aliens in the United States, like Heng, that have been sent to prison, ordered deported, and their native nation stalls, delays, and eventually refuses to take these outlaws back. So they are running loose in the United States.

The worst offending nations are Cuba, China, India, Pakistan, and Jamaica.

The United States should consider cutting aid and stopping visas to a nation that won't take their criminals back. And maybe that will get their attention, and they will take their people home.

And that's just the way it is.

THE REDUCE UNNECESSARY SPENDING ACT OF 2011

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Reduce Unnecessary Spending Act of 2011.

Many decisions made over the past decade on both sides of the aisle contributed to the Nation's untenable debt. The Reduce Unnecessary Spending Act provides another deficit-reduction tool to eliminate unnecessary spending. It grants the President expedited rescission authority to create another opportunity to reduce spending and provides a strong incentive for Congress to work together to trim unnecessary spending and dedicates all spending cuts to deficit reduction.

Expedited rescission is a well-known concept with bipartisan support. The Budget Committee's current chairman, Mr. RYAN, introduced expedited rescission in the 110th Congress. Senator JOHN MCCAIN and Senator THOMAS CARPER have introduced similar legislation this year, with 32 bipartisan cosponsors.

Exercising fiscal responsibility requires strong discipline and a commitment to cutting unnecessary spending. Expedited recession provides another layer of spending cuts and another opportunity for deficit reduction.

Printed on recycled paper.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the legislation.

ENERGY IS JOBS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, you have heard it said many times: Energy is jobs. Energy is jobs.

We have a wealth of resources in our Nation: oil, natural gas, and coal. Yet we see gas prices rising to unbelievable rates here in America, approaching, in many places, in excess of $4 a gallon. And what are we doing about it? Not very much. We've got a permitting process that is failing America. And we have an opportunity today to show America just how bad that problem is.

Later today, I'm going to be introducing a bill called the ROAD to Jobs Act. It stands for regulatory openness, accountability, and disclosure. And we are going to show the American people, through a report that is going to be required from the Council on Environmental Quality, just how flawed that permitting process is, requiring them to show the permits that are in cycle and what the economic implications are of not authorizing permits to go after America's resources.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND SPENDING CUTS

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Last week, we saw real signs of economic recovery when the unemployment rate dropped below 9 percent for the first time in 2 years. This is encouraging news, but we still have a long way to go to promote private sector growth.

The Republicans are digging their heels in on billions of dollars of reckless cuts that threaten our economic growth and put 700,000 American jobs at risk. We agree that spending cuts are necessary to reduce the deficit. This is not about whether to cut or not. This is about where to cut, how much to cut, and how fast to cut. The Republican agenda threatens our core obligations to our seniors, to our safety, and to our future.

We need disciplined budgeting. We need targeted cuts that won't hurt our economy. And we need strategic investments to make America competitive for future generations. Republicans are putting partisan politics ahead of American priorities. Instead of enacting job-destroying cuts, we should be focusing on job creation and sound budgeting.

Enough is enough. It's time to get serious and pass a responsible spending plan that grows the economy and invests in the future.

COMMENDING THE WORK OF THE U.S.-INDIA BUSINESS COUNCIL

(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, I rise to commend the work of the U.S.-India Business Council. Founded in 1975, the primary mission of the USIBC is to strengthen bilateral investments and trade between our two great nations. America and India now share $50 billion in annual trade that mutually benefits both countries. Our two democracies—the world's largest and the world's oldest—have held joint military exercises, increased two-way tourism, and have engaged in bilateral cooperation on many fronts, including the global war on terrorism.

Thanks to the leadership of President Ron Somers, the USIBC, hosted by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has grown to 400 member companies creating jobs in America. Indian businesses have invested billions across the Nation, including Mittal Steel in Georgetown, South Carolina. For 36 years, USIBC has opened the doors of American businesses in India, creating jobs in both countries as strategic partners.

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

I cherish the memory of Addison Morton Graves, who passed away 50 years ago on March 8.

□ 0910

BICYCLING ADVOCATES OFFER POSITIVE MESSAGE OF HOPE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hundreds of cyclists, parents, business people, and especially bike industry leaders who flooded Capitol Hill this week with a message of bike partisanship. They were addressing the issues found on the front page every day in our newspapers about what would happen if we made it easier to use the most efficient form of urban transportation ever designed. It would make a huge difference to the health of our families, dealing with traffic congestion and air pollution, and reduce the tyranny of our addiction to oil if we burned more calories and less fossil fuel.

It is also big business. Billions of dollars are made from the sales, service, manufacturing, and bike tourism. And most important, it makes our communities more livable, our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

Thank you, cycling advocates, for your positive message of hope. I hope that it found receptive ears here on Capitol Hill.

BURDEN OF BUDGET CUTS

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a process now and over the next week to decide how we are going to fund the government for the next few months and for the next year. Republicans have already decided where they want to put the burden of the cuts that we all know we have to make in the budget. They want to put them on the least fortunate of our country.

Let me read something from The Washington Post this week written by Harold Meyerson. Mark Whitehouse of the Wall Street Journal looked at how businesses were dividing up the pie 18 months into every previous recovery since 1947 and found that 58 percent of their increases in productivity trickled down to their workers in increased wages. What has happened today is the other way around: Only 6 percent of productivity gains have gone to our newly more productive workers. In other words, our people, our working families have already paid the price.

What have the corporations and businesses done with that profit that they have made? Mostly, they are buying their stock back. They are not hiring people or investing in research. So as we decide where we are going to tighten the belt as we move forward on our budget, let's make sure that we tighten it on the fat cats as well as the people who have already been strangled.

OPPOSING EDUCATION SPENDING CUTS

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to sit and not say anything about how we are damaging our future. We cannot consider the kind of cuts that are proposed to our future and think that this country will be prosperous. This plan eliminates the funding for math and science partnerships. We must make strategic investments in STEM education in order to maintain a competitive workforce.

This plan eliminates Even Start, Reading is Fundamental, and Striving Readers. It cuts more than $1 billion from Head Start. This represents a massive setback for youth who are most in need. This plan is especially damaging for our youngest children just beginning their academic careers. These children will fall behind before they even get started. The Reading is Fundamental program has provided books for young children whose families cannot afford them.

Mr. Speaker, we must not allow our country to continue to fall behind in competitiveness.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 836.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILSON of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY MORTGAGE RELIEF PROGRAM TERMINATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 836.

□ 0914

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 836) to rescind the unobligated funding for the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program and to terminate the program, with Mr. WESTMORELAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, the American people woke up several days ago to the very sad reality that this Nation has just incurred its single largest monthly deficit in the history of the Nation, $226 billion, which, by a back-of-the-envelope calculation, that is roughly $2,500 for every household in just 1 month. And, Mr. Chairman, February is the shortest month of the year. This is on top of our Nation's first trillion-dollar deficit, our Nation's second trillion-dollar deficit. And now, according to the budget presented by the President of the United States, the third-largest, the largest deficit, in America's history and the third trillion-dollar-plus deficit.

Mr. Chairman, the Nation is drowning in a sea of red ink. If we want to help job creators create jobs today, we have got to start taking away the uncertainty of this huge national debt. If we want to save our children from bankruptcy tomorrow, we have to start doing something about the national debt. But everybody says essentially: well, not in my backyard. Not with my programs. Not today. Let's do it some other day. Let's kick the can down the road.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is a Nation that is borrowing 40 cents on the dollar, much of it from the Chinese, and we are sending the bill to our children and grandchildren. This is a form of intergenerational theft. The Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland, when Republicans were in control and the deficit was a fraction, a fraction of what it is today, he termed it ''fiscal child abuse.'' The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said that when the annual deficit was $200 billion. Now the monthly deficit is $200 billion. If we want to help create jobs today, if we want to spare our children bankruptcy, we have got to quit spending money we don't have.

And so this week, Mr. Chairman, House Republicans have brought a couple of bills to the floor to do something that is rarely ever done in this institution, and that is to save American families and save small businesses money: terminate a program. You know, as we are coming off the 100th anniversary of Ronald Reagan's birthday, I am reminded, and perhaps I don't have the quote exact, but he said something along the lines of the closest thing to eternal life on Earth is a Federal program.

So the bill we have before us today is a program that was originally authorized in 1975 and was never funded in its 35-year history. Now, a billion dollars has been allocated for this program. It is not out the door. Nobody has used that money. It is in a series of so-called foreclosure mitigation programs that the administration has put forth, almost all of which have been abject failures even by their own yardstick, by their own measurement.

Number one, the best foreclosure mitigation program in America is a job. It's a paycheck. It's not a government check, it's a paycheck. Job creators are hampered by the uncertainty of the national debt. Historic levels of debt will lead to historic levels of taxation, which leads to historic levels of unemployment.

□ 0920

The equation could not be more true. The equation could not be more elementary.

But don't take my word for it, Mr. Chairman. Let's hear from some of the job creators in America. Let's hear from the CEO of Caterpillar, which employs tens of thousands of people across our Nation: Unfunded entitlement programs, coupled with the coming wave of retiring baby boomers, will push the deficit to untenable levels. It is a train wreck.

Mike Jackson, the CEO of AutoNation, with 19,000 employees: The best thing that this town could do to help the economic recovery become sustainable is to deal with the deficit.

Bernie Marcus, the former chairman and CEO of Home Depot, with over 200,000 employees in the U.S.: If we continue this kind of policy, we are dead in the water. Businesspeople, they don't know what's coming—the debt, the budget. This debt we have is in the trillions. I'm going to have to pay for this somehow.

Mr. Chairman, these are just a few of the voices of job creators.

I am heartened to see that the unemployment rate ticked down last month. Frankly, it is attributable mostly to the fact that we now have a divided government. Job creators now know there is at least some check on the excesses of the Obama administration. It is a testament to the fact that, at the end of the last Congress, Republicans were successful in blocking, at least for 2 years, the single largest tax increase in America's history, and I don't know any American who believes that if you increase taxes on one's company that that's going to lead to a raise, to a bonus, or to employing more workers.

Finally, we have what Warren Buffett calls the regenerative nature of the free enterprise system. This is an economy that wants to recover; but since the Great Depression, we've never had a longer recession or a more tepid recovery, which is due to the policies of the President and of the previous Democratic Congresses. So, if we want to help create jobs today, we're going to have to show that we can put the Nation on a fiscally sustainable path.

Now, this is a $1 billion program where not $1 has left the door yet. I'm sitting here thinking, Mr. Chairman: If this body, after having 75, 76 some odd different government housing programs that add up to, roughly, 56 some odd billion dollars that, frankly, have grown at an exponential over the family budget—the family budget has to pay for the HUD budget—if we can't terminate, in order to save our children from bankruptcy, in order to help create jobs, one program at $1 billion where not one penny has left the door, how are we ever going to make the tough decisions that are necessary to save the country from bankruptcy?

Mr. Chairman, at some point, you've got to quit spending money you don't have. At some point, when do you ever say enough is enough? When do you say we are tired of borrowing money from the Chinese? Is it the future of our children? Is it their destiny to shine the shoes of the Chinese? Is it our children's destiny that one day they'll wait tables for the Chinese? It's not the dream I have for my 7-year-old son. It's not the dream I have for my 9-year-old daughter. It's not the American dream.

The American Dream is to leave your children with greater freedoms, greater opportunity, and a higher standard of living. That's what I believe the American Dream is.

If we can't terminate one program from which the Obama administration itself says we're going to lose 98 cents on the dollar—I didn't say it; it was the Obama administration that said it, losing 98 cents on the dollar. If we can't do this, Mr. Chairman, I have great fear and great trepidation for the future.

So I urge my colleagues to take one small, tiny baby step towards the path of fiscal sustainability. Take one measured baby step, and tell job creators in

America we are going to put the Nation's fiscal house in order. Go ahead. It's safe to invest in America again. It's safe to create jobs.

We're going to get this done. Take one tiny step today to help create those jobs and save our children from a pathway to bankruptcy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I hope Members will be careful walking on the floor right now, especially on the Republican side of the aisle, because I wouldn't want anyone to fall into the enormous gap that has just been created between the gentleman's comments and his voting record.

Mr. Chairman, we heard a great argument about the need to cut the budget deficit and stop spending. During the recent debate on the budget, an amendment was offered to limit entitlement spending to farmers to $250,000 per entity. The amendment said no agricultural entity, no individual, could get more than $250,000 per year. It was defeated by the Republican Party. The majority of Democrats voted for it. It will cost $1 billion over 10 years—at least.

We had the Brazilian cotton farmers, but my friends on the other side hate for me to mention that because unpleasant reality is always bothersome. You know, over a 4-year period, we're going to spend more money subsidizing American and Brazilian cotton farmers than we are on this program.

The gentleman from Alabama said yesterday that it was Obama who made him do it. Rather implausibly, he argued that he was compelled to follow this recommendation of the Obama administration to send $150 million a year to Brazilian cotton farmers for 4 years because the President told him to do it. Well, that's a very selective invocation of the President, I must say—no more persuasive than Flip Wilson having invoked the devil as having made him do it, and of course there are sometimes analogies in the way in which they refer to the President.

One hundred fifty million dollars. Now, the argument, by the way, was that we have to send $150 million to Brazilian cotton farmers. The gentleman voted for it because otherwise we would be in trouble with the World Trade Organization. But we could have saved that $150 million to the Brazilians by not sending $150 million to the American cotton farmers. By the way, that would include American cotton farmers who could get more than $250,000 a year.

So we're not debating whether or not we should reduce the deficit. It is how. Do you exempt agriculture, as many of my friends do, because they represent agricultural districts? As for conservatism and the free market, it has got no application to the growth of cotton or grain or of many of these other programs that receive so much money.

Beyond that, we have the military. Now, we're talking here about trying to stop a serious economic problem in American cities. Well, we can't afford that, but $400 million was voted to be spent on infrastructure in Afghanistan. I do not think that that $400 million will be very well spent. I understand there are some national security needs, but I think that that war has gone on too long. And the notion of sending $400 million to build up the cities in Afghanistan and to deny helping America makes no sense.

We are also being told that we can send $1.2 billion for Iraqi security forces over and above what we spend on the American military. We are sending $1.2 billion. I voted against that. Members on the other side voted for it. The whole war in Iraq has been an enormous waste, in my judgment, of American money at the cost of American lives. Brave, young Americans went to war when they were asked to by their country, but it was a mistake for them to be sent there. The war in Iraq has so dwarfed any domestic expenditures in this area that I do not understand how Members can, on the one hand, talk seriously about cutting the deficit and then have voted for more and more and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars for that war in Iraq.

Now we have another point that should be made. It is true this $1 billion that we are asking for—and by the way, according to the CBO, it will cost $840 million, not 98 percent in total expenditure, but 84 percent. It's still a high number, but $140 million is still $140 million. So this will cost $840 million, according to the CBO, if it is fully run. It is going to come out of the Treasury right now, but let's be clear: The reason it will come out of the Treasury as we try to deal with this—by the way, here is what the program is:

It says to Americans who took out mortgages and became unemployed that we will help them pay their mortgages because you can't afford mortgage payments out of unemployment compensation.

□ 0930

That's the lavishness of this program. We're taking people who are in trouble and facing losing their homes and having more foreclosures, which have negative effects not just on the individual foreclosed, but on the neighborhood, on the city, on the whole economy. So this has a macroeconomic impact, but we are going to come to their assistance.

In the financial reform bill passed last summer, we, in the conference committee, voted to take this money from an assessment on the largest financial institutions. We voted that financial institutions with $50 billion or more in assets and hedge funds with $10 billion or more in assets would have to pay for this. And our logic was that it was the activity of these institutions that caused the crisis that led to the unemployment and led to the foreclosures. Many of them profited from it.

And we then had the TARP—and this is money that we voted in the TARP in another set of programs—and we said, you benefited from intervention. We didn't do it because we loved you. We did it because we had to save the economy from going upside down. I know Members like to rail about bailouts, but let's be very clear: every activity in the United States—known as a bailout recently—was at the initiative of the George Bush administration or Mr. Paulsen and Mr. Bernanke. And they were bipartisanly supported, and I agree that we had to do them. We had to do them because of failures in past regulatory policy.

But the fact is that in the bill we passed last summer, this money wouldn't have come from the Treasury. It wouldn't have added to the deficit. It would have been recouped from an assessment on large financial institutions. The Republican Party blocked it—not here, they didn't have the votes here, as we don't often have the votes today, but in the Senate.

So I will make this announcement: I plan to reintroduce next week the provision of the financial reform bill that would have taken the money for this program and other programs to alleviate the impact of foreclosure—the Neighborhood Stabilization Program that helps get foreclosed property back into productive use, aid to the homeowners who are unemployed—and pay for it, as we tried to do last July but Republican opposition stopped us, not from the taxpayer, but from the large institutions. And I don't mean to demonize, but I think Goldman Sachs and Wells Fargo and the Bank of America and Citicorp and Morgan Stanley and the large hedge funds, I think they can pay for this. That's what we would have done. So I agree, this should not come from the taxpayer.

By the way, with regard to the bill we debated yesterday—and I regret not pointing this out, but, you know, you can only correct so much error in a limited amount of time. I talk fast, but error outpaces me when we get into these debates.

We were talking yesterday about money that was going to be spent in another program, the FHA refi. And people talked about $8 billion. Yes, $8 billion—it won't cost $8 billion—but $8 billion that was set aside, if necessary, from the TARP. And people said that TARP money was promised to go back to the taxpayers. It was, and here's how—Members may have forgotten this, having voted for it; but in the TARP legislation we added a provision that said in 2013, when the TARP is concluded, the President at that time is mandated to send to the Congress a bill that would recoup the funds that had not been returned to the Treasury from those large financial institutions. And we reiterated that in the financial reform bill over the Republicans' objections.

So the point is this: the TARP money that will be spent—if it is on the refinancing—and the TARP money that will be spent on the HAMP program will not come out of the Treasury. It will be reimbursed to the Treasury—if my colleagues on the other side go along with what we voted for—from the large financial institutions. So let's be very clear, whether we are talking about the programs in the financial reform bill or the programs in the TARP, they are a package of programs to deal with the consequences of foreclosure.

I must say, I saw a draft of my Republican colleagues' budget views, and they said—astonishingly—that spending TARP money to deal with foreclosures was inappropriate because those were unrelated to the financial crisis. Foreclosures unrelated to the financial crisis? That is an illogic that I am surprised at. Ideology drives you to certain ridiculous conclusions, but that one goes further into that than I would have thought.

So let's again be very clear. Our proposals are that the large financial institutions—assets of $50 billion or more, hedge funds of $10 billion or more, most of which would direct beneficiaries of our activity in dealing with the financial crisis that many of them helped cause—that's how we will fund these programs.

So with regard to the HAMP, with regard to the FHA refinance, no, that will not come out of the Treasury. That will be reimbursed ultimately, yes. The TARP money goes back and the law calls for that to be assessed. And so, yes, I understand my Republican colleagues, they don't want Goldman Sachs or Citicorp or any of the large financial institutions or any of the large hedge funds to have to pay the cost. But that's what the debate is, not the Treasury and the average taxpayer versus alleviation of foreclosure, the large financial institutions.

And, yes, they did succeed, temporarily, I hope, in changing that. They knocked out of our bill a requirement that the large financial institutions would help us mitigate foreclosures and help us have cities buy up property that is rotting and causing trouble; and, unfortunately, temporarily, that's not the case.

But I will file the bill next week. And given their concern for the taxpayer and the deficit, they will have a choice: do you add the cost of these programs to the deficit, because they're not going to become law, these repealers. The President is going to veto them. The Senate won't pass them even for him to do that. Are you then going to say that it will come out of the deficit, or will you join us in taking it from Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley and the Bank of America and those unreasonable institutions that do a lot of good work, but they can afford this $1 billion. Their bonuses alone would pay for these programs.

So let's be clear what the choice is. First of all, we have people who are prepared to send money to Brazilian cotton farmers so they can send money to American cotton farmers. They will not limit entitlements to agricultural individuals to $250,000 a year. They'll send billions to Afghanistan and Iraq that will be wasted, not for our defense, but to build up their infrastructure and their security. And then, when it does come to the relatively small amount that we will be spending on some of these programs, like $840 million here—and that's small compared to what they spend elsewhere, for instance, in their wars—they would rather have it come out of the taxpayer. They would rather not spend it at all; but if they have a second choice, it comes out of the taxpayer and not out of the large financial institutions.

So let's frame the debate appropriately. The large financial institutions, because of inappropriate regulation and improper regulation during the Bush years—fairly, the Clinton years as well, but mostly the Bush years—provoked a financial crisis. We began to deal with it in 2008 in the last months of the Bush administration in a bipartisan way. We did it. We provided some funding in the first instance to those very financial institutions, not out of love for them, but because we thought that was needed to stabilize.

The requirement is that any money spent under the TARP will ultimately be recouped by an assessment on the large financial institutions. Apparently, the Republicans want to forget that one. They want to act as if it's the Treasury, apparently because they can't bear the thought of telling the large financial institutions, who were a large part of the cause of the financial crisis and benefited from our efforts to correct it, that they should have to pay.

And we do know that when we said this program and programs to give money to municipalities—which they very much want—to buy up property that would otherwise fester because there would be nobody to make them take care of it, that they prefer that to be paid for by the taxpayer than by the large financial institutions. We'll give them a chance to correct that mistake.

So I hope this bill is defeated. And next week we will have legislation that I hope our committee will be having hearings on and act on which will reinstate the provision that says all of the four programs we're dealing with this week and next week will be dealt with in one of two ways: it will be financed by the TARP, and that money will be recovered when the program is over by an assessment on the large financial institutions; and the smaller amounts that will go to this program, that money will also be recouped from the large financial institutions. And those institutions which received hundreds of billions—they have repaid it and it has been useful—but they were great beneficiaries of it. They caused some of the problem in general. They will be the ones that will bear the cost.

So that's the choice. We have a choice of doing nothing to alleviate the impact of foreclosures on the overall economy, on municipalities, and on families, or of doing something and recouping that money from the large financial institutions.

□ 0940

I hope that we will, in the end, decide that we were right to say that the large financial institutions can appropriately be asked to bear part of that burden.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, for the past several years the conversation in Washington has been about how much we can increase spending. Today, the debate is centered on how much we can increase savings.

On November 2, voters sent a message that they will not sit by as Congress spends our way into national decline. It was a statement of rejection towards a buildup of debt and burdensome regulation that continues to cloud the prospects for the future.

The new Republican majority has responded with a cut-and-grow agenda designed to produce results. We're cutting spending and job-destroying regulations and growing private sector jobs in the economy.

Last month, we voted to cut spending down to 2008 levels. Today, through our YouCut program, we offer American taxpayers the opportunity to recoup roughly $300 million dollars in wasteful spending. The savings come from terminating a program funded in the Dodd-Frank regulatory bill. This mandatory spending program allegedly provides loans to homeowners potentially facing foreclosure, but it is estimated that the subsidy rate, meaning the amount of the loan that will not be repaid, is 98 cents out of every dollar.

So we are borrowing money we don't have to give loans to certain homeowners that can't repay and that other American families will have to pay back in higher taxes in the future. This program truly does not make sense and leaves everyone worse off.

At a time, Mr. Chairman, when we must do everything in our power to balance the Federal budget, this legislation must pass. And I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT. I thank our ranking member for yielding time.

I'm here today because this is a series of actions, all of which I oppose, that are in sequence. And I think we need to put this in perspective.

Yesterday, my colleagues were proposing to terminate the FHA Refinance Program that helps people refinance mortgages under FHA. Next week,

we'll be back on the floor out of our committee with a proposal that they have made to do away with the Community Stabilization Program, which is designed really to stabilize communities and keep people who own properties and are trying to pay their mortgages from seeing the values of their properties go down even further. And next week they'll be offering a proposal to do away with the mortgage refinance assistance program called HAMP.

Of all of the four proposals, including the one we're here debating today, this, I think, is the most mean spirited and most duplicitous one and I think the one that most vigorously deserves to be opposed by my colleagues here in the House; because this proposes to do away with a program that assists people who were employed, got a mortgage, were paying their mortgage, then lost their jobs to the downturn in the economy and found themselves in a position where they could no longer afford to pay their mortgage. These are not people who were out getting second homes. These are working people who had jobs, fell on bad times, and lost their jobs and getting unemployment benefits. And all we're saying is give them a break for 12 months and give them the opportunity to go back into the marketplace and find a job, and then they can resume paying their mortgages.

It is absolutely mean spirited to say to somebody who has complied with all the rules and lost their job by no fault of their own and then find themselves unable to pay their mortgages that we won't try to give you some measure of relief.

It's further complicated—made even more duplicitous, really—by a provision that has been inserted into this bill that directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to conduct a study and, based on that study, issue a report on the best practices that could be used to implement this program—a program which they are proposing to terminate.

Why would you spend taxpayer money to have a study on the best practices to implement a program that the bill itself says is going to be terminated? A waste of taxpayer money. Yet my colleagues are here representing to the Members of this House and to the American public that their whole objective is to save the taxpayers money.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WATT. I don't understand the rationale of my colleagues. And it would be something else if this bill were going to see the light of day in the Senate. It's not going anywhere.

This is a message bill, Mr. Chairman. That's all this is about. Let's send a message to the American people that we can cut. Whether we're cutting money that's taxpayer money or cutting money that's going to be paid out of the top fund that the law requires the biggest financial institutions in America to make the taxpayers whole, if, at the end of the day there is a deficit in repaying this money, it doesn't matter. Let's just stand up and beat on our chest and say to the American people and think that they will believe that we are doing something to save them tax dollars.

This bill saves no tax dollars, and it's an abomination.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM).

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program Termination Act.

And I'm sitting here and I hear that we're mean spirited, and it makes me think of the last year that I had with my father before he passed away. I spent a lot of time with my dad because I was taking him to the hospital. He had lung cancer. And we had to sit and wait, often more than an hour, to see the doctor to get his tests or to get his chemo.

And I asked my father, knowing that his life was nearing the end, what was the toughest thing that he ever had to do. My father told me the toughest thing he ever had to do was tell his children ''no.'' Sometimes when you're a child, you don't understand. You ask for things, whether it be new hockey skates or a new baseball mitt, or whatever it may be, and a good parent sometimes says they can't afford it.

Well, I don't think it's mean spirited to step up and answer the message not that we're sending, but the message that the American people sent us that we cannot continue reckless spending. And this program, to put it right back on point, this program is the poster child of waste and reckless spending.

□ 0950

It's not me. It's not anyone in this Chamber that said it's going to be subsidized 98 cents on the dollar, we will lose 98 cents on the dollar. The administration said that: 98 cents on the dollar. We cannot continue to spend on programs that are failing. That is the definition of waste. We were sent here to cut the spending, to stop the waste for one reason, so that we can grow the economy. And when we grow that economy, we actually create jobs. The whole point, if I understand the argument on the Democratic side, is that these people have lost their jobs.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. GRIMM. For that reason, the answer is not more failed programs; it's growing the economy and creating a job. We need to give them hope, not false hope.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Two years ago, the President told us that we were all to blame for the housing bubble and the financial crisis that followed. No, we're not. Those families who passed up the get-rich-quick real estate seminars and who turned down the loans that they couldn't afford, or who settled for a smaller home, or who rented because that's all they could afford, they're not to blame. And they shouldn't be left holding the bag.

Ninety-one percent of Americans are making their mortgage payments not only because it's the right thing to do, but because they know that the sooner the market corrects itself the sooner their homes will begin to appreciate once again. By propping up bad loans and by undermining responsible homeowners, our government's extending the agony and postponing the day when the market stabilizes and home buyers can safely reenter the housing market.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. I have been listening to the discussion. Certainly over the last several years I have been in the committee where we have seen program after program being introduced to try to alleviate the problem that we know exists with the foreclosure issue. But this is about making choices today. This is about making choices about programs that are working, programs that are not working, programs that are costing too much, and programs that we need to reshape and reform.

I believe this program is one that we can in good measure eliminate. It hasn't really gotten started. It's a billion-dollar program, and in some sense we already know, and we've heard from many in the discussion, that 98 cents out of every dollar that's set forth as a loan in this program will actually be a forgiven loan.

Now, we talk about fairness and mean-spiritedness. Is it fair to the rest of the folks who are working, scraping, paying their mortgages every single day to know that 98 cents of every dollar that goes out the door in helping some other folks is never going to come back in when the original agreement—it is a loan. I think this is a good-sense cut that will lead to more jobs and better-sense government.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself 15 seconds to note that I am not surprised at that, because there are people on the other side who think it's unfair to pay the unemployed anything, like unemployment compensation. So, no, I don't think it's unfair to say to people who are unemployed in this economy that they will get some economic help. And that's what this is about.

I yield 3¾ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 836. This is one of four anti-foreclosure programs that the majority is voting to terminate. This particular program they want to terminate today is designed to assist homeowners who have experienced a significant reduction in income or are at risk of foreclosure due to loss of a job, involuntary unemployment, underemployment, or a medical condition.

This is a group that needs our help. There are 1.2 million households with a mortgage where a head of household or spouse is unemployed. And in my home State of New York, where Mr. GRIMM—I wish I had the opportunity to ask him, was he aware that 142,000 households in our home State have a mortgage with a person who is the head of the household or spouse is unemployed. And this program potentially could have helped those people.

The majority leader who spoke earlier, in his home State, the great State of Virginia, there are over 59,000 households that have a mortgage in which someone in the family is underemployed or unemployed. And in the great State of Texas, the largest number of households with a mortgage and a spouse or head of household who is unemployed, there are over 172,000 families in this terrible situation.

Families across the country would benefit from the program. But instead, they are cutting it. The program fulfills an important gap because it addresses a temporary loss of income and helps homeowners when they are most vulnerable. It has been successful in Pennsylvania, which has its own State-run program. Over 45,000 homeowners have been assisted, with an average loan of $11,000; and 85 percent of these recipients have been able to stay in their homes as a result. If we continued this program, we would be able to help families across the country.

So I oppose terminating the program, and I oppose tossing hardworking Americans out in the street. I oppose this mean-spirited effort to terminate help for unemployed Americans.

Now, to put this in perspective, this program is one of four that the majority is putting forward to terminate programs that would help people stay in their homes. Yesterday, they terminated the FHA Refinance Program. Next week they're going to attempt to terminate HAMP and the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. Yet economist after economist tell us that in order to strengthen our economy we have to stabilize the housing market.

So these cuts are wrong. They are wrong in the first place, and they are certainly wrong at this time when we are working to dig our way out of this hole and to get people back to work.

This program, like the others, is narrowly tailored to help a specific class of homeowners because of this economy and because of the high level of unemployment. During the financial crisis, we lost 7 million jobs in this country. We are slowly gaining jobs again, but we are not even at the point where we are keeping place with the workforce.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

EMERGENCY HOMEOWNER LOAN PROGRAM (EHLP) STATE ALLOCATIONS—OCTOBER 2010

State	Households with a Mortgage, Head or Spouse in the Labor force	Household with a Mortgage, Head or Spouse Unemployed	Share	HUD Allocation
Texas	3,091,395	172,280	0.1354	135,418,959
New York	2,282,350	142,040	0.1116	111,649,112
Pennsylvania	1,960,525	134,605	0.1058	105,804,905
Massachusetts	1,048,520	77,650	0.0610	61,036,001
Washington	1,052,975	71,590	0.0563	56,272,599
Minnesota	1,003,985	71,050	0.0558	55,848,137
Wisconsin	974,890	65,570	0.0515	51,540,638
Missouri	948,920	62,340	0.0490	49,001,729
Virginia	1,284,620	59,320	0.0466	46,627,889
Colorado	865,890	52,525	0.0413	41,286,747
Maryland	986,825	50,840	0.0400	39,962,270
Connecticut	599,820	41,915	0.0329	32,946,864
Kansas	441,240	22,580	0.0177	17,748,782
Arkansas	372,850	22,565	0.0177	17,736,991
Iowa	514,585	22,110	0.0174	17,379,343
Louisiana	570,160	21,235	0.0167	16,691,558
Utah	413,850	21,090	0.0166	16,577,582
Oklahoma	499,880	19,815	0.0156	15,575,381
Puerto Rico	241,335	18,720	0.0147	14,714,668
Idaho	243,960	16,900	0.0133	13,284,075
New Hampshire	236,540	16,100	0.0127	12,655,243
New Mexico	261,340	13,645	0.0107	10,725,515
Maine	230,635	13,205	0.0104	10,379,657
West Virginia	228,700	10,610	0.0083	8,339,884
Nebraska	285,530	10,565	0.0083	8,304,512
Hawaii	148,885	8,005	0.0063	6,292,250
Delaware	146,535	7,695	0.0060	6,048,577
Montana	132,410	7,265	0.0057	5,710,580
Vermont	109,490	6,145	0.0048	4,830,215
Alaska	94,145	4,950	0.0039	3,890,898
Wyoming	85,010	2,985	0.0023	2,346,329
South Dakota	117,250	2,610	0.0021	2,051,563
North Dakota	94,275	1,680	0.0013	1,320,547
Total		1,272,200	100%	1,000,000,000

Source: Census—American Community Survey, 2009.

Note: EHLP funds were allocated based on each eligible state's share of unemployed homeowners with a mortgage in 2009. Actual allocations to states will be reduced on a pro-rata basis to cover HUD administrative costs (To Be Determined).

Mr. BACHUS. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chair, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there is a more basic and fundamental question that we are confronting today. That question is, Can we continue to go out of our way to help major corporations? As a matter of fact, $700 billion. Can we go out of our way to help them and make sure that the programs work for them and then turn our backs on the taxpayers that helped those very same major corporations? That's the basic question that we have to contend with. Are the banks and the major corporations too big to fail and are the taxpaying Americans who helped bail them out too small to help?

□ 1000

Can we continue to end programs that help people stay in their homes that did not create the exotic products, that did not create prepayment penalties that coincide with teaser rates, that did not create loans wherein you qualify for your teaser rate but you don't qualify for your adjusted rate? Can we continue to allow them to be evicted when we can help some of them?

We may not be able to help everybody, but when you can help somebody, you ought to try to do the best that you can and help those that you can.

With reference to the FHA refi that passed, that was ended yesterday by a vote of this House, that bill did not lose money unless persons failed to pay their mortgages. It was only if mortgages were not repaid that FHA came forward and covered the cost. So to say that it cost $8 billion is incorrect. It cost whatever at the end of the program may have been spent; but that

money had not been spent, so the money was there.

There was also a premium to be paid by persons who got the refis. FHA was going to help a lot of people stay in their homes and help a lot of communities and neighborhoods maintain their integrity and their property values.

We, today, have an opportunity to help people with emergency mortgage assistance, people who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own because of this downturn in the economy. It is a very simple premise.

Will we allow ourselves to save major corporations and deny the people, the taxpaying Americans, some help in their time of need?

If there is one thing that I heard from American people, it was: Where is my bailout?

Well, when we come up to the plate, and we try to help people who actually need and merit the help, somebody comes forward and finds a reason why we can't help them. This is the day to help those American people. Let's not let them be too small to help while others will allow banks to be too big to fail.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chair, at this time I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, again, we cannot lose sight of the fact that our Nation is drowning in a sea of red ink. It is a sea of red ink that continues to hamper job creation. Job creators today are uncertain of our future.

They know, though, they know that historic levels of debt lead to historic levels of taxation, which can only lead to historic levels of unemployment. They are looking for some signal from this body that we get it, that we get it, that we are going to stop borrowing 40 cents on the dollar, much of it from the Chinese, and sending the bill to our children and our grandchildren.

Again, when the annual deficit, the annual deficit was $200 billion and dropping, as opposed to the monthly deficit, which is now over 200 billion, but when the annual deficit was 200 billion, the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, said that was fiscal child abuse.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle are introducing the term ''mean spirited.'' I don't know. Is fiscal child abuse mean spirited? It's their term, Madam Chair. I will let them reflect upon that.

