



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2011

No. 165

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 1, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN CAMPBELL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As we meditate on all of the blessings of life, we especially pray for the blessing of peace in our lives and in our world. Our fervent prayer, O God, is that people will learn to live together in reconciliation and respect so that the terrors of war, and of dictatorial abuse, will be no more.

As You have created each person, we pray that You would guide our hearts and minds, that every person of every place and background might focus on Your great gift of life and so learn to live in unity.

May Your special blessings be upon the Members of this assembly, in the important, sometimes difficult work they do. Give them wisdom and charity, that they might work together for the common good.

And bless all peacemakers in our world. May Your eternal Spirit be with them and with us always.

May all that is done this day in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

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 Illinois (Mr. SCHILLING) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SCHILLING 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.

HERO STREET MEMORIAL PARK

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

Mr. SCHILLING. I rise today in support of our veterans and wish to focus in on a particular specific street in Silvis, Illinois. In the town of Silvis, Second Street holds so much history from World War II and the Korean War.

On Saturday, October 29, 2011, the people of Silvis celebrated the 40th anniversary of Hero Street Memorial Park.

In honor of the brave soldiers who lived on this street and whose families have made the park their own, I introduced a resolution to designate the park on Hero Street as "Hero Street Memorial Park" earlier this year, and I am pleased that we are able to honor these brave warfighters.

The brave men who fought in World War II and the Korean War from this little street were the sons of Mexican immigrants that came to the United States and volunteered their lives for their country. When America entered these wars, 78 residents from this street from 35 families helped defend the United States and her allies.

Eight of these brave men died for our great Nation. Their names are Tony Pompa, Frank Sandoval, Joseph Sandoval, Willie Sandoval, Claro Soliz, Peter Masias, Joe Gomez, and Johnny Munos.

In honor of these brave men and their fellow soldiers who fought by their sides, the community renamed this street in May of 1967. Four years later a memorial park was built on Second Street, and in 2007 a monument was added.

My resolution recognizes the sacrifices of these brave soldiers and what

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7167

their families did to support our country during that difficult time. We can never forget those who gave their lives for this great Nation, and this resolution will ensure we do not. This resolution will not cost anything—just the time we should spend in honor of our veterans and those brave men who gave their lives.

On behalf of a grateful Nation, we honor the 40th anniversary of Hero Street Memorial Park. The service and sacrifice of all of those who served and their families must never be forgotten.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SUES ANOTHER STATE

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

Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. Speaker, once again the Department of Justice is using taxpayer dollars to sue States for a job the government refuses to do.

The Federal Government won't or can't enforce immigration laws, so South Carolina has been forced to take matters into their own hands to protect their citizens. We've heard this tale before about the Federal Government suing States like Arizona and Alabama.

In this case, the administration says that the South Carolina law will interfere with and undermine the Federal Government's control over relations with foreign governments. The Federal Government is more concerned about not hurting the feelings of other countries like Mexico than it is about protecting our country.

The Attorney General has made it clear that he will continue his crusade against the States who try to crack down on illegal entry. Next up on the list? Utah and Georgia. For what? Upholding the law. Meanwhile, sanctuary cities get a pass from the Federal Government.

We hear the rhetoric that illegals are here to do jobs that Americans won't do. Now, South Carolina is getting sued for doing a job the American government won't do—protecting the security of this Nation and enforcing the law.

And that's just the way it is.

SENATE INACTION HURTS FARMERS AND JOB CREATORS

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Seven months ago this body passed H.R. 872, a common-sense bill to protect farmers, ranchers, and job creators from redundant and needless regulation. We passed it overwhelmingly with bipartisan support, with more than 50 Democrats voting "yes," and sent it to the Senate.

Unfortunately, as we know all too well, the cul-de-sac at the other end of this Capitol called the Senate once again did nothing. Their inaction has real-world consequences as yesterday those repetitive and burdensome regulations were forced in by judicial fiat.

While they failed this opportunity to act and help our economy, the Senate does have other chances. I urge them to take up the forgotten 15 bills we passed for jobs here in the House, move the Forgotten 15, and help get our economy moving again.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS LEAD THE WAY TO JOB CREATION

(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, sadly more than 14 million Americans are still without a job. The unemployment rate has been above 8 percent for the last 2½ years. As the Vice President recently acknowledged, this administration is responsible for the current economic conditions of our country.

House Republicans have sought to introduce legislation that will create jobs and put American families back to work by empowering small business owners, simplifying the tax code, encouraging entrepreneurship and growth, and maximizing domestic energy production.

House Republicans have focused on job creation. By passing over 15 job bills since January, House Republicans have provided realistic solutions to America's economic woes.

Now is the time for liberals in the Senate and this administration to change course from the failed policies of borrow, tax, and spend.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 1, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate of November 1, 2011 at 9:44 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 394.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 368.

That the Senate passed S. 1637.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1410

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 1, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on November 1, 2011, at 12:19 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits a copy of the notice filed earlier with the Federal Register on the national emergency with respect to Sudan.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-69)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the Sudan emergency is to continue in effect beyond November 3, 2011.

The crisis constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan that led to the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, and the expansion of that emergency in Executive Order 13400 of April 26, 2006, and with respect to which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13412 of October 13, 2006, has not been resolved. These actions and policies are hostile to U.S. interests and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Sudan and maintain in force the sanctions against Sudan to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 1, 2011.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until approximately 4:45 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4:45 p.m.

□ 1648

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

REAFFIRMING "IN GOD WE TRUST" AS THE OFFICIAL MOTTO OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 13) reaffirming "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States and supporting and encouraging the public display of the national motto in all public buildings, public schools, and other government institutions.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 13

Whereas "In God We Trust" is the official motto of the United States;

Whereas the sentiment, "In God We Trust", has been an integral part of United States society since its founding;

Whereas in times of national challenge or tragedy, the people of the United States have turned to God as their source for sustenance, protection, wisdom, strength, and direction;

Whereas the Declaration of Independence recognizes God, our Creator, as the source of our rights, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.";

Whereas the national anthem of the United States says "praise the power that hath made and preserved us a nation . . . and this be our motto: in God is our trust.";

Whereas the words "In God We Trust" appear over the entrance to the Senate Chamber and above the Speaker's rostrum in the House Chamber;

Whereas the oath taken by all Federal employees, except the President, states "I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.";

Whereas John Adams said, "Statesmen may plan and speculate for Liberty, but it is Religion and Morality alone, which can establish the Principles upon which Freedom can securely stand.";

Whereas if religion and morality are taken out of the marketplace of ideas, the very freedom on which the United States was founded cannot be secured;

Whereas as President Eisenhower said and President Ford later repeated, "Without God, there could be no American form of government, nor, an American way of life."; and

Whereas President John F. Kennedy said, "The guiding principle and prayer of this Nation has been, is now, and ever shall be 'In God We Trust.'": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress reaffirms "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States and supports and encourages the public display of the national motto in all public buildings, public schools, and other government institutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 13 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1650

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

When our Declaration of Independence was penned, it was unique in that the writers of that document recognized that the rights that we have as American citizens didn't come from some committee in this body, some resolution, or even from the king, but rather came from God himself. In 1814 during the War of 1812, Francis Scott Key noticed through the battle fires that were going on a unique thing and began to pen what would become our national anthem when he wrote "The Star Spangled Banner" and mentioned that "In God We Trust" was the motto of this great Nation.

The 39th Congress of the United States in 1865 during the Civil War which threatened to tear this Nation apart authorized "In God We Trust" to be placed on certain coins, including the dollar, the half dollar, and the quarter dollar.

The 43rd Congress in 1873 authorized "In God We Trust" to be placed on coins as the Secretary of Commerce would so desire, and the Secretary of the Treasury.

In the 60th Congress in 1908, Congress mandated that "In God We Trust" be placed on all gold and silver coins.

In the 82nd Congress in 1951, the Senate Chamber demanded and authorized and then had "In God We Trust" placed over the entrance door in the Senate Chamber.

In the 84th Congress in 1955, Congress enacted and President Eisenhower ap-

proved legislation requiring the motto to appear on all coins and currency.

In the 84th Congress in 1956, Congress officially adopted "In God We Trust" as the national motto of the United States. And in that Congress, the Senate said it was important for the spiritual and psychological value of the country to have a clear and well-defined national motto.

In the 87th Congress, this body authorized "In God We Trust" to be placed right behind where you're standing, where it still stands today.

In the 107th Congress, we reaffirmed the Pledge of Allegiance and once again our national motto.

And in the 109th Congress, the Senate reaffirmed the national motto.

In the 110th Congress in 2007, Congress said that on the dollar coin, we had to put "In God We Trust" from the edge of coin back to where it belonged on the front or back of the coin.

And in the 111th Congress in 2009, this body authorized "In God We Trust" to be in the Capitol Visitor Center and mandated it be placed in there.

Mr. Speaker, so what brings us to today? Well, unfortunately, there are a number of public officials who forget what the national motto is, whether intentionally or unintentionally. There are those who have become confused as to whether or not it can still be placed on our buildings, whether it can be placed in our school classrooms. Almost a year ago, the President, in making a speech across the world, said that our national motto was "E Pluribus Unum." When the Visitor Center was opened, was tried to be opened, \$621 million of taxpayer money, a part of this very structure that you and I are standing in here now, they did not have the national motto in there. In fact, they inscribed in the stones that our national motto was "E Pluribus Unum."

We have because of those kinds of omissions many people confused today, asking when we changed it, what happened to it, can they still display it in rooms. So we believe that today it's fitting that we come together as a Congress and reaffirm that great national motto, do what the Senate did just a few years ago, and once again make clear to the people in this country that our national motto is "In God We Trust" and encourage them to proudly display that motto.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I hope and urge the adoption of this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Although the American people are concerned about restoring our economy and creating jobs, today we are returning to irrelevant issues that do nothing to promote economic growth and put Americans back to work. We have seen this before.

In the 107th Congress, we passed a bill to reaffirm the phrase "One Nation, under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance, and reaffirm the national

motto. We went so far as to reenact into law, word for word, the existing law making “In God We Trust” the national motto, just to be sure.

Now, no one has threatened it. No one has said it was not the national motto. This resolution today, which has no force of law, simply restates the national motto—once again.

Why have my Republican friends returned to an irrelevant agenda? Irrelevant because it does nothing. It simply restates existing law that no one has questioned. Why are we debating non-binding resolutions about the national motto?

The American people are demanding action on the President’s jobs legislation. They are demanding that we pay attention to rebuilding our national infrastructure. They are demanding that we deal with a budget fairly and effectively. They are demanding fairness for the middle class and for the 99 percent of Americans who don’t write million-dollar checks and hire expensive lobbyists and make huge campaign contributions.

And yet here we are, back to irrelevant issue debates, the kind of thing people do when they have run out of ideas, when they have run out of excuses, when they have nothing to offer a middle class that is hurting and that has run out of patience.

What happened to Republican pledges that we weren’t going to do these kind of symbolic resolutions anymore? Symbolic because, after all, it changes nothing. The national motto remains the national motto, as much today and tomorrow as yesterday. What happened to Republican pledges that we were going to focus on the business of legislating? That was earlier this year.

Make no mistake about it: Some have taken a decidedly divisive tone when discussing the national motto. Some have sought to imply that their political adversaries, including the President, are somehow less godly, or less patriotic, and have used the national motto as a political wedge to drive home that point, or to try to drive home that point.

I think that kind of divisiveness undermines national unity which, especially in times like these, is very important. Rather than trying to one-up each other over who can be the better or more godly American, we should be working together to solve our very real problems.

Mr. Speaker, let’s get back to the work we were sent here to do. Let’s stop playing the kind of social issue games that do nothing to move the Nation forward. The national motto is not in danger. No one here is suggesting that we get rid of it. It appears on our money. It appears in this Chamber above your head. It appears in the Capitol Visitor Center, all over the place. We don’t need to go looking for imagined problems to fix. We’ve got enough real ones to worry about.

