

pay tenfold in the years to come. Studies show that 60 percent of the nearly 16 million children who witness domestic abuse every year mimic it later in their lives.

We have our work cut out for us, but one thing that defines our country is the notion that anyone who abuses another human being, woman or man, will be brought to justice. When Topeka, Kansas, decriminalized domestic violence earlier this month, we took a huge and unacceptable step backwards. In honor of the victims who have lost their lives to domestic violence and those who live in fear every day, let us recommit ourselves today to their safety.

I thank you again, Mr. GREEN.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the lady, especially for citing the statistical information. It is important for our Nation and our country to understand that these are real people who are being harmed and that this is not something that occurs in some segments of society. This crosses all lines—economic lines, gender lines, political lines—and it's up to us to have bipartisan efforts to end this.

I'm honored that my friend, Mr. POE, has joined us today, as this has been a bipartisan effort. But we've got to get this message back to the communities because indifference is what allows this to continue to a certain extent. No one should be indifferent. Everybody has a duty to report it, everybody has a duty to condemn it. And if we do this, then we can make every person who performs an act of violence *persona non grata* in our communities.

I want to thank the Speaker for the time. One hour is never enough to cover all that we should cover, but I'm grateful to the leadership for giving us the 1 hour that we've had.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2576, MODIFYING INCOME CALCULATION FOR HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 674, GOVERNMENT CONTRACTOR WITHHOLDING REPEAL ACT

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (during the Special Order of Mr. AL GREEN of Texas), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-261) on the resolution (H. Res. 448) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2576) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the calculation of modified adjusted gross income for purposes of determining eligibility for certain healthcare-related programs, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 674) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the imposition of 3 percent withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MISSOURI RIVER FLOODING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor. And before I go into my presentation, I want to go into the subject matter the gentleman from Texas has led this previous Special Order on, just as a means of discussing a way to look at victims' rights.

For me, I was caused to reexamine the situation as a victim. I had had some heavy equipment that was destroyed by vandals back in the year 1987, a year that shall live in infamy. It was in the middle of the farm crisis years. A lot of that damage was uninsured, but we did catch the perpetrators. A long, long story; it was hundreds of thousands of dollars of damage. I followed through on everything, seeing myself as a victim who had an obligation to assist the prosecution as a citizen and a victim would and should. And I remember sitting in the courtroom in Sac City, Iowa, when they brought up the trial of one of the perpetrators. The bailiff announced to the court: This is the case of the State v. Jason Martin Powell. And I sat there thinking, how is it the State versus the perpetrator? I'm not in this equation. I'm not even the versus; I'm just here as a spectator. And so I began to examine what that really means. What it means is that the State and the law enforcement component, in this case the State, is the intervenor. If you have a grievance with someone, and I certainly had a grievance with the people that destroyed my equipment and nearly destroyed my business, before the law and order days, that would be settled in some other fashion, likely in some violent fashion. And if you go back a couple thousand years or 3,000 years before the law was established, like Mosaic law, or Roman or Greek law—but as law was established, it was to eliminate the vigilante component of this, and the State stepped in and intervened.

Another way of looking at it would be when everything was owned by the State. The subjects in, let's say, old Western Europe, old England, the subjects were the property of the king. The State supplanted the king. The subjects and everything they owned were the property and the ownership of the king in England, so when you see old English common law and you see how it transfers into the United States, and it becomes the State v. Jason Martin Powell, the perpetrator, convicted perpetrator, I will say, and I can say his name in the record here now, that transfer was, if you committed a crime, you shot one of the king's deer, if you murdered or assaulted one of the king's subjects, you were committing a crime against the king. So in our society when you commit a crime, you are committing a crime against the State.

I'm taking us all to this point, Mr. Speaker, because once the State is sat-

isfied that they have established justice, the victim doesn't really have anything more to say about it. The victim is not in that equation. My position needs to be developed more than it is, but my point is if the State is going to intervene, then the State has to enforce the law, then the State has to protect the citizens adequately. And when they fail, then what's the obligation of the State? They are not ensuring us to be protected from violent crime. They're simply doing the best they can without a consequence for the State. All the way around that circle is this.

□ 1750

Back in those years, I remember a study that was done, and that study will come to me in a moment. It was a 1995 study. In that study, they put a value on each crime. And I remember that a rape victim—they valued murder at around a million dollars; rape at about \$82,000. Now, I can't imagine who would submit to rape for \$82,000 dollars, but that was the quantity.

Then they also put in that study that a criminal who was loose on the street—an average criminal loose on the street—would commit \$444,000 worth of crime in a year. Well, it costs about \$20,000 a year to lock them up. They do \$444,000 worth of damage to the society in a year. But that damage is not compensated. That comes out of crime victims in great, huge, whopping chunks of their lives, their security, and their property.

So I would just suggest that if the State were liable for all of the damage that's caused by perpetrators, we would have a more effective criminal justice system. I'm not advocating that we bring that forward in this Congress, but I just discuss that way of looking at this, how we got to the point where the State is the intervenor. Because the State is the successor to the Crown in old English common law, and a crime committed under the Crown was a crime committed against the King, because he owned everything, and it damaged his ability—even if it was the serf—to produce.

So we are now the successor philosophy, but we've forgotten this part, that victims are paying the price. The State is not paying the price. It's no longer a crime against the State, even though the State is the intervenor.

I would yield to the gentleman from Texas and thank him for presenting this. It just sparked that memory, and I wanted to put that into the RECORD and let you know how I think about crime victims.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I especially thank you for placing things in a proper historical context. It's greatly appreciated.

Having taught a class myself in trial simulation, one of the things that we discussed was the origin of the concept of the State. And it evolved to the extent that you've called to our attention, but it also became a "we the people" country. Our country is a "we the