Now I hear the ranking member talk about fiscal responsibility, and he points to one item: cotton. We have heard cotton throughout this debate. But I would note that the ranking member apparently voted for the conference report on the farm bill which includes cotton subsidies that he comes to this floor to decry.

He speaks about a WTO decision, but it's the Obama administration that says that countervailing measures would have cost this country more than 800 million. I suppose we could have that debate, but I would recommend that the ranking member have the debate with the Obama administration, because that's where many of us got the information.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. There were two ways we could have dealt with it, yes. The gentleman and the Obama administration on one side. I disagree with the President. We could have avoided that by reducing American cotton subsidies to the same amount as we did with Brazil. So we could have either saved 300 million or not.

Mr. HENSARLING. Reclaiming my time, I would just point out to the ranking member that was not the vote before us. And if there was a chance to get out the cotton subsidies—and I must admit people on both sides of the aisle vote for them, but the opportunity was at the point of the conference report on the farm bill which the gentleman from Massachusetts voted for.

But to put this again in a larger context, we on this side of the aisle fervently believe that you will not have job creation until you put the Nation on a fiscally sustainable path. We are talking about $1 billion here. If we can't do it on this program, what program can we do it on?

And I must admit, I also find it ironic how many of my friends on the other side of the aisle will come to the floor and say, You know what? There are people in this Nation trying to force loans onto people who are unemployed, people who can't afford to pay it back, people who are in debt. That's predatory lending, and now they want the government to do the same thing.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chair, I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. HENSARLING. We heard throughout the debate there needs to be a consistency, a consistency of debate. So let me get this right. A payday lender is guilty of predatory lending if they loan money to somebody who is underwater, to somebody who may be struggling, but if the Federal Government does it, it's something else. It's noble. I don't see the consistency in the debate there, Madam Chair.

But again, most importantly, when does the day arrive that we quit spending money we do not have? I say today is that day.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. How much time remains, Madam Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alabama has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. May I inquire, do we have general leave?

The Acting CHAIR. Yes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, the last statement is, of course, totally contradictory from the gentleman from Texas. But when you just want to bash things, you will say anything.

You cannot simultaneously say this program is too generous because of its forgiveness and is a predatory loan. The fact is it has very generous forgiveness provisions, which is why it is scored at 84 percent, not 98 percent. So that argument the gentleman just made is, of course, entirely self-contradictory because it can't be both.

Secondly, as to agriculture, I did vote for an amendment that would change it, but the gentleman, the spectacle of my Republican colleagues hiding behind Obama is bizarre. You could have done what we have offered, which was to cut the $150 million from going to Brazil and then cut it out of America. But it's not the only item I mentioned.

I mentioned the $1.2 billion the gentleman wanted to send to Iraqi security forces, the 400 million to build infrastructure in Kandahar and Kabul, the $250,000 limit the Republicans rejected on individual entities. So, no, there are billions in agriculture and the military. I didn't just mention one item.

The gentlemen do understand that they are vulnerable, so they blame Obama. They and Obama are both wrong about sending money to Brazil. But the most important point is this, and I hope in his final time the gentleman from Alabama will address it.

In the first place, on two of these programs—the HAMP Program, which we will deal with next week on the floor, and the FHA refi—the money doesn't come from the Treasury. They keep saying it, but they are wrong, and ignoring a fact doesn't make it go away. Those are funds that come from TARP.

In the financial reform bill, we reinforced an earlier provision. It says, the FDIC ''is authorized to conduct risk-based assessments on financial companies'' to pay for this, the money that's left in the TARP. We have a mandate to the FDIC so that when the TARP is finished, large financial companies will have to pay this, not the Treasury.

So I know that troubles people on the other side. They are solicitous of these large financial companies. But when they talk about it adding to the deficit, they are wrong. It is statutorily required that this will come, over their objection, from the large financial institutions.

As to the other two programs, including the one today, we had similar language in our bill to do that. It was rejected by the Republicans because we needed to get 60 votes in the Senate. So, yes, for now, that 840 million will come out of the taxpayer. If we had our way and the Republicans had not been successful in frustrating us, it would have also come from Goldman Sachs and from Morgan Stanley and the other large institutions, and I will give them another chance.

So the fact is that the bulk of this money does not come from the Treasury. It is mandated that it will be repaid back to the TARP, and I hope the gentleman from Alabama will address that in his final remarks.

□ 1010

Is he for repealing that? Does he believe we should not as we have said we would twice legislatively, including on one bill he voted for, assess the large financial institutions and hedge funds? Does he want to take it off? But of course if he doesn't, it doesn't come from the Treasury. It doesn't add to the deficit. It may reduce the bonuses at some of the large financial firms, it may reduce the dividends at some of the large financial firms, but that's not adding to the deficit in a way that we care about.

And as to the other money, the money for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and for this program, if they will come back with us and join, that also will come from the large financial institutions.

So let's drop the phony arguments about the deficit. If you want to protect the large financial institutions, be honest about saying so.

TITLE XVI—FINANCIAL CRISIS ASSESSMENT AND FUND

SEC. 1601. FINANCIAL CRISIS SPECIAL ASSESSMENT.

(a) SPECIAL ASSESSMENT.—The Council shall impose, and the Corporation shall collect on behalf of the Council, one or more special assessments on the financial companies identified in subsections (e) and (f) to collect, in the aggregate, the lesser of—

(1) $19,000,000,000; and

(2) the product of 1⅓ and the amount necessary to fully offset the net deficit effects of the provisions of this Act (excluding the effects of sections 1601 and 1602) for the period starting on the date of enactment of this Act and through September 30, 2020, which amount shall be determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget—

(A) by reference to the latest statement submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairmen of the House and Senate Budget Committees titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, excluding the net deficit effects of the special assessments imposed under sections 1601 and 1602, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage in the House acting first on the conference report for that Act; or

(b) TIMING OF PAYMENTS.—The special assessments described under subsection (a) shall be collected on an annual basis, with the first payment due no later than September 30, 2012, and subsequent payments due no later than September 30, 2013, no later than September 30, 2014, and no later than September 30, 2015, respectively.

(c) ASSESSMENTS PLACED IN THE FINANCIAL CRISIS SPECIAL ASSESSMENT FUND.—Special assessments collected pursuant to this section shall be deposited by the Corporation as follows:

(1) The first $15,000,000 in special assessments collected pursuant to this section shall be deposited in an account to be maintained by the Corporation for the payment of reasonable implementation and administrative expenses of the Corporation associated with the collection of assessments for the Financial Crisis Special Assessment Fund established under section 1602; and

(2) the remainder of the special assessments shall be deposited into the Financial Crisis Special Assessment Fund established under section 1602.

(e) COMPANIES SUBJECT TO ASSESSMENT.—The Council shall impose risk-based assessments on and the Corporation shall collect such assessments from financial companies in such amount and manner and subject to such terms and conditions that the Council determines are necessary in order to satisfy the requirements of subsections (a), (f), (g) and (h).

(f) MINIMUM ASSESSMENT THRESHOLD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall not assess financial companies with less than $50,000,000,000, adjusted for inflation, in assets on a consolidated basis and shall assess financial companies with $50,000,000,000, adjusted for inflation, or more in assets in accordance with subsections (g) and (h).

(2) HEDGE FUNDS.—The Council shall not assess financial companies that manage hedge funds (as defined by the Council, in consultation with the Securities and Exchange Commission, for purposes of this section) with less than $10,000,000,000, adjusted for inflation, of assets under management on a consolidated basis, and shall assess any financial companies that manage hedge funds with $10,000,000,000 or more of assets under management in accordance with subsections (g) and (h).

(h) REQUIREMENT FOR EQUITABLE TREATMENT IN ASSESSMENTS.—In establishing the special assessment system under this section, the Council shall consider differences among financial companies based on complexity of operations or organization, interconnectedness, size, direct or indirect activities, and any other risk-related factors the Council may deem appropriate to ensure that the assessments charged take into account the risk posed to the financial system by particular classes of financial companies.

(6) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ASSESSMENTS.—Any financial company that fails or refuses to pay any assessment under this section shall be subject to a penalty under section 18(h) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as if that financial company were an insured depository institution.

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

The American people have sent us here to tell the truth, and the truth is that there are too many government programs that do not work and actually make things worse. These government programs are paid for by the American people.

You can say that it's not from the Treasury, or that it's from the Treasury; that it's from TARP, it's not from TARP. But the fact remains that it is from the American taxpayer. In fact, the gentleman at one time said it comes out of the Treasury. Then he said it comes from TARP. But the promise in 2008 was that it would go back to the American people. It would go back in the national Treasury. In fact, it does not. I will address where it goes, and I think the American people, when they find out where it goes under this program, they're going to be even more upset. I don't think they'll be surprised, because I think they've come to realize that there's not a lot of will in Washington to protect them, the taxpayers.

The American people already know that there are too many ineffective government programs that cost too much, and this is a poster child for those programs. If you can't cut this program, I'm not sure you can cut any. And when we find such programs, we as the representatives of the people have a duty and a responsibility to the taxpayers to end these programs. That's what we are doing this morning. We're going to end this program. That's what we're here for.

In this legislation by the gentleman from Texas, we stop a $1 billion failed spending program. Now it's a well-intentioned program. But just as the road to hell is paved with good intentions, so is the road to higher deficits and record-breaking debt, a debt that our children and our grandchildren will have to pay.

You know, when we talk about the taxpayers ultimately fund this program, when we borrow at 42 cents out of every dollar, it's our children and our grandchildren that will have to pay for these programs. We're charging something and we're telling them to pay the bill.

Today, we have an unthinkable debt of $14 trillion, a debt that imposes a birth tax on every child born in America. It's $45,000 today. Just last year it was $35,000. It's grown by $10,000. Even worse, this debt or birth tax is growing every day, because our government is spending some days $5 billion, some days $8 billion more than it takes in and adding to what our children and grandchildren will have to pay.

One question that the American people often confront is, are they better off than their parents and will their children be better off than they are, and their grandchildren? It's interesting that in survey after survey, or poll after poll, the American people say, we're better off than our parents. Our parents fought for our freedom, they preserved it in numerous wars, they saved their money, they watched their money, they worked hard, and they left us in good shape.

But when that same question is a little different question, ''Do you think your children or grandchildren will be better off?'' the American people know. They instinctively know. ''No'' is the answer, sadly. And that's because of our national debt and our deficit. In fact, both the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Secretary Robert Gates have said that it's a national security problem. Our debt threatens our very existence as a country.

This Washington spending binge is driving our country right off a cliff. We've seen the effect of overspending on our economy today. The government absorbs so much money from our citizens that it's hard to create private jobs. Each dollar out of the economy is a job that the private sector can't create.

Now actually President Reagan and President Clinton both realized this and they grew the economy. Those were the only two years with a growing economy and government spending either level or going down. That's the

only time in our country we had a surplus. They both realized that it was the private sector that would see us out of this. This growth in the Federal Government and in its spending is hampering job creation. And that's what these homeowners need. They need a job.

Let's look at this program. This is from the Obama administration. This is their budget that was just filed. Here is what the American people need to know. What does this program do? It offers a loan of up to $50,000 to pay all arrearages to homeowners on their first mortgage. Fifty thousand dollars. And then to pay up to 24 consecutive months of mortgage payments; 24 months of their mortgage payment.

Both the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Massachusetts kept talking about the large financial institutions. That's who is owed the money. In fact, we're not getting this money from the large financial institutions. Just the contrary. We're paying them, because they're the ones that hold this mortgage. So when the taxpayers write a $50,000 check under this program to pay arrearages on the mortgage, who do you think it goes to? It goes to Bank of America. It goes to Morgan Chase. It goes to Citigroup. It's shocking that the gentleman from Massachusetts would actually say that this money is coming from the very institutions that are going to receive this money. This billion dollars is not going to homeowners. It's going to these large financial institutions. He says they're the ones that ought to be paying this, not the homeowners or not the taxpayers. We always thought the homeowners were supposed to pay their mortgages. But I think we could all agree that it's not the taxpayer. It's just an astounding thing.

He says that if Flip Wilson told us to vote for something, we would. But it wasn't Flip Wilson. It was Ron Kirk. And what did he tell us? If I were Chairman FRANK, I would talk about anything but this failed program. I think that's why they've talked about everything but this failed program. It was Ron Kirk that told us that our automobile sector would suffer, that our pharmaceutical sector would suffer. He said that this would cost jobs in medical equipment, electronics, textiles, wheat, fruit, nuts, cotton. He did include cotton. He said $60 billion worth of exports were at risk.

□ 1020

Well, do the math: 7,000 jobs for each $1 billion worth of exports, that's 420,000 jobs. So do you want to vote against something that would put 420,000 Americans out of jobs? And then they would all line up for another government program that the minority would design?

The other thing—and this is the last thing I'll say. They keep saying that the taxpayers will get paid back. Well let me introduce this. This is from the Obama administration. This is their same budget for fiscal year 2012. It estimates the losses on this program, and they have accused us of making up these figures, 97.72. That's the loss on this program, 98 cents out of every dollar. Madam Chair, it's time to end this failed program.

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 836. This legislation would repeal any underlying authority for loans and other assistance to unemployed homeowners at a time when we still have nearly nine percent of our Nation out of work. The effects of this bill would kill the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program before it has any chance of helping homeowners who are in desperate need of immediate assistance.

It is troublesome to me how we as a nation can bail out banks, the automobile industry and even other nations. However, when a neighbor has lost their job through no fault of his or her own, we are willing to sit on our hands. Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong message to send to our constituents.

The Emergency Mortgage Relief Program will provide $1 billion to the Department of Housing and Urban Development and is projected to help 30,000 to 50,000 distressed homeowners. The bridge loans that will be disbursed through this program will be at zero interest to the borrower. This will allow homeowners a chance to receive some relief from payments until they are able to find a job, or are able to resume payments through other means.

Madam Chair, this Congress must ask itself who we value and more importantly who do we stand with. Congress must stand on the side of homeowners. I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 836.

Mr. STARK. Madam Chair, I rise today to oppose H.R. 836, the Emergency Mortgage Relief Termination Act.

The new Republican Majority has been in control for 10 weeks. This has been enough time for them to reveal their agenda—an assault on working Americans. The Majority has no plan to keep families in their homes. They have no plan to create jobs and they have no plan to improve health care.

Earlier this year, the Majority voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Their plan for those who can't afford insurance or have a pre-existing condition? "NoCare." What about the majority's jobs agenda? The GOP's spending bill, H.R. 1, would result in the loss of up to 700,000 jobs. When asked about the impact of H.R. 1 on the economy, the Speaker replied: "So be it." Today, we are witness to the Republican plan for those families struggling to pay their mortgage. In short, their plan is, "good luck." If you are one of the 2 million homeowners in California whose mortgage is underwater—good luck.

The Emergency Homeowners Loan Program that is on the chopping block today was part of last year's Wall Street Reform legislation. It is designed to provide short-term bridge loans to homeowners who have lost their jobs, so they can stay in their home while they search for a new job. The program is paid for by a fee on large banks. The program that the majority voted to eliminate yesterday, the FHA Short Refinance Option, would allow homeowners with underwater mortgages to reduce up to 10 percent of their loans principal and refinance into stable FHA loans.

Although I agree that both Congress's and the Administration's response to the mortgage crisis has been wholly inadequate, the answer is to improve these programs, not to eliminate them. Congress could work to provide homeowners with the same bankruptcy protections that investors have or we could require banks that received TARP funds to participate in loan modification programs. I don't expect that Republican leaders will be pursuing any of these ideas.

The Majority has no plan to create jobs, improve health care, or keep families in their homes. I urge all of my colleges to reject this agenda and vote no.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 836, the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program Termination Act.

This legislation would end the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Emergency Homeowners' Relief Program, a program designed to help unemployed homeowners keep their homes.

Buying a home is one of the biggest commitments and the most valuable investment of our adult life. If this program is eliminated unemployed homeowners will have nowhere else to turn when their home is threatened.

Our unemployment rate is now 8.9 percent. We must not forget those still struggling to pay their bills and trying to provide for their families.

Ending vital recovery programs and offering reckless spending proposals will only move our country backwards. While cuts are necessary to address the nation's long-term fiscal problems, cutting too deeply before the economy is in full expansion will add unnecessary risk to the housing recovery.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 836, the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program Termination Act.

The Emergency Mortgage Relief Program, also known as the Emergency Homeowners Loan Program, EHLP, was established to help responsible homeowners who, through no fault of their own, are unemployed or underemployed or suffer from a medical condition and can no longer make their mortgage payments.

The $1 billion relief fund provides these homeowners with zero-interest loans, credit advances, or payments. Up to 30,000 distressed homeowners at risk of foreclosure could be assisted by this program. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, is working to implement EHLP as soon as possible to assist homeowners in the 32 states that are not participating in the Hardest Hit Fund, HHF, a successful $7.6 billion fund that has been made available to the 18 states that have been hardest hit by the housing crisis. EHLP is also modeled after a highly successful program in Pennsylvania. Simply terminating EHLP before it has had a chance to take effect and help the homeowners who need it the most is unconscionable.

With 13.7 million people unemployed in our country, I am sure that all of my colleagues have constituents who are unemployed or underemployed and are in need of a lifeline.

I met a couple who work as substitute teachers in Kona on Hawaii Island. As the economy worsened, it became harder and harder for them to find steady work. Despite

applying for numerous jobs, they remained underemployed. For more than a year, they tried to work with their mortgage lender to avoid delinquency and foreclosure, submitting all of their financial documentation many times. The lender clearly was not motivated to help them. It was only through the support of the Hawaii HomeOwnership Center, a federally funded nonprofit in Hawaii that provides foreclosure prevention assistance, in addition to an inquiry from my office that the couple was able to get forbearance and a permanent modification. To top it off, the husband received a good job offer. But, this couple will never forget the stress and anxiety of fighting to keep their home.

Not all the stories of struggling homeowners have a happy ending. In fact, many of them do not. Programs like the Emergency Homeowners Loan Program are a lifeline for these individuals and families. This bill is another example of Republicans turning their backs on middle class Americans.

I urge my colleagues to help struggling homeowners throughout the country by supporting programs like EHLP and voting against this measure.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, the Emergency Mortgage Relief program was created in the Dobb-Frank Act to help distressed homeowners who fall behind on their mortgage payments due to involuntary unemployment, underemployment or a medical condition. The program works by providing qualifying borrowers with a zero interest bridge loan that enables them to make their mortgage payments until they can find a job or otherwise resume paying their loan. Assistance under the program is terminated when a borrower's income is restored to 85 percent of pre-crisis levels and is limited to a maximum of 24 months or $50,000, whichever comes first.

Madam Chair, this program is modeled after successful initiatives at the state level—such as the Homeowners Emergency Mortgage Assistance Program, HEMAP, in Pennsylvania, whose 85 percent success rate has helped over 45,000 homeowners stay in their homes at an average loan amount of $11,000 per borrower. With our economic recovery still gaining momentum, and unemployment hovering around 9 percent, now is not the time to terminate assistance to borrowers at risk of losing their homes through no fault of their own. Instead, we should give this program a chance to work and extend a temporary hand to those who need this assistance the most.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule.

No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order except those received for printing in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in a daily issue dated March 9, 2011, or earlier and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered read if printed.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 836

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Emergency Mortgage Relief Program Termination Act''.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Arizona.

(Mr. PASTOR of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to both H.R. 830, the FHA Refinance Program Termination Act, and H.R. 836, the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program Termination Act, which we will debate tomorrow.

I readily recognize that both these programs could have accomplished more in helping Americans to save their homes. But, just because a program needs improving does not mean that it should be eliminated.

There is a tremendous need for programs that help homeowners to stay in their homes. We have assisted large national banks, Wall Street investment companies, and the major automobile companies of our country. In fairness, we cannot turn our backs on the hard-working American homeowners—who in most cases were victims of the large, multi-billion dollar financial organizations—and allow them to lose their homes because the economy has hit on such low times.

These mortgage assistance programs can make a difference in the Fourth Congressional District of Arizona. I am told by housing officials in Arizona that part of the reason so little has been done and these programs have had such a limited level of success is that the infrastructure for administering them, both in the private and semi-public sectors, was not in place. And, even when it was put into place, many financial institutions failed to fully cooperate.

Can these programs be improved? The answer is a definite yes.

Should these programs be improved? Again, the answer is yes.

But let us work to fix them, so that they can keep families in their homes.

Local authorities need more discretion in making decisions. The Phoenix housing market is a perfect example of this. Dollar limits that may suffice in other parts of the country are not sufficient in higher priced markets like Phoenix, Las Vegas, Miami, and San Diego.

But, we should not just eliminate these programs because they have struggled to become operative. Let's work together to fix the problems, not create further problems by evicting people from their homes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Chair, it is a very strange Congress. At a time when Wall Street has been bailed out, banks have been bailed out—and banks were bailed out who kicked people out of their homes, now the programs that have been created to help keep people in their homes, these programs are going to be canceled by the majority, which, of course, will cause people to lose their homes to the banks. So the banks in America have people coming and going. And they keep getting more and more money.

Madam Chair, millions of Americans are facing or will face foreclosure in the coming months. Their hold on their homes has been endangered by unemployment, or predatory loan terms, or falling house values. We are in the worst crisis facing homeowners in the history of this country. And the facts are well known. No one in the House can feign a lack of knowledge of the misery that has gripped American homeowners and neighborhoods across the country. Yet today, this House takes up a bill to terminate a program intended to assist distressed borrowers. Next week, the House will consider more bills to eliminate two other assistance programs.

What message is this Congress sending? If you're a distressed borrower or you have a relative who is in trouble or a neighbor in distress, the message of this House is, tough luck. Worried about losing your house? Tough luck.

Government assistance to distressed borrowers should be effective. I can agree with my colleagues on that. I share the belief that some of the programs intended to assist distressed borrowers do not help enough people. But is that an argument to just end the programs? You know that people need help and that the programs aren't effective, and you just say, well, we're going to end the program. How does that help people stay in their homes? It doesn't.

I submit that the fundamental problem with these programs, the fundamental problem is that they depended on the voluntary participation of the very banks and servicers that created the housing crisis in the first place. So the programs are set up where you need the banks to participate. Banks don't want to participate, or they slow-walk the applications, and before you know it, people are just left in a desperate strait where their homes are being lost.

Now, when the banks were in trouble, taxpayer assistance was rushed forward. I voted against the bailouts. Now that the banks have emerged from a crisis, unfortunately, our friends in the majority are determined to dismantle the few legal efforts that are there to preserve and protect homeowners.

We should be reforming these programs, not dismantling them. If the House approves the bill before us today, H.R. 836, Congress will be turning its back on people whose lives have been wrecked by a crisis created by irresponsible banking practices. So I'm urging a ''no'' vote on the bill, Madam Chair. But I also hope that we take a very cold and sober look at what we're doing here. We're really attacking the very victims of this housing crisis, and we're giving comfort to those who created the crisis.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. RESCISSION OF FUNDING FOR EMERGENCY MORTGAGE RELIEF PROGRAM.

Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, there are rescinded and permanently canceled all unobligated balances remaining available as of such date of enactment of the amounts made available by section 1496(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111–203; 124 Stat. 2207; 12 U.S.C. 2706 note).

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CANSECO

Mr. CANSECO. 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:

Page 4, line 22, after the period insert the following: ''All such unobligated balances so rescinded and permanently canceled shall be retained in the General Fund of the Treasury for reducing the debt of the Federal Government.''.

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

Mr. CANSECO. Madam Chairman, I want to thank my colleague and friend from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) for offering the bill to terminate the emergency mortgage relief program.

The amendment I'm offering will ensure every penny of savings that come from terminating the emergency homeowner relief program will go back to the Treasury's general fund in order to reduce the debt of our country.

We are in the midst of a spending-driven fiscal crisis. Today, every child born in the United States is responsible for more than $45,000 of the debt. If we don't stop spending and put our Nation back on a sustainable fiscal path, we will ensure that the futures of our children and grandchildren drown in a sea of red ink.

The total debt of our Nation is on track to equal the entire size of our economy. The debt held by the public today is $10.43 trillion. That represents 69.4 percent of GDP. Per household, this is $89,007. The gross debt, according to the monthly Treasury statement through February, our gross debt is $14.194 trillion, which is 94.41 percent of GDP, or $121,128 per household. No nation in history has ever survived a debt burden the size towards which we are hurtling.

As I travel across the 23rd District of Texas, over and over I hear of very, very real concerns my constituents have over our out-of-control Washington spending and our exploding deficits and debt.

The facts are really frightening. There is over $14 trillion of debt on the backs of American families. We've had two straight years of trillion dollar-plus deficits. The CBO projects that the deficit for fiscal year 2011 will be $1.5 trillion, and the President's recently released fiscal year 2012 budget projects more than $1 trillion in deficits.

Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has warned that ''the most significant threat to our national security is our debt.''

□ 1030

These are dire facts, and are more than just numbers on a ledger. They represent a real threat to our economy and our security and job creation.

Yesterday, Moody's announced that they had downgraded the debt of Spain, another country in a long line of downgrades in Europe. With the deficit and debt realization, you cannot say that would never happen in America. Spain is expected to have a budget deficit of 6 percent of GDP in 2011, while the United States is expected to run a deficit of about 9.8 percent of GDP in 2011. Without a change in our course, we are on track to become the next Spain, the next Greece.

The writing is on the wall. We are headed to a fiscal and economic nightmare if nothing is done. This is an unsustainable path that will end one of two ways: either we have the courage to tackle our Nation's problems, or we continue throwing money at wasteful programs and revert to the status of a Third World country.

My colleagues on the other side have made clear which option they will choose. They want to continue to create wasteful programs hoping that the magic one will come along and fix all of our problems. We have to stop kidding ourselves that this is the way to create jobs and economic prosperity.

Not only do we have an obligation to reduce our debt for the sake of our economy, but we have a moral obligation to our children and grandchildren to leave this country to them better than we found it. Unfortunately, that is not the case right now unless we act.

This Congress has a clear mandate from the people who sent us here to do our job: cut the spending and reduce the debt. With this bill and my amendment, we will do both. I urge passage of my amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FATTAH. We heard just the other day in this Chamber the leader of our great ally Australia talk about the greatness of our Nation and how it is the belief that we can achieve anything.

This lack of confidence illustrated in the rhetoric here on the floor today about the greatness of America, maybe we need to walk back a minute and look at how we invested and rebuilt Japan and Germany after the war, how we bailed out Mexico, over $40 billion. How, today, this day alone, we are spending $2 billion this week in Afghanistan. We have people all over the world trying to assist others. We will be one of the first nations rushing to help those affected by the tsunami this morning in Japan. This is a great Nation.

We come today, however, to say to law-abiding, tax-paying citizens who lost their jobs because of the shenanigans on Wall Street, that even though we were able to help the banks to the tune of trillions of dollars, we can't provide a small bridge loan to help a homeowner who has been paying their bills, been abiding by the law and has been affected by the actions or inactions of the government and Wall Street.

Now, this is not a new program built on hopes and dreams. This is a replication of a program that has been operating in Pennsylvania for 20 years. It actually has a history in which the State of Pennsylvania has put in $235 million and gotten back $250 million, and in which 44,000 homeowners have been able to secure their homes over a small interruption in their employment by getting help over 24 months.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman tell us from what party the Governors of Pennsylvania have come during this period?

Mr. FATTAH. Well, this was started under a Republican Governor, Governor Thornburgh. I introduced this as a young State legislator with no gray hair, and it has worked very well in the State of Pennsylvania. I offered it here in this Chamber. In 2007, we hit a 50-year high in mortgage foreclosures.

It makes no sense to move someone out of their home, ruin their credit for a decade and have their family be homeless when in the Pennsylvania instance, for less than $7,000 on average, you can help them over a period of difficulty.

So here is the Republican majority. They say, look, we can't find it within us as a Nation, even though we help people all across the globe, to actually pause for a minute for a paltry sum and help a citizen in our own country meet a burden, and do it in a way that would actually be more cost effective for our taxpayers.

We should reject this. We should reject the notion that somehow we are so much in debt that we can't afford to help our own citizens. What we should know is we are the wealthiest country in the world. Just yesterday, we should read the story about how we have a few billionaires who have trillions of dollars. We should remember that last week on the front page of USA Today, we had a story saying for a quarter-of-a-million dollars, seats on boards of directors were going wanting in our country because they weren't being paid enough for six meetings a year.

We can afford to pay our bills. The Republican majority says let's cut 1.5 percent of what the Federal Government is going to spend this year in the face of a $1.5 trillion deficit. If they want to balance the budget, they should step forward for a much more aggressive plan. This is not about balancing the budget. It will not get close to balancing the budget. This is about somehow being willing to help big banks when President Bush stepped

forward and said we have to do TARP. But when it comes to helping a homeowner meet their obligation, somehow we have to do less than our best as a Nation.

This is not the America that has come to have great allies like the leader of Australia who spoke from that podium who said we can do anything and how the whole world looks at us as a beacon of hope. We should think again. This is ill advised, and I hope that this House rejects this bill and today stands up for an American citizen who needs a little help.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. First of all, I commend the gentleman from Texas for his good amendment. I think it is interesting that we keep talking about the country, and certainly that is important and the taxpayers are important. The other flaw in this program is that it encourages these people to get further in debt. And quite honestly, the level of debt they have is their primary problem. It is the same mentality that has kind of gotten our country in the jam it is in where we will have to have a vote here in a few weeks about raising the debt ceiling. It is the reason a lot of individuals and companies and governments around the world are overleveraged.

So what we are saying is the way to fix someone's problem that has too much debt is for them to take on more debt. It is absurd to think that is good for these borrowers.

I would like to yield to my good friend from Texas (Mr. CANSECO).

Mr. CANSECO. I thank you for yielding.

I think we need to focus on what this amendment does and the purpose of it. The purpose of it is to bring back those funds that are allocated to this failed program and bring them back into the Treasury so that the Treasury can use those funds in order to reduce the debt that we have. It is but a small return into the Treasury, but it goes a long way into fiscal responsibility so we can continue on that path and reduce that budget.

Now, with regards to the program itself that this amendment addresses, we have to realize that this program spends an enormous amount of taxpayers' money that came out of Dodd-Frank, a $1 billion HUD emergency homeowner relief program which provides loans or credit advances to unemployed borrowers. This program would spend 98 cents for every dollar that does not come back. Those are very important, to realize that these funds are taxpayer funds that would otherwise go as a grant to the borrower, not any repayment program, but grants to the borrower, that does not get repaid.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1040

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. First, let me address the wholly contradictory argument of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

We have heard on the other side, through the eagerness to just say negative things, two entirely contradictory things: one, that this is too lavish a subsidy to the homeowner and, two, that it will further indebt the homeowner.

Members do understand that they cannot possibly both be true. In fact, there is a significant element of subsidy here, and those who take this money and who pay off their mortgages will get a subsidy so they will not be further in debt.

The argument just made by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) is wholly without basis. The argument that it is a more generous subsidy is a more accurate one. By the way, even if they were to pay it back, avoiding late fees and interest helps them out.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Well, as the ranking member knows, it has been billed as a loan program, but what we're saying is that it is, in fact, a grant program.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Reclaiming my time, no, that's not what the gentleman is saying. The gentleman is completely contradicting himself.

He says it's a grant program. First, he was contradicting the other gentleman from Texas. Now he's contradicting himself. He said it's a grant program. Well, if it's a grant program, why did the gentleman say it was getting people further in debt?

The gentleman has been caught in a totally contradictory argument. He did not say it was a grant program. He said it was getting people further in debt.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I think one of the things that points out how terrible this program is——

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I'm sorry, I reclaim my time. I will yield if you want to clarify what you said. You had your 5 minutes. I'm not going to yield for general philosophy. I'm sorry, but it's my time. I was yielding if the gentleman thought I was misinterpreting him. For him to simply repeat what he already said takes time that I don't want to give him.

He did contradict himself completely. First, it was a program that was going to put people further in debt. Now it's a grant program. He can decide which it is.

I now want to go back and make my central point, which is that the only reason this has any impact on the taxpayer is that the Republicans insisted on protecting the large institutions. The gentleman from Alabama said all this money is going to the large institutions. Well, that's not true, because it does go to pay off loans to keep people from being foreclosed. Some will go to smaller institutions. Some will go to credit unions. Some will go to community banks.

But here is the point: under our proposal, which the Republicans temporarily blocked—and I hope they'll repent—all of the funding would have come from the large institutions, but the Members don't want to address that. Under our proposal in the bill that passed—and we had to amend it, and we're going to try and come back and change it again—every single penny that will be expended here will come from institutions of more than $50 billion in assets and hedge funds of more than $10 billion in assets.

So, if you do it our way, not a penny will come from the taxpayer. It will come from the large financial institutions. And, yes, it will be a help to these individuals. Some of them will pay some of it back, but they won't have late fees. And, yes, the gentleman was correct when he said the second time around that it could become a grant program.

I will now yield to the gentleman from Texas if he can explain to me how it can both be a grant program and something that gets people further in debt.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I have a question for the gentleman: Do you think this is a loan program or a grant program? Which do you think it is?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I understand it's going to be primarily——

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. It's a question of——

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I'm sorry. It's my time. You asked me a question. I'm going to answer it. I will note you don't want to answer the question.

I am being consistent. Yes, I think it will work out for most people as primarily a grant program, 84 percent. I am pointing out that the gentleman is trying to cover his own embarrassment because he made the argument without any basis that it was going to put people further in debt. He then acknowledges that it's a grant program. People do not become further indebted when they receive grants.

So, yes, it will work out for people who are responsible, to a great extent, as a grant program. That's why the CBO says 84 percent will be spent. That 84 percent in our bill, as we did it, would come from the large financial institutions. I don't want it to come from the taxpayers. While temporarily it now does, we will be offering a bill—I hope the committee of which the gentleman is an active member will give us consideration—so we can amend the law under which this program is authorized so that every penny, whether it's loans or grants or some combination—it will be primarily grants—will

come from the large financial institutions and not a penny from the taxpayer.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Does the gentleman think that the language in the legislation as it is written now represents it as a loan or as a grant?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. It will work out as a grant.

Again, I am struck by the gentleman from Texas. He is the one who said it was an excessive loan program and a grant program. He has made two entirely inconsistent statements in a very short period of time. Even for a politician, that's a record for self-contradiction.

The point is that it is both a grant and a loan. It will be primarily a grant.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. TERMINATION OF EMERGENCY MORTGAGE RELIEF PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Title I of the Emergency Housing Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), as amended by section 1496(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is hereby repealed.

(b) TREATMENT OF REMAINING FUNDS.—Notwithstanding the repeal under subsection (a) of this section, any amounts made available under the provision specified in section 2 of this Act and obligated before the date of the enactment of this Act shall continue to be governed by the provisions of law specified in subsection (a) of this section, as in effect immediately before such repeal.

(c) TERMINATION.—Upon the completion of outlays to liquidate all amounts referred to in subsection (b) of this section and the completion of all activities with respect to such amounts under the provisions of law specified in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall terminate the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program authorized under the provisions specified in subsection (a).

(d) STUDY OF USE OF PROGRAM BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, VETERANS, AND GOLD STAR RECIPIENTS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall conduct a study to determine the extent of usage of the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program authorized under the provisions specified in subsection (a) by, and the impact of such program on, covered homeowners.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth the results of the study under paragraph (1) and identifying best practices, with respect to covered homeowners, that could be applied to the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program.

(3) COVERED HOMEOWNER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''covered homeowner'' means a homeowner who is—

(A) a member of the Armed Forces of the United States on active duty or the spouse or parent of such a member;

(B) a veteran, as such term is defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code; or

(C) eligible to receive a Gold Star lapel pin under section 1126 of title 10, United States Code, as a widow, parent, or next of kin of a member of the Armed Forces person who died in a manner described in subsection (a) of such section.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Chair, I offer an amendment as the designee of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 23, strike ''AND''.