This resolution is a waste of time, a waste of effort. And again, remember

that this country is a country for all people—whether they are religious or not, whether they believe in God or not, whether they believe in one God or not. The First Amendment tells us we should make no law respecting establishment of religion nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This is not an establishment of religion, but simply restating this when no one has threatened it, when no one has questioned it. It is an exercise to tell people who may not believe in God: You don’t really count; you’re not really Americans.

The establishment clause is there to protect religion from government, and government from religion, to separate the two.

This resolution is here to say we don’t want to separate the two. If someone was threatening the national motto then maybe it would be necessary. As it is, this is simply an exercise in saying we’re more religious than the other people. We’re more godly than the other people. And by the way, let’s waste time and divert people’s attention from the real issues that we’re not dealing with, like unemployment. We shouldn’t go looking for imagined problems to fix when we have enough real ones to worry about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I would like to respond to my good friend as he said this is irrelevant, nothing to offer the middle class that is hurting, when he says this is just a symbolic gesture.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who believe that the Declaration of Independence is just a symbolic document, just words. There are those who believe that that flag behind you is just a symbol, and the Pledge of Allegiance we make to it just words. And there are those who believe that “In God We Trust” right up there—just words.

They don’t realize what so many other Congresses, so many Presidents of this United States have realized: They are far more than words; they are the very fabric that has built and sustained the greatest nation the world has ever known. And I challenge my good friend who would dare say that that declaration was just a symbol, that Pledge of Allegiance just a symbol, or “In God We Trust” just a symbol, to dare say to President Lincoln, when he brought in “In God We Trust” and he talked about that and he embraced it during the greatest conflict this country has ever known, the Civil War, he was just wasting his time, it was irrelevant, he wasn’t doing anything to that Nation that was hurting.

Or to say it to Woodrow Wilson, who would embrace it during World War I when this Nation was at a very, very difficult time, that it was just irrelevant, it was just words and it did nothing at all.

Or to say to President Roosevelt, during World War II, when we didn’t know whether we’d have the freedoms that “In God We Trust” gives us the opportunity to have and that flag gives

us the opportunity to have, that “In God We Trust” was just words.

□ 1700

Or John Kennedy, or Dwight Eisenhower, or Ronald Reagan, or Francis Scott Key during the middle of a battle that challenged the existence of this Nation—just words.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my good friend that I understand how there are few who believe that “In God We Trust” is just words. But I would say today that it is far more than words. It is worth defending just as that Pledge of Allegiance is worth defending and that Declaration of Independence is worth defending. And I’m grateful that we will have an opportunity to do just that today.

The challenges the gentleman says don’t exist with court suits and public officials who are saying that not “In God We Trust” is our national motto but something else, it’s worth our standing today and taking 40 minutes to do what so many Presidents and so many Congresses have done before in saying that we should inspire this Nation with hope and optimism that we are different from the rest of the world and those words will continue to stand behind where you stand.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Nobody said that the national motto “In God We Trust” is just words. Nobody said any such thing. What I said is that this resolution is just words because no one is threatening the national motto. It’s there. It’s on our currency, and it’s on our walls. It’s there. It’s our national motto. No one denies that fact. Nothing will change when we pass this resolution. It was our national motto yesterday, it’s our national motto today, and it will be our national motto tomorrow.

This resolution is simply words designed to distract attention from our real problems to a nonexistent problem. There’s no challenge to our national motto. There is no challenge to the foundations of this country. There is a challenge to our economy, and that we ought to be paying attention to.

So all the nice words that my friend from Virginia talked about how important our belief in God is, I agree, obviously. But this resolution is a waste of time and a diversion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee whose leadership helped bring this resolution to the floor, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) both for yielding me time and for introducing this resolution.

There are few things Congress could do that would be more important than passing this resolution. It reaffirms “In God We Trust” as the official motto of

the United States. It provides Congress with the opportunity to renew its support of a principle that was venerated by the Founders of our country and by its Presidents on a bipartisan basis.

In our Declaration of Independence, the Founders declared: "We the Representatives of the United States of America appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World do with a firm Reliance on the Protection of divine Providence pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor."

George Washington, as President of the Constitutional Convention, declared, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; this event is in the hand of God!" James Madison, the Father of the Constitution, declared while he was President "a day of thanksgiving and of acknowledgements to Almighty God." Madison said in his declaration that "no people ought to feel greater obligations to celebrate the goodness of the Great Disposer of Events and of the Destiny of Nations than the people of the United States."

Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence wrote, "God who gave us life gave us liberty. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their own only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God?"

More recently America's Presidents have reaffirmed the same principles. President Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "In teaching this democratic faith to American children, we need the sustaining, buttressing aid of those great ethical religious teachings which are the heritage of our modern civilization. For not upon strength nor upon power, but upon the spirit of God shall our democracy be founded."

President Kennedy said, "The world is very different now, and yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God."

During the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln counseled Americans to have "a firm reliance on God, who has never yet forsaken this favored land" and recognized that it is God's pleasure to "give us to see the right." And Ronald Reagan told the American people, "We are a Nation under God, and I believe God intended for us to be free."

Thanks to the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES), now it is our turn to show that we still believe and recognize these same eternal truths. We can do that by approving a resolution that will allow today's Congress, as representatives of the American people, to reaffirm to the public and the world our Nation's national motto, "In God We Trust."

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

Mr. FORBES. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, in contrast to the suggestion made that we don't need to have this reaffirmation of our national motto, I provide this evidence. First of all, we had a lawsuit by an individual in my district that went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court about the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance. Secondly, that same individual is now suing, attempting to get up to the Supreme Court on this very question of "In God We Trust." Third, just a couple of years ago, I had to fight very, very strongly to get the words "In God We Trust" emplaced, in fact, in the CVC, where it is now.

And for all of those that we've referred to in our history, I think we've omitted one which is very, very important, the leader of the civil rights revolution. Martin Luther King made it very clear in his letter from the Birmingham jail that, in fact, we act out of the requirements made on us by the God in whom we trust. That makes us a Nation that respects the liberties and the individual worth of every single member of our society. If he had not, in fact, looked to our historic belief in God as a basis for those principles that all Americans abide by, that is, that we are equal in the eyes of God and therefore equal in the eyes of our government, he would not have been successful.

This is an important message that we need to reaffirm. It is, in fact, under attack. We are not wasting time. For example, how could we waste time in making sure that "In God We Trust" is, in fact, enshrined in our laws and as our national motto?

Religious faith has been an ever present fact in our history which must be included in any picture of who we are as Americans. The failure to include it among other representations would give an incomplete and inadequate picture of our national ethos.

The motto "In God We Trust" first appeared on a United States coin in 1864 during the Civil War, and later became the official motto of our nation in 1956 by an act of Congress. It is codified as Federal law in the United States Code at 36 U.S.C. 302, which provides: "In God we trust" is the national motto.

We must say no to any revisionists who seek to rewrite the American narrative. It was not secularism and materialism which inspired those from other continents to travel across dangerous seas to a foreign land where they sought refuge from religious persecution. Neither can the manifest destiny in the hopes and dreams of those who populated the land that we now call America be described apart from a spirit which led them to face challenges and even death to fulfill those dreams.

No. It was something greater than themselves which guided them in such quests. This understanding of a greater purpose was reflected in the *Mayflower* Compact signed aboard the *Mayflower* in 1620. In acknowledging Divine Providence, John Winthrop and the other Pilgrim signers expressed the desire to form a democratic form of government and

a mutual regard for one another as equals in the sight of God.

There was a sense of destiny in those first Americans who were drawn here by that same vision. In a very real sense they conceived of themselves as a chosen people. They saw their covenant as connected with the blessing of a new land but even more importantly with an idea that America was a place with a transcendent purpose. This ethos of the older covenant provided them with a foundation rooted in a common commitment to the creation of a new political order.

The Founding generation of our nation possessed that same sense of purpose. John Adams, the author of the Massachusetts constitution, a key player in drafting the Declaration of Independence, and the President of the United States represented this worldview. Adams was committed to this early understanding that a Hebrew metaphysic was the cornerstone of the new American culture. Adams understood that only the nature of an intelligent, wise, and sovereign God could not only create, but also sustain the morality necessary to civilization itself.

He observed:

We have no government armed with powers capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion. Avarice, ambition, revenge, or gallantry would break the strongest cords of our Constitution as a whale goes through a net. Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.

Adams understood that a constitution must be more than mere parchment or paper. Rather, our nation's basic law must be grounded in a moral order which embodies the timeless first principles of an older covenant.

Such sentiments followed what has become recognized as the clearest enunciation of those cardinal principles of American character. In his Farewell Address President Washington observed:

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports . . . And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded by the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

The American Revolution was rooted in a very different worldview than its French counterpart. The conception of liberty to which the founding generation aspired was rooted in a Transcendent source. With respect to the philosophy underlying our political institutions and governance, we need look no further than the Declaration of Independence to discover what is perhaps the clearest statement of the source of those rights which would later be enshrined in our Constitution. We are informed in the Preamble that:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness.

The source of these unalienable rights—rights that cannot be given or taken away—should be noted. Where do our rights come from? They are not the product of mere men. They are not the product of mere agreement.

No. we are endowed with these rights by our Creator. The significance of this is that if our rights do not ultimately come from man, they cannot be taken away from us by mere men. It is the ultimacy of a transcendent source which gives rights their substance.

The role of the Declaration as the principal statement of American political philosophy must surely have a prominent place in our effort to unfold a catechism of American character. It is significant that Abraham Lincoln in one of his debates with Stephen Douglas derivatively stated that “[i]f the Declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book, in which we find it, and tear it out!” There is a practical component to this argument in that “the United States Code includes the Declaration of Independence as one of the Organic Laws upon which all statutory law rests.”

However, there is a more compelling reason that Lincoln might have responded with such firmness. For he would later note at Gettysburg that it was “Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.” On that day of November 19, 1863 at Gettysburg, it had been 107 years since those immortal words contained in the Declaration had been declared to the new nation. Lincoln saw the Civil War as an epochal struggle necessary to this promise of the Declaration, “that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

This our history, and our concepts of human dignity and equal justice before the law are deeply rooted the notion of eternal justice.

Perhaps no greater testimony exists to this fact than the Reverend Martin Luther King’s, Letter from a Birmingham Jail. He described his plight with the following eloquence:

... I am in Birmingham because injustice is here. Just as the eighth century prophets left their little villages and carried their ‘thus saith the Lord’ far beyond the boundaries of their hometowns; and just as the Apostle Paul left his little village of Tarsus and carried the gospel . . . to practically every hamlet and city of the Graeco-Roman world, I too am compelled to carry the gospel of freedom beyond to the Macedonian call for aid.

This great leader of the Civil Rights movement clearly understood the origin and nature of rights. He spoke of “God-given rights.” In describing the concept of rights he wrote:

One may well ask, “How can you advocate breaking some laws and obeying others?” The answer is found in the fact that there are two types of laws; there are just and there are unjust laws. I would agree with Saint Augustine that “an unjust law is no law at all.

Now what is the difference between the two? How does one determine when a law is just or unjust? A just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in terms of Saint Thomas Aquinas, an unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal and natural law.

Dr. King reasons from experience that rights must be rooted in a moral law that is itself rooted in the law of God. The expression of a majority is itself an insufficient basis for rights. The argument by Stephen Douglas on behalf of the doctrine of popular sovereignty (allowing

states to determine the slave question by a popular vote) failed because of the moral premise that majority sentiment should not overcome the fundamental First Principle that it is not permissible to own another human being. The exercise of political will without moral justification is nothing more than the use of force legitimized by a vote. Douglas’ position that such a question could be left to the decision of the various states was in fact an argument on behalf of cultural relativism. Lincoln understood that this was not a sufficient basis for law and argued that “there is no right to do a wrong.” Rights which are not grounded in a transcendent being ultimately are left to the historical vagaries of taste and opinion.

This understanding concerning the centrality of religious faith in our nation’s history is also reflected in an opinion written by the late Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. Perhaps one of the most liberal Justices ever to sit on the Court, Douglas nonetheless observed that “We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a supreme being.” Of course, not every American believes in God—that is not what Justice Douglass was getting at. Rather, his focus was on our history as a people. And it is undeniable that throughout our history the religious faith of the American people—in all of its various forms—has been an integral part of who we are as a people. A plurality of faith commitments has come together in the American experience to form a canopy of overlapping consensus concerning the providential nature of our history.