Page 5, line 24, before the period insert the following: '', AND MEMBERS AND VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES AND THEIR FAMILIES''.

Page 6, line 19, strike ''or''.

Page 6, line 25, strike the period and insert ''; or''.

Page 6, after line 25, insert the following:

(D) such members and veterans of the Armed Forces who have service-connected injuries, and survivors and dependents of such members and veterans of the Armed Forces with such injuries.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I offer this on behalf of my good friend from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN). It is a good amendment. It would add military servicemembers and veterans who have service-related injuries, as well as survivors and dependents of such individuals, to be included in the study in this bill.

These families often face new hardships. They will likely need modifications to their houses to help them get around, especially if the servicemembers are now disabled. There may be significant changes in their ability to move around and in the skills they are able to perform. This will ultimately have a significant impact on their livelihoods.

It is my hope that we can gain a better understanding of how we can best provide for the families of those who have served our country and who have paid the ultimate price.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Texas who consecutively denounced this program for putting people in debt and for being a giveaway grant asked me whether it was designated as a loan or a grant. The answer is neither. The program is called the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program, meaning it leaves open what kind it would be. So that's the answer to his question, and that's why some of us were less confused than others of us.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I think the bill says that it's a loan, so as soon as that individual takes an advance in this program, it becomes the liability of that individual. Now, there are certain ways in this bill, either from forfeiture or through some of the provisions, where that indebtedness is forgiven; but I will tell you that the proper accounting is that the day that the individual payment is made on his behalf it becomes the liability of that individual.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman gets himself further and further in the hole when trying to explain his contradictory statements.

The facts are very clear. He began by saying it was going to put them further and further in debt. That, of course, contradicted his colleagues who had said it was going to be too much of a subsidy. In fact, it does not say ''loan'' or ''grant'' in the title. It says ''emergency relief,'' and it does provide for a loan and forgiveness.

So I am sorry the gentleman got himself tongue-tied, but don't blame the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

Ms. WATERS. 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, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. PUBLICATION OF MEMBER AVAILABILITY FOR ASSISTANCE.

Not later than 5 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall publish to its Website on the World Wide Web in a prominent location, large point font, and boldface type the following statement: ''The Emergency Mortgage Relief Program, which would have provided unemployed homeowners with low-interest loans to assist them in paying their mortgage, has been terminated. If you are unemployed and concerned about not being able to pay your mortgage, please contact your Member of Congress for assistance.''.

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I rise to present my amendment, which I believe is a commonsense provision that provides transparency and clarity for distressed homeowners.

Specifically, this amendment would require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to publish on HUD's Web site a statement indicating that the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program has been eliminated. The amendment explains that this program would have provided unemployed homeowners with low or no-interest loans to assist them in paying their mortgages.

□ 1050

Further, my amendment directs unemployed homeowners to contact their Members of Congress directly since the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program is no longer available.

If you listen to the recent debate, you can understand why this is important. First of all, we need transparency in what we do and in the public policy that we make. We need to be able to communicate better and clearly with our constituents.

And so they have been told and started to get involved with this program that would assist unemployed homeowners to be able to stay in their homes. As you know, this program was specifically developed so that it could deal with the high unemployment rates and the fact that people who had been working—some of them all of their lives—are now unemployed or underemployed or have medical conditions that cause them not to be able to pay their bills in the way that they had been paying them in the past. And so now that we are coming along just since this program has started and saying, oh, sorry, the program is eliminated, we need to be able to communicate that, and this is what this amendment would do.

American homeowners deserve our assistance and they deserve our help. We have just experienced a recession, almost a depression, where small businesses and big businesses alike had to close their doors or to downsize, and it has left us with some of the highest unemployment rates that we have experienced in many, many years. And still the unemployment rates are unacceptably high, still hovering around 9 percent, and in some communities it's even worse than that. It goes up to 15 and 20, and in some communities even 30 percent. And so our American citizens have turned to government and said, What can I do? Can you help?

This is but one of four programs that was designed to help them. Unfortunately, my friends on the opposite side of the aisle have decided that not only are they going to eliminate this program, the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program for unemployed homeowners, but they have decided they are going to eliminate the HAMP program, that is the Home Affordable Modification Program.

Yesterday, they voted off this floor the FHA program that would assist homeowners in refinancing. And don't forget, this FHA program was really for middle class citizens who paid their bills, who were not in default, had not lost their homes yet but their homes were underwater and they were trying to stay in them by reducing the mortgage. This legislation under the FHA would have helped them to do that.

You're going to hear more about the NSP program that my friends on the opposite side of the aisle are eliminating also.

But today, this is the most sensitive that we're doing now. This is the most sensitive because we have seen in Pennsylvania, as was described by my friend Mr. CHAKA FATTAH from that State, how this program has worked well for the last 20 years in assisting unemployed homeowners. We will set the regulations for how this is done. And of course they will look at these individuals in terms of how long they've been unemployed, how they've paid their bills, and whether or not they believe they're capable of not only utilizing the program but repaying these loans at some point. I don't think it's too much to ask of us to be of assistance.

I notice that my colleague from Texas referred to it as ''these people.'' These people are our people. These people are American citizens. These are constituents who vote and send us here to make good public policy. It has been said over and over again that we bailed out the too-big-to-fail institutions, that we were generous in our loans to them, billions of dollars that went into those too-big-to-fail institutions.

So I would simply ask for an ''aye'' vote on this very simple amendment that would bring some transparency to what we're doing.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I want to read a portion of this amendment filed by the gentlewoman from California. It says, ''The Emergency Mortgage Relief Program, which would have provided unemployed homeowners with low interest rate loans to assist them in paying their mortgage, has been terminated. If you are unemployed and concerned about not being able to pay your mortgage, please contact your Member of Congress.''

You see, that's what is so confusing about the arguments by my colleagues on the other side. They can't decide if this is a loan or a grant—one time it's a loan, one time it's a grant—but, in fact, the program says it's a loan. In fact, HUD, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the title of their rule is Emergency Homeowners Loan Program.

The other reason I rise in opposition to this is that we're terminating a program that has had zero customers. So it seems ambiguous here to have the Federal Government go through a process here where we're going to notify homeowners of a program that never was instituted, never was used, that it does not exist anymore. That seems a little wasteful and I think in many ways could be misleading. Obviously, when you look at the way that the program is structured, it becomes a grant program. And so we're misrepresenting that in the sense that, well, it says it's a loan, but it's really not a loan. It's a grant.

And so I think this is something that is one of the things that the American taxpayers are really kind of tired of is the government out there misrepresenting or creating confusion to homeowners that may be seeking assistance. So I would just say that at this particular time this is not necessary and that we should not put a confusing piece of information out there on the Web site.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I need to clarify this.

I'm a freshman here in Washington, D.C. I was not here for the creation of this program, but it's my understanding—and I'm hoping to hear some clarification from you—that there has not been a single application that has even been put in, much less denied or accepted, because this program has not had the regulations promulgated. That is correct; right? I mean, it strikes me that it's like giving a job layoff notice before you've even hired anybody. And that really is the issue, it seems to me, that we need to make sure that we are getting people back to work. That is the best protection that we can possibly give to any program out there for people to make sure that they can make their payments is by giving them a job.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, and I think he makes a great point. In fact, it is a program that has not had an application, has not been promulgated. And so there is a reason why we feel like this is not necessary, and I encourage my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 836, the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program Termination Act.

This legislation, like the other war on affordable housing bills being brought to the floor by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, seems to terminate a much needed Federal program that helps struggling homeowners. To be clear, shutting down a badly needed foreclosure mitigation assistance program is not a solution to Federal deficits and will simply hurt homeowners and the current economic recovery.

Rather than turning our backs on homeowners, we should be working together to improve and expand programs to help the millions of Americans and communities affected by the housing crisis all over our Nation.

For several years now, many Americans have struggled with foreclosures, underwater mortgages, and abandoned and blighted properties. For local towns and cities, this crisis has also

decimated their tax base, leading to a ripple-up effect producing funding shortfalls for basic services like police, firefighters, and teachers. This creates deficits at every level of government.

I keep hearing from my Republican colleagues that the debt is crushing Americans and we must act now. Well, what about the crushing debt of negative equity facing almost a quarter of all homeowners in this country? Nearly one-fourth of all Americans owe more on their mortgages than their homes are now worth. There are nearly 11 million families who feel trapped in their homes, unable to sell or move if they wanted to, or even to refinance to lock in a better interest rate. And the statistics in my home State of Florida are far more staggering than the national average. Forty-five percent of all mortgages in Florida are underwater.

□ 1100

In Broward County, where I live, that number is more than 50 percent. Yes, over half. More help is needed, not less.

However, what is offered today is a ''repeal and abandon'' approach, leaving homeowners with few or no options. This is simply unacceptable. For 10 weeks now, the House Republican leadership has failed to bring to the floor a single piece of legislation to create jobs despite making occasional casual references to jobs.

What they've done instead is push legislation that will destroy jobs—just like the spending bill we pushed through the House a few weeks ago that would cost our economy 700,000 jobs. These housing bills risk further injury to our economic growth.

Now, I can appreciate the arguments that the current housing programs have not done enough to help homeowners, and I agree. But that's why I support legislation offered by Congressman CARDOZA to require Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to refinance underwater mortgages so homeowners struggling to stay out of foreclosure can better afford to stay in their homes.

And that's why I support taking a hard look at how we can improve the current Federal programs so more homeowners receive assistance.

But my Republican colleagues have no plan to helping make housing more affordable or keeping people in their homes—nor will they. That's because they believe the lending industry will take care of it. For those with short memories, that's the same laissez faire approach that caused the Wall Street meltdown in the first place.

The Republican leadership began the 112th Congress with a lot of fanfare by reading the Constitution on the floor of the House. Well, it's not enough to simply read the Constitution, but to abide by it and carry out its charge. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution vests the Congress with a duty to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce.

However, over the decade leading up to this housing crisis, the Congress simply abandoned its duty to the American public. Lax Federal regulations and oversight led to an ''anything-goes'' attitude. Banks were making subprime loans people couldn't really afford and then bundling these loans and selling them off, eventually becoming toxic assets that crashed our financial markets.

We owe more to our constituents than Speaker BOEHNER's ''so be it'' attitude. We must do more than just stand by and say the lending industry will take care of this crisis. A foreclosure has a devastating effect on each and every homeowner and tears at the very fabric of the family.

Saying you support family values is mere lip service unless you take actions to value the family by striving to keep families intact with a roof over their heads.

That is why I support the amendments offered by many of my Democratic colleagues—most of which have been ruled non-germane because, as far as I can tell, they propose helping too many homeowners. Apparently, any Federal effort that would help more than zero homeowners is simply too broad and unacceptable to the authors of this legislation.

Perhaps this boils down to a fundamental disagreement of our role in looking out for our constituents and assisting at the Federal level.

The Democratic minority remains committed to our goals for the 112th Congress—to create jobs, strengthen the middle class, and responsibly reduce the deficit. We will continue to judge each of your bills by this standard.

The legislation before us today fails on all three counts, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chair, hundreds of times since I took the oath of office just a few weeks ago, I've heard references to ''kicking the can down the road.''

This kicking of the can, the ''can'' being the deficit and the debt, has come to the end of that road. In fact, we have used this term so many times, America has a chronic case of turf toe.

Washington is in a state of denial. We continue to give away taxpayer dollars—correction, borrowed dollars—to people who can't afford to pay it back. Our friends from the other side want you to believe that we don't have a heart, that we're insensitive to the plight of those who are struggling because they've lost jobs and can't afford their mortgages.

Well, let me tell you what Americans understand. Americans understand that we cannot continue to live in this irresponsible way—giving away borrowed money, program after program, knowing that it's going down a rat hole. Just another kick at the proverbial can. If you can't cut an expensive, irresponsible program like this one, then what can you cut?

Look, we're all about job creation. Job creation is the preferred way to deliver us from this financial plight that we happen to be in. But the problem with job creation right now is that there is a dark, dark cloud hanging over America as we know it with a huge deficit, a record deficit, and a mounting debt, a debt so large that very soon in this very Chamber we'll be taking up the issue of a debt ceiling increase.

That dark cloud includes higher taxes, that dark cloud includes burdensome regulation, and that dark cloud certainly includes deficits and debt.

This program must be eliminated. The savings must go to deficit reduction.

We have come to the end of the road. We can no longer kick this can any further. My colleagues and I are demonstrating leadership in this arena, something this Congress has lacked for several years.

I encourage support of H.R. 836.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. It amazes me that somebody could say that homeowners, American homeowners, losing their homes and us trying to help them to stay in them is like throwing money down a rat hole. I might suggest that we might look at Afghanistan or the war in Iraq where we're spending $2 billion a week as a place where we could find the money to balance our budget.

But at this moment, Madam Chair, I would like to yield to my good colleague from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise to oppose the statements that were just made by the new gentleman from Arkansas, the one who claims that he and others are providing legitimate leadership for the first time. I would like to be in opposition to the fact that he describes what we're doing as ''pouring money down a rat hole.''

Let me just be very clear about my opposition. I do not like the American people being referred to that way. One of the other gentlemen on the opposite side of the aisle this morning referred to our citizens as ''these people.'' Now I hear our citizens being referred to as people who are receiving funds that are going down a rat hole.

The American citizens are not rats. The money that we are appropriating through good public policy is not money that's going down a rat hole. As a matter of fact, he knows, if he knows anything about this crisis that we're confronted with, that not only have we bailed out the biggest institutions in America that are too big to fail with billions of dollars that we loaned to them—and I didn't hear anybody talking about that money ''going down a

rat hole'' or ''those people'' or ''these people.''

Let us be a little bit more respectful as representatives of the people in the way we describe our public policy here.

I don't consider that credible leadership, Madam Chair, and I would ask the gentleman to refrain from referring to the citizens of this country in that way.

And I would ask the Members of Congress to reject those arguments and to look at what we are doing and to understand, as the gentlelady from California has said, if they want to be credible in how they reduce the deficit, they should look at the money that we're spending on a war that we can't win—money, the billions that we're putting into Afghanistan. But no, they choose not to do that.

They choose to attack the most vulnerable in our society, people who have worked all of their lives who are asking their government for a little assistance because now they're underemployed or unemployed or they have medical conditions that don't allow them to meet their obligations.

I stand with the people. I stand with the citizens. The people on this side of the aisle generated the public policy under these four programs to help American citizens. And for those who don't want to help people whose homes are underwater, who don't want to help people whose neighborhoods are being decimated by these boarded-up properties, who don't want to help hard-working citizens who have worked all of their lives, who don't want to rise to the occasion of this crisis in our economic system, let them continue to identify themselves.

I have an amendment here that says, okay, if that's how you feel, then let's post on the HUD Web site exactly what we're doing. We're eliminating this program. And let the citizens call us so that we can tell them, yes, we have a program. They would like to say this program has not been started. It has. As a matter of fact, we started to get calls right after the Dodd-Frank bill was signed into law with people asking about the program, wanting to get in the program, being thankful that we had somehow come up with ways to help them.

□ 1110

It's not a program that has not begun; it has begun. And this amendment that I have before this floor would simply say: Tell the people that you are eliminating the program. Let them know that it no longer exists. Clear up any confusion about whether or not we stand with the people or we are going to work against the people.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Madam Chair, everybody needs to understand a little history here, all right?

This program was put first in place in 1975. I was 6; all right? This vital program has been in existence since 1975. I understand some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may have been here for either the creation or shortly thereafter, but this vital program for 36 years remained unused, unfunded, and ineffective because it didn't exist. Now we hear that it's a vital program. We hear that we cannot continue to protect the homeowners of America without this program. It is absolutely nonsensical that we are going to put people further in debt and call that helping them.

Here is what happened the last time government started going in and demanding that credit be eased and all these other things. And I have some experience in this. I was a former Realtor, licensed Realtor in Michigan. I can also tell you I have done housing development. My family is involved in construction.

It used to be, not that long ago, it used to be that you either had to own your lot or you had to have 20 percent down to go get a mortgage and a loan. Well, that 20 percent quickly became 15 percent, which quickly became 10 percent, which became 7, which became 5, which became 2 percent, which became zero down, which became 120 percent loan-to-value because we needed to get people in homes. Well, that was not because the private sector and the free market was dictating that. It was because this body and others were directing them to do that.

We have an opportunity here to unwind some things that have been done. As I said, I wasn't here for the creation of this well-intentioned but crazy initiative, but I am here for the unwinding of that program, as are many of my other new colleagues, and it's about time we do that.

Madam Chair, how we realize we can really truly help people, how we are going to help homeowners, is we are going to get them a job. We are going to create an atmosphere, not a government program. We are going to create an atmosphere that's going to allow the private sector to go out and be productive.

Prosperity is created by the private sector, not the public sector. The public sector receives the dollars that it gets from us, taxpayers, from me as a small business owner, from my employees. It's not a government program that's going to create that prosperity; it's the private sector. It's our job to create an atmosphere that's going to allow that private sector job creation to happen.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chair, I have to respond to what I just heard because it simply isn't true. The notion that the government directed people to make these loans is not true. I don't understand what directive the gentleman is referring to. I would be glad to yield to him.

What policy of the Federal Government, what law directed people to make loans of 120 percent loan-to-value?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate the opportunity from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Fannie and Freddie. We had Fannie and Freddie that were allowed to go do that.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I reclaim my time.

Understand the difference, ''directed'' and ''allowed.'' Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac never originated a loan. They could not have directed anybody to do anything. They were the secondary market. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac could only get into action if some private entity made the loan in the first place. Beyond that, during the period when we had the increased subprime loans, which some of us were trying to ban, Fannie and Freddie were in a declining percentage.

But I will yield again to the gentleman to tell me who directed the private sector to make these loans.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate that.

It was an encouragement that happened, and it was allowed.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I reclaim my time.

I want to say to the gentleman, we are here in the House of Representatives making policy. You have got to be precise. I would say to Members about what you say, ''directing'' and ''allowed'' are two very different things. It is one thing to allow it.

By the way, when you were talking from the perspective of the private sector, it's a very big difference. And there are many things that the government allows that I wouldn't direct. There are things it allows that I wish people wouldn't do. But the gentleman didn't say ''allowed''; he said ''directed.'' That's simply wrong. I asked because—and he didn't say this, and I acknowledge that, but there were some who tried to blame the Community Reinvestment Act.

I should note that in the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, three of the four Republican appointees, including Bill Thomas, our former colleague here, chair of the Ways and Means Committee, and Douglas Holtz-Eakin, who was the chief economic adviser to Mr. MCCAIN, specifically repudiated the notion that the CRA had caused this. So we ought to be very clear.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I will be the first one to acknowledge that occasionally Republicans make mistakes as well. So thank you very much.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I was not talking about Republicans making mistakes. I have no idea what that's

supposed to contribute to the debate. I was citing two responsible and thoughtful Republicans, the former chair of the Ways and Means Committee and Mr. MCCAIN's chief budget adviser, plus all of the financial regulators under both Bush administrations who said CRA wasn't the problem.

Now, the gentleman didn't say that it was. Some people have said that, because CRA did have some kind of more mandatory position, but it wasn't for those subprime loans. In fact, with regard to the loans the gentleman is legitimately complaining about, it was those of us on the Democratic side who tried to ban them. Beginning in 2004, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), I joined them a little bit later, tried to outlaw those loans. And we were blocked by people who said, No, that's a mistake.

In fact, in 2007, when this House, when we became the majority, finally did make illegal many of those loans in a bill, The Wall Street Journal denounced us and said we had created a Sarbanes-Oxley restriction for housing.

So I just want to make it clear that there was no direction by any entity of the Federal Government. The gentleman appears to acknowledge that when he said, well, Fannie and Freddie allowed it. That's a long way from saying that it was directed.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Thank you. I appreciate that. I am curious, though, how, getting back to this particular amendment and this particular bill, as we are removing this program, why is this program so vital if it was authorized in 1975, and in 1995 the Clinton administration under HUD used this language?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. You've got to move quickly. I have only got 5 minutes here.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. The language that they said is they wanted to remove this outdated, obsolete, and underutilized program.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I am reclaiming my time. The gentleman is using it up with the papers.

Here's the deal: 1975 is when it happened in Pennsylvania, not in America, if he had been listening carefully. Secondly, in 1995 we didn't have this foreclosure crisis. Third, as to was this just a new program, in fact, this program for the 32 States where it will operate is based on the program which operated in 18 other States, so we have had experience with it.

By the way, the gentleman from Alabama's Governor praised this program in his State where it operated. The Governor of New Jersey, Mr. Christie, praised this program.

So this is a new program for these 32 States, but it is modeled on a program that has worked successfully in these other 18 States. In 1975, it was Pennsylvania, not the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

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

Ms. WATERS. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. 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, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, this Act shall take effect on, and any reference in this Act to the date of the enactment of this Act shall be construed to refer to, the first date occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act on which the Current Population Survey (CPS) of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, as released monthly, identifies that the unemployment rate for the United States is equal to 7.5 percent or less.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order against this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chair, I offer an amendment to House Resolution 836, the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program Termination Act. My amendment would simply delay implementation of H.R. 836 until the unemployment rate is at 7.5 percent nationally or lower.

□ 1120

Why 7.5 percent? Because if my Republican colleagues really want to terminate this program, focus on what people in America really want, jobs.

Ten weeks into this Congress and not one single bill has come from our Republican colleagues with respect to jobs. We haven't even had a chance to see how this program can be beneficial to the people we represent, to our neighborhoods, to the economy.

I know that shortly after the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act the phone was ringing off the hook in my offices as people were trying to find out how they could get some help to stay in their homes.

The Emergency Homeowner Loan Program was designed to assist homeowners who have experienced a significant reduction in income—in income, not because they got into a bad loan; because they have lost their jobs, because they have found another job but it doesn't pay enough, because they are underemployed, because they have found a part-time job which doesn't give them benefits so they have to use COBRA, and they have to pay for their health care simply because they have less money right now during this time when you all have not been able to help us create jobs.

This would provide as many as 30,000 distressed homeowners with loans until they are able to find better jobs or find jobs. Assistance terminates when the borrower's income is restored to 85 percent of their pre-crisis level, and the assistance is limited to 24 months or $50,000, whichever occurs first.

You know, unexpected situations, they occur in our lives. Many people who are unemployed today or are underemployed today didn't expect to lose their jobs. They went every day. They worked hard every day. As people were losing jobs, they worked harder, they stayed longer. They became more productive and still, because of decisions made by other people other than those who were working hard, they lost their jobs, or a medical problem came up. You get cancer, you have got to go to the doctor, you have got to do chemotherapy. Your employer says, don't need you around because you are out.

You have got bills piling up, and you have no job, and you are working and you can't work. And now you are going to lose your home. You are going to put people who have cancer and other serious problems like that, health problems, out of their home?

This is a program to help those kinds of people. I don't know. The last time I checked, Americans cared about each other. If we can even save one family in their home, then it is worth it.

The banks have proven that working to keep our neighbors in their homes is not a top priority for them. Don't join them. Don't join them in sending the message to America's workers, to America's families, to America's homeowners that you, too, do not think that they are a priority.

I urge you to allow this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I would note that the gentlelady from California's economic program known as the stimulus has helped another 3 million of our fellow citizens lose their jobs.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I make the point of order that the amendment violates clause 10 of rule XXI known as the cut-go rule.

I have been advised by the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment would cause a net increase in mandatory spending relative to the bill in the period specified in the rule.

Accordingly, the point of order lies, and I ask for a ruling from the chair.

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I wish to be heard, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I think this is directly related to what is going on. I don't understand how people don't understand what is going on here. Because we have this program, the Republican side says let's eliminate this program and then, if you want to help people, you need to find more money and cut another program.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentlewoman from California wish to address the point of order?

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I do believe it's germane, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California violates clause 10 of rule XXI by proposing an increase in mandatory spending over a relevant period of time.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XXI and clause 4 of rule XXIX, the Chair is authoritatively guided by estimates from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the net effect of the provisions in the amendment would increase mandatory spending over a relevant period as compared to the bill.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chair, as I sat here and I listened to all of this, there are some things that are missing from this discussion which I think we are forgetting. And that, you know, sometimes I think that we forget that this is America.

This is a country that has gained its power through its moral authority, not necessarily by its military might. And we have heard discussions this morning about kicking the can down the road, putting money into a rathole. You know, the more I think about it, Madam Chair, I think it is a very sad day when somebody from a State with high foreclosures can get up and talk about destroying a program that will help his own neighbors. There is something wrong with that picture.

President Barack Obama uses a term that I wish I had invented. He says that we have an empathy deficit in our country.

And I wonder what it's going to feel like on Sunday when my colleagues go to church, read from the same Bible that I read from, and can brag about the fact that they were able to kill a program that would allow some 30,000 people to stay in their own homes while at the same time, when I go to church, I will have to explain to them why they did it.

We are better than that. We are better as a Nation. We are better, and it's easy for people to go home. You will go home tonight, you will fly home. You will have a nice, warm house.

But let me tell you about the other America, the America that has come to five foreclosure prevention events that I have held in my district, 40 miles away from here. They come in with papers in hand because they simply want some relief. They have lost their jobs, duh, through no fault of their own.

They come in with tears running down their faces. They are black, they are white, they are Hispanic, they are Asian. They are Americans.

So you say to them, the taxpayer, the dollars that you pay, I don't want to use them to help you stay in your house and their houses. They are the same Americans that I used to see get on the early bus, the early bus, and then go to work. But now they have no jobs, in part because of the same kinds of efforts we see over and over again about saying getting rid of regulations, the regulations that were not adhered to, the ones that were not in place are the very ones that got us where we are. That's why many of them don't have jobs and are now losing their homes. We are better than that.

That's why I was one of the authors of this revision. I am tired of seeing my fellow citizens come in, your neighbors and my neighbors, people that look like your mother and my mother, people that look like your son and my son. Tears running down their faces, simply wanting a break. They are not looking for a handout. They are looking for a bridge.

And so it is when you go to church on Sunday, when they ask you, what did you do this weekend? What did you achieve?

You could say to them, stick your chest out and say, yeah, I stopped some 30,000 people from staying in their homes, Americans.

□ 1130

And then there's another argument that bothers me, Madam Chair. They act like we cannot create jobs and keep people in their homes at the same time. We can do better than that.

And so I hope that when you go back and you talk to your neighbors and you say, a $1 billion program. A billion dollars. We were trying to get a little bit more, but even in the conference committee, the Republicans cut that down. And now they're back at it again.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, we can do better than trillions of dollars of debt that is borrowed from the Chinese and the bills are sent to our children and grandchildren. When the annual deficit was $200 billion and falling, another gentleman from Maryland, the distinguished Democratic whip, said it was fiscal child abuse. Now we have a monthly deficit equaling that annual deficit.

So I listened carefully to this gentleman from Maryland. And when I go to church on Sunday, I'm going to be very glad in my heart, in my head, that I did not commit an act of fiscal child abuse on my children or anybody else's children or grandchildren. We have got to stop spending money we don't have.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on the amendment on which further proceedings were postponed.

The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) 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 185, noes 237, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

AYES—185

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
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)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger

Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—237

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
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
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
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
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Akin
Engel
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Reyes
Smith (WA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Wu

□ 1155

Messrs. WALDEN, BARTON of Texas, and Mrs. SCHMIDT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. RYAN of Ohio and RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, 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. 836) to rescind the unobligated funding for the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program and to terminate the program, and, pursuant to House Resolution 151, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I am, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Connolly of VA moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 836, to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 3(b), before ''shall continue'' insert the following: '', and any amounts made available for use under such Program pursuant to subsection (d),''.

In section 3, strike subsection (d) and insert the following new subsection:

(d) CONTINUATION OF PROGRAM FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, VETERANS, AND GOLD STAR RECIPIENTS.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION OF AMOUNTS FOR ASSISTANCE FOR ELIGIBLE HOMEOWNERS.—Not later than the expiration of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall—

(A) determine, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the amount necessary to provide assistance under title I of the Emergency Housing Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) to eligible homeowners (as such term is defined in paragraph (3) of this subsection); and

(B) submit notice of such determination to the Congress that specifies such amount.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Effective upon the submission to the Congress by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development of the notice required under paragraph (1), there is authorized to be appropriated, for assistance under the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program under the provisions of law referred to in subsection (a) of this section only for eligible homeowners, the amount identified in such notice.

(3) ELIGIBLE HOMEOWNER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''eligible homeowner'' means a homeowner who is—

(A) a member of the Armed Forces of the United States on active duty or the spouse or parent of such a member;

(B) a veteran, as such term is defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code;

(C) eligible to receive a Gold Star lapel pin under section 1126 of title 10, United States Code, as a widow, parent, or next of kin of a member of the Armed Forces person who died in a manner described in subsection (a) of such section; or

(D) such a member or veteran of the Armed Forces who has a service-connected injury, or a survivor or dependent of such a member or veteran of the Armed Forces with such an injury.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this final amendment, which I submit with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), who led this battle in committee, protects our men and women in uniform who risk their lives to keep us safe in our homes by protecting theirs. It would continue providing emergency mortgage assistance to servicemembers, veterans, and Gold Star families, amending the underlying bill that would otherwise strip away such vital assistance to homeowners in distress through no fault of their own.

Whether it is the result of being laid off or a severe medical condition or emergency, Congress has not turned its back on our Nation's veterans when they are in need, and now is no time to start.

As my colleagues are well aware, the foreclosure crisis has affected millions of American families. Sadly, our military families have suffered some of the worst brunt of this impact. Last year, 20,000 active-duty Reservists and veterans lost their homes, the largest number in recent history. Did you

know the foreclosure rate around our Nation's military installations is four times higher than the national average? From 2007 to 2008, the rate of foreclosure in towns within 10 miles of a military facility swelled by 217 percent compared with 59 percent in the rest of the country.

□ 1200

Right here in our own backyard—in my district, in the community of Woodbridge, Virginia—the foreclosure rate spiked an astounding 414 percent around the Quantico Marine Corps Base. Why is that? Because the unemployment rate for our military heroes who served in Iraq and Afghanistan is 15 percent higher than the national average. We all know how difficult the transition back into civilian life can be, particularly for the disabled as they try to find work.

Congress has repeatedly singled out veterans for additional assistance, whether it is workforce training or small business assistance. In fact, the House, itself, initiated a Wounded Warrior Program to place veterans in our Member offices; but even with that assistance, the men and women who so bravely fought on behalf of our Nation find difficulty succeeding back home. That's why we had more than 75,600 homeless veterans in 2009.

I know a young man in my district who returned home with a severe disability from a tour of duty in Iraq. Thankfully, the modest financial support he currently receives has enabled him to remain in his home, but barely, and he is only one adverse event away from foreclosure. What if his situation worsens? What if he suffers the loss of unemployment or develops a catastrophic illness? How am I supposed to tell him or his family, not to mention the thousands of others like him in many of our communities, that we are turning our backs on them?

Rather than continuing to provide for the needs of our veterans when they need us the most, this legislation patronizes them by calling for yet another study to tell us what we already know: that our military families suffer disproportionately from foreclosures. We don't need a study to tell us the right thing to do.

In a sincere attempt to honor their memories, many of my colleagues post pictures outside their offices of local servicemembers who have made the ultimate sacrifice. Those men and women fought and died protecting our homes. How can we now tell their families that we're not going to fight to protect theirs?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this final amendment and to help preserve the American Dream for those who are out there protecting that dream for each of us.

With that, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is about our veterans. I have but 1 minute, so please allow me to speak on behalf of our veterans for 1 minute.

This is a moment of truth for us. Our veterans have been there for us. We had the courage of our convictions to send them to war. They have done their jobs, but many of them are returning home to properties that are being foreclosed upon. That will be abated. This is an opportunity for us to spend 0.859 percent of the $1.6 trillion that we have spent in Iraq and Afghanistan to help our veterans retain their homes. They have been there for us. The question is: Will we be there for them today?

Don't you take up time to make sure that the veterans don't get what they deserve. Veterans have worked hard for us. We sent them to war. Let's now make sure that we take care of them in peace. Let's take care of our veterans.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the gentleman.

We are talking about our soldiers, our veterans. What do they do? They fight for our freedom, for our national defense. What is the greatest threat to our country now? What is the greatest threat to our national security? It is the debt. Don't take my word for it.

Admiral Mullen said just 2 months ago: The most significant threat to our national security is our debt.

Defense Secretary Robert Gates recently said on CNN: The country's dire fiscal situation and the threat it poses to American influence and credibility around the world will only get worse unless the United States Government faces its financial crisis.

We can start representing our soldiers and our veterans and those they defend by cutting out this worthless $1 billion program where 98 cents out of every dollar is never repaid. Let's move today. Let's defend our country. Let's start cutting our debt.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee brought to our attention something that, I believe, every veteran now knows, which is that the biggest threat to our national security is our national debt.

I am not a veteran. My brother was. He fought during the Cold War. My father was. He fought during Korea. My grandfather was. He fought during World War II. So I know veterans, Mr. Speaker, and there are no citizens in our country who are more passionate about the preservation of our national security than our veterans. There is no veteran I know of who would not put country before self. There is no veteran I know of who wants to mortgage our Nation's future to China. There is no veteran I know of who wouldn't be ashamed and embarrassed to have China foreclose on our Nation because of the national debt that has been run up by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

If we want to have a secure Nation, if we want jobs, if we want to save America from bankruptcy for our children, we've got to quit spending money we don't have. Veterans put country before self.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Members, what we are talking about is trying to eliminate a program that is duplicative, a program that has been wasteful over the last few years.

I think the colleagues who are speaking against what we are trying to do don't quite understand how the VA home loan program works. Veterans have their own program that they can go to and borrow money. They are not being disadvantaged by our doing away with the program that we are talking about today.

In fact, if VA individuals have loans that are guaranteed by the VA and their homes are under water, they can go back to the VA and, in some instances, get those loans refinanced without appraisals, including all the fees, including all the closing costs—I will remind you again—even if the homes are worth less than what the original loans were all about.

Just a moment ago, we heard of the large increases in the number of foreclosures. Let me tell you what the number is in regards to foreclosures with VA loans. The foreclosure rate is 2.5 percent. Why? Because the VA works with the people who have these loans to make sure that they don't get into serious delinquencies, which is being more than 90 days in arrears, so that they can stay in their homes; and if something happens when they have problems, the VA has a program to take care of that, too.

□ 1210

But here we have our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in some instances—some of my colleagues may not have heard this—questioning what we do in church on Sunday because we're not committed as the Lord requires us to do to other people. That's not right. Both sides of the aisle are committed to what we think is right, and what we think is right is not mortgaging our country on the backs of our children and our grandchildren anymore.

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

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 238, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

AYES—182

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
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
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—238

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
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
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
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

DeLauro
Ellison
Engel
Fattah
Giffords
Green, Gene
Harper
Polis
Reyes
Smith (WA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

□ 1227

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 173, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 2011, I inadvertently missed rollcall vote No. 173, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 177, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

AYES—242

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
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
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
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
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	Green, Al	Olver
Andrews	Green, Gene	Owens
Baca	Grijalva	Pallone
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Pascrell
Bass (CA)	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Berkley	Heinrich	Pelosi
Berman	Herrera Beutler	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Peters
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Peterson
Blumenauer	Hinchey	Pingree (ME)
Boswell	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Quigley
Braley (IA)	Holt	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Honda	Rangel
Butterfield	Hoyer	Richardson
Capps	Inslee	Richmond
Capuano	Israel	Ross (AR)
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Carney	Jackson Lee (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Chu	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clarke (MI)	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Sarbanes
Clay	Kissell	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kucinich	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Schwartz
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Conyers	LaTourette	Serrano
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Costello	Levin	Sherman
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Shuler
Critz	Lipinski	Sires
Crowley	Loebsack	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Cummings	Lowey	Stark
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Tierney
DeFazio	Markey	Tonko
DeGette	Matheson	Towns
DeLauro	Matsui	Tsongas
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Van Hollen
Dicks	McCollum	Velázquez
Dingell	McDermott	Visclosky
Doggett	McGovern	Walz (MN)
Donnelly (IN)	McIntyre	Wasserman Schultz
Doyle	McNerney	Waters
Edwards	Michaud	Watt
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Waxman
Eshoo	Miller, George	Weiner
Farr	Moore	Welch
Fattah	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Filner	Murphy (CT)	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Wu
Fudge	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Neal	
Gonzalez		

NOT VOTING—13

Bilbray	Luján	Stutzman
Brady (TX)	Meeks	Thompson (CA)
Engel	Polis	Thompson (MS)
Giffords	Reyes	
Granger	Smith (WA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute left in the vote.

□ 1233

Ms. BASS of California changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make known that I was unable to cast a ''yes'' vote on Final Passage of H.R. 836, the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program Termination Act. I am in favor of this legislation and would like the RECORD to reflect my support.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 836, EMERGENCY MORTGAGE RELIEF PROGRAM TERMINATION ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 836, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to accurately reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 839, HAMP TERMINATION ACT OF 2011; AND H.R. 861, NSP TERMINATION ACT

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is scheduled to meet on Tuesday, March 15, at 3 p.m., to grant a rule, which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 839, the HAMP Termination Act of 2011, and H.R. 861, the NSP Termination Act.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment to either bill must submit an electronic copy of the amendment and description via the committee's Web site. Members must also submit 30 hard copies of the amendment, one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment, and an amendment log-in form to the Rules Committee in room H–312, upstairs, of the Capitol by 10 a.m., Tuesday, March 15. Both electronic and hard copies must be received by the date and time specified. Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bills as ordered reported by the Committee on Financial Services, which are available on the Rules Committee Web site.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format. Members should also check with the Office of the Parliamentarian, the Committee on the Budget, and the Congressional Budget Office to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House and the Congressional Budget Act.

If Members have any questions, please contact me or the Rules Committee staff.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, to inquire about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider at least two bills under suspension of the rules on Monday, which will be announced by the close of business today. On Tuesday, we expect to consider a short-term continuing resolution to fund the government for another 3 weeks. On Wednesday, the House will consider one or possibly two more bills from the Financial Services Committee addressing mandatory spending: H.R. 839, the Home Affordable Modification Program Termination Act; and H.R. 861, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Termination Act. Finally, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the House will consider a concurrent resolution sponsored by Mr. KUCINICH related to the War Powers Resolution.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

He mentioned the CR, the continuing resolution, the continuing authorization to operate government, which I understand will be for a 3-week period.

Can the gentleman tell us what will be in that continuing resolution at this point in time?

Mr. CANTOR. As the gentleman knows, our majority is committed to the process of providing a 3-day notice for all Members, as well as their constituents, to see what we will be voting on. The Appropriations Committee is busy preparing the text of that, and it will be presented online this afternoon. The details will be in that online version this afternoon.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Now, it's my understanding we are not scheduled, according to his announcement, to meet next Friday.

Is that accurate?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes. I would say to the gentleman that is correct.

Mr. HOYER. And I take it the gentleman is reasonably certain, obviously we don't know what the other body will do, but in light of the fact that that CR will be offered next Tuesday, the gentleman's presumption is that, in fact, we will be out sometime on Thursday.

Mr. CANTOR. Well, I would say to the gentleman, we certainly look forward to the Senate acting expeditiously and acting quickly on the House's 3-week extension. Assuming that goes as well, the gentleman is correct in assuming that we will not be in session next Friday.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman and I have had this discussion, and I think we both agree that continuing to fund government on either a 2-week or 3-week cycle is not what we ought to be doing. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, a number of economists have indicated that if, in fact, we

proceed to funding levels that reflect H.R. 1, which is my assumption of what will happen according to what the gentleman has told me and, I think, said publicly, the funding levels that are included in H.R. 1 on a week-to-week basis, which leads me to believe that if we are having a 3-week extension will be somewhere in the neighborhood of $6 billion in additional reductions.

Would that be accurate?

Mr. CANTOR. I would agree with the gentleman that, yes, as he and I have discussed, we intend for the 3-week extension to maintain the current formula upon which we are operating today, and that is a reduction of spending of $2 billion per week. I expect the Appropriations Committee, again, to introduce a 3-week, short-term extension cutting $2 billion per week later this afternoon, consistent with the House position as spelled out in H.R. 1.

□ 1240

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I would observe to him that with respect to H.R. 1, numerous economists have indicated, including Mark Zandi, who was, of course, one of the principal advisers to JOHN MCCAIN when he ran for President, Chairman Bernanke, chairman of the Federal Reserve, Goldman Sachs, Moody's, and others, that the just rejected H.R. 1, if adopted, would lead to the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs, in one analyst's point of view, over 800,000 jobs.

In fact, of course, three Republicans voted against H.R. 1 in the Senate, and one of those who voted for H.R. 1 in the Senate said this, Mr. Speaker: Let me be clear that I strongly oppose some of the proposed cuts in the House-passed bill—that was H.R. 1—particularly the drastic cuts that would disproportionately affect low-income families and seniors. Making such deep and immediate cuts to critical low-income heating assistance, weatherization, and Head Start programs in the middle of the fiscal year would cause serious problems for those who rely on these programs. That was Senator COLLINS, a Republican from Maine, when the bill was on the floor.

So let me ask the gentleman, do we have a plan to proceed so that we can, A, retreat from the uncertainty that we keep creating by these 2 weeks? I know that he and I agreed that this is not the way to proceed, but does the gentleman have a plan, A, to move forward so that we can fund government through September 30, complete funding for this fiscal year, and turn our attention and focus on what I know the gentleman knows the Appropriations Committee is now focusing on, the fiscal year 2012 appropriations and spending plan.

Does the gentleman have in mind when we might get to a plan to fund the balance of government, not on 2- or 3-week cycles but between now and September 30?

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

First of all I want to respond to the first part of the gentleman's discussions regarding Mr. Zandi and the other individuals he spoke to regarding the predictions of doom because of our position on H.R. 1.

I would say to the gentleman, and as he knows, there are as many economists, certainly several hundred, who signed a letter indicating that the cuts were not something that would produce the results that Mr. Zandi and others have predicted.

In fact, it's Mr. Zandi's math that was applicable to the stimulus bill that I think most Americans do know now failed in the promises made that we would see unemployment not rise above 8 percent.

Again, the gentleman and I have had a discussion before that if the answer was just spend more government taxpayer dollars to create jobs, why don't we just go spend it all and then everybody will be employed again. Well, we know that's not true and that doesn't work.

We also know that Chairman Bernanke did not agree with the predictions of the kinds of cuts that Mr. Zandi and others have predicted, according to his testimony. Certainly we believe, very strongly, that if you cut government spending, we create an environment for private sector jobs.

And to the gentleman's direct question about when we can proceed with a longer term solution so that we do not have to continue operating in stopgap ways, I would say to the gentleman, as he knows, it's not just the House, it's trying to work with the Senate as well as the White House.

The Senate did act this week, and we now know that the Senate rejects our $60 billion, approximately $60 billion cut off of 2010 levels, and it also rejected the proposed $10 billion worth of cuts by Leader REID. In fact, there were more votes in favor of the $60 billion H.R. 1 level than there were for the $10 billion level off of current spending.

The problem is the White House has not indicated where it wants to go. And as we both have discussed before, as I have told the gentleman, I just don't see where the leadership is on the part of the White House.

It is obviously up to the White House to come to the table as well, as the President has got to sign the bill. We agree it is much better for us to be operating with some certainty and not have to be operating off of stopgap measures every several weeks. But we don't want to shut government down, we want to cut spending.

If this is how we are able to do it, we are going to deliver on that promise to cut spending. But I do share with the gentleman the frustration that we don't see any type of coalescence around a notion that we should have some type of longer term agreement on this fiscal year.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his response, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I understand the gentleman's issue with respect to the President. Both the gentleman and I understand and agree that the Constitution, in article I, gives to the House of Representatives of the United States and the Senate the responsibility to raise and spend moneys, so that this is a primary responsibility of the legislative department of government, which he and I have the privilege of serving in. While I understand that the gentleman is accurate, both alternatives were defeated in the United States Senate.

The President put an offer on the table in his 2011 budget. We then, in December, froze spending at 2010 levels, which was $41 billion less than the President's offer which he put on the table.

We have now had two additional offers put on the table. The next offer was, of course, included in H.R. 1. That passed this House but did not pass the Senate.

The Senate, however, did put an offer on the table, as the gentleman pointed out, cutting an additional $10 billion above the $41 billion, or $6 billion above the $4 billion that was included in the short-term CR which expires on March 18.

What I ask the gentleman again is, does the gentleman now propose, and will the gentleman and his side of the aisle be proposing, a counteroffer, as I said last week, or is the gentleman's position you are staying, as I seemed to hear you say, at the $100 billion figure that was included in H.R. 1, which implies that unless there is an agreement to your figure, that we will have to shut down government or agree to your figure.

I want to make sure that I understand your thoughts on that.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I say to the gentleman again, it is the House that has taken the position that we want to see cuts of approximately $60 billion off of current 2010 levels. The Senate said it wanted to cut $10 billion off of 2010 levels.

There is a $50 billion difference here. What we believe is we need to do everything we can to try to figure out how to do more with less in Washington.

The American public sent us to Washington to spend their money the way they would. I think most people also, certainly our conference, believe you cut government spending, you create private sector jobs. That's what we are about. We are waiting to see what position the White House will take so that we can move forward and begin the job that we are supposed to be about right now, which is the next fiscal year.

As the gentleman knows, we are here because, unfortunately, the last Congress did not pass a budget, did not pass appropriations bills. We are trying to clean up that mess.

So we are waiting to see what the White House's position is so we can begin to see how we can maximize efficiencies in government, cut spending,

so that we can see more private sector jobs.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answer. I think I did not receive an answer in terms of whether or not the gentleman is saying it's either $100 billion or nothing, and that there will be no counteroffer to the offer that is on the table, either from the President or, more accurately at this point in time, in terms of the timing from the Senate, which got us to $51 billion in cuts, which, although the gentleman would like to say it's between zero and $60 billion, the gentleman in his Pledge to America said he was going to cut $100 billion. The reason he got to $100 billion was he counted the $41 billion cut from the President's initial offer of 2011 spending.

What has happened, since the gentleman and his party made that offer, Mr. Speaker, is that, in fact, $41 billion of that $100 billion was accepted in the CR that was passed which expired 2 weeks ago.

□ 1250

Since that time, we've put from the Senate's perspective an additional $10 billion on the table to get us to $51 billion. The way I calculate it, that is more than halfway from the gentleman's offer, not of $60 billion in his Pledge to America but $100 billion. And the way he got to $100 billion is the $41 billion that we already cut in the first CR, the additional $10 billion is now $51 billion. I say to the gentleman, we've come halfway, a little more than halfway. And we are now asking the gentleman, is he going to have a counteroffer for us that we can consider from our offer of $51 billion which we believe is more than halfway?

I will tell you further, Mr. Leader, that it is my staff's belief, and I could be corrected on this, that the offer that is on the table represents the single largest cut from one year to the next since I have been in the Congress of the United States, which is largely under Republican Presidents.

We obviously are prepared to agree and have agreed on very substantial restraints in spending, cutting spending, trying to get a handle on this deficit. As you know, I'm concerned about the fact that in the rule we adopted on the first day of the session that you provided for $4.7 trillion in additional tax expenditures, if you will, tax cuts, cutting of revenue, that is projected currently by CBO which will lead to $4.7 trillion of additional spending, while you have proposed a trillion dollars of cuts, leaving a net appreciation of the deficit of $3.7 trillion, increased deficit that is in fact planned for under your rule.

All I am asking for now is, do you have and will you have a counteroffer to our $51 billion offer so that we can then try to move on and reach compromise? If it is simply, no, we want $100 billion or nothing, then we'll have to make a decision, as I have told the gentleman, on our side of the aisle: What do we do at that point in time? We obviously have the majority in the Senate and we have the President of the United States, the American people have elected. And as Newt Gingrich, your former Speaker, our former Speaker, said in 1998, we have to reach agreement. And the way you reach agreement is to get offers back and forth. We think we have an offer on the table and we'd like to hear your counteroffer.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. First of all, the problem is that the $10 billion off of current spending, that that is the largest cut that has ever been proposed since the gentleman has been in Congress, that's the problem. That's the problem.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I did not say it was the largest cut that had ever been proposed in Congress. I said it is the largest cut from one year to the other, from the previous year's spending. And it is $13.6 billion, I believe. Seventeen billion. My staffer, who's brilliant, much more brilliant than I am, reminds me that I am——

Mr. CANTOR. I'm told the gentleman has a lot of those.

Mr. HOYER. Right. Both of us do.

Mr. CANTOR. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. I want to clarify so the public understands as well when they hear us, what we're talking about cutting from is 14 percent of the budget, the discretionary, non-defense, non-security, part of the budget. So let me focus on that. And when I speak of the cut, and it is $17 billion in non-security, that from year to year, since I've been here since 1981, is the largest single cut in non-defense, non-security discretionary spending from one year to the other. Yes, it is. And that's in a very small 14 percent slice of the budget. Frankly, the discussions we have had to date ignore the other 81, 82, 83 percent of the budget. Obviously interest rates are not subject to being reduced. We need to pay our debt.

So I just want to clarify, A, that I am speaking of the discretionary part of the budget, non-defense, non-security; and, yes, from year to year it is in fact what's sitting on the table as an offer to you the largest cut we've had in non-defense, non-security discretionary spending in the last 30 years.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly the problem still. Because, as the gentleman alludes, we have over a trillion and a half dollar deficit this year alone. I understand the gentleman's point about there being just a smaller piece of the budget from which these cuts are being taken. But the bottom line is, that's the problem. We've got to work harder to cut more so that private sector jobs can be created.

I would say to the gentleman two things: One, I look forward to his support, then, of the budget that we bring forward, because we are, as the gentleman knows, going to be dealing with how to reform the entitlement programs, which are the significant driver of deficits into the future as he knows. So I do look forward to that. We will be dealing with that within a month's time. I look forward to that debate.

But I would lastly say, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman know what kind of cuts the Senate can support at the 60-vote level? Because I don't. So I don't see a counteroffer there. I don't see a position that the Senate or the gentleman's side of the aisle has taken. I don't see the President having come down at a level that is acceptable at all because he hasn't come down to a level.

This is the problem, Mr. Speaker. We have made our position known. The House wants to cut 60 some billion dollars off of the 2010 levels or $100 billion off of the 2011 proposals. We don't want the status quo. We want to continue to cut spending. We can't come to any agreement when the other side doesn't come forward with any offer, and that's why we have been forced into this situation where we are once again proposing a stopgap measure so that we can see the government operate, so it doesn't shut down, in the name of trying to do more with less.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend.

Let me make a point here, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, the gentleman continues to take the position until we get to 100, there is no credible counteroffer. Two billion a week.

The gentleman served with a very conservative Member, also a great Member of this Congress, a guy named Joe Scarborough. Most of America knows Joe Scarborough. Let me give a quote from Joe Scarborough:

''There are elements of the GOP spending plan that cause me great concern. The belief of some on the right that America can balance the budget by cutting education, infrastructure, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and home heating assistance for the poor is tantamount to budgetary witchcraft.''

That's not a Democrat. That's Joe Scarborough, conservative Member from northern Florida, with whom I served. Now a lot of people see him on Morning Joe every day. The fact of the matter is that's what he said. Now we're looking for a counteroffer, because we don't agree with some of H.R. 1, as you well know. As a matter of fact, every conservative Democrat, every liberal Democrat and everybody in between voted ''no'' on H.R. 1, as did three of your Republicans over there and SUSAN COLLINS, who voted for it, said she didn't like the elements in it.

So what I am saying to my friend, very sincerely, is, he can preach all he wants about we need to cut spending. We agree with that. And the issue is where you cut it from. What impact does it have? Does it sustain the economy or does it deflate the economy? Does it create jobs or does it lose jobs? Does it help people who need help or does it abandon people who need help? That's the issue.

And what I am saying to my friend with all due respect is, we have made

an offer. The gentleman wants to talk about the President. Article I of the Constitution says we need to do this. This is our responsibility. The people elected us to do it. And the people elected us to reach agreement.

And how do you reach agreement? This is what I want. This is what you want. We have come up. We have moved; pretty substantially. We think it was appropriate to move. Now we are asking you, are you prepared to move from the position you have taken consistently at your figure, which a lot of your folks think has problems in its constituent parts?

□ 1300

I'm asking you, and I can't get an answer, and you apparently are not going to make a counteroffer as to, okay, we took 100, we passed it, couldn't pass the Senate, you offered something in return. And what I mean by ''you,'' the Senate didn't pass it. The gentleman is absolutely correct. But we Democrats have made the offer here and there of the $51 billion. The President has indicated he could sign that. He said that publicly.

Now, that's our offer sitting on the table. My suspicion is you've rejected that offer. And if you have rejected it, what is your counteroffer? That is my question.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman again.

Not to belabor the point, but I did say, Mr. Speaker, that there were not 60 votes in the Senate for the offer he speaks of. In fact, there were more votes for the $60 billion off of the current funding levels that is our plan. So there is really no offer on the table that is valid because it can't pass the Senate.

What is the Democratic Senate's offer on the table? The gentleman rightfully says it is up to us in Congress. The people elect us to try and come together and agree upon a spending plan. What is the offer? There is no offer that could pass in the Senate. We passed the House version. We know where the House stands. So I'm just having difficulty in understanding where the offer is.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has made his points. He is frustrated because he sees there is no movement because the Senate has been unable to get an offer on the table that can garner 60 votes. So the gentleman wants us to negotiate with ourselves. No. We want to cut spending and keep the government open. That's why we're in the position we are, to do another stopgap measure so that we can hopefully iron out some differences, cooperate in trying to keep the government open, and cut spending so that people in the private sector get back to work.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

As I understand what the gentleman is saying, if the Senate can't get 60 votes—which, of course, we have seen the gridlock for a long period of time where the Senate can't get 60 votes—that we're not going to go anywhere from the offer that he's made to pass something that can, in fact, garner 60 votes in the Senate.

I regret that the Senate, frankly, didn't get 60 votes for our offer. And he is correct that he got a few more votes for H.R. 1 than was gotten for the Senate majority leader's counteroffer. But the fact of the matter is this is really an issue between the Republicans and the Democrats.

Senator MCCONNELL has said, as I know the majority leader says, we'll pass what the House passes. That's what he said. Now, if that's the case, then we need to pass something that can garner 60 votes over there. We know that H.R. 1 couldn't get 60 votes. We know that Senator REID's proposal couldn't get 60 votes.

And if we're going to move this government forward and not fund it on 2-week cycles—and Senator MCCAIN has said that funding the Defense Department on 2-week or 3-week cycles is undermining our national security. So there is no disagreement that doing things 2 weeks at a time does not make sense. And if the gentleman's view is simply you will not make some offer that we think—and we can have a discussion about trying to come to agreement on that—that we can get 60 votes for in the Senate and we're going to fund it on 2-week cycles, I say to my friend, that's going to be damaging to the economy, create great uncertainty, and undermine our national security. And I would hope that the gentleman would see fit to determine where we can meet somewhere in the middle.

We think we've come 51 percent of the way towards your hundred. Towards your hundred. You keep talking about 60. That was not your pledge. Your pledge was 100. And the way you got to 100 was to count the 41. We've done that. We've done another 10. So we've come, we think, 51 percent of the way. You don't count it that way, and we understand that. But whatever way we come, we need to move on.

You won the majority. God bless you. I'm sorry about that, but I live with it, and there it is. You have the majority. And with the majority, you have the responsibility to see if we can move this country forward. That's what Newt Gingrich said. And you can't be the perfectionist caucus, as he referred to, of sticking just at a number that doesn't have the votes in the United States Senate.

And if we're going to be on this 2-week cycle, I will tell my friend, you may keep passing these 2 weeks at a time. None of us want to shut down government. But I will tell you that while I and my colleagues, some of my colleagues, may vote to do this one more time, for me, it's the last time. We need to have a plan to fund this government for the balance of the fiscal year to September 30. It is irresponsible for us not to have that. And just each of us sticking to our number, you sticking to your number, and just pointing fingers at one another saying ''the Senate can't get 60 votes for anything we propose'' will not serve our country or our people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2011

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF DR. MICHAEL ALESSANDRI

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great individual of my south Florida community, Dr. Michael Alessandri, for his work with children and young adults who have been diagnosed with autism. Dr. Alessandri, a professor of psychology at my alma mater, the University of Miami, will be honored at the Kesher Annual Scholarship Journal Dinner to celebrate his commitment to this amazing organization.

Kesher, an organization that provides an academic and Jewish education to children with special needs, was formed in 1995 with two classrooms and 20 students. Today, with the help of Dr. Alessandri, the organization is shaping the lives of over 80 children and young adults with autism through their personalized student curriculum. Dr. Allesandri's dedication to helping children and young adults with autism obtain an education has been fundamental to the success of Kesher.

Once again, I would like to congratulate Dr. Alessandri and all of the staff, faculty, and parents and the students of Kesher, and hope others follow his lead in making our community a better place in which to live.

LEASE EXTENSION AND SECURE ENERGY ACT OF 2011

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, unemployment is still at nearly 9 percent, $4 gasoline is on the way, and the Obama administration still doesn't get it. They've locked up our domestic energy resources through the recently issued Wild Lands order, which had no congressional authority, and they continue to pursue regulatory drilling moratoria.

Every developed country in the world looks to their own resources to fuel their economies. We have access to resources that dwarf the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and we can finally put our country on a path to energy independence. The United States has vast energy resources on our public lands and off our coasts that belong to the taxpayers.

This is why I've introduced the Lease Extension and Secure Energy Act of 2011. This bill would extend offshore leases impacted by the Obama administration's drilling moratorium for an additional 12 months. This legislation would return time lost during the drilling moratorium, adding certainty so domestic producers can continue exploration without a looming lease expiration.

We need the stability that comes from an all-of-the-above energy approach. We need a commonsense energy policy that brings stability to the marketplace, creates good paying American jobs, grows our economy, reduces our dependence on foreign oil, and raises trillions of dollars to help pay off our growing $14 trillion national debt. We owe this to our children and to our grandchildren.

IN HONOR OF ANN'S CHOICE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this past week, I had the privilege of addressing about 700 residents back home in my district, the residents of the Ann's Choice retirement community in Warminster Township, Bucks County, and to thank those residents and senior citizens for collectively putting together over 55,000 hours of community service, really outstanding community service, back home in Bucks County.

Some of the many activities that accounted for a tremendous amount of hours included tutoring and reading to elementary school children, providing wheelchair escorts, sorting and packaging clothing for the needy, creating blankets for ill children, and providing comfort to those in need.

Mr. Speaker, communities are built on service to others. Through this service, the community of Ann's Choice is, in fact, strong and vibrant. The countless lives they have touched have made Bucks County a stronger and better place to live, and for that I salute them.

□ 1310

CATASTROPHIC CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk a little bit about what has been going on recently. We heard a little colloquy just a moment ago with the majority leader and the minority leader talking about what is going on in H.R. 1 and some of the catastrophic cuts that are being proposed by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I spoke earlier during the debate on H.R. 1, and found from communications that the people back in my district in Oregon are taking it seriously. They are worried that we will do the devastating $60 billion worth of cuts within a short, 1-year time frame that has been universally panned, actually, by experts across the country.

My colleagues and I on the Democratic side have offered alternatives that I think are a little more reasonable. We realize, as the gentleman from Maryland talked about, we need to make some reductions, but we should make them in a serious way, something that will accomplish our goals. I think scaring Americans needlessly is inappropriate.

The cuts they are talking about are not going to happen. The Food and Drug Administration, we just passed a food safety bill in the last Congress, and they want to cut $240 million below the 2010 level, much less implement the Food and Drug Safety Administration work that we have asked them to do. USDA would be furloughing inspectors. Our meat safety programs would not be safe. We would not be able to have the processing plants inspected on a regular basis going forward.

The ability for some of our small, rural communities to have safe drinking water hinges on the wastewater and drinking programs that we have, the revolving loan funds that we have here in Congress. Reducing the programs as much as Republicans want would cause serious, serious problems. It would also eliminate 54,000 engineering, construction, and support jobs as a result of this. We need to be adding jobs, not subtracting jobs at this point in time.

We also have State and local grants. We have States back home, and our local communities are starving right now. A lot of the budgets are out of whack. The worst thing we can be doing is cutting our State grant programs which fund the education, public safety, and health care needs of our local communities. We should actually be empowering and helping them through these tough budget times, and only the Federal Government has that ability.

The firefighter grants are being cut. COPS grants are being cut. Our public safety is at serious risk here. I can't believe this is being proposed in any serious manner whatsoever. I have to assume it is all part of the political theater and part of the campaign still. It is time to get off the campaign trail and quit the political circus and get back to actually worrying about serious reductions we have to make to put our country back in balance, and that means going to other programs.

They are also wanting to cut title 1 grants to school districts. This is the one area where the Federal Government actually comes to the aid of the local school districts with special ed and IDEA moneys that they need to actually make sure that they can deliver those high-cost special needs programs to students. We are actually cutting them: $700 million from the two big formula programs we have here. It is a 4 percent cut to title 1 programming when our local districts need it the most.

Head Start, a proven, performance-based program to get our kids off to a great start and a great education so they don't need the remediation that we have to do later on in high school and college. They are cutting Head Start 20 percent, so 200,000 children would be kicked out of the Head Start program. I don't think that's the way you become a world leader. I don't think that is going to help our STEM programs do the research and innovation we need.

Pell Grants. Pell Grants, a commitment we made to American students, I think it is really important. Back home in Oregon, I worked very, very hard on a scholarship program that actually, with our Federal aid, our State aid, scholarship programs, parental involvement, and student working at a minimum wage job during the summer full time and during the school year part-time, the student could actually graduate from college with an undergraduate degree and no more than $13,000 or $14,000 in debt. When we take our share of the bargain away by cutting the Pell Grant program from our promised level of $5,500 down to $4,700, that can make the difference between young men and women actually being able to afford that college education so they can compete with the best and brightest around the world.

Job training. It is unbelievable to me that in H.R. 1, our Republican colleagues are cutting job training employment services; more than $4 billion in cuts to job training programs. This is unconscionable, folks. This is exactly the time when we need to get these dislocated workers back into the workforce. The Trade Adjustment Act cuts are unconscionable. We need to make sure that there is an opportunity for these folks to retrain, get back in the workforce, pay taxes, and help get the economy back on track. Cutting these programs just doesn't make any sense.

They are even cutting Social Security, folks. Pretty amazing. They cut the operational budget from $125 million below the 2010 level, and $1 billion dollars below the President's requested level for 2011. They apparently don't think that we need technology to improve Social Security's ability to work with seniors and make sure that they get the services they need, to cut down on mistakes and to cut down on the fraud and abuse in the benefit programs for our deserving Social Security recipients. They don't care. They really don't care. It is pretty amazing the range and scope of these cuts.

We have listened to Ben Bernanke in the Budget Committee say that the Republican plan would result in hundreds of thousands of jobs lost in this country. Mark Zandi, MCCAIN's economist, he puts a number on it of 700,000 jobs lost. Goldman Sachs, not exactly a paragon of liberal virtue, said it would really hit our GDP, maybe 2 percent.

We need jobs, we need jobs, we need jobs. We have to be smart how we go about this. Right now we need surgical cuts, not the meat ax approach that is being proposed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

I offered a proposal during the debate that would have cut our budget by about $22 billion. It is kind of a nice intermediate approach as I see it from where the Senate is and where our colleagues started. It also looks at the defense budget. I am a huge supporter of our warriors overseas and in this country. They do great things, whether it is a local disaster or a serious problem abroad. But we have to look at the contracting and the weapons procurement programs. Secretary Gates has been very, very clear that there is lots of room, lots and lots of room for improvement there.

I think we need to work on a bipartisan approach. Enough of the political theater, frankly, on both sides. It is time to sit down and look at the individual programs and services that are most in need for this country right now. And until we are willing to sit down and do that, we are going to continue to do these 2- or 3-week continuing resolutions that make a mockery out of the greatest country in the world, funding the Federal Government of the United States of America 2 weeks at a time. I think there is nothing that makes us look more foolish in the world's eyes and in our own constituents' eyes and to the folks at home. It is time for us to really move forward.

There has been a lot of bashing of our public sector employees across the Nation. A public sector job is apparently a bad thing. Well, I am here to tell you in my corner of the universe in Oregon, the public sector employer is oftentimes the biggest employer, and sometimes the only employer of any real size in some of these communities. The school districts, the school districts in rural Oregon are oftentimes the big employer. These are good jobs. These are people, teachers who are giving of their time. And, frankly, my wife is a teacher, she is working overtime, after hours, putting their own dollars sometimes into the kitty to make sure our kids get a great education. The demagoguery that goes on of the public sector is, I think, unfortunate and out of place here.

The hospitals in rural parts of our country are oftentimes the biggest employer. Oftentimes they are public hospitals; they are not private operations. Not-for-profit hospitals, there are a bunch of them in Oregon, and they are huge employers. That has got to be recognized. Again, the demagoguery, I just don't think has any place.

□ 1320

Right now, I point to a project that's going on along the central coast of the great State of Oregon, which is moving the NOAA fleet, the Pacific NOAA fleet, down into a small community that has been devastated for years, not just by this recent recession, but by over 20 years of strife. Fishing has been cut back. Fishing grounds have been cut back. Timber has been cut back. You can't cut any trees anymore in our State. They've been hurting for a long time. The recession has added to it. They've tried to go into the tourism business, and that has been hit, obviously, with what has gone on in this recession.

As a result of that, we actually have a very exciting opportunity for the Pacific NOAA fleet to come down and regenerate that economy, providing thousands of new jobs, with hundreds immediately related to the NOAA project, itself. For all the parts, all the remediation, all the opportunities to partner in the community, there should be some great opportunities, I think, for the central Oregon coast. This would all be put in jeopardy because the Commerce budget and the NOAA budget are cut.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Would the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. SCHRADER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding since he has just made a good litany of ill-intentioned potential cuts by the Republicans.

You just mentioned NOAA. I'd like to point out that, as we're speaking, we're waiting for the third tidal wave to hit the Oregon coast. They're about an hour apart. We should be hit again in about 10 minutes.

Now, the reason we know where these waves are, what their amplitude is, what the potential for damage is, the reason we were able to evacuate those communities last night, and the reason we're online right now with our State emergency services people is because of the warning buoys we have and because of the great work of the National Oceanic Atmospheric Association and the National Weather Service.

The Republicans have proposed to decimate those programs in H.R. 1. So, in the Republican world, when everybody at NOAA is furloughed for 21 days, if there happens to be an earthquake in Japan and if you live on the Pacific Coast or if there are some tornadoes in the Midwest, tough luck, sorry. We had to furlough those employees who would have warned you to go to your tornado shelter. We had to furlough those employees who would have warned you to evacuate the low-lying areas on the Oregon-California Coast and in Hawaii. But, no, they have targeted massive cuts in the NOAA budget—$450 million. It's estimated that NOAA, because of the time of year these would be put in place, would have to have 21 days of furloughs for all of its employees. There will be $110 million in cuts to the National Weather Service and a big cut to State disaster preparedness grants.

So, right now, our Emergency Operations Centers in Oregon, in California, in Hawaii are in full swing. The reason that they're able to be in touch with people in scattered coastal communities and in relatively difficult areas to access, which could be cut off if the waves are bad enough, is because of the Federal assistance that we have given to them to set up these centers. Under the Republicans' budget, we would cut $206 million from State Emergency Operations Centers.

Now, where are the States going to get the money in this bad climate? I guess those places won't be tended to either.

So we won't know the tidal waves are coming because they'll have laid off the people at NOAA. We won't know the tornadoes are happening. Even if we did happen to stumble over that fact despite these cuts, we won't have the Emergency Operations Centers to coordinate in order to evacuate people and to rescue and to coordinate medical services.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield to me on that same point?

Mr. SCHRADER. Absolutely.

Mr. DICKS. Being from Washington State, I am as concerned as the gentleman is about the west coast. We have a number of Indian tribes that are right down at the coastal waters, and several of them are trying to move back because of a tsunami. This is a great wake-up call.

One of the things I'm worried about are the satellites. We have new satellites that we're supposed to be procuring. This program is in some trouble, and I'm worried that these cuts are going to affect the ability of NOAA to get these satellites in a proper time. They give us the warning on major weather fronts. This is another important aspect of this. FEMA is another problem.

I just want to rise to congratulate the two gentlemen from Oregon for bringing this to the floor as we watch to see how these tsunamis hit the west coast of the United States. I mean, some of the weather forecasters have said that this could be a very serious problem, but we hope it isn't. I just wanted to associate myself with the remarks that have been made here and stress how important the NOAA budget is and the importance of getting these satellites replaced in a timely way.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentleman would just yield again.

Mr. SCHRADER. Indeed.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This all seemed to have started with our former colleague, Bobby Jindal, now the Governor of Louisiana, when last year or the year before last he made fun of money that was being appropriated for volcano monitoring. I'll tell you, actually, that

I live in a region that has a number of dormant volcanoes—not extinct, but dormant—and it is crucial.

Three Sisters has got a bulge on it. We're watching that all the time. There is the potential for a big lahar that could wipe out some communities and people downstream. Certainly, up in the Seattle area, there are concerns about Mt. Rainier. We have Mt. Hood and others.

So all of these attacks on emergency services seem to come with all of the juice that Bobby Jindal got out of criticizing volcano monitoring. Well, I think it's pretty darned important to monitor volcanoes, too.

Mr. DICKS. We've had a volcano. Mount St. Helens erupted and it was enormous. I had been told again and again when I was chairman of Interior that California has a very complex system of detection. The rest of the country doesn't. Washington and Oregon do not have the same level of early warning equipment. So I think this is another thing that we've got to work on.

Again, these cuts are going to make it more difficult for us to get the equipment that we need to predict and to detect when these things are occurring. I worry about Mt. Rainier. Mt. Rainier could have the lahar, and we've been told by USGS that Washington State could have a 9. This was 8–9, and look at the enormous damage that was done there. I mean, we could have another major event in the future. I hope it doesn't happen, but it does happen every 300 or 400 years.

Mr. SCHRADER. It may even be sooner than that.

I mean, you can't help but note the devastation wrought by the earthquake in New Zealand just very recently and now here in Japan. This is the Pacific Rim, the volatile Pacific Rim. So I think there are a great deal of problems that we've got to be careful of.

The good Congresswoman from Hawaii is feeling the brunt of it right now. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. HIRONO. Thank you very much.

I thank the two gentlemen from Oregon for bringing this matter to our attention.

I think we make a very serious mistake when, in a fervor to cut budgets and to do it in a meat-ax way, we cut the very programs that we're going to need to rely upon in times like this, meaning in the times of the kind of devastation that has hit Japan. Of course, Hawaii is the first U.S. State to be hit with the tidal wave that followed that disaster, and it's still playing out. We still haven't done the ''all clear'' sign in Hawaii, by the way.

With the kinds of cuts that we are contemplating in H.R. 1, FEMA is going to have a major impact. I also want to say, before I go further, that our hearts go out to the people of Japan, and we stand ready to assist them in any way. I think that it is so important at a time like this that we have the resources to employ the best technology, cutting-edge equipment, well-trained personnel to respond when these emergencies occur.