This is our history. It is who we are as a people. Although we are not captives of the past, it would be nothing less than national suicide were we to fail to uphold the integrity of our collective story. Worse yet, we must never allow our history to be rewritten by those seeking to serve their own ends. For our understanding of our past serves to define who we are and to direct our aspirations for the future. To allow others to deny the foundational role of religious faith in our nation’s history is not only an assault on our history but an attempt to dramatically alter the direction of our nation in the years ahead.

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

I would point out that the lawsuit that the gentleman from California referred to lost at the Supreme Court, and that was a number of years ago, which adds to the point that, of course, “In God We Trust,” our national motto, is not under attack or under threat, nor is “under God” in the Pledge of Allegiance under attack or under threat. And this is, in fact, an unnecessary resolution.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Will the gentleman yield on those points?

Mr. NADLER. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. The gentleman who brought that case to the Supreme Court has a case pending in Federal Court right now on the issue of “In God We Trust,” and there is a Federal action out of the District Court in Wisconsin right now attempting to get us to take out the words “In God We Trust” in the CVC. Those are still active lawsuits.

Mr. NADLER. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman may be correct. I’m not

familiar with that case. But cases making these challenges occur all the time. They lose 100 percent of the time, and there’s no reason to expect that that will change.

So, again, “In God We Trust” was our national motto yesterday and it’s our national motto today. Whether this resolution passes or not, it will be our national motto tomorrow, and we’re wasting our time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), the chairman of the Veterans Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia, for bringing this legislation to the floor; and I thank my friend from California for, in fact, pointing out to the gentleman from the other side of the aisle that, in fact, there are attacks on our national motto “In God We Trust.” We do know that there are attempts to take it out of the CVC.

This country for many, many years—in fact, from its inception—has relied on a faith in God. Yes, there are attacks every day. There are attacks on our chaplains within our military services that are now being told in some instances that they cannot perform religious duties in reference to their faith. We have the flag-folding ceremony that is under attack now on veterans’ cemeteries where people are now being told that they are not being allowed to do the flag-folding ceremony during the death of a person that has served time in this military.

□ 1710

But I think the unfortunate thing is that, as we stand here today, this is important. This is not a waste of time. It’s important that we stand here and we renew our national motto, “In God We Trust.” Ronald Reagan said, in fact, that if we ever forget that we are one nation under God, that we will then be one nation gone under.

And so I’m proud to stand with my good friend from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) and all the Members who have come on the floor today to again reaffirm that our national motto is—yesterday, today, and will be tomorrow—“In God We Trust.”

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia for introducing this resolution.

“In God We Trust” is an important part of American history, and this resolution is necessary to ensure that it remains a part of our history.

Today, some individuals argue that the Constitution says that America cannot have any mention of God in a public atmosphere. These folks argue that Americans must be censored when they talk in public about God or even

religion. I strongly disagree with that contention, the Supreme Court disagrees with that contention, and using the writings of our Founding Fathers as a guide, I believe they would also disagree with that contention.

What makes us unique, Mr. Speaker, is the way we started as a Nation. We had this concept in the Declaration of Independence that we are worth something as individuals, and that we are worth something as individuals not because government gives us rights or men give us rights, but the Declaration of Independence says that we are all endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights. In God we trusted then and in God we must continue to trust now.

The truth is that our Constitution says that we are guaranteed freedom of religion, not freedom from religion. And having the word "God" in our national motto does not establish an official religion for the country; it just simply recognizes the role that faith and religion have played in our history.

I believe, as many other Americans do, that America is a special place, a chosen place, and even an exceptional place. And America is more than just another country on the globe, as some say. Throughout our history, we've served as a beacon of light in an often dark world. And one reason is because in God we trust. As it has been said: Unless the Lord watches over the city, the watchmen watch in vain. I agree with that, and we should affirm it.

And that's just the way it is.

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER).

Mr. HARPER. "In God We Trust." For over five decades, America has celebrated this phrase as our national motto. This pronouncement is part of our national anthem, is written on our coins and our currency, and is engraved in both Chambers of Congress. But the United States' foundation in God far outdates the period that our country has recognized this steadfast expression as our national motto.

Our country's first national document, the Declaration of Independence, spoke to unalienable rights given to Americans by our Creator. Numerous sources point to our Founders' collective reliance on God for direction and wisdom as they drafted the United States Constitution.

When Congress adopted our Great Seal in 1782, included in its design were numerous allusions to biblical references. And in 1787, when the Constitution was framed at the convention in Philadelphia, Benjamin Franklin reminded the delegates that God governs in the affairs of men, declaring, "And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

The Founding Fathers knew that prayer and God's Holy word had protected them, blessed them and given them guidance to begin their

journey. These Judeo-Christian principles offered a firm, time-tested foundation for America's founders, and it is the inclusion of these principles into our government that makes America special.

Today, as I walk through our Nation's Capitol, I am constantly surrounded by the reminders of God's presence: scripture verses such as John 15:13 found on a statue, paintings of the baptism of Pocahontas and the pilgrims in prayer that we are indeed endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights.

America's religious consciousness cannot be ignored.

This is why we must reaffirm "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States and encourage the public to display this declaration in all public buildings.

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. During the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin wrote a speech urging the assembly to begin their morning session with daily prayer. Franklin wrote: I have lived a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men.

He went on to say that: Without God's concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; we shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we, ourselves, shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages.

Just as Benjamin Franklin suggested, we must continue to affirm that God has a place in blessing our government, in guiding our lawmakers, and that He has the ability to lead our Nation back to a path of righteousness and prosperity.

"In God We Trust" has great meaning in our Nation, and we must encourage its display in all public buildings and government institutions. So I urge my colleagues to pass House Concurrent Resolution 13.

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

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

Mr. LANKFORD. I hear many people say that our country has never been more at odds and our rhetoric more divisive than now. I would strongly disagree. I would remind us of a time in 1861 when our Nation stood at the precipice of the Civil War and the oratory spilled over into bloodshed. During that dark moment in our Nation's history, the Secretary of the Treasury ordered the Director of the U.S. Mint to create a new inscription for the national coins. He wrote: "No nation can be strong except in the strength of God, or safe except in His defense. The trust of our people in God should be declared on our national coins."

The Director of the Mint responded back with a variation of the phrase that he pulled out from the Star Spangled Banner, the statement, so our motto is "In God is our trust," since it was a familiar hymn and indicative of the American people. It was later finalized as, "In God We Trust" and was first put on a 2-cent coin in 1864, near the end of the Civil War.

This was not some isolated moment in American history; this is a consistent theme. Whether it be the shelling of Baltimore in 1814, when Francis Scott Key watched, knowing this was the decisive moment, or whether it was World War I or World War II that entered the Cold War, immediately after that as we were fighting against communism, trying to find what is it that sets the United States apart from the other nations around the world, it is this unique thing: Our founding documents are based around this statement, We are given our rights from God, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We as Americans believe our rights are from God. It is in God we trust.

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for bringing this forward.

I know that down through the ages there has been this great question that has occurred to mankind, and it is a similar one: Is God God or is man God? In God do we trust or in man do we trust? I would submit to you that the answer to that question, Mr. Chairman, is one of profound significance.

Indeed, Christopher Columbus trusted in God, and his service to God was to go out and search the world to find ways to do things that would honor God, and he ran into this place called America. Indeed, those who were colonists that first came to America came here because they wanted to worship God; they wanted to find a way to honor God. Indeed, the Founding Fathers that started this country did so in the name of God. So their trust in God has had a profound impact on those of us that live in this day.

And I would submit to you that if we answer the question the other way, if man is God, then an atheist state is as brutal as the thesis that it rests upon and there is no longer any reason for us to gather here in this place. We should just let anarchy prevail because, after all, we are just worm food. So indeed we have the time to reaffirm that God is God and in God do we trust.

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution reaffirming "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States of America.

The motto is more than just a slogan. It defines the sentiments, I believe, of the Founding Fathers. While they never intended there to be an official state religion, they fully endorsed the idea of the acknowledgement of God.

□ 1720

From the opening of each day in the House and in the Senate with prayer, to the private prayers of the individual Founders, the Founders indeed did put their trust in God. I believe they knew in their hearts that God had a special place for the United States of America and this new Nation.

And while they knew that a Christian and godly Nation could never be achieved by any legislation that Congress could pass, they knew it was the people of the Nation who would individually receive God in their hearts for this to be truly a godly Nation.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution that's before us reaffirming our motto "In God We Trust."

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

I've listened to this discussion. There's no question that most people in this Chamber, maybe everybody in this Chamber, agrees with the phrase, with the motto, "In God We Trust." I certainly do.

It's no question it's the motto of this country. We've adopted it. It's no question that it's not threatened. No one's seeking to change it, except for every so often there's a court case which uniformly gets thrown out, and that's not new.

There's no necessity for this resolution except, really, the only reason for this resolution, frankly, is to declare how good we are, that we're going to reaffirm what needs no reaffirmation, and to divert attention from the issues that we really ought to be dealing with.

So let me say, again, "In God We Trust" is the motto of the United States. It was yesterday, it is today, it will be tomorrow whether we pass this resolution or not.

We do have to be sensitive to the fact that not everyone in this country believes in God, and they are just as much Americans as those of us who do believe in God.

I see no reason for passing this resolution to reaffirm what is already the case and what we've affirmed before. So it's a waste of time. And I am not saying that "In God We Trust" is a waste of time, nor that the national motto is simply words or a symbol. They mean something.

But this resolution is simply words which does nothing, is intended to do nothing other than to get up and say, we're godly, we're good people. And it's true, we are, I hope. Most of us are. But we don't have to declare it. And we don't have to make people who may not agree with it feel that they're not as American as we are.

We don't have to spend the time in this House when we're not spending it on things that are important in terms of something that we can actually change, that we can actually do something about, like creating jobs and affecting the economy. We can't change this. This is the national motto. It will remain the national motto. This resolution changes nothing.

If this resolution were saying, let's abolish the national motto, then it would change something and we'd say, well, you can debate it one way or the other. But this changes nothing. It simply diverts attention, it wastes our time, and it is unworthy for that reason.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, in closing, the gentleman from New York says that we are simply declaring how good we are, that we are wasting our time, that we have other things that are important.

I realize that there are some who don't see the difference between what we're doing in reaffirming "In God We Trust" as our national motto from naming a post office or commending some athletic team that's won the last sports contest. But I happen to believe that when Thomas Jefferson stated in the Declaration of Independence that our rights came from God, he didn't think that was irrelevant or not important.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will support this resolution.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to reaffirm "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States (H. Con. Res. 13), and I want to thank Congressman RANDY FORBES for introducing this resolution and commend him for his tireless and ongoing defense of America's Christian heritage.

I believe that reaffirming our commitment to "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States matters. It pays tribute to our present and past, and it facilitates our future. America was founded on the principle that we derive our rights from our Creator. They are not given to us by government or by kings. These rights are given to us by God.

I don't believe that one can adequately explain the near boundless prosperity and advancement of the United States of America since 1776 other than the hand of Providence. In these difficult times, now more than ever, we should reaffirm "In God We Trust" as our official motto.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 13, rise today "Reaffirming 'In God We Trust' as the official motto of the United States" which would support and encourage the public display of the national motto in all public buildings, public schools, and other government institutions. This motto reflects our nation's rich history of religious freedom and tolerance.

More than three hundred years ago, bound by their common faith and desire for tolerance and liberty, a small group of pilgrims journeyed to America. They sought a place where they could safely and freely worship according to their own beliefs.

The tradition of religious freedom is one of the fundamental liberties upon which our na-

tion was founded. The founding document of our nation, The Declaration of Independence, states that men are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Reaffirming 'In God We Trust' as the national motto does not violate these rights; instead, this is an acknowledgement of our nation's unwavering commitment to religious freedom.

The English word God does not exclusively refer to a Christian God or God from any one religion. There are names of God in a variety of religious traditions throughout the world, including Hinduism, Sikhism, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, indigenous African religions, and Native American religions. In all of these diverse faiths, names of God are invoked to address the Supreme Being or deity in liturgy and prayer. In fact, the word God is defined as referring to the Supreme Being, the creator and ruler of the universe. This definition does not imply that God is tied to a specific religion, but rather unique to individual faith traditions.

We are a diverse nation, filled with people from around the world, people of varying backgrounds, races and religions. In Houston, where I represent the 18th Congressional District, 44 percent of the population is Hispanic, and 25 percent are African Americans. Houston is also home to the third largest Vietnamese community in the country, as well as the 5th largest Indonesian population, and a sizeable community of individuals from Nigeria, India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Norway. Within these diverse cultural backgrounds, there are many different religions, faiths and customs.

The 18th Congressional District recently made great progress in celebrating all of Houston's religions. On October 18, 2011, Houston's Institute of Interfaith Dialog broke ground for the Houston Interfaith Peace Garden, a multi religious center. The goal of the organization and the Peace Garden is the promotion of understanding among different faiths through shared experiences.

As my constituents in the 18th Congressional District have shown, promoting understanding between religions strengthens communities, and unites Americans. For centuries, religion has been a comfort to people in tragedy, and way to celebrate in triumph. Reaffirming "In God We Trust" as the national motto is a reaffirmation of faith, a reaffirmation of a creator and Supreme Being, and uniting all religions under the comfort this brings. However, in no way should this legislation or my vote for H. Con. Res. 13 deny the superior constitutional standing of the 1st Amendment of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution guaranteeing freedom of religion in the United States of America.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 13, a resolution to reaffirm "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States of America. Though the motto itself was not officially adopted until 1956, the saying has long been a part of our nation's history and its sentiment has prevailed much longer than that.

Since its onset, America the Beautiful has been a Nation of Faith. Now, as our country faces a fatigued economy, high unemployment, and a challenging budget situation, our continued trust in God is critical and must not wane. Like the battle-worn American flag that first inspired Francis Scott Key to write "In

God is our trust!" during the war of 1812, our faith in God must remain steadfast through the dark times.

It is fitting that we consider H. Con. Res. 13 today, because on this day in history 234 years ago, Congress similarly considered a resolution recognizing "the superintending providence of Almighty God" in developing our nation.

The First National Proclamation of Thanksgiving, issued by the Continental Congress on November 1, 1777, recommended that President George Washington set aside December 18th the following year as a day for "solemn thanksgiving and praise." The resolution further declared that such a day might:

"please [God] graciously to afford his blessings on the governments of these states respectively, and prosper the public council of the whole; to inspire our commanders both by land and sea, and all under them, with that wisdom and fortitude which may render them fit instruments, under the providence of Almighty God, to secure for these United States the greatest of all blessings, independence and peace and

"that it may please Him to prosper the trade and manufactures of the people and the labor of the husbandman, that our land may yield its increase; to take schools and seminaries of education, so necessary for cultivating the principles of true liberty, virtue and piety, under his nurturing hand, and to prosper the means of religion for the promotion and enlargement of that kingdom which consisteth in righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

Mr. Speaker, just as we did 234 years ago today, let us recognize the undeniable hand of God in cultivating our great nation, and give thanks for the mercies he has bestowed on us throughout our history. Let us also reaffirm today, not just the text of our national motto, but that truly "In God is our trust."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 13.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

WIRELESS TAX FAIRNESS ACT OF 2011

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1002) to restrict any State or local jurisdiction from imposing a new discriminatory tax on cell phone services, providers, or property, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1002

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 "Wireless Tax Fairness Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) It is appropriate to exercise congressional enforcement authority under section 5 of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and Congress' plenary power under article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States (commonly known as the "commerce clause") in order to ensure that States and political subdivisions thereof do not discriminate against providers and consumers of mobile services by imposing new selective and excessive taxes and other burdens on such providers and consumers.

(2) In light of the history and pattern of discriminatory taxation faced by providers and consumers of mobile services, the prohibitions against and remedies to correct discriminatory State and local taxation in section 306 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (49 U.S.C. 11501) provide an appropriate analogy for congressional action, and similar Federal legislative measures are warranted that will prohibit imposing new discriminatory taxes on providers and consumers of mobile services and that will assure an effective, uniform remedy.

SEC. 3. MORATORIUM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No State or local jurisdiction shall impose a new discriminatory tax on or with respect to mobile services, mobile service providers, or mobile service property, during the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) MOBILE SERVICE.—The term "mobile service" means commercial mobile radio service, as such term is defined in section 20.3 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, or any other service that is primarily intended for receipt on, transmission from, or use with a mobile telephone or other mobile device, including but not limited to the receipt of a digital good.

(2) MOBILE SERVICE PROPERTY.—The term "mobile service property" means all property used by a mobile service provider in connection with its business of providing mobile services, whether real, personal, tangible, or intangible (including goodwill, licenses, customer lists, and other similar intangible property associated with such business).

(3) MOBILE SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term "mobile service provider" means any entity that sells or provides mobile services, but only to the extent that such entity sells or provides mobile services.

(4) NEW DISCRIMINATORY TAX.—The term "new discriminatory tax" means a tax imposed by a State or local jurisdiction that is imposed on or with respect to, or is measured by, the charges, receipts, or revenues from or value of—

(A) a mobile service and is not generally imposed, or is generally imposed at a lower rate, on or with respect to, or measured by, the charges, receipts, or revenues from other services or transactions involving tangible personal property;

(B) a mobile service provider and is not generally imposed, or is generally imposed at a lower rate, on other persons that are engaged in businesses other than the provision of mobile services; or

(C) a mobile service property and is not generally imposed, or is generally imposed at a lower rate, on or with respect to, or measured by the value of, other property that is devoted to a commercial or industrial use and subject to a property tax levy, ex-

cept public utility property owned by a public utility subject to rate of return regulation by a State or Federal regulatory authority;

unless such tax was imposed and actually enforced on mobile services, mobile service providers, or mobile service property prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) STATE OR LOCAL JURISDICTION.—The term "State or local jurisdiction" means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, any territory or possession of the United States, a political subdivision of any State, territory, or possession, or any governmental entity or person acting on behalf of such State, territory, possession, or subdivision that has the authority to assess, impose, levy, or collect taxes or fees.

(6) TAX.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "tax" means a charge imposed by a governmental entity for the purpose of generating revenues for governmental purposes, and excludes a fee imposed on a particular entity or class of entities for a specific privilege, service, or benefit conferred exclusively on such entity or class of entities.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term "tax" does not include any fee or charge—

(i) used to preserve and advance Federal universal service or similar State programs authorized by section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254); or

(ii) specifically dedicated by a State or local jurisdiction for the support of E-911 communications systems.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of subsection (b)(4), all taxes, tax rates, exemptions, deductions, credits, incentives, exclusions, and other similar factors shall be taken into account in determining whether a tax is a new discriminatory tax.

(2) APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in determining whether a tax on mobile service property is a new discriminatory tax for purposes of subsection (b)(4)(C), principles similar to those set forth in section 306 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (49 U.S.C. 11501) shall apply.

(3) EXCLUSIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(A) the term "generally imposed" as used in subsection (b)(4) shall not apply to any tax imposed only on—

(i) specific services;

(ii) specific industries or business segments; or

(iii) specific types of property; and

(B) the term "new discriminatory tax" shall not include a new tax or the modification of an existing tax that either—

(i)(I) replaces one or more taxes that had been imposed on mobile services, mobile service providers, or mobile service property; and

(II) is designed so that, based on information available at the time of the enactment of such new tax or such modification, the amount of tax revenues generated thereby with respect to such mobile services, mobile service providers, or mobile service property is reasonably expected to not exceed the amount of tax revenues that would have been generated by the respective replaced tax or taxes with respect to such mobile services, mobile service providers, or mobile service property; or

(ii) is a local jurisdiction tax that may not be imposed without voter approval, provides for at least 90 days' prior notice to mobile service providers, and is required by law to be collected from mobile service customers.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT.

Notwithstanding any provision of section 1341 of title 28, United States Code, or the

constitution or laws of any State, the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to amount in controversy or citizenship of the parties, to grant such mandatory or prohibitive injunctive relief, interim equitable relief, and declaratory judgments as may be necessary to prevent, restrain, or terminate any acts in violation of this Act.

(1) JURISDICTION.—Such jurisdiction shall not be exclusive of the jurisdiction which any Federal or State court may have in the absence of this section.

(2) BURDEN OF PROOF.—The burden of proof in any proceeding brought under this Act shall be upon the party seeking relief and shall be by a preponderance of the evidence on all issues of fact.

(3) RELIEF.—In granting relief against a tax which is discriminatory or excessive under this Act with respect to tax rate or amount only, the court shall prevent, restrain, or terminate the imposition, levy, or collection of not more than the discriminatory or excessive portion of the tax as determined by the court.

SEC. 5. GAO STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study, throughout the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, to determine—

(1) how, and the extent to which, taxes imposed by local and State jurisdictions on mobile services, mobile service providers, or mobile property, impact the costs consumers pay for mobile services; and

(2) the extent to which the moratorium on discriminatory mobile services taxes established in this Act has any impact on the costs consumers pay for mobile services.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 6 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, a report containing the results of the study required subsection (a) and shall include in such report recommendations for any changes to laws and regulations relating to such results.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from California (Ms. CHU) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1002, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Congresswoman LOFGREN and I introduced H.R. 1002 with the broad bipartisan support of 144 original cosponsors. We now have 236 cosponsors, and I want to thank Ms. LOFGREN for her hard work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, access to wireless networks represents a key component of millions of Americans' livelihoods, providing the efficient communication ca-

pabilities, whether by phone, broadband Internet or otherwise, necessary to run a successful business.

The exorbitant discriminatory taxes on wireless customers are not only unfair, they are counterintuitive, adding yet another costly impediment to the success of so many American businesses who are struggling in the midst of a prolonged recession and an already hefty tax burden. Low-income and senior Americans who frequently rely on wireless service as their sole means of telephone and Internet access also bear the brunt of this discriminatory tax's impact.

H.R. 1002, the Wireless Tax Fairness Act, provides a balanced approach that protects the revenue needs of States and localities, while allowing for a 5-year hiatus on new discriminatory wireless taxes, encouraging States and localities to develop a national tax regime that maintains the affordability of a wireless service.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this constitutionally sound, pro-consumer bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 1002, the Wireless Tax Fairness Act of 2011, will impose on States a 5-year moratorium on any new tax on mobile services, mobile service providers, and mobile service property. This will deny States the flexibility to respond to economic downturns during the moratorium and, therefore, undermine the ability of States to pay for essential services such as public health and safety, education and maintenance of State highways.

The legislation is based on faulty information and will benefit the wireless services industry. Further, the legislation contains vague language which will lead to increased litigation for both State and local governments and the wireless industry. Because of these and other concerns presented by the bill, many organizations are opposed, including the League of Cities, National Governors Association, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, the AFL-CIO, AFT and NEA, amongst others.

Why are they opposed?

Because, first, this bill will force States to cut services and increase taxes on nonwireless taxpayers.

□ 1730

In order for States and local communities to continue to recover from this recession, they need all tools at their disposal to balance their budgets, to preserve and create jobs, and to provide essential services like police, fire, and education.

In fact, demand for many of the essential services, such as unemployment payments and other social programs, has increased during the economic downturn. Yet this bill takes away one of the tools to tax the wireless industry at the expense of other taxpayers and businesses. The moratorium will

exclude from possible State taxation millions, if not billions of dollars, in future revenue from wireless service taxes. Thus, to balance their budgets, States will be forced to cut even more services and shift more of the tax burden on to other local taxpayers.

As a former member of the California Board of Equalization, the Nation's duly elected statewide tax board, I understand the unique fiscal challenges facing our Nation today and believe we should leave local taxes in the hands of local officials and residents.

Finally, State legislators and local officials who are elected by their constituents and accountable to them have decided to impose these taxes. By passing this legislation, Congress impedes upon local elections and is telling local governments how to run their budgets.