In fact, when this tragedy occurred in Japan, they dedicated Federal employees at the National Weather Service at a specific tsunami warning center, and they were there to provide advance warning to the people of our islands. This early warning allowed the Coast Guard, Hawaii State Civil Defense, and the other State and county officials to put into motion the State's emergency warning response plans.

This whole thing began to unfold in Hawaii in the very early morning hours. I'm just grateful that all of our first responders had everything they needed in order to be able to take the appropriate action. They had to decide whether or not schools would be open and whether public buildings were going to remain open. In fact, they did evacuate people in the low-lying areas just to make sure that the safety of our people and of our visitors would be protected.

So, right now, the reports are encouraging in Hawaii. There has been some flooding on several islands, but the level of damage, however, thankfully, is not severe. There have been no reports of injuries or fatalities, but as I mentioned, the ''all clear'' sign is not there yet.

□ 1330

So the kind of cuts to FEMA, we mentioned already the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, would have seen its budget cut by $454.3 million, including our $126 million cut to the National Weather Service. So there goes advance warning.

The cuts would not have spared the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, either. And according to the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee's analysis, cuts to FEMA and the Coast Guard would have totaled $441 million. This includes a $105 million cut to the Coast Guard's acquisition, construction and improvement accounts, money for ships and equipment to deal with emergencies; a $50 million cut to FEMA's Interoperable Emergency Communication Grants program, money that helps our first responders get the equipment to communicate with each other.

This was a huge problem when 9/11 occurred, where our first responders could not keep track of what was going on, couldn't talk to each other. So a $35 million cut to FEMA's predisaster mitigation grants, hurting our communities' ability to implement necessary prevention measures against threats.

So we've heard all the time about we should learn to do more with less. Well, in our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee hearing where we had the people from the Coast Guard come to testify, these kinds of cuts mean that they really are facing doing less with less. And we also hear about how families understand the need to cut. Well, when families cut, they do less with less.

So these kinds of slogans and the kind of meat-ax approach to the kinds of cuts we're looking at in H.R. 1 are devastating, and especially now when we are once again confronted with a huge, huge natural disaster in Japan that can have ramifications particularly on Hawaii and the west coast.

It, again, shows the foolishness of these kinds of massive cuts that really disable our ability to deal with these disasters.

Mr. SCHRADER. I appreciate the gentlelady's comments. We have some breaking news from southern Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Yes, exactly. I just got an email—and I've got to go take a phone call in the Cloak Room—but they just announced that some heavy waves have come into the harbor at Coos Bay. This would be the third period of waves. They say the fourth or the fifth might be the worst. The port tells me the docks are breaking apart. Luckily—since we had ample warning because we still do have NOAA and we still do have buoys before these Republican cuts go into effect—there were no people on the docks. At this point we're not aware that anyone has been injured. But this is a serious and developing situation. And I would expect the gentleman's district just north of mine is probably having a similar experience in Newport or other areas.

Mr. SCHRADER. Well, we're on the phone right now trying to make sure that the folks are safe. I do know that schools have been evacuated, and the lower elevations that are very flood prone, they've taken precautions. Thank goodness, thanks to the comments I've heard from the gentlelady from Hawaii and the Congressman from Washington as well as my colleague from Oregon, we have some of these programs in place that can actually save lives and make sure that the economic infrastructure hopefully in the future is not at risk.

Just this morning I had a visit from Mark Apple with Oregon State University talking about a program that's in danger because of these cuts, because of the cuts to the National Science Foundation programs, along with NIH and anything else that's got research that the Republicans are trying to cut away.

They've got a great project. They've hired 25 people already. They're putting buoys on the floor of the ocean and sensing devices to actually have real-time monitoring of ocean conditions so we can actually anticipate what's going to be happening long before it actually hits our coast. We can also plan—plan our fisheries, plan what we need to do with ocean acidification that's devastating the oysters up and down the Pacific coast and actually in other parts of the world right now.

The leading research is being done in my district on oyster larva and trying to make sure that ocean acidification does not cause a problem. That stuff is in danger right now. I don't think some of my colleagues on the other side of

the aisle understand how important this stuff is. So we're going to have to be watching very, very carefully, I think, going forward and make sure that there are not these bludgeoning deep cuts that are not really smart.

Where is the discussion about the duplicative programs? We just had a great GOP report. I've heard a lot of posturing on the other side. Where is it? It's not included in H.R. 1. I mean, look at this. In Afghanistan and Iraq we've got USAID programs and Department of Defense rebuilding the country. There's not even a centralized data system that tracks U.S. funds used. I mean, that's crazy. Why aren't we looking at that? Why isn't that part of what we're working on?

Our domestic food assistance programs. There are 18 different programs. I want to see something in a budget resolution or a proposal going forward that talks about streamlining some of this stuff, that the data collection, the administration of these programs you can save millions and millions—perhaps billions of dollars. And here is a quote: ''Little is known of the effectiveness of some of these programs because they have not been well studied.''

Job training. I talked about job training. They're taking a meat ax to it. There are 47 programs in job training. Let's get those organized so we can leverage the limited dollars we're going to be able to put forward in these tough economic times.

Same thing for transportation for the disadvantaged, 80 different programs; laudable, but let's get together on this. Again, there doesn't need to be 80 different programs. Where are my colleagues' concrete proposals? They're in charge; they're the majority party. Where are their concrete proposals to improve this, for goodness sakes?

Military health, veteran services. We've got to do right by our men and women who have served this country through times good and times bad. Our responsibilities are distributed so far widely we can't even get critical procurement centralized opportunities that would save billions of dollars, billions and billions of dollars.

We also have a situation where the Department of Defense now, if they conveniently need some money, rather than go through appropriate channels, they have urgent needs processes for developing, modifying and fielding new military capabilities. Well, that's being abused, folks. GAO found eight entities that respond to them, five for counter-IED technologies, and they have no way of tracking the system for this program, no way of tracking metrics for this program. Must be nice to be able to spend the taxpayers' money with no accountability.

I was at a dinner the other night working on some budget issues, and it came out that when the Department of Defense was asked about contracting—how many civilian folks do you have under contract, how many people are you contracting with—their answer was, somewhere between 1 million and 10 million. I mean, that's a big range, folks; that's a big range.

The Department of Defense has no clue as to how and what they're doing. Where is that money being spent? We cannot afford rampant, undisciplined—unauditable has been the term used—spending in the Department of Defense. They're supposed to report their budget annually, come in with a coherent budget. It has been determined that it is unauditable, folks. I mean, we talk about the domestic side—and, yes, there are certain things we can do, as I'm talking about here, to improve the programs, but it's also on the defense side that we've got to get our act together.

Let's talk about economic development. I mean, we want to make sure we're getting the biggest bang for the buck here. We have 80 different economic development programs spread through Commerce, HUD, USDA, Small Business Administration. I mean, it's all good that we're doing that, but let's have some centralized opportunities. Let's leverage the resources.

In my home State of Oregon when I was budget chair, we would see the Federal Government's money come in. It was all different programs tied with all these little strings. It made it very difficult for my local agencies and my local communities to use the money. Very, very inflexible. And that's got to end. We've got to break down these silos, allow people to work across the spectrum so that we can get the biggest bang for the buck.

I would also point out that in our surface transportation programs we work really hard trying to keep America competitive. In H.R. 1, there are huge cuts to the transportation budget. If we're going to be competitive going forward like we were after World War II when Eisenhower, a Republican President, and Congress put together a secure highway fund, realizing that our security depended on having interstate highways that were connected, you could travel at a reasonable rate, we need to be thinking along those same lines now.

If they were worried about the cost of that program and not the security of this country or the economic benefits, it would never have gotten off the ground. I mean, this is a capital program. And, again, my colleagues across the aisle don't seem to understand the difference between an operational budget and a capital budget.

□ 1340

We need to be making infrastructure investments right now.

There is an opportunity for America, probably a narrow window—I'd say the next 10 years—for us to be competitive going forward with the rest of the world. Right now, the developing nations that are pretty developed, like China, India, they're developing 21st century infrastructure. We're still dealing with a 20th century infrastructure, and that's not going to cut it, colleagues. That's just not going to get the job done.

We've got to be thinking about making the strategic investments so our businesses can be competitive worldwide around the globe.

Right now, there's a new enterprise in my home State of Oregon on the coast that's currently under siege through the natural disasters where they're actually trying to export Dungeness crab—the best crab in the world, with no disrespect to my colleagues from Maryland. But the best crab in the world comes from the Pacific coast, the north coast, if you will, Dungeness crab.

They're now able to export live crab to China. But the hurdles to go through to get there are almost insurmountable. That was started back in 2003. They tried to get a program going. And because of the difficulties in transporting and some of the bureaucratic redtape to go through that, it didn't work.

They have now come up with a much more viable program for a whole new industry to really export to China. Instead of China exporting here and hurting our jobs, we're creating jobs in the Pacific Northwest and exporting high-quality products to China. We need more of that sort of innovation going forward. That's the type of investment in infrastructure.

We shouldn't have to ship it to Vancouver, B.C., to get it over there on a direct flight. We should be able to have a direct flight from Portland, Oregon, to make that actually happen.

So I think we're missing the boat here in terms of what we're trying to effect and the issues I think that we're dealing with in this H.R. 1. We're trying to hit only domestic programs, programs that our kids depend on. Penalizing the kids of the future.

Oftentimes, I hear my colleagues across the aisle talking about we've got to worry about our kids and our grandkids. I see the photos brought to the floor. Well, let's worry about our kids and grandkids and support the education programs I talked about earlier. Let's support the early health care prevention programs that were in the health care bill last Congress, make sure our kids don't suffer from the same problems that are debilitating obese Americans right now.

I mean, we know that prevention is important. We must be funding prevention. We need the innovation to come up with the programs to make sure that our chronic diseases are under control. The health care cuts in H.R. 1 are unbelievable. I know it's politically their big mantra to roll back or repeal health care reform, but folks, that is the wrong way to go right now. Our health care system is broken. We desperately need some help.

I welcome my colleague from the north coast of Oregon.

Mr. WU. I thank the gentleman, my friend, and the adjoining Representative on my southern border and my colleague from the State of Oregon.

We rise together, and I rise today to recognize the tremendous tragedy that has struck Japan early this morning. This tragedy follows on other tragedies similar in nature that affected Chile earlier this year and Haiti in the very recent past.

We in the Pacific Northwest feel a special connection to these events because we have the Cascadia fault off the coast of Washington, Oregon, and northern California. And about a 250-mile stretch of the Cascadia fault is locked tight. With great regularity since the last Ice Age 12,000 years ago—the furthest back that we can reach in our studies—this fault locked up, has snapped and created earthquakes of 9.0 magnitude, very similar to the 8.9 Richter scale-magnitude earthquake that struck Japan early this morning.

Our hearts go out to the Japanese people and to their friends and relatives who are here in the United States.

We have an obligation, and we have an ability to mitigate these problems, to plan for them, and to reduce the risk to the American people and to Oregonians. My All Hazards legislation passed in the last Congress addresses these risks in a comprehensive way. By uniting the risks of fire, wind, flood, and earthquakes we can better allocate scarce resources in this era of scarce resources so that we can get a better buy on the Federal dollar.

Different agencies are involved in reducing the risk of earthquake. We know about FEMA and how it can do a great job and how it can do a poor job. FEMA is primarily engaged in the business of recovering from natural disasters, and it is part of the All Hazards legislation that I passed last session.

NIST, one of the agencies under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee which I chaired last Congress, NIST is in the business of prevention, of researching what causes building failure, of doing model codes, of promulgating model codes so that the local and State building codes can encourage and, indeed, require more earthquake-resistant buildings and, indeed, also other infrastructure such as rail lines, bridges, and airports. These are all important infrastructure that in Chile survived to a decent extent.

With the severe earthquake in Japan, even with Japan's high standards, a remarkable number of structures are currently incapacitated, and we can do better and we will do better by adequately supporting these very important research and standard-setting agencies.

Furthermore, an agency that Mr. SCHRADER talked about, NOAA, that is going to bring jobs to Oregon. And an important part of Mr. SCHRADER's congressional district, but important to the whole Northwest and to our Nation, indeed, NOAA does a crucial service by helping to support education, educating not just our young people but all citizens about earthquakes and especially tsunami.

It is these people just out of college who are funded with fellowships, and they call together sessions—and I've seen these sessions convene in our State of Oregon—and they educate the residents about how to reduce their risk, how to behave during an earthquake, how to evacuate and the best routes to take to escape the follow-on tsunami. These are crucial activities to surviving an earthquake and the earthquake's natural consequence off our coast, a tsunami.

And it's not just the residents of the coast, because the population of the coast is swelled several times by inland residents who come to Oregon's beautiful shoreline. And those students and those adults also need this education so that, instead of going out to the shore to look at a receding waterline, which many people in Indonesia did—you know, it's a natural curiosity; right? And you don't necessarily know that a tsunami is about to follow.

This kind of education is so you know to head for high ground right now. Don't delay. As soon as the ground stops moving, head for high ground. This inexpensive education will save lives. It's what has been done in some parts of the world, and it has saved lives. It hasn't been done in other parts of the world, and the casualty figures reflect it.

The All Hazards legislation which I was able to pass in the last Congress knits these different components together: NOAA for education purposes; NIST to set standards, to do research, to prevent building collapses and bridge collapses and other collapses which cost us money and business downtime; FEMA to recover from that damage which occurs. These are crucial things to do, and we know what the price of inaction is.

This government has responded heroically and well when minimal, appropriate investments are made. And when those investments aren't made, when the preparing agencies aren't prepared themselves, then we have something like Katrina, where American citizens were found floating face down in the dark waters of New Orleans. We should never, ever fail Americans in that manner again.

And Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. DEFAZIO and I, we'll be darned if we're going to let Oregonians suffer the way that some Americans have had to. Making these small-dollar investments today, we'll save lives tomorrow.

□ 1350

It's the smart thing to do. It's the wise thing to do. It's the right thing to do. Pinch pennies and pound foolish will cost us lives.

Today's tragic earthquake and tsunami that brought devastation to Japan was a stark reminder of the importance of disaster preparedness for Oregon's coastal communities.

Over half of people in the United States reside in coastal areas, and billions of dollars of commercial and recreational activity depend on healthy oceans and coasts.

The efficiency of tsunami response efforts this morning in Oregon, Hawaii, and elsewhere demonstrates the hard work that community officials have already put toward tsunami preparation.

At the same time, we must be ready for the kind of disaster scenario that Japan faced this morning, one that presents much shorter warning times and a devastating ocean surge.

Local officials are doing their part, but the federal government has a critical role to play in hazards preparation and response efforts.

Without continued federal funding for ocean observation, seafloor modeling, and projects that build the infrastructure for withstanding ocean surge, the next tsunami could be devastating to vulnerable ocean communities.

All of the federal R&D agencies, even if it's not their primary mission, have a hand in hazard preparation and response. For example, in the aftermath of last year's devastating earthquake in Haiti, NASA used their satellites and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles to predict where mudslides were going to occur.

Our thoughts today are with the people of Japan, who have suffered widespread loss of life and destruction of property. Oregonians and all Americans stand ready to assist the Japanese people in rebuilding and recovery efforts.

Mr. SCHRADER. I thank the gentleman from the north coast of my great State of Oregon for his comments. They're right on the money, and I very appreciated his time.

I would now like to yield some time to the gentlelady from Hawaii, our new Member. Welcome.

Ms. HANABUSA. Thank you, both gentlemen from Oregon.

I would like to first begin by extending heartfelt condolences to the people of Japan, and they should all know that we will stand by them as they work to recover from this tragic disaster. But I would also like to say thank you to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have come up to me today and they've asked a single question. Is everything all right at home? Is your family all right? Do you have family in Japan? It didn't matter whether one was an R or one was a D. Those concerns were extremely genuine.

As I walked over here, the Capitol guard asked me, Ms. HANABUSA, is everything okay at home? And then it struck me what this is all about. We are people, and we are always going to be there to help others.

We must also look at why Hawaii has really been prepared for these kinds of disasters. I do congratulate both the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center, as well as our officials back home who did an excellent job preparing. But I would also like people to consider what it cost and how we were able to come here.

Remember when the good Senator from Hawaii, Senator INOUYE, did that unspeakable thing, that earmark called the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center.

And, yes, it was an earmark. He had the foresight, as only, for example, like my good colleagues from Oregon and people who represent their districts, to know what that district needs and started way back when with the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center. And that has grown. If you watched the news this morning, as I did from 3 o'clock in the morning, you could hear them saying, our projections are this, we're looking at what's going on, and we think it's going to be about 2 feet. We got those projections before they hit Hawaii. You know what? They were right. What do we have to attribute to that? The fact that there was wisdom and there was funding and there was the recognition that a Pacific Tsunami Warning Center was essential.

It's not only for Hawaii. It's for the whole Pacific. When they wanted information of what it meant for Guam, what it meant in Japan, what it meant for the west coast, who was the expert? The Pacific Tsunami Warning Center. It is unfortunate that in H.R. 1 it stands massive cuts. It is also unfortunate that people look upon it like it's ''that earmark'' and therefore should be cut.

I ask my same colleagues on both sides who said, Is everything all right at home, to realize that and to recognize that the one way you can help protect not only the people of the State of Hawaii, but the west coast, as well as anyone in the Pacific Rim, is to set aside labels and to recognize that it is funding like that that goes to save lives. That is what we can rely upon.

So when we remember this unfortunate and tragic day, let us also remember how fortunate we were because we had information and we were prepared, and how inexpensive being prepared is when you look at the investments that have been made. Thank you very much.

Mr. SCHRADER. I appreciate the very kind remarks. Indeed, our hearts go out to the people of Japan, much like they did in New Zealand. Very concerned about the health and welfare. I am sure this country will come to their aid like it does in any disaster, and like a lot of our friends did when we suffered similar consequences, whether it's Katrina or the horrible attacks on 9/11. We have had our brothers and sisters around the world come to our aid, and I appreciate that.

I would ask how much time we have left in the hour, if I may.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHRADER. To follow on the gentlelady's remarks, I think there are areas where we can get together. The illusion that cutting the domestic budget for this country, the discretionary budget, is going to solve our woes and put us back in financial balance and avoid the Armageddon that's somewhat before us is a horrible illusion. I don't think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really believe that's going to be solving any of our problems. Even the defense reductions that I talked about that are targeted to increase the efficiency of the Department of Defense and make sure our warriors get what they really need, even including the defense budget, it's not going to be getting at the root cause of our debt and deficit problems.

As we all know, those two, domestic and defense discretionary expenses, only account for about 30 percent of the budget for the American people. The bulk of it is tied up in other areas. Our Tax Code is shown to be extremely inadequate. We are collecting revenues now at an all-time low. Yes, some of it's the recession; but it's also because we give away more in tax breaks than we actually spend on domestic and defense programs in this country in the discretionary budget. Yes, $1.2 billion given away in tax expenditures. We spend money on these tax breaks. It's spending money by giving away all these breaks.

We need to broaden our tax base, quite frankly, and reduce the rates. I think if we're going to get real about solving our budget problems, we need to begin to embrace some of the recommendations, if not the package that the fiscal commission the President set up last year, we need to embrace those recommendations in some form. This is the real meat of the issue, colleagues. This is where the rubber meets the road. If we do not actually have the guts, the political courage to step up and deal with some of these problems, we are mortgaging our children and grandchildren's future.

In the last Congress, much was said about the health care reform. No matter how you feel about that bill, and I said this again and again at town halls back home, no matter how you feel about the bill, you should be in favor of the $500 billion in savings in the Medicare budget. These are long overdue. A lot of these things weren't new. They had been proposed one Congress after another, but no political will, no political courage to step up and try and take them on.

I think it's important for Americans to understand and respect their leaders, that the people in this body, in this Chamber, and in our sister Chamber across the Capitol Rotunda, that we're willing to step up and make these tough decisions. I don't think anyone wants to pay hospitals for preventible readmissions. I think everyone wants to make sure that the repayment system for our hospitals and our doctors is as efficient as possible. I think everyone wants to make sure that fraudulent companies are not taking advantage of seniors in the Medicare or Social Security system. I think people ought to see our Medicare and support system, our safety net system, if you will, protected. It's really important that we have that opportunity and that we make these tough decisions.

If we're not going to look at tax reform, we're not going to look at Social Security, we're not going to look at Medicare, Medicaid, other mandatory savings in the budget, we will have missed the boat. I think the people back home get it. I think the only people that don't get it are the people in Congress. It's time that we step up and make some tough decisions and show these people we have some backbone.

There is this little waiting game going on here in Congress right now. I will show a little of my hand if you show a little of your hand. That's fine. I understand everyone wants their ''political cover,'' but it takes leadership, people willing to step up and embrace some of the solutions that are already on the table.

I think there are ways you can do it without causing problems. Indeed, I think you can actually solve problems. You know, I think we need spending caps. We did PAYGO in the last Congress. We only did half of PAYGO. We only dealt with mandatory spending. We need to have the spending caps that were in place when a Democratic President and a Republican Congress instituted PAYGO in the mid-nineties. If we put that in place, then we have real, real control on our domestic and defense spending.

I think if we are going to do reductions, we should prioritize both. Equal cuts in defense and domestic spending, at least for the first few years here. We can at least make sure that there is an opportunity for both sides, if you will. Both sides of the aisle have different priorities, I respect that, but let's treat them equally.

□ 1400

I think that the draconian cuts of $60 billion or $100 billion in the President's recommended budget are too draconian. I am worried smarter people than I, as I alluded to earlier in my remarks, have talked about how devastating that would be. We can get to the same result—rolling back to 2008 levels—if that's where we want to go by approaching it in a thoughtful way. The fiscal commission talks about gradually reducing it so that we are at those levels by 2013, and then allowing inflationary increases only. Again, the spending caps would help us.

In the tax reform arena I don't think there is anybody that doesn't want to have their taxes reduced. I would love to see my tax rates go down. Right now, the effective rate for a lot of folks, when you add in the State and local taxes, is nearly 50 percent in my corner of the world. You know, that's terrible.

If we were able to get rid of the tax breaks, get rid of all of the giveaways that we have out there, we could actually reduce the tax rates almost in half. We could reduce our corporate tax rate down to at least 29 percent. Then we would be a little competitive with the rest of the world. There wouldn't be maybe quite so much overseas offshoring of American jobs. It would be more palatable, more appealing to keep these jobs and these businesses and these plants here in America so we

could have Made in America products going overseas instead of importing everything from China or India.

I think if we were to reform the Tax Code along the lines that I am talking about, and that I see in some of the fiscal commission reports, that we could actually use some of that savings to reduce our deficit, seriously, going forward, reducing the deficit on an ongoing basis. Now I am not proposing necessarily that we reduce or get rid of all tax expenditures over the long haul. We should have an opportunity to add back for set periods of time with specific sunsets targeted tax expenditures that help our economy or help those most in need of our help. I think that's the more thoughtful discussion we need to have going forward that's missing so far.

Social Security. Social Security is going to be gone, cut benefits, 25 percent in about 25 years if we do nothing. So if you don't care about Social Security, don't do anything. Don't do anything. That's what we are doing right now. We are not doing anything.

If you care about Social Security, I mean, I have friends, I have friends that are 30 and 40 years old, and they don't expect Social Security to be there when they get of age. And I don't think people already know Social Security's age for full benefits is 67. It's not 65. That was changed back during the Reagan years.

We could do some pretty smart fixes here. The commission talks about raising the retirement age to 69, over 65 years gradually. I know it's going to feel that, we are not going to affect the seniors right now. The seniors right now, full benefits, fully protected. Even those about to become seniors, full benefits just right now.

But if you raise that age to 69 over 25 years or over 65 years, I think that's a pretty good deal if that helps keep Social Security solvent. The payroll tax originally was set up to be roughly 90 percent of payroll. It's down to about 85 and scheduled to go down to about 82 percent of the payroll out there. That's not the way the system was designed.

The system was designed to work at a higher level. If we just go back to that same payroll level that's subject to the same payroll tax to fund Social Security, it helps keep it in balance. And there is early means testing. I mean, I have to admit as a new Member of Congress, a hardworking, small business guy, I was not focused on Social Security. But in Congress it's a big, big thing, and I am getting close enough to where it becomes a personal issue.

I did not know Social Security is already means tested. The commission suggests a little tweaking of that to make sure the poorest of the poor still get good benefits and get maximum needs taken care of. They add another bracket, if you will, in Social Security.

And with those three simple little things, with some hardship exclusions, obviously, for people in tough, labor-intensive jobs, we can make sure that Social Security is protected for the next 75 years as opposed to going away or seeing a 25 percent reduction in just 25 years.

There are smart things we can do, folks. We already started down the road to being smart in our Medicare program. There is discussion of Medicaid. I don't think voucher programs or privatizing have any place in this discussion. But there are smarter ways that we can come together on, Republicans and Democrats, working together to really get at taking care of our country's deficit needs. We can reduce our debt, the deficit, dramatically in the near term if we just pay attention to what I have talked about here.

Let's get off the H.R. 1 bandwagon, the political theater, the circus that's consuming a lot of taxpayer dollars and really not moving this country forward. Let's begin the dialogue right here, right now about taking care of the big cost drivers, the big spending items that are affecting our future and our children and grandchildren's future.

EVEN COWBOY POETS WANT TO CUT SPENDING

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was absolutely dumbfounded recently when I heard the Senate majority leader slamming the long-term continuing resolution passed by this House, which cut government spending by more than $100 billion below the President's FY 2011 budget request.

He particularly lamented the elimination of funding for an annual cowboy poetry festival in Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Senate majority leader that the rugged individualism of the American cowboy will not be snuffed out due to the lack of a Federal subsidy. In fact, I believe that the American cowboy supports our efforts to get this out-of-control Federal spending under control.

Let me quote, Mr. Speaker, from a poem written by Yvonne Hollenbeck, who has been featured at the National Cowboy Poetry Gatherings in Elko, Nevada. The title of her poem is ''How to Cut Taxes'':

So, I think if I was the President of this home of the free and the brave,

I'd close up all those departments and think of the money I'd save.

Mr. Speaker, this is the poet that I would give a personal subsidy to, and I would hope that our colleagues in the other body would take that good old American cowboy common sense and help us start saving the American people's money.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate being recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I have come to the floor to raise some issues here, to address you and hopefully be able to penetrate with some rationale and logic that I think is essential that the American people benefit from, and that is this, that, for some time now, we have been making the case that there are automatic appropriations in ObamaCare in an unprecedented fashion with regard to the magnitude and the duration of them.

These automatic appropriations were written into the bill in preparation. The automatic appropriations were written into the bill in preparation for and anticipated, I believe, the loss of the majority by the Pelosi Congress, because I think they expected that this Congress would be handed over by the American people to a Republican majority that had been assigned the task by the American people to repeal ObamaCare, to defund ObamaCare.

That's what everyone ran on. There are 87 Republican freshmen here, all of whom have voted to repeal ObamaCare, and I believe all of whom, if they spoke to the issue at all, Mr. Speaker, also pledged to cut off the funding to ObamaCare.

I have sought to facilitate that happening and taking place. In doing so, I have drafted legislation that's patterned after the language that was written into a continuing resolution in April of 1974. That's the language in a continuing resolution that shut off the funding to the Vietnam War.

It says something very similar to this. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds made available in this act and no funds heretofore appropriated shall be used for offensive or defensive operations in Vietnam or the countries adjacent to it.

In other words, it's not really an exact quote, but it is the compression of the language, and it's an accurate depiction of what it said. What it did was it shut off all funding for anything that was used to support the South Vietnamese military, including M–16 rounds, 105 rounds, MREs, anything that was going to support a military operation offensive or defensive was shut off by this Congress by language in a CR.

Now, who could conceive, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress couldn't figure out how to write language on how to shut off funding to ObamaCare. They didn't find the Vietnam War unconstitutional. Two Federal courts have found ObamaCare unconstitutional.

□ 1410

I hear arguments that say, well, there is an obscure rule somewhere that says that this is written into a legislation that makes it what they call mandatory spending. Therefore, this Congress, this 112th Congress, is

prohibited from getting their hands on that and can't shut off the automatic $105.5 billion.

Please, Mr. Speaker. We all know that no previous Congress can bind a subsequent Congress. None of our predecessors can put up a vote in 2010—or 1810—that binds us here. We set the rules and we appropriate the money here. Automatic appropriations written into an authorization bill of the largest magnitude of any legislation that I know: ObamaCare. We expected the authorization, the authorization that says, we open the door up now and the discretion of the appropriators in the subsequent Congress will decide if those authorized categories are funded. Forty-eight places in ObamaCare, there's authorization written right in with appropriations. Unprecedented.

Yes, it does happen in small little ways. Ironically, National Public Radio has in the past gotten an authorization/appropriation that went in outyears as far as way out there to 2 years, Mr. Speaker. Some of the ObamaCare automatic authorization/appropriation language goes in perpetuity. There's a billion dollars set in a category that says Medicare Modernization Effort that is a billion dollars every year, that automatically spits out a billion dollars and goes to CMS to do Medicare modernization to the end of the world. In perpetuity. It takes it out of the hands of Congress. And this Congress is going to sit here and wring their hands and say, there's a mandatory piece of spending language that's here and we can't stop it in an appropriations bill?

This Congress stopped the Vietnam War in an appropriations bill, Mr. Speaker. Can't we stop an unconstitutional, irresponsible socialized medicine policy in an appropriations bill? Yes, we can. There is no rational reason why we cannot. I have faced straw man argument after straw man argument. These little things, they stand up a straw man and he's supposed to look like a whole demon himself that rules the road. And it might be an argument such as, ''King's language will violate the rules of the Senate. Therefore, they will never take it up.'' Not so. You take the language down to the Senate and they say, Bring it. We want it. We want the House to send language to the Senate that shuts off the automatic funding to ObamaCare.

And then they will say, ''No, the language isn't accurate enough. It isn't precise enough. It doesn't get at what we want.'' Show me some better language. It's patterned off the language that shut off the Vietnam War. That worked. They don't have an argument as to where there's a hole in my language. There isn't a hole in my language, Mr. Speaker. It says, no funds in this act, ObamaCare, and I list the two of them actually. It is 111–148 and 111–152. That's ObamaCare and the reconciliation package that came from the Senate to circumvent the filibuster rules that they have in the Senate. In both of those, we shut off any funding that's automatically appropriated. And it says: No funds in any previous act and no funds in the continuing resolution or in any fiscal year shall be used to carry out the provisions of ObamaCare, patterned exactly off the language that shut off the funding to the Vietnam War. If we can end a war in an appropriations bill, we can shut off an unconstitutional, irresponsible, $2.6 trillion in irresponsible spending bill, Mr. Speaker. And that's what we must do.

We pledged to the American people that we would repeal ObamaCare, and we won a huge majority here in order to repeal ObamaCare. Mr. Speaker, we have to act on it. We need to act on it now. Every day, every minute that goes by, we're seeing that $105 billion spent to send the tentacles of ObamaCare down, send the roots down. They're working night and day, 24/7, Mr. Speaker, they're doing that to establish and expand the dependency class in America and tell us that we can't live without ObamaCare, that we can't take responsibility for our own health care, and that the money that's spent and invested keeps our private sector and our doctor-patient relationship from functioning and growing and adapting to the markets that they must do so.

We're losing huge health insurance companies across the country. Principal in my State laid off hundreds. And that's true across the Midwest at least, on down to Texas. Insurance company after insurance company is pulling out because there's no certainty out there in the market anymore, and they understand that there are going to be fewer insurance companies if ObamaCare is implemented. They're calling upon this Congress, shut off the funding to ObamaCare. Yes, we passed the repeal. Every Republican and with Democrat support, bipartisan, passed the repeal of ObamaCare, H.R. 2, sent it to the Senate. HARRY REID found a way to force a vote on it where it didn't succeed over there, but 47 Republican Senators voted to repeal ObamaCare. And I cannot be convinced that those same legislators, House and Senate, would not vote to shut off all the funding to ObamaCare if provided the language in a continuing resolution.

I believe that we can look the President in the eye and say, Mr. President, we've demonstrated that we will keep the dollars there for the legitimate and prudent function of government available, as we have in a short-term CR that expires March 18, as is proposed by a short-term CR that is likely to be released later on today—after the whip team has already whipped it, by the way. We've demonstrated we want to keep the government open. But if the President, speaking through HARRY REID, decides that all the functions of government can be shut down unless he has his pet project, ObamaCare, the American people will side with those of us who side with them.

We want an America that has liberty and freedom and vitality, where people make their own choices, where we have the selection of 1,300 health insurance companies, 100,000 health insurance policies, and not government-at-the-Federal-level intervention into those decisions that are made by individuals and doctors and families and businesses.

America wasn't built by government plans, by one-size-fits-all, by socialized medicine. America wasn't built by people who sit in their lofty liberal towers deciding that they've been gifted with an intelligence and an intellect so that common, ordinary people can be taken care of by elitists. We were built by individuals, individuals that make individual decisions, to start a business, end a business, take a job, quit a job, to make a purchase or not make a purchase, to provide a service, to stop and help their fellow man. We're an America that lives on the American Dream, to leave this country a better place than it was when we found it.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare diminishes the future of all Americans. It shapes and diminishes the arc of history in a way that cannot be forgiven by those who follow behind us. This is a destiny issue for this country. This is a pivotal issue for this country. I stand and I have written a letter and I have joined with MICHELE BACHMANN.

I see my friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is here. We agree that a continuing resolution that does not include the language that shuts off the funding that is automatically implemented in ObamaCare, we will vote ''no'' on that continuing resolution, Mr. Speaker. And I will continue to do so until such time as ObamaCare has met its end.

Some will say, the President will never sign a bill that repeals ObamaCare. He would never sign an appropriations bill that shuts off the funding for ObamaCare. I'm not suggesting that that's an easy decision for him. But when I look back through the arc of history and I think what Socrates did at the end of his life, I think the President can make a hard decision here. If Socrates can drink the hemlock, the President can sign the repeal of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, I would be so glad to be able to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1420

AMERICA'S HERITAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for the remainder of the hour, approximately 48 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, these are trying times. Charles Dickens said ''the best of times and the worst of times.'' More freedoms than any nation has ever enjoyed in the history of the world are right here in this country. We have been blessed so richly. And

lest we begin to think we've been blessed because of something that we did to deserve to be born in America, for all those wonderful people who have immigrated to America, we didn't deserve to be born here or immigrate here. So why did we end up being in the country with the greatest freedoms in the history of the world, since it wasn't because of something we did to deserve to be here?

The answer is very clear. We've been blessed as a nation because of the actions of those who went before us. For those who believe in the Bible, it's full of one incident after another, historically, where it was shown that generations ended up being blessed because of the faithfulness of one generation.

One of the things that was difficult for me to come to grips with as a judge is how often children pay for the sins of the parents. And that's bringing me to where we are today. We are a nation that has done the unthinkable, a nation that has brought in around $2.1 trillion for the last couple of years and yet has spent 3.6, 3.5, $3.6 trillion. How irresponsible could that be? And the problem is future generations will have to pay and pay and pay for the self-indulgence, the arrogance and the self-centeredness of this generation. And it's heartbreaking when you step back and take a good look at what's going on.

Polls indicate that 70 percent or more of American adults believe that this will be the first generation—my generation will be the first in American history that does not leave the country to our children better than we found it. It's why I'm here. We can do better than that, but we'd better hurry. Because if we have 2, 3, 4 more years of what the President proposed, $1.65 trillion in deficit spending, there's not going to be a country. I don't care how much smarter we think we are in this country, how much more intellectual some of the liberals may be here, you can't outrun history.