A second reason for opposition is that this bill is a special interest bill for the wireless industry. It benefits the wireless services industry at the expense of other industries. Despite industry claims, this bill will not lead to more broadband development and competitiveness. Current State and local taxes on wireless services and providers have not diminished adoption rates, nor have they inhibited broadband expansion.

In fact, the wireless industry has not yet presented any data indicating that State and local wireless taxes have had adverse effect on wireless subscribership, revenue, or investment. Instead, the wireless industry continues to grow and profits remain high.

If this bill becomes law, it would set up a dual tax system on telephone services by giving preferential treatment to cell phone customers but continue to allow taxes on traditional wire-line phones. This will put a higher burden on those without cell phones.

Finally, vague definitions within this bill will lead to increased litigation. H.R. 1002 will increase litigation costs for wireless service providers and State and local governments. Courts will have to interpret the many vague terms that are contained within the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee, Mr. COBLE.

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, wireless communications have become a mainstay of modern day Americana. There are now over 290 million wireless subscribers in the United States. As mobile phones become more common and available, they have also become more critical to their users. You don't have to look far in Washington to find someone talking or texting on a mobile device, or, for that matter, in my home in Greensboro, North Carolina. They're everywhere. They are ubiquitous. While

most of this is the result of sheer demand, the Federal Government has taken important steps to ensure that we have quality mobile service that is accessible to everyone.

Unfortunately, some State and local taxing authorities have begun to impose higher taxes on wireless services than on other goods and services. Often times, these taxes are arbitrary and go unnoticed because they're passed on to consumers as another line item at the bottom of their monthly wireless phone bill.

Although States and local governments should not be prohibited from taxing wireless services, they also should not use wireless as a revenue cow. The Wireless Tax Fairness Act would impose a 5-year moratorium on any new discriminatory wireless taxes. Current wireless tax rates, even if higher than taxes on other services, would not be changed or affected by this bill. Thus, State and local revenue projections from wireless taxes will not be affected.

This bill would give States breathing room to reform their wireless tax policies at the State and local level, which they have admitted they need to do.

I'm pleased to support this legislation and again thank the gentleman from Arizona for having yielded.

Ms. CHU. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN).

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and thank the gentleman from Arizona for his kind comments.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Wireless Tax Fairness Act for three successive Congresses, and I am gratified that it is being considered by the full House here today.

Nearly everyone agrees that expanding broadband Internet access and adoption is critical to the economic future of our country. As the FCC put it in the National Broadband Plan, the U.S. must lead the world in broadband innovation and investment and take all appropriate steps to ensure that Americans have access to modern high-performance broadband and the benefits it enables.

I introduced the Wireless Tax Fairness Act because discriminatory taxes on wireless services are not consistent with this top national priority. Cell phone bills are on average taxed at a far higher rate than other goods and services. In many jurisdictions, the taxation of wireless approaches or even exceeds the rates of so-called sin taxes on goods like alcohol and tobacco. These disproportionate taxes discourage investment and adoption of wireless services, including advanced wireless broadband.

Before he was the President's chief economist, Austan Goolsbee, published a peer-reviewed study finding dead-weight losses to society of up to \$5 for every \$1 in taxes on broadband service, including wireless.

Now, these taxes fall particularly hard on working-class and lower-in-

come Americans who are most likely to rely on their cell phone for all of their communications, including access to the Internet. And in fact, the Pew study and the CDC have indicated that usage of cell phones for Internet access among Latinos and African Americans in the United States was far higher than that among other Americans. And so, this regressive tax burden troubles me, especially in these economic times.

Now, for 14 years before I was a Member of Congress, I served on the board of supervisors of Santa Clara County. So I really do understand the need of local governments to balance their budgets every year and to get revenue. But this bill would not affect any existing revenues. In fact, it wouldn't prevent raising taxes on all goods. If you're going to have a half-cent sales tax on everything, include wireless. What this would do is prevent you from singling out wireless services for disproportionate taxation.

Ultimately, the moratorium for 5 years should yield to modernization of State and local telecommunication taxes. Separate higher taxes on wireless services are an outdated legacy of the days when telephone service was a regulated monopoly. A timeout from discriminatory tax increases will encourage States and localities to focus on enacting reforms that work for all stakeholders.

In general, I do believe that State and local governments should have the autonomy to set tax rates as they see fit. And, in fact, during the committee markup we added an amendment that allows voter-approved discriminatory taxes if that's what the voters of a jurisdiction wish to do.

But beyond that there are exceptions when Congress recognizes the need to protect in advance a national imperative. And that's one of these instances. As the national broadband plan said, wireless broadband is poised to become a key platform for innovation in the United States over the next decade.

We should not let discriminatory taxes on wireless service disrupt this potential. Several years ago, we adopted a prohibition on discriminatory taxes on Internet access. At the time, I don't think we fully realized that wireless was going to be the onramp for so many of our citizens to the Internet. And so we did not include it at that time. This is to correct that omission.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona for working with me and all of the 236 cosponsors who are part of this effort.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. In conclusion, H.R. 1002 is irresponsible legislation that will restrict State flexibility to raise much-needed revenues, which will force State governments to eliminate essential government programs and services and shift burdens to other taxpayers.

For all of these reasons, I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1740

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, many points have been made about discriminatory taxes and their impact on businesses and individuals. For all the reasons that were so eloquently put forth by the gentlelady from California, we would urge the support of this legislation, and I would again thank the gentlelady for her tremendous effort in this area and on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1002, the Wireless Tax Fairness Act, which aims to help consumers and cell phone companies, unfortunately ignores the interests of state and local governments. The bill prevents states from determining what and how much to tax certain activities within their borders.

True, increased taxes and fees on wireless services ultimately hurt consumers. Every penny matters and every tax increase can impact consumers' pocketbooks and their choices to spend on other goods and services.

Rather than taking up this bill, we should consider ways how Congress can help our state and local governments, many of which are barely staying afloat financially during the current economic climate.

These states and municipalities must balance their budgets while still providing essential police and fire services, assisting those in need, maintaining our roads and bridges, and ensuring an education for our children. Because of severely reduced revenues, many of our states are cutting their budgets and reducing funding for such essential services as law enforcement and education.

This bill will only reduce more future state and local government revenues. For that reason, state and local governments and employee unions oppose this legislation.

Instead, Congress can and should help our state and local governments. We could pass H.R. 2701, the "Main Street Fairness Act," which I introduced earlier this Congress or similar legislation.

H.R. 2701 would ensure fairness in the marketplace between remote retailers and their brick and mortar counterparts. It would level the playing field for retailers by requiring remote sellers to collect the same sales tax that local retailers have to collect. Thus, mom-and-pop retailers would no longer be at a competitive disadvantage against online retailers. And, it would support our states by providing them the authority to collect very much needed sales taxes which they have not been able to collect from remote sellers.

I cannot support H.R. 1002 because it will prevent states from exercising their authority within their own borders.

Instead, we should support more balanced measures, such as the Main Street Fairness Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1002, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KATE PUZEY PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER PROTECTION ACT OF 2011

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1280) to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, the development of a sexual assault policy, the establishment of an Office of Victim Advocacy, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1280

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 “Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act of 2011”.

SEC. 2. PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER PROTECTION.

The Peace Corps Act is amended by inserting after section 8 (22 U.S.C. 2507) the following new sections:

“SEXUAL ASSAULT RISK-REDUCTION AND RESPONSE TRAINING

“SEC. 8A. (a) IN GENERAL.—As part of the training provided to all volunteers under section 8(a), the President shall develop and implement comprehensive sexual assault risk-reduction and response training that, to the extent practicable, conforms to best practices in the sexual assault field.

“(b) DEVELOPMENT AND CONSULTATION WITH EXPERTS.—In developing the sexual assault risk-reduction and response training under subsection (a), the President shall consult with and incorporate, as appropriate, the recommendations and views of experts in the sexual assault field.

“(c) SUBSEQUENT TRAINING.—Once a volunteer has arrived in his or her country of service, the President shall provide the volunteer with training tailored to the country of service that includes cultural training relating to gender relations, risk-reduction strategies, treatment available in such country (including sexual assault forensic exams, post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) for HIV exposure, screening for sexually transmitted diseases, and pregnancy testing), MedEvac procedures, and information regarding a victim’s right to pursue legal action against a perpetrator.

“(d) INFORMATION REGARDING CRIMES AND RISKS.—Each applicant for enrollment as a volunteer shall be provided with information regarding crimes against and risks to volunteers in the country in which the applicant has been invited to serve, including an overview of past crimes against volunteers in the country.

“(e) CONTACT INFORMATION.—The President shall provide each applicant, before the applicant enrolls as a volunteer, with—

“(1) the contact information of the Inspector General of the Peace Corps for purposes of reporting sexual assault mismanagement or any other mismanagement, misconduct, wrongdoing, or violations of law or policy whenever it involves a Peace Corps employee, volunteer, contractor, or outside party that receives funds from the Peace Corps;

“(2) clear, written guidelines regarding whom to contact, including the direct telephone number for the designated Sexual Assault Response Liaison (SARL) and the Office of Victim Advocacy and what steps to take in the event of a sexual assault or other crime; and

“(3) contact information for a 24-hour sexual assault hotline to be established for the purpose of providing volunteers a mechanism to anonymously—

“(A) report sexual assault;

“(B) receive crisis counseling in the event of a sexual assault; and

“(C) seek information about Peace Corps sexual assault reporting and response procedures.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section and sections 8B through 8G:

“(1) PERSONALLY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.—The term ‘personally identifying information’ means individually identifying information for or about a volunteer who is a victim of sexual assault, including information likely to disclose the location of such victim, including the following:

“(A) A first and last name.

“(B) A home or other physical address.

“(C) Contact information (including a postal, email, or Internet protocol address, or telephone or facsimile number).

“(D) A social security number.

“(E) Any other information, including date of birth, racial or ethnic background, or religious affiliation, that, in combination with information described in subparagraphs (A) through (D), would serve to identify the victim.

“(2) RESTRICTED REPORTING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘restricted reporting’ means a system of reporting that allows a volunteer who is sexually assaulted to confidentially disclose the details of his or her assault to specified individuals and receive the services outlined in section 8B(c) without the dissemination of his or her personally identifying information except as necessary for the provision of such services, and without automatically triggering an official investigative process.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—In cases in which volunteers elect restricted reporting, disclosure of their personally identifying information is authorized to the following persons or organizations when disclosure would be for the following reasons:

“(i) Peace Corps staff or law enforcement when authorized by the victim in writing.

“(ii) Peace Corps staff or law enforcement to prevent or lessen a serious or imminent threat to the health or safety of the victim or another person.

“(iii) SARLs, victim advocates or healthcare providers when required for the provision of victim services.

“(iv) State and Federal courts when ordered, or if disclosure is required by Federal or State statute.

“(C) NOTICE OF DISCLOSURE AND PRIVACY PROTECTION.—In cases in which information is disclosed pursuant to subparagraph (B), the President shall—

“(i) make reasonable attempts to provide notice to the volunteer with respect to whom such information is being released; and

“(ii) take such action as is necessary to protect the privacy and safety of the volunteer.

“(3) SEXUAL ASSAULT.—The term ‘sexual assault’ means any conduct prescribed by chapter 109A of title 18, United States Code, whether or not the conduct occurs in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, and includes both assaults committed by offenders who are strangers to the victim and assaults committed by offenders who are known or related by blood or marriage to the victim.

“(4) STALKING.—The term ‘stalking’ means engaging in a course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to—

“(A) fear for his or her safety or the safety of others; or

“(B) suffer substantial emotional distress.

“SEXUAL ASSAULT POLICY

“SEC. 8B. (a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall develop and implement a comprehensive sexual assault policy that—

“(1) includes a system for restricted and unrestricted reporting of sexual assault;

“(2) mandates, for each Peace Corps country program, the designation of a Sexual Assault Response Liaison (SARL), who shall receive comprehensive training on procedures to respond to reports of sexual assault, with duties including ensuring that volunteers who are victims of sexual assault are moved to a safe environment and accompanying victims through the in-country response at the request of the victim;

“(3) requires SARLs to immediately contact a Victim Advocate upon receiving a report of sexual assault in accordance with the restricted and unrestricted reporting guidelines promulgated by the Peace Corps;

“(4) to the extent practicable, conforms to best practices in the sexual assault field;

“(5) is applicable to all posts at which volunteers serve; and

“(6) includes a guarantee that volunteers will not suffer loss of living allowances for reporting a sexual assault.

“(b) DEVELOPMENT AND CONSULTATION WITH EXPERTS.—In developing the sexual assault policy under subsection (a), the President shall consult with and incorporate, as appropriate, the recommendations and views of experts in the sexual assault field, including experts with international experience.

“(c) ELEMENTS.—The sexual assault policy developed under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following services with respect to a volunteer who has been a victim of sexual assault:

“(1) The option of pursuing either restricted or unrestricted reporting of an assault.

“(2) Provision of a SARL and Victim’s Advocate to the volunteer.

“(3) At a volunteer’s discretion, provision of a sexual assault forensic exam in accordance with applicable host country law.

“(4) If necessary, the provision of emergency health care, including a mechanism for such volunteer to evaluate such provider.

“(5) If necessary, the provision of counseling and psychiatric medication.

“(6) Completion of a safety and treatment plan with the volunteer, if necessary.

“(7) Evacuation of such volunteer for medical treatment, accompanied by a Peace Corps staffer at the request of such volunteer. When evacuated to the United States, such volunteer shall be provided, to the extent practicable, a choice of medical providers including a mechanism for such volunteers to evaluate the provider.

“(8) An explanation to the volunteer of available law enforcement and prosecutorial options, and legal representation.

“(d) TRAINING.—The President shall train all staff outside the United States regarding the sexual assault policy developed under subsection (a).

“OFFICE OF VICTIM ADVOCACY

“SEC. 8C. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF VICTIMS ADVOCACY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish an Office of Victim Advocacy in Peace Corps headquarters headed by a full-time victim advocate who shall report directly to the Director. The Office of Victim Advocacy may deploy personnel abroad when necessary to help assist victims.

“(2) PROHIBITION.—Peace Corps Medical Officers, Safety and Security Officers, and program staff may not serve as victim advocates. The victim advocate referred to in paragraph (1) may not have any other duties in the Peace Corps that are not reasonably connected to victim advocacy.

“(3) EXEMPTION.—The victim advocate and any additional victim advocates shall be exempt from the limitations specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) and paragraph (5) under section 7(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2506(a)).

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—

“(1) VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT.—The Office of Victim Advocacy shall help develop and update the sexual assault risk-reduction and response training described in section 8A and the sexual assault policy described in section 8B, ensure that volunteers who are victims of sexual assault receive services specified in section 8B(c), and facilitate their access to such services.

“(2) OTHER CRIMES.—In addition to assisting victims of sexual assault in accordance with paragraph (1), the Office of Victim Advocacy shall assist volunteers who are victims of crime by making such victims aware of the services available to them and facilitating their access to such services.

“(3) PRIORITY.—The Office of Victim Advocacy shall give priority to cases involving serious crimes, including sexual assault and stalking.

“(c) STATUS UPDATES.—The Office of Victim Advocacy shall provide to volunteers who are victims regular updates on the status of their cases if such volunteers have opted to pursue prosecution.

“(d) TRANSITION.—The Office of Victim Advocacy shall assist volunteers who are victims of crime and whose service has terminated in receiving the services specified in section 8B(c) requested by such volunteer.

“ESTABLISHMENT OF SEXUAL ASSAULT ADVISORY COUNCIL

“SEC. 8D. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Sexual Assault Advisory Council (in this section referred to as the ‘Council’).

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Council shall be composed of not less than 8 individuals selected by the President, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, who are returned volunteers (including volunteers who were victims of sexual assault and volunteers who were not victims of sexual assault) and governmental and nongovernmental experts and professionals in the sexual assault field. No Peace Corps employee shall be a member of the Council. The number of governmental experts appointed to the Council shall not exceed the number of nongovernmental experts.

“(c) FUNCTIONS; MEETINGS.—The Council shall meet not less often than annually to review the sexual assault risk-reduction and response training developed under section 8A, the sexual assault policy developed under section 8B, and such other matters related to sexual assault the Council views as appropriate, to ensure that such training and policy conform to the extent practicable to best practices in the sexual assault field.

“(d) REPORTS.—On an annual basis for 5 years after the date of the enactment of this section and at the discretion of the Council thereafter, the Council shall submit to the President and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on its findings based on the reviews conducted pursuant to subsection (c).

“(e) EMPLOYEE STATUS.—Members of the Council shall not be considered employees of the United States Government for any purpose and shall not receive compensation other than reimbursement of travel expenses and per diem allowance in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

“(f) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Council.

“VOLUNTEER FEEDBACK AND PEACE CORPS REVIEW

“SEC. 8E. (a) MONITORING AND EVALUATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the President shall establish goals, metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans for all Peace Corps programs. Monitoring and evaluation plans shall incorporate best practices from monitoring and evaluation studies and analyses.

“(b) PERFORMANCE PLANS AND ELEMENTS.—The President shall establish performance plans with performance elements and standards for Peace Corps representatives and shall review the performance of Peace Corps representatives not less than annually to determine whether they have met these performance elements and standards. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as limiting the discretion of the President to remove a Peace Corps representative.

“(c) ANNUAL VOLUNTEER SURVEYS.—The President shall annually conduct a confidential survey of volunteers regarding the effectiveness of Peace Corps programs and staff and the safety of volunteers. The results shall be provided in aggregate form without identifying information to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. Results from the annual volunteer survey shall be considered in reviewing the performance of Peace Corps representatives under subsection (a).

“(d) PEACE CORPS INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Peace Corps shall—

“(1) submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives—

“(A) a biennial report on reports received from volunteers relating to misconduct, mismanagement, or policy violations of Peace Corps staff, any breaches of the confidentiality of volunteers, and any actions taken to assure the safety of volunteers who provide such reports;

“(B) a report, not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this section and every three years thereafter, evaluating the effectiveness and implementation of the sexual assault risk-reduction and response training developed under section 8A and the sexual assault policy developed under section 8B, including a case review of a statistically significant number of cases; and

“(C) a report, not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this section, describing how Peace Corps representatives are hired, how Peace Corps representatives are terminated, and how Peace Corps representatives hire staff, including an assessment of the implementation of the performance plans described in subsection (b); and

“(2) when conducting audits or evaluations of Peace Corps programs overseas, notify the Director of the Peace Corps about the results of such evaluations, including concerns the Inspector General has noted, if any, about the performance of Peace Corps representatives, for appropriate action.

“ESTABLISHMENT OF A POLICY ON STALKING

“SEC. 8F. (a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall develop and implement a comprehensive policy on stalking that—

“(1) requires an immediate, effective, and thorough response from the Peace Corps upon receipt of a report of stalking;

“(2) provides, during training, all Peace Corps volunteers with a point of contact for the reporting of stalking; and

“(3) protects the confidentiality of volunteers who report stalking to the maximum extent practicable.

“(b) DEVELOPMENT AND CONSULTATION WITH EXPERTS.—In developing the stalking policy under subsection (a), the President shall consult with and incorporate, as appropriate, the recommendations and views of those with expertise regarding the crime of stalking.

“(c) TRAINING OF IN-COUNTRY STAFF.—The President shall provide for the training of all in-country staff regarding the stalking policy developed under subsection (a).

“ESTABLISHMENT OF A CONFIDENTIALITY PROTECTION POLICY

“SEC. 8G. (a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish and maintain a process to allow volunteers to report incidents of misconduct or mismanagement, or violations of any policy, of the Peace Corps in order to protect the confidentiality and safety of such volunteers and of the information reported, and to ensure that such information is acted on appropriately. This process shall conform to existing best practices regarding confidentiality.

“(b) GUIDANCE.—The President shall provide additional training to officers and employees of the Peace Corps who have access to information reported by volunteers under subsection (a) in order to protect against the inappropriate disclosures of such information and ensure the safety of such volunteers.

“(c) PENALTY.—Any Peace Corps volunteer or staff member who is responsible for maintaining confidentiality under subsection (a) and who breaches such duty shall be subject to disciplinary action, including termination, and in the case of a staff member, ineligibility for re-employment with the Peace Corps.

“REMOVAL AND ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

“SEC. 8H. (a) IN GENERAL.—If a volunteer requests removal from the site in which such volunteer is serving because the volunteer feels at risk of imminent bodily harm, the President shall, as expeditiously as practical after receiving such request, remove the volunteer from the site. If the President receives such a request, the President shall assess and evaluate the safety of such site and may not assign another volunteer to the site until such time as the assessment and evaluation is complete and the site has been determined to be safe. Volunteers may remain at a site during the assessment and evaluation.

“(b) DETERMINATION OF SITE AS UNSAFE.—If the President determines that a site is unsafe for any remaining volunteers at the site, the President shall, as expeditiously as practical, remove all volunteers from the site.

“(c) TRACKING AND RECORDING.—The President shall establish a global tracking and recording system to track and record incidents of crimes against volunteers.

“REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

“SEC. 8I. (a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall annually submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report summarizing information on—

“(1) sexual assault of volunteers;

“(2) other crimes against volunteers;

“(3) the number of arrests, prosecutions, and incarcerations for crimes involving Peace Corps volunteers for every country in which volunteers serve; and

“(4) the annual rate of early termination of volunteers, including demographic data associated with such early termination.

“(b) GAO.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report evaluating the quality and accessibility of health care provided through the Department of Labor to returned volunteers upon their separation from the Peace Corps.

“(c) ACCESS TO COMMUNICATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall determine the level of access to communication, including cellular and Internet access, of each volunteer.

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this section, the President shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on the costs, feasibility, and benefits of providing all volunteers with access to adequate communication, including cellular service and Internet access.”.

SEC. 3. RETENTION OF COUNSEL FOR CRIME VICTIMS.

Section 5(1) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2504(1)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and counsel may be employed and counsel fees, court costs and other expenses may be paid in the support of volunteers who are parties, complaining witnesses, or otherwise participating in the prosecution of crimes committed against such volunteers”.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON STAFFING OF OFFICE OF VICTIM ADVOCACY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Office of Victim Advocacy established under section 8C of the Peace Corps Act, as added by section 2, should provide an adequate number of victim advocates so that each victim of crime receives critical information and support;

(2) any full-time victim advocates and any additional victim advocates should be credentialed by a national victims assistance body; and

(3) the training required under section 8A(a) of the Peace Corps Act, as added by section 2, should be credentialed by a national victims assistance body.

SEC. 5. PERSONAL SERVICE CONTRACTS.

The Peace Corps Act is amended—

(1) in section 7(a)(3) (22 U.S.C. 2506(a)(3)), by inserting “, or contracted with for personal services under section 10(a)(5),” after “employed, appointed, or assigned under this subsection”; and

(2) in section 10(a)(5) (22 U.S.C. 2509(a)(5)), by striking “any purpose” and inserting “the purposes of any law administered by the Office of Personnel Management (except that the President may determine the applicability to such individuals of provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.))”.

SEC. 6. INDEPENDENCE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE PEACE CORPS.

Section 7(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2506(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) The limitations specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) and in paragraph (5) shall not apply to—

“(A) the Inspector General of the Peace Corps; and

“(B) officers and employees of the Office of the Inspector General of the Peace Corps.”.

SEC. 7. CONFORMING SAFETY AND SECURITY AGREEMENT REGARDING PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS SERVING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Peace Corps shall consult with the Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security and enter into a memorandum of understanding that specifies the duties and obligations of the Peace Corps and the Bureau of Diplomatic Security of the Department of State with respect to the protection of Peace Corps volunteers and staff members serving in foreign countries, including with respect to investigations of safety and security incidents and crimes committed against volunteers and staff members.

(b) INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Inspector General of the Peace Corps shall review the memorandum of understanding described in subsection (a) and be afforded the opportunity to recommend changes that advance the safety and security of Peace Corps volunteers before entry into force of the memorandum of understanding.