There are lessons that are established. And if you commit this act, then in the laws of nature and history, you're going to get this result. If you spend too much money you don't have for long enough, you're going to lose your country. It's happened over and over. It doesn't matter how smart you are. It doesn't matter how many letters you have after your name. It doesn't matter if you commit certain acts; you're going to get certain results, just as sure as if it's a scientific experiment that's been proven over and over.

Well, it has been proven. If you spend too much, you're going to lose the country. Now the Germans, after World War I, thought perhaps they could print the money fast enough so that they could pay the massive indebtedness they had after World War I and that could get them on solid footing. Some remember the cartoons from history books. There are people alive today that remember, themselves, wheelbarrows with cash being carried to buy bread. That was a cartoon I saw in my history book.

And, ultimately, as the country's economy collapsed, they became so desperate that they were willing to elect a little guy with a mustache who began to blame those of Jewish origin, leading to the worst holocaust in the history of mankind. Nothing we can be proud of. What led to it? What opened the door for this barbarian to take over such a proud country and lead them into this unthinkable, horrible crime against humanity, over 6 million Jewish people were killed, exterminated? Economic problems, spending too much, owing too much and trying to print money to make it up didn't work. So they got desperate.

Look at the Soviet Union. Most historians give credit to President Reagan because he was unflinching even when some described a defense shield as Star Wars as some fictional, ridiculous thing that we might try to do. On the other hand, President Reagan could see clearly that the truth was that to have a doctrine called ''mutual assured destruction,'' properly called MAD, then that was truly mad. You're going to have two countries racing to make nuclear weapons. The only defense is that you both agreed you'll never put up a defense. So if one country launches its nukes at the other, then the other will certainly launch theirs, and both will be mutually assured that they will both be destroyed. And that's the defense? President Reagan saw that as no defense. It was not a proper defense.

And some called him a nitwit and ignorant. I can identify. I'm accused of those things on blogs every day. Maybe I am. But I know history. And the history and the truth is that by his moving forward with a way to actually defend the people of the United States with a defense shield that would stop incoming nuclear weapons, then the Russians had no choice. They had to try to keep up. They couldn't keep up financially, and they went broke.

I learned a great deal during the summer I spent in the Soviet Union as an exchange student in college. That was when it was truly the Soviet Union. I saw socialized health care up close and personal. I saw it. I went through a medical school, I went through hospitals, I went through clinics and I needed some help at one point. But I knew one thing: I sure didn't want to ever go to socialized medicine. That was for sure. Because the doctors, I was surprised to find out, really weren't respected over there unless it was some national doctor nationally known, otherwise these doctors were like poorly paid plumbers. Plumbers got a lot more respect.

It was a 9-to-5 type job. They'd show up. They didn't care if they hadn't seen you before. They'd see you; it didn't matter whether you got that well or not. That was largely the case. You'd run into somebody that tried to do a good job every now and then, from what the Russian students would tell me; but, basically, you might as well try to heal yourself and be your own physician.

Because when you go to socialized medicine, just as Dr. Berwick has indicated before President Obama put him in charge of our health care, when you go to socialized medicine and you put the government in charge, whether you want it or not, whether you will admit it or not, historically, if you go to socialized medicine, if you go to government-controlled medicine, then you're going to have rationing. Dr. Berwick made that clear. It's not a matter of if. It's a matter of when and how much.

So unless ObamaCare is repealed, we will get rationed care. Our President told people on that side of the aisle the day they were going to vote on and pass ObamaCare that he had some good news: if they would just vote for it, then things would be different. Whereas in the past—and these are his words—in the past you go to the doctor and get five tests; now you'll go to the doctor and get one test.

Well, for those of us that have experience, I know that if my mother had been given one test, they would never have found her brain tumor. It took 6 days. It prolonged her life for 15 years; and she made invaluable contributions to mankind, to east Texas, Texas and the country during that period and was an invaluable teacher of students, of children in the eighth grade.

□ 1430

One test, she would have been dead. Six days of tests, they found it. Well, Mother would have been dead.

I have a lady in my district who contacted me when this whole debate started and said: You need to know my experience. I immigrated from England. My mother got cancer over there and died. The sole reason my mother died of breast cancer was because she was in England. And in England, you have to be put on a list. You're on a list to get a mammography. You're on a list to be treated. You're on a list to get radiation or any other kind of chemotherapy. You're on a list, and that is the way you deal with government-controlled health care, because ultimately government-controlled health care does not break the bank because you ultimately, unless the nation just completely goes broke. They say, You know what? We have this much money. And, therefore, we can only give out this many tests. We can only do this many transfusions, this many transplants. We only have this much chemo, radiation. And let's see, sir or ma'am, we don't think you're productive enough, and so you're not getting it. We, as your government, overseeing your health care, have to make a call. Somebody has got to.

That's where government-controlled health care goes. It's where it has to go or it bankrupts the country.

But the good news is, for those who worry about health care bankrupting

the country, we may not have to get that far unless we take responsible steps that any right-thinking group of leaders should take, then we could finish out with a whimper. Every country meets its demise at some point. No nation lasts forever, and anyone who thinks so has never studied history appropriately. And this Nation will be no exception.

The only question is are we going to be a generation that takes such responsible steps and follows the rules of history, many of which Jesus laid out. You want to be a generation that is blessed and have your children blessed, here are the rules. Well, we need to follow the rules if our children and our grandchildren are going to be blessed, because the track we are on right now, and all those left-wing blogs that like to take shots at us who are conservatives, they will one day be looked at as such blatant fools because that's the way it goes. A country, toward the end of its demise, the liberals who say there can be no end to this wonderful, hedonistic society, they are the most popular because they are playing to people's hopes. There will be no end to this society. Sure, there will be no end. It will go on. Forget these naysayers.

Well, I'm not a naysayer; I'm a yeasayer. And I would like this generation to say yea to blessing at least the next couple of generations. But it's in our hands. But once the naysayers who are truly the naysayers who say nay, nay, you people who want to be responsible, spend within your means, who want to provide for the common defense, you guys, you're crazy. You're nuts.

I've been called nuts for pointing out the fact that we have actually had people, men, associated with known terrorist groups send over their wives to have children in this country. Then the wife comes back with a baby with an American passport and an American citizenship. You can go online. China provides birthright citizenship. You pay a fee and we will get you an American visa. Come into the United States.

There is a Muslim-owned hotel in New York City, and they were upset online, it seemed like, because people were not giving them credit for being the first group to come up with birthright citizenship. You pay a big fee to this hotel in upper New York, and they would put you up for a month. If you are pregnant, they get you a doctor to help deliver your baby, one of the best in New York, and they had the mechanism in place to help you get that American passport.

And then the most precious gift that anybody could be given, a child, a blessing, not a terror, a gift of a child is born with an American passport, and it is taken back. And in some cases, I hope and pray it is not many, but I know it is happening, they are taken back, and until they are adult, they are trained to hate Americans. And that the greatest thing they could ever do for eternity is help destroy the American way of life.

They look at our way of life and they see rape and crimes occurring in America and they say: See, that is what happens when you don't have a totalitarian, religious sharia law existing where we tell everybody what they can and can't do. We don't allow that kind of freedom because it leads to debauchery. I happen to think that God gave us that much freedom and the freedom to choose; and, unfortunately, some choose wrong. Eventually, every country has too many who choose wrong, and that's when they lose their country.

So it made sense, if you're interested in providing for the common defense, that we would take a look at those who are trying to destroy us. And, by the way, the State Department is not going to take a look at that. I made an official inquiry of the State Department, my office did, and asked: Tell us how many times women have come into this country and had babies when their husband was known to be on the terrorist watch list or associated with a terrorist group. The State Department came back and told us: We can't tell you because we don't check. The husband's name is on any woman's application for a visa, but we don't inquire if there is going to be hospitalization. You wouldn't want it to be specific as to one gender, but you could inquire. And to help keep immigrants from bankrupting our country, it would seem like the State Department would inquire: Are you anticipating hospitalization when you come into this country?

And of course I have a bill on health care that says any immigrant, in order to get a visa, is going to have to show that they have already purchased health insurance for any health care they will need in the United States. We are willing to let people in. We let in more people on visas than any nation in the world. We are willing to let you in, but you've got to pay for your health care while you're here. Well, we don't do that.

One lady had said, The great thing about my daughter coming in and having a baby—and yes, her husband was a member of a terrorist group in the Middle East, on our terrorist watch list—but the good news is she doesn't even have to pay for anything. She can leave with an American passport, and she doesn't have to pay for anything. The Americans pay for it.

We have to stop that. It's nuts. The State Department doesn't inquire if you anticipate hospitalization. And even though the spouse's name is on the visa application, they say, as a rule, we don't bother to check to see if the spouse is a terrorist.

You have groups out here who are condemning Justices on the Supreme Court because their spouse may be politically active. They show themselves to be blatantly extremely partisan, like Common Cause, because they have never raised that issue with a former leader of the ACLU whose husband, late husband, apparently a fine man, but he did have political interests and they were affected by decisions of the Court, and those groups never complained about that. But they only come after conservatives on the Court, like Justice Scalia, Justice Thomas, who believe that the words on the page of the Constitution, the pages, mean what they say. They don't change over time; otherwise, you can have no consistency as a nation.

So it would only make sense that somebody up here in Congress who has taken an oath to provide for the common defense would say: You know, we've noticed that every one of these terrorists in the last—well, since 1991 who have really wanted to do anything to destroy our way of life as a whole, that they seem to have a connection that they are not Muslim; they are radical Muslims. They are radical Islamic jihadists.

□ 1440

So wouldn't it make sense to take a look?

We know the largest percentage of Muslims in America are peace-loving. They don't believe that ''jihad'' means you go kill your neighbor. They believe it's an internal jihad, where you change your life and leave the old behind; but there are disagreements over what percentage of Muslims are these radical Islamic jihadists who want to destroy our way of life. Wouldn't it make sense that we'd make inquiry into that? It sure seems to me that we should. Yet PETE KING, the chairman of the appropriate committee, wanted to do just that, and he has been under death threats ever since it first came up.

Now, for some of us, we say, Gee, in order to keep my commitment to my oath to provide a defense for this country, I think we need to look at this issue of radical Islam when you have a Major Hasan at Fort Hood who kills American soldiers in their place of refuge while yelling ''Allah Akbar.'' Perhaps we should look at that issue. This is despite the fact that the Defense Department didn't even want to mention the word ''jihad'' or the word ''terrorist,'' did not want to point out the fact that they had made him the imam for Fort Hood or the fact that he had apparently told many people, If I get orders to deploy to the Middle East, I cannot risk spiritually having to kill a Muslim for one of the reasons besides the three for which I'm allowed to kill another Muslim, one being converting to Christianity. I can't risk that spiritually, so I'll have to go on a rampage and kill people here if I get orders to deploy.

Amazingly, he got orders to deploy, and he killed American soldiers—but none of that was brought up in the record. It's extraordinary that it's not even mentioned in the report. How blind do we have to be?

So we have one responsible committee chairman who says—well, there

are plenty of responsible people here. He is the committee chair with jurisdiction. He is going to have a hearing, and he gets blasted in death threats.

So, to my way of thinking, when someone announces ''you know what? I'm going to have a hearing, and we're going to look into whether radical Islam is violent'' and if the radical Islamists respond by saying ''we're going to kill you and kill your family,'' I think they kind of help make PETE KING's case. If he says he just wants to have a peaceful hearing and you say ''we're going to kill you for it,'' well, that seems to me they're making his case.

The peace-loving Muslims are not the problem, but there is an element of radical Islam in this country and in this world that wants to destroy our way of life. There will be books that will ultimately, someday, belittle those people who are accusing PETE KING of all kinds of impropriety—racism, bigotry, xenophobia—all those things a lot of us are accused of because they don't know us and because they don't know our hearts. Someday, books will point out: Look how silly these people were. They had people saying, We're going to kill you; and they said, Uh-oh, we'd better not make them mad and try to defend ourselves and figure out how to do that. Let's just try to placate them.

History shows, when you try to placate radical Islamists, particularly since 700–800 AD, you're going to not only not placate them; you're going to grow more contempt because, not only do they see you as an infidel, but they see you as a stupid infidel who is trying to pay off the people who want to kill them.

So we know that, in the hearing, our friend across the aisle, Mr. ELLISON, testified. He brought up the case of Mohammed Salman Hamdani—and my apologies if I mispronounce that—who was a Pakistani-born Muslim American. As Mr. ELLISON pointed out, Hamdani rushed to Lower Manhattan on the morning of September 11, 2001, to assist in rescue efforts, and died in the collapse at the World Trade Center.

Mr. ELLISON was thinking—and I'm sure, absolutely, there was no intent to mislead and that he actually believed what he was saying. But he said, after the tragedy, some people tried to smear his character solely because of his Islamic faith. They spread false rumors and speculated he was in league with the attackers, all because he was Muslim.

So I'm proud to be able to point this out, and I hope that it's a comfort to my friend Mr. ELLISON; but in fact, as Matthew Shaffer pointed out in this National Review article last night, he said that, in fact, 6 weeks after the September 11 attacks, before Hamdani's remains were identified, Congress did sign the Patriot Act into law with this line included—and this is in the Patriot Act:

''''Many Arab Americans and Muslim Americans have acted heroically during the attacks on the United States, including Mohammed Salman Hamdani, a 23-year-old New Yorker of Pakistani descent, who is believed to have gone to the World Trade Center to offer rescue assistance and is now missing.'''

The article goes on. It reads:

''That is, Hamdani was actually singled out for particular high honors among the thousands of victims of the September 11 attacks. There is little evidence,'' if any, ''of the 'rumors' that he did otherwise. You can go to Google and search for Mohammed Salman Hamdani's name, using various time frames from before today's hearings.'' That was yesterday. ''You'll discover two discordant sets of returns, none for sites and news reports accusing Hamdani of being a terrorist and many thousands of pages honoring him as a hero while claiming that he was 'widely accused' of being a terrorist.''

They can't find the allegation of his being a terrorist, only those saying he was widely accused and what a hero he was.

''Web pages that do source that claim that Hamdani was 'widely accused' of being a terrorist typically trace back to a single report from the New York Post, dated October 12, 2001, and titled 'Missing—or Hiding? Mystery of NYPD Cadet from Pakistan.' The piece has been taken offline, but its content is preserved elsewhere.

''His family distributed missing person flyers in the fear that the 23-year-old, who is trained as an EMT, went instead to the World Trade Center to help and was killed. But investigators for the FBI and NYPD have since questioned the family about which Internet chat rooms he visited and if he was political.

''Hamdani, a graduate of Queens College, with a biochemistry degree, had been in the NYPD cadet program for 3 years. He became 'inactive' because he needed to work full time, his mother said. Police sources said he hadn't been to work at the NYPD since April, but he still carried official identification.

''One source told the Post: 'That tells me they're not looking for this guy at the bottom of the rubble. The thing that bothers me is, if he is up to some tricks, he can walk past anybody using the I.D. card.'

''Hamdani's mother, who has been in the United States for two decades, denied her son was political or a religious fundamentalist. Cops at the Midtown Tunnel reported spotting someone who looked like Hamdani yesterday morning.

''So the Post reported (1) that Hamdani's family believed he died in the World Trade Center attacks; (2) that the FBI asked Hamdani's mother a few background questions after a mistaken sighting; and (3) that an unnamed source felt such questioning implied guilt. No doubt, that was hard on the grieving mother; but frankly, this—a mistaken sighting and very preliminary investigations of many people, most of whom turn out to be innocent—is the kind of thing that inevitably happens after a major terrorist attack.''

So the article points out that Mr. Hamdani has been singled out by this Congress and by people in New York for being the hero that he apparently was. There is no allegation by this Congress, of which I'm aware, of blanket smearing, saying that all Muslims are evil. They're not. The disagreement is over what percentage. Is it 1 percent or 10 percent that is being radicalized and wants to destroy our way of life? It's a question worth looking into.

□ 1750

Because there were actual witnesses at the hearing that pointed out that their young children had been taken—I say young, a teenager to me is young these days—and had been turned against the United States through a mosque, taken to a foreign country and radicalized to finish the process. Why wouldn't we want to look into that? It only makes sense. Because if you bury your head in the sand, even though you don't see any danger your rear end is hanging out there to some pretty significant danger, and we shouldn't be in that posture as a country.

Now we also know that the Muslim Brotherhood has been active in foreign countries. We've seen what happened in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, other countries around the Middle East. But I would humbly submit that the thing that ought to scare Americans the most about our stature in the world, about the way our allies and friends look at this Nation and about how they perceive whether or not we will be able to—and will—help in a crisis, came when we saw that King Abdullah, King of Jordan, had made an appointment to apparently work out some kind of deal with a madman named Ahmadinejad. Abdullah, I've met him before, he's a brilliant man, we've visited a couple of times, he's a brilliant man, he has a different world view, but this country in the past has appreciated his ability to keep order and keep peace in his country.

When an ally like King Abdullah makes an appointment with a madman—possibly to cut his own deal for protection—it ought to send off alarms all over this Nation that we're in trouble. The world perceives us as weak. Our friends have seen we don't stand with our friends. We'll snub Israel. We'll leave them hanging until the last second on whether or not we'll even veto a resolution Lebanon brings to the U.N.—which is what this administration did. We'll snub their prime minister when he comes early on, as this administration did. Oh, sure, the administration tried to warm up to him right before the election and tried to jockey for political help back in the fall of 2010, but our allies and our enemies are not as stupid as some in this town think. They see the way we treat our friends, our allies, those who have

stood with this country through thick and thin, and they've seen the way we've turned on them.

They see what we've done with enemies of ours, as Qadhafi has been in the past, as Ahmadinejad has been, as Kim Jong Il in North Korea has been, and they say, gee, if we go strongly against this country, the Obama administration will come rush to see what they can give us to try to make us friends—obviously they won't make us friends, but we'll take whatever they've got to give. In fact, in the case of North Korea and the Clinton administration running over there and saying, look, we'll build you a nuclear power plant if you will just quit trying to make a nuclear weapon. You'll give us a nuclear power plant? Doesn't that have nuclear fuel? Yes, it does. We might be able to take that fuel and make a nuclear weapon? Sure, yeah, I mean, it's possible. But if you'll just promise us you won't do that, we'll give you the nuclear material, the facility, we'll show you how to do it. Well, sure. Okay. Yeah, we'll give you that promise. And of course we provided them what they needed to go nuclear and build nuclear weapons. It makes no sense. We ought to be smarter than that.

But we didn't learn our lesson with North Korea that you can't placate a terrorist leader, so this administration has talked about sanctions. And we've had some sanctions against Iran, and I really think that they're going to work by 2015 or 2020, but unfortunately by then, Iran will have nuclear weapons, and they will have the ability to say you either withdraw your sanctions or we're going to use the nukes that we've now sent on yachts and are outside major places you care about to blow your major cities up. It's a crazy way to defend the country, to placate your enemies.

I've had this bill—I've filed it three Congresses and I'm hoping now that we're in the majority we'll get it passed; it seems like I pick up more supporters every time—called the U.N. Voting Accountability Act. It simply says that any nation—you know, they're sovereign nations, they can do what they want as long as they don't come after us, don't commit crimes against humanity, but they're sovereign nations, so basically what it says is any nation that votes against a U.S. position more than half the time in the U.N. will receive no financial assistance of any kind from the United States in the subsequent year. As I've said before, you don't have to pay people to hate you, they'll do it for free. We can save the money, we need to save the money.

We heard that President Mubarak—really a king, but called President Mubarak—one report said he had $70 billion in a bank, now there's only $7 billion. Where do you think he got that money? We've been giving him somewhere around $2 billion a year for years. We have propped up so many evil people in countries where they devastate their own people, we shouldn't be giving them money for that. Let charitable groups go in and give aid directly to the people. They do a great job of that, better than the government because we as a government usually have to give it to the government, and then the government uses it to go in their bank accounts and to do what they will with their people. It doesn't make sense.

I was also a little surprised to find out how much we help Lebanon because they were short on some of their weaponry, and the U.S. was of some assistance to help them rearm last year. And I was trying to remember, oh, yes, why was Lebanon a little short on weaponry? That's right. They were killing Israelis—our friends and allies—back 5 years ago. That's why they were short on weaponry. But not to worry, U.S. to the aid; we'll provide military weapons to our enemies, to the enemies of those who are dear, devoted friends like Israel. Yeah, we'll equip your enemies. We'll sell jets to countries that won't recognize Israel. Three billion dollars for a friend in kind of an oasis in the middle of a lot of hostility is a small price to pay, but unfortunately when you pay billions to Israel's enemies $3 billion is not enough.

So why, instead of running up the tab, why don't we as a nation quit funding Israel's enemies, quit helping their enemies, quit helping to put in place—as President Carter did by pulling the rug out from under the shah—apparently not a nice man what he did to his people—but by President Carter pulling the rug out from him, he fell. And of course President Carter welcomed Khomeini as a man of peace, and then we shortly found he created a terrorist state like none before in history. Good job.

We've got to stop doing those kind of good jobs. We've got to get back to the basics of providing for the common defense, quit condemning those who are not xenophobes—they're not phobes of any kind—but they see the world through a clear window, the window of history, and see that if you help your enemies, they will destroy you. You help your friends, they remain your friends, and they remain vital and helpful to you in the world picture.

One other thing we did to Israel last year—I believe it was in May I read that this administration for the first time voted with all of Israel's enemies to require them to disclose any and all nuclear weaponry. Because people in leadership in the appropriate places here in America apparently have not read the Old Testament. They have not read history. You can go back and find where Hezekiah was the king. And I know there are some journalists who think that Jews came from Poland, but actually there's archaeological evidence to show that they were actually in Israel 3,000 years ago and that King David was King of Israel around 1000 or so B.C.

□ 1500

And of course we know Mohammed lived 600 or so A.D. So 1,600 to 1,700 years before there was a Mohammed, there was a King David ruling over Jews in Israel. They have a history in the land. We voted with Israel's enemies. And the lesson from Hezekiah was, as you can read from the Old Testament, Isaiah was sent to Hezekiah. He knew what he had done. Pardon the Texas paraphrase, but he said, in essence, What have you done? He said, Oh, these great Babylonian leaders came over, and so I showed them all our treasure, and I showed them our defenses.

And Isaiah, in essence, said, You fool. Because you've done this, you'll lose the country.

You don't placate your enemies and think they're going to be your friend if you give them things, you show them all your great defenses, because they'll figure a way around them and you will lose your country.

Every country meets its demise and heads to the dustbin of history at some point. We've got to rein in the ridiculous deficit spending. We've got to quit hurting our friends abroad and quit helping our enemies and be about the oath that we all took in this body. And if we will do that, if we will follow the precepts that history—and even FDR said, Follow the teachings in the Bible. People have found it a help for ages—if we do those things, future generations will be blessed because of us, and not condemned.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) laid before the House the following communication from the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 11, 2011.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: My letter of March 3, 2011 notified you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has been served with a subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in a case now ending before that Court. That letter incorrectly referenced the pending case as a civil case. In fact, it is a criminal case.

Sincerely,

DARRELL E. ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1537

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 14, 2011, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

822. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Repair of Naval Vessels in Foreign Shipyards, pursuant to (122 Stat. 4584); to the Committee on Armed Services.

823. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Award-Fee Contracts (DFARS Case 2006-D021) (RIN: 0750-AF51) received February 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

824. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 2 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

825. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Flood Insurance Program, Policy Wording Correction [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0021] (RIN: 1660-AA70) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

826. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Bank Secrecy Act Compliance; Fair Credit Reporting; Technical Amendments [Docket ID: OCC-2011-0003] (RIN: 1557-AD38) received February 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

827. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Orderly Liquidation Authority Provisions of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act received February 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

828. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), and the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, reports prepared by the Department of State for the October 20 — December 20, 2010 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq under Section 7 of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-338); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

829. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on the status of Data Mining Activities, pursuant to Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act, Section 804; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

830. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting FY 2010 Annual Performance Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

831. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Non-American Fisheries Act Crab Vessels Harvesting Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XA177) received February 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

832. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XA176) received February 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

833. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XA168) received February 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

834. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Greater Than or Equal to 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Legnth Overall Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XA167) received February 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

835. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XA169) received February 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

836. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Extension of Emergency Fishery Closure Due to the Presence of the Toxin That Causes Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning [Docket No.: 050613158-5262-03] (RIN: 0648-AT48) received February 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

837. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 17B [Docket No.: 0907271173-0629-03] (RIN: 0648-AY11) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

838. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter to inform of the Executive Branch's determination and the Department's steps in the two pending DOMA cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

839. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Robinson Knife Manufacturing Company and Subsidiaries v. Commissioner 600 F.3d 121 (2d Cir. 2010), rev'g T.C. Memo 2009-9 received February 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

840. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Disclosure of Return Information to the Department of Agriculture [TD 9245] (RIN: 1545-BE15) received February 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

841. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled ''Review of Medicare Contractor Information Security Program Evaluations for Fiscal Year 2008''; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 147. Resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Twelfth Congress (Rept. 112–30). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 839. A bill to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to terminate the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to provide new assistance under the Home Affordable Modification Program, while preserving assistance to homeowners who were already extended an offer to participate in the Program, either on a trial or permanent basis; with an amendment (Rept. 112–31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 861. A bill to rescind the third round of funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to terminate the program; with an amendment (Rept. 112–32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

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

H.R. 1031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the shipping investment withdrawal rules in section 955 and to provide an incentive to reinvest foreign shipping earnings in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 1032. A bill to establish judicial procedures for causes and claims relating to any action or decision by a Federal official regarding the leasing of Federal lands (including submerged lands) for the exploration, development, production, processing, or transmission of oil, natural gas, or any other source or form of energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 1033. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for unreimbursed funeral expenses with respect to a deceased indigent individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 1034. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 1035. A bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to permit Medicaid coverage for citizens of the Freely Associated States lawfully residing in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 1036. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow temporarily a reduced rate of tax with respect to repatriated foreign earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 1037. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the national collection of data on stillbirths in a standardized manner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1038. A bill to authorize the conveyance of two small parcels of land within the boundaries of the Coconino National Forest containing private improvements that were developed based upon the reliance of the landowners in an erroneous survey conducted in May 1960; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. BOREN, Mr. COLE, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. LANKFORD):

H.R. 1039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Indian employment credit and the depreciation rules for property used predominantly within an Indian reservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COLE, and Mr. ROSS of Florida):

H.R. 1040. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide taxpayers a flat tax alternative to the current income tax system; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H.R. 1041. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare competitive acquisition program for durable medical equipment and prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Appropriations, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1042. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require that certain species be treated as extinct for purposes of that Act if there is not a substantial increase in the population of a species during the 15-year period beginning on the date the species is determined to be an endangered species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SHULER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BARROW, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BOREN, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. MCINTYRE) (all by request):

H.R. 1043. A bill to provide an optional fast-track procedure the President may use when submitting rescission requests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. AKIN):

H.R. 1044. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under part A of the Medicare Program on a reasonable cost basis for anesthesia services furnished by an anesthesiologist in certain rural hospitals in the same manner as payments are provided for anesthesia services furnished by anesthesiologist assistants and certified registered nurse anesthetists in such hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1045. A bill for the relief of the survivors of Michael T. Theodore, Jr., Joshua A. Sherbourne, and Zachary A. Nolen; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 1046. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a member of the Armed Forces to designate anyone as the person authorized to direct disposition of the remains of the member if the member dies while on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. YODER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Ms. FOXX, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 1047. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to protect State requirements for a secret ballot election of labor organizations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1048. A bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. BUERKLE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. AUSTRIA):

H.R. 1049. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to direct the Council on Environmental Quality to report to Congress annually on the number of permits required under Federal law for which applications have been submitted and that have not been issued because an environmental impact statement is pending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CANSECO, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 1050. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 1051. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to clarify the use of private contracts by Medicare beneficiaries for professional services and to allow individuals to choose to opt out of the Medicare part A benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1052. A bill to guarantee the right of individuals to receive social security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act in full with an accurate annual cost-of-living adjustment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 1053. A bill to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled ''An Act to define

the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine (for herself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 1054. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide access to certified professional midwives for women enrolled in the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. BURGESS, and Ms. HAYWORTH):

H.R. 1055. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit coverage of certain covered part D drugs for uses that are determined to be for medically accepted indications based upon clinical evidence in peer reviewed medical literature; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 48. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. FARR, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BACA, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 165. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Women's History Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCCOTTER (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H. Res. 166. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 2011 as ''National Kidney Cancer and Kidney Health Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 1031.

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

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that ''All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.''

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 1032.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 1033.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 1034.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 1035.

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.''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 1036.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1037.

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. GOSAR:

H.R. 1038.

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

Congress has the express constitutional authority to manage and convey federal lands, pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution. This clause provides, in relevant part: ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . .'' Federal lands may only be appropriated by an act of Congress. United States v. Fitzgerald, 40 U.S. (15 Pet.) 407, 421 (1841) (''No appropriation of public land can be made for any purpose, but by authority of congress. By the third section of the fourth article of the constitution of the United States, power is given to congress to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.'')

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 1039.

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. BURGESS:

H.R. 1040.

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

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section VIII: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes''.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1041.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and including, but not solely limited to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 1042.

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

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 1043

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

Article, I Section 9, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 5, Clause 2.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 1044.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1045.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1046.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 1047.

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

This legislation follows the 10th Amendment to the Constitution, standing up for the rights of the states to an overreach of the federal government as it relates to the National Labor Relations Board's stated intent to sue four states over provisions in their state constitutions.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 1048.

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

Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 1049.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1050.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1051.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause I (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1052.

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

Article I, Section 8, empowers Congress to impose and collect taxes ''to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 1053.

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. PINGREE of Maine:

H.R. 1054.

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 Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1055.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 48.

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

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .'' In addition, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 10: Mr. YODER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 27: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 58: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. RIVERA.

H.R. 104: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 110: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 153: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. KELLY.

H.R. 154: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 178: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. RIVERA.

H.R. 191: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 258: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 303: Mr. RIVERA and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 308: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 358: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 402: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 409: Mr. RIVERA.

H.R. 421: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 459: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 529: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 546: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.R. 576: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 601: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 605: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 625: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 651: Ms. CHU, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 656: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 665: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 687: Mr. RIVERA and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 694: Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 700: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 710: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 721: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 729: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 733: Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COOPER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 745: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 750: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 772: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 780: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 819: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CRITZ, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 822: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. RIVERA, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 831: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 835: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 838: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 840: Mr. HALL and Mr. LANDRY.

H.R. 861: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 862: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 872: Ms. SEWELL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LONG, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 892: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 893: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 896: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 900: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 904: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 909: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 910: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 925: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 948: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 951: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 959: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 965: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 984: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 987: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 992: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 993: Mr. PAUL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1004: Mr. SCHOCK and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1028: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BARROW, Mr. WOLF, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. CALVERT, Ms. FOXX, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LATTA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. BOREN.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. YODER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. NUNES, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. BOREN.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. WOODALL, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. OLSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. KELLY, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 11: Mr. BACA.

H. Res. 25: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. TONKO.

H. Res. 34: Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 44: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. CARTER.

H. Res. 60: Mr. ISSA.

H. Res. 76: Mr. PITTS.

H. Res. 85: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. MARINO.

H. Res. 100: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FARR, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas,

Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. DOYLE.

H. Res. 106: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 111: Mr. LANCE, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 137: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Res. 143: Mr. POSEY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res 48, Additional Continuing Appropriations Amendments, 2011, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING STEPHANIE SCHEIB

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Stephanie Scheib. Stephanie is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of the USA and earning the high honor of the Gold Award.

Stephanie's outstanding achievement reflects her hard work and dedication. Stephanie has exhibited unique and creative examples of service that have made a difference in her community. I am confident that she will continue to hold herself to the highest standards in the future. This is an accomplishment for which Stephanie can take pride in for the rest of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Stephanie Scheib for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of the USA and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of the Gold Award.

INTRODUCTION OF THE REMOVING EXCESS LITIGATION INVOLVING ENERGY ON FEDERAL LANDS ACT

HON. PAUL C. BROUN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced the Removing Excess Litigation Involving Energy on Federal Lands Act, RELIEF Act. This legislation would help streamline judicial procedures for causes and claims regarding the leasing of Federal lands for the exploration, development, production, processing, or transmission of oil, natural gas, or any other source or form of energy.

Excessive legal challenges have significantly delayed and in many cases prevented energy resources from reaching the American public. These oftentimes frivolous legal challenges have helped contribute to our nation's economic turmoil and skyrocketing energy costs.

The RELIEF Act would not take away anyone's "day in court;" instead, it will simply streamline the process for all parties involved. This legislation would require that all claims be filed within 60 days of an action or decision and that any proceeding be resolved within 180 days of the claim being filed and gives precedence over other court proceedings. In addition, it requires that all appeals from the District Court be reviewed by the Supreme Court and that any proceeding be resolved within 180 days of the claim being filed. To deter frivolous lawsuits, it also requires that any person seeking judicial review of any action under this Act shall pay the prevailing party's legal fees and other expenses, unless the Court finds that the position of the person was substantially justified or that special circumstances make an award unjust.

As the economic downturn continues and energy prices soar, our nation must do everything in its power to access the abundant natural resources with which we have been blessed. I believe this legislation can play an important part in our nation's economic recovery by alleviating current energy costs, while also helping to ensure our energy future.

HONORING THOMAS PATRICK O'ROURKE

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Thomas Patrick O'Rourke, a devoted husband, father, grandfather, son and brother and to mourn him upon his passing at the age of 75.

Born on February 22, 1936, Thomas O'Rourke was the younest of six children born to James and Mary O'Rourke and attended both Detroit Catholic Central and St. Cecelia before graduating from St. Cecelia in 1954. Having honorably served this great nation as a member of the United States Army, SPC 4 Thomas O'Rourke was honorably discharged on September 30, 1962. Thomas married the love of his life, Mary Ellen on May 3, 1974. A dedicated and loving father to their four children, Thomas embodied the truest spirit of the Irish enjoying the boundless conversation and camaraderie the Gaelic League and the Ancient Order of Hibernians. He was affectionately known as "Mr. Notre Dame" among his friends at the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post where he was an active member.

On March 7, 2011, Thomas O'Rourke passed from this earthly world to his eternal reward. Thomas will be deeply missed by his wife of 36 years, Mary Ellen. He will long be remembered as a father devoted to his beloved children Katie, Molly, Tom and Erin. Thomas O'Rourke leaves a legacy in his grandchildren, Ella, Aidan, Jack, Megan, Danny, Colleen, Maggie and the impending James, due in July. He is survived by his sister, Marge. Preceded into eternity by his parents, James and Mary as well as his brother James and his sisters Marie, Dorothy and Jane, Thomas was a wonderful man, kind to all he encountered. He will be truly and sorrowfully missed.

Mr. Speaker, during his lifetime, Thomas O'Rourke enriched the lives of everyone around him. There is no doubt that Thomas was a beacon of joy, hope and inspiration to those who knew him. As we bid farewell to this exceptional man, I ask my colleagues to join me in mourning his passing and honoring his life and his service to our community and our country.

STATEMENT ON H.R. 998, THE "STUDENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT"

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a proud cosponsor of the "Student Non-Discrimination Act," SNDA, introduced today by my friend Congressman JARED POLIS of Colorado.

I commend Congressman POLIS for his commitment to creating and fostering a safe educational environment for all students. The legislation we introduced today would assure equal protection for lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender, LGBT, students.

As an educator for over 30 years, I have witnessed firsthand the devastating impact bullying and harassment has on students emotionally, socially and academically. These problems are pervasive and persistent in our schools. The hostile environment created by harassment and bullying not only deprives students of the opportunity to receive a quality education, but also contributes to academic underachievement. Furthermore, bullying and harassment can, and have, led to life-threatening violence and suicide, as evidenced by several nationally reported incidents including cases in New Jersey, Philadelphia, New York and across the United States.