(2) REPORT.—The Director of the Peace Corps shall consider the recommendations of the Inspector General of the Peace Corps regarding the memorandum of understanding described in subsection (a). If the Director enters into the memorandum of understanding without implementing a recommendation of the Inspector General, the Director shall submit to the Inspector General a written explanation relating thereto.

(c) FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.—

(1) REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT REPORT.—If, by the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Peace Corps is unable to obtain agreement with the Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security and certification by the Inspector General of the Peace Corps, the Director shall submit to the committees of Congress specified in paragraph (2) a report explaining the reasons for such failure and a certification that substantial steps are being taken to make progress toward agreement.

(2) COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS SPECIFIED.—The committees of Congress specified in this paragraph are the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8. PORTFOLIO REVIEWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Peace Corps shall, at least once every 3 years, perform a review to evaluate the allocation and delivery of resources across the countries the Peace Corps serves or is considering for service. Such portfolio reviews shall at a minimum include the following with respect to each such country:

(1) An evaluation of the country’s commitment to the Peace Corps program.

(2) An analysis of the safety and security of volunteers.

(3) An evaluation of the country’s need for assistance.

(4) An analysis of country program costs.

(5) An evaluation of the effectiveness of management of each post within a country.

(6) An evaluation of the country’s congruence with the Peace Corp’s mission and strategic priorities.

(b) BRIEFING.—Upon request of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate or the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Director of the Peace Corps shall brief such committees on each portfolio review required under subsection (a). If requested, each such briefing shall discuss performance measures and sources of data used (such as project status reports,

volunteer surveys, impact studies, reports of Inspector General of the Peace Corps, and any relevant external sources) in making the findings and conclusions in such review.

SEC. 9. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) INCLUSION OF SEXUAL ASSAULT RISK-REDUCTION AND RESPONSE TRAINING.—The Peace Corps Act is amended—

(1) in section 5(a) (22 U.S.C. 2504(a)), in the second sentence, by inserting “(including training under section 8A)” after “training”; and

(2) in section 8(a) (22 U.S.C. 2507(a)), in the first sentence, by inserting “, including training under section 8A,” after “training”.

(b) CERTAIN SERVICES.—Section 5(e) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2504(e)) is amended, in the first sentence—

(1) by inserting “(including, if necessary, for volunteers and trainees, services under section 8B)” after “health care”; and

(2) by inserting “including services provided in accordance with section 8B (except that the six-month limitation shall not apply in the case of such services),” before “as the President”.

SEC. 10. OFFSET OF COSTS AND PERSONNEL.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the Peace Corps shall—

(1) eliminate such initiatives, positions, and programs within the Peace Corps (other than within the Office of Inspector General) as the Director deems necessary to ensure any and all costs incurred to carry out the provisions of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, are entirely offset;

(2) ensure no net increase in personnel are added to carry out the provisions of this Act, with any new full or part time employees or equivalents offset by eliminating an equivalent number of existing staff (other than within the Office of Inspector General);

(3) report to Congress not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act the actions taken to ensure compliance with paragraphs (1) and (2), including the specific initiatives, positions, and programs within the Peace Corps that have been eliminated to ensure that the costs of carrying out this Act will be offset; and

(4) not implement any other provision of this Act (other than paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)) or any amendment made by this Act until the Director has certified that the actions specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) have been completed.

SEC. 11. SUNSET.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall cease to be effective 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of Senate bill 1280, the Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act of 2011.

This bill represents the culmination of bipartisan and bicameral efforts to remedy long-standing problems in the Peace Corps regarding the way that rapes, sexual assault, and other violent crimes committed against Peace Corps volunteers serving overseas are handled.

Senate bill 1280 incorporates structural reforms in the Peace Corps that I had proposed in my bill, H.R. 2699. These are based on recommendations made by the Peace Corps Inspector General. It also incorporates the essential provisions of Representative POE's bill, H.R. 2337, to bring best practices to the Peace Corps' response to victims of sexual assault. Both of these bills, Mr. Speaker, were adopted by our House Foreign Affairs Committee by unanimous consent.

Senate bill 1280 is named in honor of a brave Peace Corps volunteer from the State of Georgia who lost her life while serving in Africa. Kate Puzey was brutally murdered in Benin when she tried to end the continuing rape of her students by reporting the assailant.

Earlier this year, in an oversight hearing held by our Committee on Foreign Affairs, we heard from Kate's mom, Lois Puzey, who testified that the Peace Corps failed to protect the confidentiality of Kate's report, and this ultimately led to the murder of her daughter. We also heard testimony from three former Peace Corps volunteers who were raped overseas. They all relayed accounts about the deplorable treatment they received by the Peace Corps after they reported their rapes.

Without the chilling testimony of these brave individuals who came forward, I do not believe that successful reform legislation like this would have been possible. They deserve the utmost respect, and they are to be commended for their bravery. Many of them are in the visitors' gallery today. Jess, Carol, Karestan, and Kate are the voices of the Peace Corps' own volunteers from across the decades, voices that can no longer be ignored.

During the course of our investigation, the House Foreign Affairs Committee received dozens of affidavits from other victims in the Peace Corps, echoing their plea for change. The accounts of these victims unveiled an institution that had too often blamed the victim and treated reports of rape as a threat to its reputation. Despite their harrowing experiences, most volunteers who have been victims of sexual assault continue to support the Peace Corps and remain committed to its noble mission—to promote world peace and friendship between peoples from different cultures.

Director Aaron Williams has begun to make important changes to better protect and serve volunteers in the Peace Corps. However, deeper reforms are needed; and the legislation before us today, which was adopted by our Foreign Affairs Committee, requires the Peace Corps to make these changes.

Senate bill 1280 combines two of our House bills, and it requires the Peace Corps to establish a confidentiality policy for reporting sexual assault. The bill sets up an Office of Victims Advocacy to oversee the response to sexual assault and other violent crimes. It also establishes a Sexual Assault Advisory Council to provide guidance to the Peace Corps volunteers and to ensure that it continues to follow the best practices as they evolve in the field.

Under this bill, the Peace Corps must keep crime statistics and track them in annual safety and security reports. It directs the Peace Corps to perform portfolio reviews to evaluate the countries where volunteers serve, including an evaluation of their safety and their security. This bill enhances the independence of the Peace Corps Inspector General by exempting that office from the 5-year limitation of Peace Corps tenure. It instructs that a Memorandum of Understanding be entered into between the Department of State and the Peace Corps, delineating responsibility for crime victim support.

I urge all Members to support this important legislation in honor of Kate Puzey and to vote in favor of Senate bill 1280. Help reform the Peace Corps to make it the polished gem of U.S. diplomacy that it was always meant to be.

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

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

I rise in strong support of S. 1280, the Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act of 2011. Today marks an important step towards improving the safety and security of volunteers who serve in the Peace Corps.

The Foreign Affairs Committee took up the issue of volunteer safety earlier this year after the broadcast of an extremely disturbing report on the ABC News program "20/20." The segment detailed the experiences of a number of young volunteers who were sexually assaulted while serving overseas but who did not receive the care and support they needed from the Peace Corps. The show also examined the circumstances surrounding the tragic death of Kate Puzey, a volunteer in the west African country of Benin who was murdered after reporting that a fellow teacher was sexually abusing some of his students.

In May we held a very useful hearing on these issues, with witnesses that included returned volunteers who were survivors of sexual assault, the Inspector General of the Peace Corps, and the Peace Corps Director. Based on the testimony we received at the hearing and in consultations with other interested parties, we drafted a bipartisan bill to improve the Peace Corps, and that legislation is reflected in the Senate bill we are taking up today.

Some of the key provisions include requiring the agency to have comprehensive policies and training for volunteers and staff on risk reduction

and response; the establishment of a victim support office to focus exclusively on supporting victims of sexual assault and other crimes; and completing a Memorandum of Understanding between the Peace Corps and the State Department, clarifying security-related responsibilities.

I think it's important to point out that Peace Corps Director Aaron Williams has already taken a number of important steps to improve the support for victims of sexual assault and other crimes. For example, the Peace Corps has hired a victim's advocate, established a confidentiality policy, and started the process of rewriting and updating their sexual assault risk reduction and response policies and training.

□ 1750

This bill codifies some of the important measures that Director Williams has put in place to ensure that they're retained by future Directors.

On its 50th anniversary, the Peace Corps continues to perform a vital role in promoting community-based development in some of the world's poorest countries, sharing American values and enriching our own Nation by bringing knowledge of other countries and cultures back to the United States.

No agency with such a modest budget has done more than the Peace Corps to extend America's presence in nearly every part of the world, and none has enjoyed such strong bipartisan support. This comprehensive, balanced, and bipartisan bill will strengthen the Peace Corps and help ensure that the agency can continue to do its important work well into the future.

I want to thank Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN and Senators BOXER and ISAKSON and their staffs and all our staffs for working so well together on these important issues. And I particularly want to single out Congressman POE, because without his initial thrust, I don't think we would be at this point today. I think he deserves the appreciation of the entire body and of the people who are most impacted by this legislation for his efforts and for his willingness to work with us in such a cooperative fashion.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am honored to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, the wind beneath our wings, the man who started this ball rolling, the author of H.R. 2337, which was incorporated into the bill before us today. And as Mr. BERMAN, my good friend from California, has pointed out, Judge POE has been the inspiration for this legislation before us today.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentle lady for yielding. And I appreciate the chair and the ranking member for relentlessly pushing this issue to the House floor as fast as it was possible and to the good folks down at the Senate, Senator BOXER and Senator ISAKSON, who are the initial sponsors of

H.R. 2337 on which we will, here today, vote on in a bipartisan way.

This legislation is bipartisan because it deals with victims of crime, American victims of crime. And victims are not a partisan bunch; they're just victims. And when someone picks out a victim to commit a crime against, partisanship doesn't play any part in it. And it's good to see that partisanship doesn't play any part in this legislation in opposing it, but it's a bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there's a group of Americans; they are really special people. I call them the American ambassadors abroad. They are young people. A lot of them are young females right out of college. It started with a concept that President Kennedy had many years ago, and it's called the Peace Corps, where these American angels abroad leave their homes in the 50 States and they go to remote parts of the world where many of us would have to look up on a globe or an atlas or the Internet to find out exactly where they are. We've never heard of these places. They are in third-world countries, primarily. They go out where many times the first Americans these folks have ever seen in this country are those Peace Corps volunteers that show up, and they show up for the sole purpose to make life better for these people overseas, sometimes in very small villages. They go and they work in very primitive conditions and live very difficultly, trying to do something really important to make the world a better place. And they do. They are remarkable people.

When they go overseas, as they have done for the last 50 years, and all over the world, sometimes crimes are committed against them. Sometimes they are very serious crimes. Sometimes that includes sexual assault, rape. And it occurs for a lot of reasons, but it does occur. Unfortunately, the Peace Corps back home for a long time ignored some of these crimes and some of these victims, and they just weren't treated right when they were trying to cry out, saying, Hey, this happened to me over there; take care of me when I come back home.

But now this legislation that has been very carefully drafted will fix that problem. It will move us to a direction where we are going to take care of these Peace Corps volunteers because what they do is important. What the Peace Corps does is important. We just want to improve it so that more and more people go and join the Peace Corps, but yet they feel safe in what they do.

These crimes against our Peace Corps volunteers came to light really at the end of last year, the beginning of this year. One reason it came to light was because of an ABC "20/20" special that aired on January 14, outlining the plight of individual Peace Corps volunteers and how they were treated—first the crime, and then sometimes continuing to be criminalized. In some

cases, our volunteers were treated like the criminals and they weren't treated like victims—the offender sometimes was treated like a victim of a crime—and those days need to end.

Mr. Speaker, I have been around a courthouse most of my life down in Texas as a prosecutor, as a criminal court judge, and I tried a lot of bad, serious cases. One of those cases that comes to the courthouses throughout our country is the crime of sexual assault, or rape. That is a unique crime because, you see, many times when the offender commits that crime against primarily a female, it has nothing to do with sex; it has everything to do with power and the destruction of that person's identity. These offenders in some cases try to destroy the soul of that victim, destroy their identity. And that is why, when the crime is committed, we treat those victims with special respect, as they rightfully deserve.