Existing federal civil rights statutes that address discrimination do not cover sexual orientation or gender identity, thus LGBT students are vulnerable to discrimination, harassment, and bullying. Furthermore, there is no recourse or legal protection when the rights of LGBT students are violated.

The Student Non-Discrimination Act is a positive step toward achieving equal protection for LGBT students. It will do this by prohibiting discrimination in public school based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity. These steps will provide LGBT students a safe environment free from discrimination to learn and succeed in school.

The SNDA has goals similar to legislation I supported as chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus including the Safe Schools Improvement Act, which helps schools and school districts develop and improve anti-bullying and anti-harassment initiatives. We need all of this and much more, until our students are safe enough to study without the strain of discrimination or fear of bullying and harassment.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Student Non-Discrimination Act and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation to ensure that all our students have access to a quality education free from fear.

HONORING LYNESIA TAYLOR

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Lynesia Taylor. Lynesia is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of the USA and earning the high honor of the Gold Award.

Lynesia's outstanding achievement reflects her hard work and dedication. Lynesia has exhibited unique and creative examples of service that have made a difference in her community. I am confident that she will continue to hold herself to the highest standards in the future. This is an accomplishment for which Lynesia can take pride in for the rest of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Lynesia Taylor for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of the USA and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of the Gold Award.

HONORING LINDA PASTO AS A 2010 GREAT COMEBACKS AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I pause today to recognize Linda Pasto, R.N., of Ithaca, New York. Linda has been selected as a 2010 Great Comebacks Award recipient for the East Region. This program honors a group of individuals who are living with varied intestinal diseases and/or recovering from ostomy surgery. It seeks to raise awareness of the quality of life issues confronting more than 700,000 men, women and children throughout our country affected by the very conditions that can result in an ostomy.

Every year on the first day of September, Linda throws a party. It's not for her birthday, but for what she considers her rebirth—the day she received her ostomy. After 10 years of flare-ups, hospitalizations and weight gain from medication due to Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis, Linda opted for ostomy surgery. At age 51, Linda's life began again. Now she uses her newfound zest and enjoyment for life to help others who are dealing with intestinal diseases.

Since her surgery, Linda went from struggling with everyday activities, including her duties as a nursing instructor, to playing with her grandchildren, traveling abroad and even going on a 3-hour kayaking trip in the Adirondack Mountains.

The Great Comebacks Program is sponsored by ConvaTec, a leading developer of ostomy and wound care products, in partnership with the Crohn's & Colitis Foundation, the United Ostomy Associations of America, Inc. and the Intestinal Disease Education and Awareness Society. Each year, Great comebacks presents regional awards to 12 individuals through the United States who have struggled with a chronic intestinal condition and have exhibited extraordinary strength and courage for managing to live full and productive lives despite daily struggles.

I urge my colleagues to take time to meet with some of the Great Comebacks award recipients. Their personal stories, like Linda's, are inspiration and will heighten your awareness about some of the huge strides being made by people living with intestinal diseases or recovering from ostomy surgery.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INDIGENT FUNERAL EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT ACT OF 2011

HON. PAUL C. BROUN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Indigent Funeral Expense Reimbursement Act of 2011. This common sense legislation would allow for up to a $3,000 federal tax credit for the providing of individual funeral services. Additionally, this legislation would not usurp existing state tax incentives for the funeral services of indigent individuals, but instead would supplement them.

Funeral homes respectfully and diligently provide the last measure of care for those in our society who have passed away. Oftentimes the family of the deceased or the deceased's estate takes care of the funeral expenses. However, in some cases, most especially in the case of indigent or unclaimed deceased individuals, the means to pay for these solemn services simply do not exist. Typically, cities, counties and states are left to cover the bill, and states often have tax credits or tax deductions available to funeral homes that provide services for indigent care. However, in these trying times, these state tax incentives are among the first cuts being made.

Across the country, because of an influx of the number of deceased individuals and their families now befitting indigent status, funeral homes and mortuaries are being forced to shoulder the financial burden of providing the last service of a person's life. This straightforward tax credit would simply remove the financial burden and allow funeral homes to provide the care and services that they are trained to provide.

HONORING MEGAN HOTTEL

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Megan Hottel. Megan is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of the USA and earning the high honor of the Gold Award.

Megan's outstanding achievement reflects her hard work and dedication. Megan has exhibited unique and creative examples of service that have made a difference in her community. I am confident that she will continue to hold herself to the highest standards in the future. This is an accomplishment for which Megan can take pride in for the rest of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Megan Hottel for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of the USA and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of the Gold Award.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL EACH ONE, TEACH ONE'S 44 YEARS OF SERVICE AND TO CELEBRATE THE 70TH BIRTHDAYS OF ITS FOUNDING FATHERS, BOB MCCULLOUGH AND FRED CRAWFORD

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the Children of the Founders in recognition of National Each One, Teach One's 44 Years of Service and to celebrate the 70th Birthdays of its Founding Fathers, Bob McCullough and Fred Crawford.

The National Association of Each One, Teach One, Inc.—"Where Knowledge is Power," is a non-profit (501c3) youth developmental & mentoring program, which uses sports as a vehicle to motivate youngsters to pursue higher education and explore various careers. They conduct college tours; provide guest speakers from public, private and the entertainment sectors, while fostering self respect, community awareness and self empowerment.

"Each One, Teach One," was a motto coined by Holcombe Rucker, who organized basketball tournaments as way to help keep kids off the street and out of trouble through life lessons. Born and raised in Harlem, Holcombe Rucker played guard at Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem before dropping out to serve in the United States Army during World War II. Upon his discharged from the Army, Rucker earned his General Equivalency High School Diploma and was hired as a Playground Director in Harlem for the New York City Department of Parks.

The Playgrounds and Parks would double-up as his office and meeting place, where people, whether they liked basketball or not, would come to Rucker for advice and words of wisdom. The word was that he spent more than half his day—thirteen to fifteen hours—at the park, beginning around 8:30 am. He even ate dinner there, which consisted of his favorite meal—Chinese food, vegetables with rice and brown gravy and was followed by a cup of coffee and a cigarette.

In 1962, Rucker would prove the importance of education and enrolled at the City College of New York, CCNY. While taking night classes, Holcombe took his work ethic and thirst for education and completed a four-year Bachelor of Arts degree in only three years. He used the degree to teach English at Junior High School 139 in Harlem. In 1965, Holcombe Rucker passed due to cancer complications at the young age of 38 years old. Before he died, Rucker would set the standard for years to come.

Over the years, Holcombe Rucker would help youth to obtain over 700 intercollegiate

athletic scholarships. Bob McCullough and Fred Crawford are two of the many prodigies and leaders, touched by Holcombe Rucker, and most important cats in New York basketball history. In 1967, under the guidance and vision of the legendary New York City Parks Department Playground Director, Coach and Mentor, Bob McCullough and Fred Crawford developed, The Each One, Teach One Basketball Program, where NBA Legends, Nate ''Tiny'' Archibald and Dean ''The Dream'' Meminger served as the program's first counselors. Bob and Fred also served as the Commissioners of the Holcombe Rucker Park Tournament and League.

Bob McCullough played basketball for Benedict College in South Carolina from 1962–65. He is considered one of the all-time greatest basketball players in the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. He was recruited by Coach John E. Brown and scored 2,135 points for a 28.4 career average during his three years with the Tigers. As a freshman in 1961–62, Bob canned 54, 56, and 64 points in exhibition games. In 1963–64, he was the star of Benedict's national scoring championship basketball team that averaged 101.2 points per game. In 1964–65, he was the second leading scorer in the nation averaging 36.4 points per game. He netted over 45 points on four occasions, 49 points twice and a single career high of 51 points against the South Carolina State Bulldogs. Bob was inducted into the Benedict College Athletic Hall of Fame in 2004.

McCullough was the first black athlete to be selected for the All-Southern Textile Basketball All-Star Team in Greenville, SC. He was named to the All-American Honorable Mention team by sportswriters for United Press International and Converse Magazine in 1965, and was offered a contract by the Harlem Globetrotters. Bob was drafted by the Cincinnati Royals of the National Basketball Association, and was dropped from the Royals when All-Star guard Oscar ''Big O'' Robinson renewed his contract. In 1967, Bob played with the New Jersey Asbury Park Boardwalkers in the Eastern Professional Basketball League, now known as the CBA. He averaged 22 points and five assists per game and was selected to the All-Rookie Team. McCullough earned a Master of Science degree from Lehman College and studied additionally at New York University, Cornell University and Hunter College.

Fred ''Freddie'' Crawford was a 1st team, All-City player at Samuel Gompers High School in the Bronx and played basketball for St. Bonaventure University, from 1960–64. In 1961, during St. Bonaventure's first venture into the NCAA tournament, sophomore Fred Crawford scored 614 points and led the Bonnies to their first NCAA Tournament in school history. Crawford continued his torrid scoring pace in his junior and senior seasons. He averaged 19.7 points per game during his junior campaign, scoring 492 points. In his senior season, he scored 631 points, earning All-East honors. Crawford also averaged 10.3 rebounds per game for his career. He was inducted into St. Bonaventure University's Athletic Hall of Fame in 1970.

Forward Freddie Crawford was selected number one in the fourth round of the NBA Draft by the New York Knicks in 1964 and spent five years in the league. Crawford had his best season in the NBA in 1968 with the Lakers when he averaged 10.3 points, 2.9 rebounds, and 2.5 assists per game in the NBA Finals against the Boston Celtics. A team that featured West Virginia's Jerry West, Keith Ericson, Providence's Johnny Egan, Saint Joseph's Cliff Anderson, USC's Bill Hewitt, Seattle University's Elgin Baylor, Oregon State's Jay Carty, UCLA's Keith Erickson, Notre Dame's Tom Hawkins, Oregon State's Mel Counts and Kansas University's Wilt ''The Stilt'' Chamberlain. During his stellar NBA career, Freddie Crawford, has also played for the Philadelphia 76ers, the Golden State Warriors and the Milwaukee Bucks.

The impact that Bob McCullough and Freddie Crawford have made, on young men and women, on and off the court through the Each One, Teach One Basketball Program, has averted generations of young people from falling into illegal activity on the streets, by promoting education, discipline, drug prevention and mentoring.

Former Each-One Teach One Counselors were, NBA legends Julius Erving, Emmitt Bryant, Connie Hawkins, Mike Bantom, Willis Reed, Wilt Chamberlain, Dave Stallworth, Hawthorne Wingo, Butch Lee, Steve Sheppard, Arnold Duggar, Larry McNeil, Kareem Abdul Jabbar, Charlie Scott, Jo Jo White, Joe Bostic, Bill Bradley, Hubie Brown, Al McGuire, Mel Davis, Joe Dupree and St. John University's outstanding Hall of Fame college coach, Luigi P. (Lou) Carnesecca, to name just a few.

Today the program is run through SCAN/El Faro Beacon Center in East Harlem, where we celebrate the National Each One, Teach One's 44 years of service. Please join me in saluting my good friends Bob McCullough and Freddie Crawford as we celebrate their 70th Birthdays.

HONORING ERIN PRICE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Erin Price. Erin is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of the USA and earning the high honor of the Gold Award.

Erin's outstanding achievement reflects her hard work and dedication. Erin has exhibited unique and creative examples of service that have made a difference in her community. I am confident that she will continue to hold herself to the highest standards in the future. This is an accomplishment for which Erin can take pride in for the rest of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Erin Price for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of the USA and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of the Gold Award.

DEVASTATION IN JAPAN

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers are with all those affected by the devastating earthquake on the eastern coast of Japan, and the resulting catastrophic tsunami that struck Japan and is currently moving throughout the Pacific, with the potential to impact Hawaii, Alaska, and the West Coast of the United States, including my state of California. President Obama has stated that the United States stands ready to help, and I join the President and the American people in pledging our assistance to the people of Japan as they recover from this terrible disaster.

The United States Congress must stand united with our ally Japan and provide it with the resources it needs to respond and recover. I will work with my colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee to ensure that we make available the resources necessary to assist the Japanese Government and the Japanese people during this time of suffering and distress. While we mourn the massive loss of lives, we recognize this is a time for action and a time for Congress to commit ourselves to assisting our friend and ally Japan.

HONORING MS. AURELIA LOPEZ GONZALEZ ON HER 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the celebration of Ms. Aurelia Lopez Gonzalez's 90th birthday. With nearly a century passing, Ms. Gonzalez has dedicated her life to her family, loved ones, and giving back to the community.

Ms. Gonzalez was born March 11, 1921 at the San Bartolo Ranch near Cadereyta Jimenez, Nuevo Leon. At a young age, Ms. Gonzalez and her parents migrated to the United States after their wooden home was washed away in a flood. At the age of nine, Ms. Gonzalez enrolled in the La Escuellita Amarilla Public School. She went on to attend Christen Jr. High School and by 1943 she graduated from Martin High School. In 1993, Ms. Gonzalez was able to attend the Martin High School's 50 year reunion at the La Posada Hotel in Laredo, Texas.

Throughout her life, Ms. Gonzalez has worked to support herself and her family at the Law Offices of Phelps and Phelps, S & H Kress Store, McCllends and H.E.B. grocery store. By 1948, she married Mr. Eusebio Busto Gonzalez. A year later, Mr. and Mrs. Gonzalez welcomed their first child, Adolfo and later would go on to have two more children, Thomas and Eusebio Jr. Unfortunately, Mr. Gonzalez contracted Lou Gehrig Disease in 1950. For the next 10 years, she tried to find a cure for the disease through taking trips around Texas and Mexico. In November of 1960, Eusebio passed away leaving her to care for herself and their three sons. After her husband's passing, Ms. Gonzalez went back to work with S & H Kress, until they closed down in 1970. Soon after, Ms. Gonzalez started working with H.E.B. grocery store in Laredo, Texas. She worked with them for 12 years until her retirement in 1982.

In her spare time, Ms. Gonzalez garnered a passion for baking. Her cakes and cookies,

known as Ojaracas, can be found around Laredo in weddings, Quinceaneras, birthdays, and Christmas. Additionally, after her time with H.E.B., Ms. Gonzalez took up teaching classes on cake decorating. The annual Wilton Cake decorating convention is where she picked up many new ideas to take back to her students. She also decorates bouquets, which can be seen during All Saints Day. Currently, Ms. Gonzalez spends her days tending to her home garden, exercising, and staying healthy. Her devotion to the Catholic faith does not waiver; she attends church every week. For nearly a century, Ms. Gonzalez has dedicated her life to the community and touching the lives of her family and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had the time to recognize and celebrate the tremendous life of Ms. Aurelia Gonzalez and her 90th birthday celebration.

HONORING ALLISON FELTON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Allison Felton. Allison is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of the USA and earning the high honor of the Gold Award.

Allison's outstanding achievement reflects her hard work and dedication. Allison has exhibited unique and creative examples of service that have made a difference in her community. I am confident that she will continue to hold herself to the highest standards in the future. This is an accomplishment for which Allison can take pride in for the rest of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Allison Felton for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of the USA and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of the Gold Award.

CONGRATULATING JOE AND SUZANNE PATERNO ON THEIR RECEIPT OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP AWARD

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, the name "Paterno" is legend across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The successes of Joe Paterno, as football coach of the Penn State Nittany Lions since 1966, compiling an astonishing 401 victories, 24 bowl game triumphs, five undefeated seasons and two national championships, are well known to even the most casual sports fans.

Not so well known, yet equally worthy of acclaim, is the generosity of Joe and Suzanne Paterno in their charitable support for educational institutions and other causes. This amazing couple, often known simply as JoePa/SuePa, has contributed over $4 million, and raised many millions more, to departments, colleges, buildings, libraries and other causes at Penn State. Sue Paterno is recognized as a philanthropist and community leader in her own right. She has served as a champion of Penn State's library system while volunteering for Pennsylvania Special Olympics, United Way, Centre (County) Volunteers for Medicine, and a tutor for student-athletes.

No wonder the American Jewish Committee has selected Joe and Sue Paterno for its prestigious 2011 National Community Leadership Award. This nonsectarian honor will be presented to the Paternos at the AJC Philadelphia/Southern New Jersey's Award Dinner on March 15, 2011, at the Union League of Philadelphia.

The National Community Leadership Award is an excellent example of the service commitment and broad outreach of both the Paternos and the bridge-building, human rights promoting organization that created it. The American Jewish Committee honors stellar achievement in civic and community circles and in the world of philanthropy. Past recipients of AJC National Awards include Sidney Kimmel, Jones Apparel; Rupert Murdoch, News Corp.; Steven Spielberg, Dreamworks; William Clay Ford, Ford Motor Company; Terry Lundgren, Federated Department Stores; Cathie Black, New York City Schools Chancellor; Henry Kravis, Kohlberg Kravis Roberts; and Steven A. Schwarzman, The Blackstone Group, L.P., among many others.

Earlier in my career, as a state legislator, I served on the Board of Pennsylvania State University and got to know Joe Paterno. His fan club stretches from the Delaware River to the Ohio line. In Philadelphia, some of us may cheer for Temple, Penn or Villanova. Every member of this House has his or her favorite college team. But in the fields of philanthropy and community service, I urge all my colleagues to join in cheering for the JoePa/SuePa team and for their AJC National Leadership Award.

TRIBUTE TO FAITH FRAZIER

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I acknowledge the passing, on February 20, 2011, of former San Leandro City Councilmember Faith Frazier. Faith was a native of New Orleans and raised in Memphis, Tennessee before attending college at both the University of Cincinnati and Memphis State. She settled at the University of California, Santa Barbara, where she received her elementary and junior high school teaching credentials and bachelor of arts. Faith met her late husband James while attending college and they relocated to San Leandro in the mid-1950s.

Faith was a pioneer for women's rights and women in government. Shortly after moving to San Leandro she worked to bring women in the community together for purposes of educating them about local city government. She wanted to help women become a part of the government and running for elected office. Her group would eventually become known as the Civic Information and Education Group, CIEG.

Faith was a member of the Board of the San Leandro Service Center—a community-based group for helping citizens in San Leandro in need of assistance. She was also a charter member of the first San Leandro Arts Council—which was reconstituted in 1998 and is still active today.

Faith was a member of the Library Board of Trustees and sat on this committee for almost 12 years until she won a seat on the San Leandro City Council in 1974. While serving as a member of the City Council she also served as a member of the Associated Community Action Program, serving low income residents of Alameda County for over 30 years, and the Alameda County Training and Employment Board.

Among her many other achievements she was also a Founding Member of the Bonaire Civic League and Charter Member of the San Leandro League of Women Voters, appointed Commissioner of the Alameda County Commission on the Status of Women, helped found the Southern chapter of the National Women's Political Caucus, Member of the Peralta Chapter of OWL (Older Women's League) which keeps track of legislation affecting women statewide and nationally, and she was an original founder of the Political Action Committee for Excellence, PACE, which supports women for elective office.

I feel privileged to have known Faith. I treasure the opportunity I had to work with her during her tenure as one of the City of San Leandro's Councilmembers and my relationship with her during her active career in community service as a public citizen.

I join the community of San Leandro in honoring Faith Frazier. Her presence and contributions will be felt for years to come.

HONORING PAIGE ALLEN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Paige Allen. Paige is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of the USA and earning the high honor of the Gold Award.

Paige's outstanding achievement reflects her hard work and dedication. Paige has exhibited unique and creative examples of service that have made a difference in her community. I am confident that she will continue to hold herself to the highest standards in the future. This is an accomplishment for which Paige can take pride in for the rest of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Paige Allen for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of the USA and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of the Gold Award.

REDUCE UNNECESSARY SPENDING ACT OF 2011

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the "Reduce Unnecessary Spending Act of 2011" on behalf of the President.

There is no question we need to rein in spending and put our nation on the path to long-term fiscal sustainability—and at the same time invest in job growth and ensure that America remains competitive in the 21st century global economy. With that in mind, President Obama put forth a tough love budget that reduces our deficit over 10 years, while also investing in our future.

This legislation will add another tool to make sure the investments we make are targeted and designed to maximize economic growth. The establishment of an expedited rescission process will help keep us on a responsible path and enforce greater fiscal discipline. An expedited rescission process allows the President to sign a spending bill into law, and at the same time propose to Congress that certain items in the bill with a budgetary cost be ''rescinded'' or cancelled. The President sends his recommendations for rescission to Congress within a short time-frame after presentment of the spending bill, and the Congress takes up the proposals on a fast track, acting in a short period after receiving the President's recommendations. The rescissions take effect only if approved by a majority in each house.

Even though the current law already provides Presidential rescission authority, the law does not ensure that the Congress will vote on the President's proposed rescissions. By contrast, the measure President Obama is now proposing, and I am introducing by request, adds new procedures that will virtually guarantee a vote. In addition, this version of the bill ensures that any savings from Congressional passage of a rescission approval bill will be dedicated to deficit reduction.

This proposal is another step forward on the path to greater fiscal responsibility. Other Members of Congress, including Chairman RYAN, have proposed different versions of expedited recession legislation in past years. I hope this year we can work together to find common ground in this area.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MEDICAID COVERAGE FOR CITIZENS OF FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES ACT OF 2011

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Medicaid Coverage for Citizens of Freely Associated States Act of 2011. I would like to thank Congressman ENI FALEOMAVAEGA, Congresswoman COLLEEN HANABUSA, and Congresswoman MADELEINE BORDALLO for cosponsoring this bill.

Compact Migrants are citizens from Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, and Palau that have migrated to the United States. Citizens from these countries are allowed to freely enter the United States without a visa, criminal background check, or health certification due to agreements signed by the Federal Government.

The 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act prohibited Federal Medicaid payments for nonimmigrants, a category that includes Compact Migrants. Prior to this specific prohibition, Compact Migrants were covered by Medicaid. Since enactment of the Federal welfare reform law, state and territorial governments have been the sole sources of funding for meeting the social service and public health needs of this ever growing population.

In 2007, Hawaii spent over $37 million to cover the health care costs of the state's Compact Migrant population. Of this amount, $30 million would have been eligible for partial Federal reimbursement through the Medicaid program.

The decision to allow citizens of the Freely Associated States to come to the United States was a Federal decision; however, the cost of that decision has fallen mainly on a handful of states and territories. Most Compact Migrants have settled in the Pacific region, likely because the environments and climates are similar to their home nations. Hawaii is home to 12,215 Compact Migrants; Guam, 18,305; and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands, 2,100. Compact Migrants are also on the continental United States, including California, Oregon, Washington, and Arkansas—a state where they have been specifically recruited as laborers. Restoring Medicaid coverage is the only fair way to address the Federal mandate.

Our former colleague and now Governor of Hawaii, Neil Abercrombie, worked with Congressman ELIOT ENGEL and Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO on an amendment to provide Medicaid coverage for Compact Migrants during the mark-up of the House health care reform bill by the Energy and Commerce Committee. This amendment was adopted by the Committee by a voice vote.

Regrettably, the Senate health care reform bill did not include comparable language. So today, I am introducing that same, bipartisan supported amendment language as a standalone bill.

Restoring the Medicaid eligibility of Compact Migrants is an important issue not only for Hawaii, but also Arkansas, California, Oregon, and Washington as well as the territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Marianas Islands. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on this important issue.

Mahalo nui loa.

HONORING MARY McCLANNAHAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Mary McClannahan. Mary is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of the USA and earning the high honor of the Gold Award.

Mary's outstanding achievement reflects her hard work and dedication. Mary has exhibited unique and creative examples of service that have made a difference in her community. I am confident that she will continue to hold herself to the highest standards in the future. This is an accomplishment for which Mary can take pride in for the rest of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Mary McClannahan for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of the USA and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of the Gold Award.

HONORING JOSEPH GIROLAMO

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. McCOTTER Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Joseph Girolamo, a remarkable Michigan citizen and esteemed veteran, upon his 90th birthday.

Born on March 9, 1921 in New York City, Joseph Girolamo is the oldest of seven children born to Pellegrino and Mary Girolamo. Pellegrino came to the United States as an immigrant from Benevento, Italy during World War I and served in the Army. The young family moved to Detroit when Joe was a toddler. Growing up in Detroit, Joseph Girolamo has made Livonia his home for the last 58 years.

Joseph Girolamo has always been active in his community. As a youngster Joe sold newspapers on the street corners of Detroit. He became a Boy Scout and a proud member of the Junior ROTC in high school. Young Joe joined the army during World War II and served honorably as a staff sergeant of General George Patton's 7th Army in the European Theatre of Africa, France and Italy. It was during his time in the service that Joe, given his penchant for taking ''creative liberties'' on the interpretation of music as the camp bugler, became known as the ''Boogie Woogie Bugler.''

When World War II, ended Joseph came home to begin a 32-year career with Ford Motor Company, working in the Tool and Die Division and holding the position of committeeman. Joe also became a very accomplished bugler. He served as Drum Major for the Wayne County Council and the Detroit Edison Lamplighter Drum and Bugle Corps. Joseph has written drill and instructed many marching units in both the United States and Canada.

During his service as an instructor he trained a women's drum and bugle corps where he met Lillian Paananen. Finding a genuine harmony, Joseph and Lillian were married on June 12, 1951. The Girolamos quite literally made beautiful music as both became state champion buglers and Joseph become a national champion bugler. On June 5, 1957 Joe and Lillian became parents to daughter Joyce Arlene and their family was complete. After celebrating 40 years of marriage in June of 1991, Joseph's beloved Lillian succumbed to leukemia in October of that year.

Joseph Girolamo continues to be involved in his community through various veterans' programs. He is the JR. VICE of VFW Post 3941 and the Patriotic Instructor for American Legion Post 32, both in Livonia. Major Joe teaches flag etiquette to the Boy Scouts, Cub Scouts, Girl Scouts and Brownies. He volunteers as a marching and drill instructor with the Livonia Churchill High School Junior ROTC. Major Joe is also a popular speaker at local schools as he shares his involvement and experiences during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, for 90 years Joseph Girolamo has graced the world with his kindness, patriotic dedication, hard work, and community spirit. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Joseph Girolamo upon

reaching his 90th birthday on March 9, 2011, and to honor his heartfelt commitment and brave service to his community and his country.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE BEVIN KALATHIL VARUGHESE MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to seek Congressional recognition of the vital mission and achievements of the Bevin Kalathil Varughese Memorial Foundation (BKV). The BKV Memorial Foundation has been instrumental in raising awareness and resources for individuals battling leukemia. The Foundation's creation was inspired by the remarkable life of one of my constituents, Bevin Kalathil Varughese—a life which was tragically cut short following an unsuccessful bout with this terrible disease.

Born in Manhasset, New York, Bevin Kalathil Varughese was an affectionate individual and a cherished son, brother, nephew, cousin, and uncle. An extraordinarily motivated young man, Bevin graduated from Herricks High School in New York and went on to earn his Bachelor's Degree in Finance and Real Estate from Temple University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. His cheerfulness, generosity, and love of life were evident to all who knew him; his personality touched all who were close to him.

Bevin's drive and good-nature were unwavering—even when he was diagnosed with Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia in January 2004 at the age of 24. Although Bevin fluctuated between relapse and remission for four years, he refused to let the disease dampen his spirits or weaken his will. Instead, Bevin focused his energy on researching the disease and the resources available to those it afflicts. By working with his family and friends, he created the South Asian Cancer Foundation (SACF) which advocates for leukemia awareness, particularly within the South Asian-American community. Bevin was also involved in a variety of other organizations dealing with the disease and those affected by it—he hosted fundraisers to benefit both the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society (LLS) and the SACF, took part in the LLS Light the Night Walk, and organized numerous blood and bone marrow drives.

Although Bevin eventually lost his battle with leukemia on February 7th, 2008 at the all-too-young age of 28, his passion and legacy live on through the Bevin Kalathil Varughese Memorial Foundation. The BKV Memorial Foundation was created in 2008 to both preserve Bevin's memory and to continue his work with the South Asian Cancer Foundation. The Foundation's mission is to raise awareness about acute lymphoblastic leukemia and other blood-related diseases. This non-profit organization provides resources to those suffering from leukemia and to their families. The assistance comes in the form of support for leukemia patients, financial aid for those who cannot afford treatment, and donations for research to find a cure for the disease. The BKV Foundation works tirelessly to raise funding through countless charity events and organizations. It has also reached out to the greater community by encouraging individuals to register with the National Marrow Donor Program (NMDP).

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the achievements and dedication of the Bevin Kalathil Varughese Memorial Foundation. Through its attempts to preserve and honor Bevin's memory, this Foundation is making a positive and lasting impact on countless lives. I ask that my colleagues in the House join me in recognition of the achievements of the Bevin Kalathil Varughese Memorial Foundation.

HONORING JORDAN GARDNER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jordan Gardner. Jordan is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of the USA and earning the high honor of the Gold Award.

Jordan's outstanding achievement reflects her hard work and dedication. Jordan has exhibited unique and creative examples of service that have made a difference in her community. I am confident that she will continue to hold herself to the highest standards in the future. This is an accomplishment for which Jordan can take pride in for the rest of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jordan Gardner for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of the USA and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of the Gold Award.

FHA REFINANCE PROGRAM TERMINATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 830) to rescind the unobligated funding for the FHA Refinance Program and to terminate the program, with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire in the chair.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 830, the FHA Refinance Program Termination Act. This bill would terminate the authority for the FHA to guarantee new single family refinance loans under the FHA refinance program at 97.75 percent of the home's value. I am concerned that the Republican plan would kill a program that offers a cost effective approach to assisting underwater borrowers achieve sustainable long-term homeownership.

This Congress should be committed to helping struggling homeowners stay in their homes. Instead it seems we are taking up measures that would only complicate this effort. According to the FHA nearly one quarter of American homeowners are underwater on their mortgages. Terminating a program that would allow hard-working Americans who are current in their mortgages the ability to stay in their homes will only add to our nation's foreclosure crisis.

Mr. Chair, homeownership is the American dream for many families in this country. The FHA Refinance Program will give the American people a chance to keep their dream alive by allowing lenders the ability to write off mortgage principal, at no cost to the tax payer.

This Congress must stand with the distressed homeowners in this country who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. Before moving forward we should ask ourselves who do we value, and more importantly who do we stand with? Congress must stand on the side of the homeowners in this country. I urge my colleagues to vote no H.R. 830.

RECOGNITION OF MS. NANCY MAZZA

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nancy Mazza for her immeasurable contributions as a leader and corporate executive in the field of retail banking. Nancy has been valuable to my district and an asset to local communities. On March 11, 2011, Ms. Mazza will be recognized by the Greater Long Branch Chamber of Commerce during their 77th Annual Business Awards Dinner with the Lois G. Libutti Community Service Award. Today, I applaud Ms. Mazza, as her achievements should serve as an inspiration to us all.

Nancy Mazza began her career at Shadow Lawn Savings Bank as a teller. As a result of her hard work and dedication, Ms. Mazza was promoted to Branch Manager in 1984. Her responsibilities included overseeing eight branches throughout Monmouth County. In 1994 Ms. Mazza acquired the responsibilities of Senior Vice President and Senior District Executive for Sovereign Bank. She was accountable for overall sales, operations, performance management, facilities and district performance in Monmouth County. She currently serves as the Executive Vice President of Retail Banking at Colonial American Bank.

Nancy Mazza is a valued member of the community. Ms. Mazza honorably serves as past-chair of the Ronald McDonald House in Long Branch and New Brunswick. She continues to remain an active member of the board. Ms. Mazza is also a committee member for United Way, Monmouth Park Charities, the March of Dimes, Michael's Feat, Jason's Dream for Kids, Tinton Falls C.U.R.E. and Toys for Tots. Nancy is an alumna of Rutgers University and earned a degree in Journalism and Communications. She is a forty-year resident of Monmouth County and currently lives in Little Silver with her husband Dominick and their three children, DJ, Joseph and Kristyn.

Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to thank Nancy Mazza for her outstanding contributions to the constituents of my district and congratulate her for the honors she has received from the Greater Long Branch Chamber of Commerce.

HONORING EMILY MISCHKE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Emily Mischke. Emily is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of the USA and earning the high honor of the Gold Award.

Emily's outstanding achievement reflects her hard work and dedication. Emily has exhibited unique and creative examples of service that have made a difference in her community. I am confident that she will continue to hold herself to the highest standards in the future. This is an accomplishment for which Emily can take pride in for the rest of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Emily Mischke for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of the USA and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of the Gold Award.

IN HONOR OF JACK HINES, JR.

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jack M. Hines, Jr. of Marshallton, Chester County, Pennsylvania on his retirement after 33 years of service as Municipal Manager of West Bradford Township and to honor him on his outstanding career of accomplishment.

In addition to his service as Municipal Manager of West Bradford Township, Jack has served on various committees of the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Officials. He has been an instructor for both the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors and the Governor's Center for Local Government Services. Jack has served as Chairman of the Legislative Committee, Chester County Association of Township Officials, and has been a member of the Advisory Board for Connect Care3, which serves members of the Pennsylvania Municipal Health Insurance Cooperative.

Further, Jack is a former Fire Chief and President of the West Bradford Fire Company, as well as being a former Fire Service Instructor and Director of the Chester County Fire School. He is a former Board Member and President of the Chester County Crime Victims Center, Chairman of the Environmental Management Center, Executive Committee Member of the Brandywine Conservancy, and Trustee of the Chester County Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, in light of his incredible years of service to his community and litany of outstanding accomplishments almost too long to record, I ask that my colleagues join me today in recognizing Jack M. Hines, Jr. for his invaluable contributions to the quality of life of the citizens of West Bradford Township and Chester County.

JAMES BILLINGS, SR. TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to rise and pay tribute to the life and career of Mr. James Billings, Sr. of Pueblo, Colorado. The community has lost a great firefighter and a man, who led a life that was dedicated to family, public service and leadership.

Mr. James Billings, Sr. comes from a family of police officers and fire fighters, and it is no surprise that he followed in the honorable footsteps of his father and brother. Born and raised in Pueblo, Mr. Billings was compelled to serve the city, and joined the Pueblo Fire Department in 1953. Serving honorably and with distinction for twenty-five years, the last six of those years as the assistant fire chief. Mr. Billings was so respected as a firefighter that many have described working with him as one of the highlights of their careers. Mr. Billings' own son, James, Jr. said that the greatest memory of his long career as the Pueblo Chief of Police was the first time he was on the job with his father. For all the achievements of Mr. Billings' career in public service, he was an even more determined family man. With his loving wife Rose, he raised five wonderful children, and was a devoted husband, father, grandfather and great grandfather.

The life of Mr. James Billings, Sr. is one that should be celebrated and recognized. This was a man who endlessly devoted himself to public service and to his family. Mr. Speaker, it has been my sincere privilege to rise and honor Mr. James Billings, Sr.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR TED JENNINGS

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the remarkable example and service of a true leader in South Alabama, someone who has taken the roles of successful businessman, trusted medical adviser, and local and national civic leader for more than 30 years.

In 2012, Mayor Ted Jennings of Brewton, Alabama, will end nearly a quarter century of service as his town's chief executive.

For many, this accomplishment alone would be the epitome of a life's work. And, indeed, Mayor Jennings has confidently guided his community for four terms.

But Ted's body of accomplishments does not begin nor end with holding public office.

A graduate of Auburn University's School of Pharmacy, a successful business owner and Director of Pharmacy at D.W. McMillan Memorial Hospital, Mayor Jennings has also made an indelible mark through his compassion and devotion to the well-being of his community. And his contributions don't stop there.

While Ted Jennings may be known to the people of Brewton as their long-time mayor and trusted pharmacist, to his colleagues in Alabama and across America, he is an indispensible resource of wisdom and experience.

A former member of the board of the National League of Cities, Mayor Jennings has held about every post one can within that important national organization, tirelessly defending the principles of good government at forums around the country. In Alabama, Mayor Jennings has also led his peers as president and long-time officer in the Alabama League of Municipalities where he has been a strong, steady voice for issues vital to local and state economic development.

A man gifted with a vision for our nation's—and region's—economic future, Mayor Jennings has for decades promoted the development of telecommunications on the local and state level, leveraging the resources of businesses and universities.

A supporter of both electronic and paved highways, Mayor Jennings also helped establish the Florida-Alabama Strategic Task Force to improve transportation between the two states to enhance both public safety and economic growth.

I have had the pleasure of working with Mayor Jennings for more than two decades and I can say, without hesitation, that his devotion to public service is without equal. I was fortunate to be a co–chair on the Alabama Rural Action Committee with Mayor Jennings, and I believe there is a no more passionate and informed voice for rural economic development than his.

As Mayor Jennings steps off the stage from a remarkable civic career, I know he will continue to have a positive impact on his community and state. To his family and close friends who have shared Ted with us for all these years, we offer our heartfelt thanks. And to the Mayor, himself, I am privileged to speak for all of South Alabama in offering our heartfelt thanks to a true servant leader, a real partner for progress and a man who leaves behind a legacy of goodness as well as success.

Thanks, Mayor Jennings, for a job well done.

HONORING WOMEN'S MONTH

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, as we work through the rigors of this congressional session, it is important that we take the time to recognize this March as National Women's History Month. The theme for 2011 is, "Our History is Our Strength," and this is understood by looking back on the challenges that women faced throughout the course of history and realizing that it has only made us stronger and more tenacious going into the future.

This month, we acknowledge those women in history who braved the fight for equal rights and paved the way for myself and many of my colleagues here today. We honor the strong women in the military who are everyday helping to ensure our safety and freedom in this world. And we honor all women for the important role that they play in their communities.

But, despite all the challenges and hurdles that we have overcome, the efforts for equality continue. As the proud representative of the

47th district of California, I will continue to strive for increase and advancement of opportunities for women all around the world. And I challenge young women everywhere to do the same and continue with even greater strength and force into the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 163, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 570, the Dental Emergency Responder Act of 2011, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

IN HONOR OF THE VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER JULIA GILLARD OF AUSTRALIA TO CONGRESS

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that this poem by Albert Carey Caswell, commemorating the historic address by Prime Minister Julia Gillard of Australia, be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in honor of the great friendship between our two countries.

ACROSS THE GREAT OCEANS

Across the great oceans
Over the deep blue seas
And all of the most distant shores
And throughout the miles we see
But lies . . .
But lies, such a great love, a bond between America and Australia so indeed!
For when we look into the mirror, a mirror image we so see
For we are so much alike, are but you, are but so you and me
As such a great bond, so very special across those seas
So very strong, so very deep
That even time and distance, cannot so destroy.
As is such a great bond between Australia and America,
That our hearts of love have so received
For we are such fine friends, so are all of we!
And throughout the generations, and throughout all of those wars
All throughout all of those dark storms
As we have so stood together, as one, as one have all of we!
As throughout all of those dreadful wars
As we have sent our fine son and daughters, off together, off to die, off to death and war
And 'Oh, what a burden bore!
To lose all of our most precious loves, that which we have all so adored!
All of those tears, those heart broken tears, that together we have so poured!
As all together we've so stood, so stood throughout the generations as one so for very sure!
For Down Under, no greater loves adorned!
Then, that bond between Australia and America
From all across those most distant shores
As we even speak the same language, all the more
And on this day, a prayer we say as so sent across those most distant shores
That this great bond, that this warm love and so friendship, as will live on for evermore!
And together as one, as out into the future we walk hand in hand, as we have done before!
'Oh across those great oceans, "It's a good day" . . . all because of our love that we have so poured!

THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT DAM

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Theodore Roosevelt Dam, an engineering marvel that is celebrating its centennial of service to the people of Arizona, including a majority of constituents in my own District.

When Federal engineers built Roosevelt Dam on the Salt River in the beginning of the 20th Century, they did not have the conveniences of a nearby town, an existing power supply or a locally skilled labor force. Several engineering feats needed to be accomplished even before construction could begin at the site 80 miles east of Phoenix.

A road was cut into the sides of mountains so supplies could be hauled from the Phoenix area to the dam site. Members of local Apache tribes helped build the road, and they continued with the construction effort for the dam. Federal engineers also constructed a 20-mile canal to develop hydroelectric power at the dam to power a cement mill, aerial trams and cableways, and other equipment.

Stone masons cut massive blocks from the sides of the canyon. Cranes were used to lower the stones, some weighing as much as 10 tons, to the riverbed. They were laid in a stair-step fashion, which gave the dam a distinctive appearance.

Federal engineers ensured the strength of the dam by requiring the mortar joints on the upstream face not to exceed 1 inch in width. Following the laying of the cornerstone in 1906, crews worked nearly nonstop, with strings of electric lights suspended above the site allowing men to work through the night. Five years later, Roosevelt Dam had risen 280 feet high, with a base 184 feet thick that narrowed to 16 feet at the top. On the day of its dedication on March 18, 1911, it was the largest rubble-masonry thick-arch dam in the world.

Due to its engineering and construction excellence, Roosevelt Dam stood nearly unchanged for more than 80 years. In the 1990s, a new generation of engineers needed to address dam safety, regulatory water storage and flood control in central Arizona. During this construction effort, the entire face of the dam was overlain with concrete, ranging in thickness from 10 to 50 feet. The concrete extended upward to create a new crest and spillways were constructed deeper and narrower, allowing for greater water releases during floods. Renovations used nearly 450,000 cubic yards of cement, enough to pave a two-lane road between Phoenix and Tucson. The additional 77 feet of height effectively doubled the capacity of the reservoir, enhancing its role in managing water supplies for the growing greater Phoenix metropolitan area.

Mr. Speaker, as Roosevelt Dam embarks on its second century of service, it deserves special recognition for its engineering marvel and being an economic engine for central Arizona.

HONORING SPECIALIST DAVID R. FAHEY

HON. NAN A.S. HAYWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Specialist David R. Fahey, who lost his life on Monday, February 28, 2011, while courageously serving our nation in Afghanistan. He was killed by an IED explosion. Yesterday he was laid to rest.

Specialist Fahey enlisted at the age of 20, in August, 2007. He was deployed to Afghanistan in June, 2010. He is mourned by family, friends, and fellow soldiers from Yorktown Heights, New York, to Washington State, Korea, and Afghanistan. He has been honored for his service with the Combat Action Badge, the Purple Heart, and the Bronze Star.

Specialist Fahey's dedication to protecting his fellow citizens extended to his plans to join the New York City Police Department after the completion of his tour of duty. His sacrifice for our nation will be remembered through the family he loved and freedom he protected. I ask the House to keep in their thoughts and prayers Specialist Fahey and all the other brave men and women in our armed services who have lost their lives, as well as those who continue to serve abroad.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN THOMAS F. MCGOVERN, AS HE PREPARES TO RETIRE AFTER 25 YEARS OF COMMISSIONED SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND TO OUR NATION

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Captain Thomas F. McGovern, as he prepares to retire after 25 years of Commissioned Service to the United States Navy and for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to the United States of America. I have worked with Captain McGovern personally in his role as the Deputy Director of the Navy Appropriations Liaison Office, and I would like to share with you some highlights of this fine officer's career.

Captain Thomas F. McGovern received his commission from the United States Naval Academy in May 1986, and was designated a Naval Aviator in March 1988. He has served in operational assignments with Patrol Squadron Forty at Naval Air Station Moffett Field, California, flying the P–3C Orion; Patrol Squadron Thirty-One as an Instructor Pilot; aboard both the USS *Constellation* and USS *Saratoga* as a Catapult and Arresting Gear Officer. Captain McGovern also served with distinction as Flag Lieutenant to the Commander, Pacific Fleet Patrol Wings and Anti-Submarine Warfare Force, at Naval Air Station Barbers

Point, Hawaii, and with Patrol Squadron One as the Senior Pilot and Operations Officer.

Ashore, Captain McGovern broadened his experience working in the Operations, Readiness and Mobilization Directorate of the Army Operations Center, Pentagon. During this joint assignment, he was assigned as an Operations Officer for United Nations Peacekeeping Operations. His responsibilities included the logistical and administrative support for US personnel assigned to the United Nations Peacekeeping missions in Iraq, Kuwait, Israel, Egypt, Western Sahara, Guatemala and the United Nations Headquarters in New York. He also served with the Office of the Chief of Naval Personnel as the Enlisted Aviation Community Manager and as the Special Assistant for Manpower for the Naval Aviation Enterprise.

Captain McGovern served as the Commanding Officer of Patrol Squadron Forty Seven in April 2003. During his tour, the squadron deployed to the FIFTH Fleet Area of Responsibility in support of Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. Their outstanding efforts were recognized by being awarded the ''Golden Wrench'' award for maintenance excellence along with the Commander Pacific Fleet Retention Excellence Award.

Captain McGovern reported to his current assignment as the Deputy Director for Appropriations Matters in the Office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Financial Management & Comptroller in March 2007. During his time at Financial Management Budget & Execution, Captain McGovern demonstrated exceptional leadership and foresight, engaging Members of Congress and the Appropriations Committee Staff, providing essential information and resources for the Department of the Navy to maintain its role as the world's dominant sea power. Captain McGovern worked through significant readiness and manpower challenges, providing essential support in shepherding three Navy budgets and multiple war supplemental requests totaling more than $550 billion in Department of the Navy funding. I can assure you that my staff, the subcommittee staff, and my fellow Members have found him to be a pleasure to work with, and he is respected by all for his true professionalism.

Mr. Speaker, On behalf of a grateful Nation, I join my colleagues today in saying thank you to Captain Thomas F. McGovern for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to this country throughout his distinguished career in the United States Navy and we wish him, his wife Katie, and his daughters, Rosemary and Lauren ''Fair Winds and Following Seas'' in his well-deserved retirement.

ASPEN VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a true honor for me to rise and pay tribute to the fraternal spirit and charitable efforts that have been exemplified by the Aspen Volunteer Fire Department. The tragedy that befell our country on September 11, 2001, was met with a resounding and galvanizing response from all citizens of the United States. The members of the Aspen Volunteer Fire Department were especially moved to help their brothers from the Fire Department of New York in any way they could.

In the days following the September 11th attacks, the Aspen Volunteer Fire Department went to all the local businesses with a fireman's helmet in hand, asking for donations to provide assistance for the Fire Department of New York. Through the efforts of the Aspen Volunteer Fire Fighters over $110,000 was raised in a span of less than ten days. To raise that amount of money in such a short amount of time is remarkable, but the Aspen Volunteer Fire Department thought there was more that could be done in support of the Fire Department of New York. The firefighters again took to the streets and urged the ski resorts, hotels and local businesses to provide their services to the Fire Department of New York at little to no cost. All the businesses obliged, and in February of 2002, seventy-seven members of New York City's Fire Department and their families were able to enjoy a trip to Aspen, Colorado. The relationship between the two fire departments has now blossomed into an annual tradition. Firefighters from New York City have been coming to Aspen every winter since the tragic 9/11 attacks as guests of the Aspen Volunteer Fire Department. This bond forged in brotherhood came full circle this past Fourth of July when members of the Fire Department of New York made the long road trip to Aspen. They brought with them a unique and powerful gift; a refurbished piece of the World Trade Center Towers. The steel from ground zero is now the center piece of the newly built Aspen Volunteer Fire House. It also signifies the shared connection between the Aspen Volunteer Fire Department and the Fire Department of New York, and most importantly serves as a memorial to all who were lost in the September 11th attacks.

Mr. Speaker, the efforts of the Aspen Volunteer Fire Department have been truly remarkable. These firefighters have tirelessly given support to the Fire Department of New York for nearly a decade, and have no intentions of stopping their good works. It has been a stirring privilege for me to rise and pay tribute to the Aspen Volunteer Fire Department.

RECOGNITION OF MAYOR ED JOHNSON

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Edward Johnson for his outstanding service as Director of the Brookdale Community College Long Branch Higher Education Center and Mayor of Asbury Park, New Jersey. I would like to congratulate him for receiving the Louis G. Libutti Community Service Award presented on behalf of the Long Branch Chamber of Commerce.

Ed Johnson was first appointed to fill a vacancy on the Asbury Park City Council in January 2005. He was later elected to a four-year term in May 2005 and re-elected to serve a second term. Mr. Johnson held this position until 2009 when he was sworn in as Mayor of the City of Asbury Park. Mayor Johnson admirably serves on several key committees and subcommittees including the Springwood Avenue Advisory Committee, Transportation Center Subcommittee, Neighborhood Preservation Program, Urban Enterprise Zone, Tax Subcommittee, Asbury Works and the Parking Advisory Subcommittee. Prior to joining the City Council, Mayor Johnson served four consecutive terms as Chairman of the Asbury Park Urban Enterprise Zone (UEZ). He is credited with the transformation of the Asbury Park UEZ into a productive organization ready to meet its program obligations and local commitment to strengthen and grow the Asbury Park business community.

Mayor Johnson currently serves as the Director of the Brookdale Community College Long Branch Higher Education Center. He has been committed to promoting quality, affordable education and workforce development opportunities in Monmouth County. Mayor Johnson has also established a successful career as an educator. In addition to establishing a successful career as an educator, he has worked in the fields of Experiential Education, International Exchange, Scholarship and Academic Programs and Higher Education. Mayor Johnson continues to support and promote open access in education and building cross-cultural communication and diversity awareness through leadership development. He is highly commended for his continued service on behalf of the residents of Monmouth County.

Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to extend my congratulations to Mayor Ed Johnson for his exceptional contributions to the residents of my district and congratulate him for the honor he received from the Greater Long Branch Chamber of Commerce.

CECIL TURNER TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Assistant District Attorney Cecil Turner of Pueblo, Colorado. As one of Colorado's outstanding attorneys, Mr. Turner had an exemplary record in the courtroom. The state of Colorado has lost a tremendous legal resource and his experience will be difficult to replace. Many members of the Colorado legal community point to Mr. Turner as both a teacher and resource who will be sorely missed.

Mr. Turner, a graduate of the University of Colorado School of Law, was an integral part of southern Colorado's legal system. Following his graduation, he joined Pueblo's legal department, where he quickly advanced. In less than a decade he rose from a department aide to chief trial deputy and eventually assistant district attorney. In 1976, he turned to private practice for several years, though he never ceased to offer advice and guidance to the district attorney's staff. He later rejoined the prosecutor's office, in 2005, and worked there for the remainder of his career.

A strong legal system is essential to the freedom of all Americans, and Mr. Turner worked tirelessly in that pursuit. Attorneys of

his caliber are rare, but his exemplary career is one to be admired. I rise today to commend Cecil Turner and thank him for his service to the people of Colorado.

RECOGNIZING ANNETTE SMITH AS THE 2012 SANTA ROSA COUNTY, FLORIDA TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Annette Smith as the 2012 Santa Rosa County, Florida Teacher of the Year. For 25 years, Mrs. Smith has been an inspiration to her students, motivating them to achieve academic excellence.

Mrs. Smith began her teaching career at Baghdad Elementary School, before transferring to S.S. Dixon Elementary School. She taught 4th and 5th grades at S.S. Dixon Elementary school until 1994, when she moved to S.S. Dixon Intermediate School.

Mrs. Smith is highly respected by her colleagues for her work and dedication to her students. She is well known for her work with at-risk students. From 1992–2005, Mrs. Smith taught in the Drop-Out Prevention/Alpha Program. In order to succeed as a teacher for these at-risk students, Mrs. Smith had to transcend the traditional teaching role. She acted as a teacher, mentor, and role model for these students. Her assiduous work ethic inspires her students, and creates an atmosphere where failure is nearly impossible.

Mrs. Smith also volunteers her time with myriad educational programs. She is a trainer for Building Better Readers, Santa Rosa County's Team Teachers, the Diagnostic Assessments of Reading, and a master trainer for Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading. She is also the school coordinator for Pace High School/S.S. Dixon Intermediate's Leadership Program and the Patriot Pals Mentoring Program.

Teachers are amongst our most valuable public servants, and they play an integral role in shaping the future of our nation. The Santa Rosa County Teacher of the Year award is a reflection of Mrs. Smith's tireless work ethic and steadfast dedication to the students of Santa Rosa County. She has proven to be among the many exceptional teachers in our nation, and I am proud to have her as a constituent in Florida's First Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Annette Smith for her accomplishments and her continuing commitment to excellence at S.S. Dixon Intermediate School and in the Santa Rosa County School District. Her passion for her students is laudable, and her dedication to her profession is exemplary. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating Mrs. Smith, and we wish her all the best.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 14, 2011.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 35 public bills, H.R. 1031–1055; and 3 resolutions, H.J. Res. 48; and H. Res. 165–166, were introduced. **Pages H1767–69**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1770–71**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 147, providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Twelfth Congress (H. Rept. 112–30);

H.R. 839, to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to terminate the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to provide new assistance under the Home Affordable Modification Program, while preserving assistance to homeowners who were already extended an offer to participate in the Program, either on a trial or permanent basis, with an amendment (H. Rept. 112–31); and

H.R. 861, to rescind the third round of funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to terminate the program, with an amendment (H. Rept. 112–32). **Page H1767**

Emergency Mortgage Relief Program Termination Act: The House passed H.R. 836, to rescind the unobligated funding for the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program and to terminate the program, by a recorded vote of 242 ayes to 177 noes, Roll No. 174. **Pages H1731–51**

Rejected the Connolly motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 182 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 173. **Pages H1748–50**

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H1739**

Agreed to:

Canseco amendment (No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of March 9, 2011) that provides that all unexpended balances rescinded and permanently canceled by the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program's termination be retained in the General Fund of the Treasury for reducing the federal government debt and **Pages H1740–42**

Neugebauer amendment (No. 3 printed in the Congressional Record of March 9, 2011) that includes military servicemembers and veterans who have service-related injuries, as well as survivors and dependents of such individuals, in a study on use of the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program. **Page H1742**

Rejected:

Waters amendment (No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record of March 9, 2011) that sought to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to post a statement prominently on the HUD website stating that the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program has been terminated and including contact information for borrowers who are uncertain as to how to proceed (by a recorded vote of 185 ayes to 237 noes, Roll No. 172). **Pages H1742–46, S1747–48**

Point of Order sustained against:

Loretta Sanchez amendment (No. 7 printed in the Congressional Record of March 9, 2011) that sought to provide that the bill take effect on the first date occurring after enactment on which the Current Population Survey of the Bureau of Labor Statistics

of the Labor Department, as released monthly, identifies that the unemployment rate for the United States is equal to 7.5% or less. **Pages H1746–47**

Agreed that the Clerk be authorized to make technical and conforming changes to reflect the actions of the House. **Page H1751**

H. Res. 151, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on Wednesday, March 9th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, March 14th, when it shall convene at noon for morning hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. **Page H1754**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:02 p.m. and reconvened at 3:37 p.m. **Pages H1766–67**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1747–48, H1750, H1750–51. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

Committee Meetings

HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security held a hearing on FY 2012 Oversight and Budget. Testimony was heard from ADM Robert Papp, Commandant, United States Coast Guard.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Forest Service FY12 Budget Oversight Hearing. Testimony was heard from Tom Tidwell, Chief, Forest Service.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services FY 2012 Budget Request. Testimony was heard from Margaret A. Hamburg, M.D., Commissioner, FDA.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Members and Outside Witness Hearing. Testimony was heard from Rep. Cicilline; Rep. Farr; Rep. Richardson; and public witnesses.

HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on FY 2012 Oversight & Budget Department of Homeland Security. Testimony was heard from John Morton, Assistant Secretary, Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

LABOR, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SERVICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies held a hearing on Status of Health Reform Implementation. Testimony was heard from Kathleen Sebelius, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing on Library of Congress FY 2012 Budget. Testimony was heard from James H. Billington, Librarian of Congress.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing on Government Accountability Office FY 2012 Budget. Testimony was heard from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General.

EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing on counter proliferation strategy and the fiscal year 2012 national defense authorization budget request for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and chemical biological defense program. Testimony was heard from Kenneth B. Handelman, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs; Andrew Weber, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Chemical and Biological Defense Programs; Kenneth A. Myers, III, Director, Defense Threat Reduction Agency; and Brigadier General Jess A. Scarbrough, USA, Joint Program Executive Officer for Chemical and Biological Defense, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

FEDERAL OVERREACH INTO ACADEMICS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training held a hearing on Education Regulations: Federal Overreach into Academic Affairs. Testimony was heard from Kathleen Tighe, Inspector General, Department of Education; and public witnesses.

FY 2012 BUDGET—EPA

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power and the Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a joint hearing entitled "The FY 2012 EPA Budget". Testimony was

heard from Kenneth B. Handelman, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs; Andrew Weber, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Chemical and Biological Defense Programs; Kenneth A. Myers, III, Director, Defense Threat Reduction Agency; and BG Jess A. Scarbrough, Joint Program Executive Officer for Chemical and Biological Defense, Office of the Secretary of Defense, USA.

COVERED BOND MARKET

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets & Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals to Create a Covered Bond Market in the United States''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals to Reform the National Flood Insurance Program''. Testimony was heard from Craig Fugate, Administrator, FEMA; Orice Williams Brown, Managing Director, GAO; and public witnesses.

LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held a hearing on a bill regarding lawsuit abuse reduction. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TRANSPARENCY THROUGH TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Technology, Information Policy, Intergovernmental Relations and Procurement Reform held a hearing entitled ''Transparency Through Technology: Evaluating Federal Open-Government Initiatives.'' Testimony was heard from Danny Harris, Chief Information Officer, Department of Education; Chris Smith, Chief Information Officer, Department of Agriculture; Danny Werfel, Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, OMB; and public witnesses.

DEBT OWED TO THE GOVERNMENT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Organization, Efficiency & Financial Management hearing entitled ''Red to Black: Improving the Collection of Delinquent Debt Owed to the Government.'' Testimony was heard from David Lebryk, Commissioner of Financial Management Service, Department of the Treasury.

FY 2012 BUDGET—NSF AND NIST

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Proposals at the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Testimony was heard from Subra Suresh, Director, National Science Foundation; Ray Bowen, Chairman, National Science Board; and Patrick Gallagher, Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology, and Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology.

PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE

Committee on Transportation: Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials held a hearing on Finding Ways to Encourage and Increase Private Sector Participation in Passenger Rail Service. Testimony was heard from Joseph Szabo, Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration; Stephen Gardner, Vice President of Policy and Development, Amtrak; and public witnesses.

CAREGIVER ASSISTANCE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on Implementation of Caregiver Assistance: Are we getting it right? Testimony was heard from Robert A. Petzel, M.D., Under Secretary for Health, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

DATA MATCHING AND GOVERNMENT BENEFITS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing on the use of data matching to improve the administration of government benefit programs. Testimony was heard from Patrick P. O'Carroll, Jr., Inspector General, Social Security Administration.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of March 14 through March 19, 2011

Senate Chamber

On *Monday,* at approximately 4:30 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of James Emanuel Boasberg, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, and after a period of debate, vote on confirmation of the nomination at 5:30 p.m., to be followed by a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S.493, SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Appropriations, March 16, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of the Navy, 10:30 a.m., SD–192.

March 16, Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Environmental Protection Agency, 2 p.m., SD–124.

March 17, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Government Printing Office (GPO), and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), 2:30 p.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services, March 15, to hold hearings to examine the situation in Afghanistan; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

March 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

March 17, Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings to examine military construction, environmental, and base closure programs in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SR–323A.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, March 15, to hold hearings to examine the Administration's report to Congress, focusing on reforming America's housing finance market, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget, March 15, to hold hearings to examine the report of the Bipartisan Policy Center's Debt Reduction Task Force, 10 a.m., SD–608.

March 16, Full Committee, to hold a joint hearing with the Task Force on Government Performance to examine modernizing performance, focusing on using the new framework, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, March 15, to hold hearings to examine realizing NASA's potential, focusing on programmatic challenges in the 21st century, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

March 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the state of online consumer privacy, 10 a.m., SR–253.

March 17, Subcommittee on Science and Space, to hold hearings to examine investing in Federal research and development, 10:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; March 15, to hold closed hearings to examine information regarding cyber security and critical electric infrastructure, 10 a.m., SVC–217.

March 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine current global investment trends in clean energy technologies and the impact of domestic policies on that investment, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works; March 16, to hold hearings to examine the report to the President from the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance; March 16, to hold hearings to examine health reform, focusing on lessons learned during the first year, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations; March 16, to receive a briefing on Libya, 9 a.m., SVC–217.

March 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Joseph M. Torsella, of Pennsylvania, to be Representative to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador, Department of State, 10:15 a.m., SD–419.

March 16, Full Committee, to receive a briefing on Afghanistan, focusing on progress and expectations, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

March 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of David Bruce Shear, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and Kurt Walter Tong, of Maryland, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as United States Senior Official for the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Forum, both of the Department of State, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; March 16, organizational business meeting to consider subcommittee assignments and any pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD–430.

March 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine health insurance exchanges and ongoing state implementation of the ''Affordable Care Act'', 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; March 15, Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine enhancing the President's authority to eliminate wasteful spending and reduce the budget deficit, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

March 16, Full Committee, business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''Supporting Employee Competency and Updating Readiness Enhancements for (SECURE) Facilities Act of 2011'', S. 550, to improve the provision of assistance to fire departments, an original bill entitled, ''Electronic Rulemaking Improvement Act of 2011'', S. 531, to amend section 5542 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that any hours worked by Federal firefighters under a qualified trade-of-time arrangement shall be excluded for purposes of determinations relating to overtime pay, S. 300, to prevent abuse of Government charge cards, S. 498, to ensure objective, independent review of task and delivery orders, S. 191, to direct the Department of Homeland Security to undertake a study on emergency communications, S. 514, to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service, and

the nominations of Heather A. Higginbottom, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, and Carolyn N. Lerner, of Maryland, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, 2 p.m., SD–342.

March 17, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Disaster Recovery, to hold hearings to examine recouping improperly paid Federal assistance in the aftermath of disasters, 10 a.m., SD–342.

March 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine catastrophic preparedness, focusing on if FEMA is ready for the next big disaster, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs; March 15, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for Tribal Programs, 10 a.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary; March 15, to hold hearings to examine the ''Freedom of Information Act'', focusing on ensuring transparency and accountability in the digital age, 10:15 a.m., SD–226.

March 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine certain nominations, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

March 17, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 222, to limit investor and homeowner losses in foreclosures, S. 216, to increase criminal penalties for certain knowing and international violations relating to food that is misbranded or adulterated, S. 410, to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings, and the nominations of James Michael Cole, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice, and Edward Milton Chen, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs; March 16, to hold joint hearings to examine the legislative presentations from AMVETS, Jewish War Veterans, Military Officers Association of America, Gold Star Wives, Blinded Veterans Association, Non Commissioned Officers Association, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Fleet Reserve Association, 9:30 a.m., SDG–50.

Select Committee on Intelligence; March 15, closed business meeting to mark up the fiscal year 2011 Intelligence Authorization, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

March 17, Full Committee, closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

Special Committee on Aging; March 16, to hold hearings to examine securities lending in retirement plans, 2 p.m., SH–216.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, March 15, full Committee, hearing to consider the Budget Views and Estimates Letter of the Committee on Agriculture for the agencies and programs under jurisdiction of the Committee for FY2012, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

March 16, Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, hearing to review the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, agricultural conservation practices, and their implications on national watersheds, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, March 15, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request, 10 a.m., H–309, The Capitol.

March 15, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request for the Department of Energy, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Securities and Exchange Commission, 10 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, hearing on FY 2012 Oversight & Budget, 10 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Oversight, 1 p.m., B–308 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, hearing on Pell Grants, 10:30 a.m., 2358–B Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, hearing on FY 2012 Budget, 10:30 a.m., HT–2, Capitol.

March 15, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing on Army Posture, 2 p.m., H–140, Capitol.

March 15, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Agencies, hearing on Millennium Challenge Corporation, 10:30 a.m., H–140, Capitol.

March 15, Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies, hearing on Department of Housing and Urban Development—Transformation Initiative FY 2012 Oversight and Budget, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request, 10 a.m., H–309 Capitol.

March 16, Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on FY 2012 Army Budget Overview, 10 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

March 16, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, hearing on Department of Energy—Science, Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, hearing on FY 2012 Budget, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, hearing on Southwest Border Enforcement, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on Fish and Wildlife Service FY 2012 Budget Oversight Hearing, 1 p.m., B–308 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, hearing on Department of Health and Human Services FY12 Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing on Veterans Affairs Budget, 2 p.m., H–140 Capitol.

March 16, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request for the United Nations and other International Organizations, 10 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request, 10:15 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on Afghanistan, 10 a.m., H–140 Capitol. CLOSED HEARING

March 17, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, hearing on FY 2012 Budget, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on U.S.Geological Survey FY 2102 Budget Oversight Hearing, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, hearing on Improper Payments, 10 a.m., 2358–B Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, March 15, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on military health system overview and Defense Health Program cost efficiencies, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing on long-term readiness challenges in the Pacific, 2 p.m., 2218 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing on the fiscal year 2012 national defense authorization budget request for national security space activities, 3 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, hearing on Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force tactical aviation programs, 11:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 16, full Committee, hearing on developments in Afghanistan, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing on the fiscal year 2012 national defense authorization budget request from the U.S. Cyber Command, 3:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on Military Health System Overview and Defense Health Program Cost Efficiencies: A Beneficiary Perspective, 8 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing on amphibious operations, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 17, full Committee, hearing on Law of War Detention and the President's Executive Order Establishing Periodic Review Boards for Guantanamo Detainees, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on military personnel overview, 11 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, hearing on soldier and marine equipment for dismounted operations, 9:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn

Committee on the Budget, March 17, full Committee, hearing on Fulfilling the Mission of Health Retirement Security, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, March 15, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, hearing on Education Regulations: Burying Schools in Paperwork, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

March 17, full Committee, hearing on Education Regulations: Roadblocks to Student Choice in Higher Education, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, March 14 and March 15, full Committee, markup H.R. 910, the Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011; and H.J. Res. 37, a resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices.

March 16, Subcommittee on Energy and Power and Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, joint hearing entitled "The FY2012 Department of Energy and Nuclear Regulatory Commission Budgets", 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing entitled "Made in America: Increasing Jobs through Exports and Trade." 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "The Implementation and Sustainability of the New, Government-Administered Community Living Assistance Services and Supports (CLASS) Program." 9:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, entitled "Oversight of DOE Recovery Act Spending." 1:30 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing on The American Energy Initiative: focus on oil supplies, gasoline prices, and jobs in the Gulf of Mexico, 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, March 15, mark-up on legislation to Approve the Views and Estimates of the Committee on Financial Services on Matters to be Set Forth in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2012, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled "Oversight of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled "Legislative Proposals to Promote Job Creation, Capital Formation, and Market Certainty", 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy and Technology, hearing entitled "The Relationship of Monetary Policy and Rising Prices", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 16, full Committee, hearing on the Agency for International Development and the Millennium Challenge Corporation: Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Requests and Future Directions in Foreign Assistance, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 17, full Committee, hearing on The Global Nuclear Revival and U.S. Nonproliferation Policy, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing on the Colombia and Panama Free Trade Agreements: National Security and Foreign Policy Priorities, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, March 15, Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, hearing entitled ''Strengthening the Border—Finding the Right Mix of Personnel, Infrastructure and Technology.'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

March 16, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies, hearing entitled ''Examining the Cyber Threat to Critical Infrastructure and the American Economy.'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

March 17, Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications hearing entitled ''Ensuring Effective Preparedness, Response, and Recovery for Events Impacting Health Security.'' 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, March 17, Subcommittee on Elections, hearing on Election Assistance Commission Operations and 2012 Budget Request, 10:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, March 14, Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition and the Internet, hearing on Promoting Investment and Protecting Commerce Online: Legitimate Sites v. Parasites, Part I, 4 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Courts Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on H.R. 1002, the ''Wireless Tax Fairness Act of 2011'', 1:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

March 16, full Committee, hearing on the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, March 15, Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing entitled ''Examining the Spending, Priorities and the Missions of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Western Area Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration and the Southeastern Power Administration'' including the President's Fiscal Year 2012 budget requests and other spending as it relates to the four Power Marketing Administrations, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 16, full Committee, hearing on the Obama Administration's De Facto Moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico: Community and Economic Impacts, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 17, full Committee, hearing on Harnessing American Resources to Create Jobs and Address Rising Gasoline Prices: Domestic Resources and Economic Impacts, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, March 15, Subcommittee on TARP, Financial Services and Bailouts of Public and Private Programs, hearing entitled, ''State and Municipal Debt: The Coming Crisis? Part II.'' 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 15, Subcommittee on Health Care, District of Columbia, Census and the National Archives, hearing entitled, ''Obamacare: Why the Need for Waivers?'' 1:30 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on National Security, Homeland Defense and Foreign Operations, hearing on TSA Oversight Part I: Whole Body Imaging, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 16, Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight and Government Spending hearing on Project Labor Agreements and the Cost of Doing Business in the Construction Industry, 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 17, full Committee hearing entitled ''The Freedom of Information Act: Crowd-Sourcing Government Oversight'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, March 15, Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation, hearing on An Overview of Science and Technology Research and Development Programs and Priorities to Effectively Protect Homeland Security, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

March 16, mark-up on H.R. 658, the FAA Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2011, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, hearing on Behavioral Science and Security: Evaluating TSA's SPOT Program, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, March 15, full Committee, markup to consider the views and estimates on the Small Business Administration's FY 2012 budget request, 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

March 16, full Committee, hearing on Spurring Innovation and Job Creation: The SBIR Program, 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, March 15, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing on Assuring the Freedom of Americans on the High Seas: The United States Response to Piracy, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

March 17, Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, hearing on Federal Regulatory Overreach in the Railroad Industry: Implementing the Rail Safety Improvement Act, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, March 17, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing on Department of Veterans Affairs FY 2012 Budget for the Veterans Benefits Administration, National Cemetery Administration, and Related Agencies, 1 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, March 15, Subcommittee on Health, organizational meeting and hearing on the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission's (MedPAC) annual March Report to the Congress which details the Commission's recommendations for updating Medicare payment policies, 1 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

March 16, Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, hearing on the tax code's treatment of abortion-related expenses and the changes to such tax treatment proposed by section 2 of H.R. 3—the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

March 17, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing on pending trade agreements with Columbia, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, March 17, hearing on Intelligence Authorities, 10 a.m, 304 HVC.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: March 16, to hold hearings to examine Northern Ireland, focusing on justice in individual cases and accountability for past abuses by security services in the region, 2 p.m., 210 Cannon Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, March 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 4:30 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of James Emanuel Boasberg, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, and after a period of debate, vote on confirmation of the nomination at 5:30 p.m., to be followed by a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 493, SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 p.m., Monday, March 14

House Chamber

Program for Monday: Consideration of the following suspensions: (1) H.R. 793—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12781 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in Inverness, California, as the ''Specialist Jake Robert Velloza Post Office'' and (2) H. Con. Res. 27—Providing for the acceptance of a statue of Gerald R. Ford from the people of Michigan for placement in the United States Capitol.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E464
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E465, E466
Broun, Paul C., Ga., E459, E460
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E461
Fattah, Chaka, Pa., E462
Gerlach, Jim, Pa., E465
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E466
Graves, Sam, Mo., E459, E460, E460, E461, E462, E462, E463, E464, E465
Hanna, Richard L., N.Y., E460
Hayworth, Nan A.S., N.Y., E466
Hirono, Mazie K., Hawaii, E463
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E459, E461
McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E459, E463
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E468
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E464, E467
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E460
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E465
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E466
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E462
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E465, E467, E467
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E464
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E462
Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E466

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.