This legislation does that. It improves the Peace Corps. It makes it a better institution. But it tells our young people that when you go somewhere in the world to represent America, to do something good, just to do something good for somebody else with no other motive, that we are going to do everything we can to protect you, and then we are going to hold people accountable for what they do to you. And we are going to do everything we can, as Americans, to take care of you if a crime is committed against you.

In the last 10 years, Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps has witnessed over 100 sexual assaults a year against its volunteers. That's 100 too many. We want to bring it down to zero.

As the chairman has mentioned about this legislation, it does several things:

It creates and requires the Peace Corps to follow best practices in training volunteers and responding to assaults against these young people;

Second, it creates a system of restricted and unrestricted reporting so victims have control over their own information and can report only as much as they are comfortable with; and

Third, it sets up an advisory council to help the Peace Corps develop programs. It helps the Peace Corps' sexual assault policy and implements it.

I do want to thank the 87 cosponsors in the House for signing on the legislation that I have sponsored. I do want to thank the chairman again for the legislation she has sponsored; both passed, as she said, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously in a bipartisan way.

And I do want to thank the Puzey family, sending their daughter overseas and having dealt with the murder of their own child. None of us want to ever see our children die before our time. I have got four kids. Three of them are girls. I've got nine grandkids. And as parents, we don't want to see that happen.

But their ability to come forward to tell that story and the story that oth-

ers have told, Peace Corps volunteers who are here today, Jess, Karestan, Carol, and Liz, they were willing to come before the Foreign Affairs Committee and testify about what happened to them and the consequences of that. I want to thank them for being willing to be here today and also to testify.

□ 1800

But I also want to thank the Members of Congress for moving this as fast as we can. With all that we're doing and going on and the economy and all of this, it's important that this legislation pass today.

I do believe these young people are America's angels abroad. Sometimes because of the economy and other reasons, we forget the greatness of America. This is a great land. And one of the reasons, one of the reasons it's great is because of the people who are here. One of the reasons those people are great is because they do things for other people. They go to lands they have never been to and they do things for people they don't even know. And those are the Peace Corps volunteers.

I appreciate the time to speak on this. I hope that it passes unanimously and sends a message to those Peace Corps volunteers: We support you. We support the Peace Corps. We want it to live 50 more years, and this bill helps those American ambassadors abroad.

SARAH LEE, CURRENT VOLUNTEER FROM TEXAS

A woman, let's call her Sarah Lee, who is serving in the Peace Corps in a foreign country right now contacted me. Sarah Lee loves her job and the organization, but can't get past the fact that she feels completely unsafe.

"Throughout my service," she writes, "I have witnessed the sorry manner in which volunteers are regarded, treated, and protected by Peace Corps. It is patently false that volunteers in X country could ever be regarded as 'safe.'"

Last year, Sarah Lee was assaulted by another person that was old enough to be her father. They were staying at another volunteer's house and she fell asleep on the couch. She was awakened in the middle of the night by the assailant inappropriately touching and kissing her.

She reported this to national Peace Corps staff, and talked to several members of the executive staff, as well as the Peace Corps Medical Officer. She was told to not leave her village. Another volunteer came to stay with her because she was having anxiety attacks and insomnia and didn't want to be alone.

While Peace Corps was investigating, the accused volunteer was traveling the country, staying at overnight PC houses in bedrooms occupied by female volunteers.

The investigators assigned to her case were terrible. Because she was from Texas, they asked if she didn't have more "conservative" notions of propriety than the perpetrator—as if this was just a violation of her southern sensibilities and the perpetrator had every right to assault her. They also told her she was attractive, so she must be assaulted like this a lot. When she asked about pressing charges, they discouraged her. They said a case like this had never been tried before, that it would be

a precedent setting case, and that if she failed, it could hurt future cases.

Eventually the Peace Corps flew Sarah Lee back to the United States, but her counselor was just as bad as the investigators. While she was sobbing, the counselor kept asking her how she felt. Because a Peace Corps Volunteer can only be kept on medical hold for a certain amount of days, she was rushed back to her country even though she did not feel ready and was still suffering from panic attacks and insomnia. When a fellow in-country volunteer urged her supervisor to give Sarah Lee more counseling, they let her talk to a counselor twice on the phone before telling her to just email—even though she has to drive to the next town for Internet access.

In the end, the perpetrator quit rather than face being fired. Nothing will appear on his record. Peace Corps never did give Sarah Lee information on how to press charges.

Sarah Lee also talks about how male teachers at the school she teaches at have repeatedly raped her students, but she can't tell anyone. The Peace Corps still has not provided a mechanism through which volunteers can report crimes without the fear of reprisal.

MARY JOE, MOZAMBIQUE 2007

Mary Joe always wanted to help people. After she graduated from Seattle University, she worked for a year at a non-profit that tutored low-income housing kids.

She joined the Peace Corps the next year because she wanted to help people abroad and, given Peace Corps' reputation, thought this was the safe way to go.

In 2007, she was sent to Cambine, Mozambique to teach English to high schoolers.

One night in the fall she went to dinner in the next town over with some fellow volunteers. While at the restaurant, her drink was drugged by a man the group had met there. The next thing she remembers is being in a car with a man sexually assaulting her. A fellow Peace Corps volunteer saw what was going on and pulled her from the car. Mary Joe blacked out again until the next morning, when she woke up and called the Peace Corps medical officer, who told her to come to the capital and get checked out.

When she arrived the next day, she was denied a rape kit by the medical officer, who said she was drunk—not assaulted. In fact, before he would give her medicine to fight against possible AIDS exposure as a result of the assault, the medical officer made her write down that she was drunk and not raped. She was told to come back in a month to find out if she had AIDS.

With no further care, it was clear that Mary Joe was not okay. Back at her post, she was startled by and had crying fits over the littlest things, couldn't sleep, was depressed, didn't want to leave her house, and had terrible nightmares. Mary Joe was disoriented and couldn't think clearly for months, yet she was asked to make big decisions. She needed someone intimately familiar with her case who could advocate on her behalf. After 2 weeks, she finally called her country director, who put her in touch with a Peace Corps psychologist in Washington, DC. The psychologist had her medevaced back to her hometown in Tucson on Halloween in 2007.

While in Tucson she was given 3 sessions with a counselor and 3 sessions with a psychiatrist. Following her counselor's recommendation, Mary Joe was medically separated from the Peace Corps.

Because she was no longer with the Peace Corps, she had to go through the Department of Labor to get her medical care. She was never told that she had to have a psychologist or psychiatrist sign her workers compensation claim, so when she submitted it with her counselor's signature, it was denied. By the time she was able to see a psychologist, it was too late to appeal the claim. She never received any more care from the Federal Government for her PTSD.

BILLIE JO, ROMANIA 1993

Billie Jo served in Romania from 1993 to 1995. From the day she arrived until the day she left, she was constantly harassed physically and verbally.

She couldn't walk out of the house without hearing cat calls. She was spit on, punched, had chestnuts and rocks thrown at her, and her life threatened. She was fondled so much while riding public transportation that she finally gave up and walked everywhere.

Peace Corps knew sexual assaults were happening to all volunteers and even talked about it in training, but they didn't take it seriously, she said. No legal recourse was offered and when a young man exposed himself to Billie Jo and her friend on the beach, the Peace Corps country director told her to "stay out of harm's way."

Eventually, Billie Jo requested a new location, Peace Corps staff refused. "No one seemed to care," she explained.

When she got back to the U.S., Billie Jo had to get counselor services through her own health care insurance because Peace Corps didn't provide any help.

Billie Jo warned Peace Corps staff not to send women to her post, but they did anyway. The young Jewish woman that came after her returned home after only a few months into her service when swastikas were drawn on her building wall.

JESS SMOCHKEK, BANGLADESH 2004

Jess Smochkek joined the Peace Corps in 2004. Her first day in Bangladesh, a group of men groped and kissed her as she walked towards her host family's house, but no one did anything to stop them.

She told Peace Corps staff over and over again that she felt unsafe, but again, no one did anything.

Months later, this same group of men kidnapped her, beat her up, and sexually assaulted her.

They left her unconscious in a back alley.

The Peace Corps did everything they could to cover it up because they were more worried about what the officials in Bangladesh might think than caring for her.

The Peace Corps blamed Jess for the attack, saying she shouldn't have been walking alone after 5pm and forced her to write down all the things she had done wrong that caused this to happen.

Rape is never the victim's fault. Ever.

When she finally got to return home, she was to tell volunteers that she was having her wisdom teeth pulled out.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time; and with the urging that the body do pass this, and hopefully pass this unanimously, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

For 50 years Peace Corps volunteers have given their generous talents and

skills to help the poor in developing countries, thereby increasing understanding between diverse cultures. Peace Corps volunteers live within the communities that they serve, and they are often located in places with unreliable access to communication, nor to the police, nor for medical services. And historically, sadly, media have underplayed the dangers of serving in the Peace Corps and they have underreported or overlooked any criticism or any problem related to the Peace Corps.

But now their own volunteers, the Peace Corps' own volunteers, have come forward with a demand for change. Congress has had several previous opportunities to help pass reform legislation to help the Peace Corps better protect its volunteers overseas. But, sadly, these efforts and these previous attempts have fallen short.

Now we have this bill, Senate bill S. 1280, that has had bipartisan and bicameral support and was drafted with the input from the Peace Corps itself and from the volunteers also.

It is unacceptable that U.S. citizens, Peace Corps volunteers, do not enjoy protection from regional security officers who are stationed at our overseas diplomatic posts because their role in protecting volunteers has not been clearly defined. Regional security officers are United States law enforcement officials. They're deployed overseas, and they are in the best position to serve U.S. citizens and work with their foreign law enforcement counterparts to seek justice on behalf of crime victims. As the Peace Corps Inspector General reported over 18 months ago, further delay in forming this Memorandum of Understanding could compromise volunteer safety and hinder response to crimes against volunteers.

The language in this bill states that if the MOU is not entered into within 6 months of the bill becoming law, then the Director must report to the committee on the reasons for failing to meet this deadline, along with a detailed certification on steps taken toward meeting this requirement in a timely fashion.

This language is the result of extensive bipartisan consultation, including regular discussion with our counterparts in the Senate. This bill is a substantial step forward and will help address longstanding safety and security problems for volunteers. For the brave victims who came forward and for Kate Puzey who gave her life in the service of the Peace Corps, help us pass this bill.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act. I am a Returned Peace Corps Volunteer, steadfast Peace Corps champion, and original cosponsor of the House version of this legislation. Kate Puzey was an intelligent, brave young woman from Georgia who was tragically murdered while serving in the Peace Corps in Benin. I was

privileged to speak with Kate's family about what a remarkable person Kate was, and I am deeply inspired by the Puzey family's commitment to turn unspeakable heartbreak into important action to ensure that what happened to Kate never, ever happens again. Kate truly represented the best of what Peace Corps can be and this legislation in her honor ensures that all Volunteers will get the best possible protections and training.

I was very troubled to hear the stories of other Volunteers who have received insufficient or insensitive support during their Peace Corps service. Earlier this year, I spoke with two courageous returned Volunteers, Karestan Koenen and Jessica Smoczek, and learned about their traumatic experiences of rape and sexual assault while serving in the Peace Corps and the inadequate assistance they received afterward. These two women, like every Volunteer, deserve the best possible support, and I commend them and the other returned Volunteer victims who have bravely come forward and shared their stories. Like the Puzey family, the trauma these individuals have suffered is unimaginable, but their actions have already helped to make Peace Corps a stronger agency.

I applaud Peace Corps Director Aaron Williams for taking immediate action to reform the agency's commitment to safety, sexual assault prevention and response, and security. Director Williams has worked closely with the Puzey family, returned Volunteers, and experts in victims' rights to develop new policies and strengthen existing ones to enhance the support and safety of Volunteers. These reforms include appointing the agency's first Victim Advocate, implementing a new Volunteer and staff sexual assault training, and signing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Rape, Abuse and Incest National Network (RAINN) to collaborate on sexual assault prevention. Peace Corps has also created a Peace Corps Volunteer Sexual Assault Panel which provides advice and input on sexual assault risk reduction and response strategies. The Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act both codifies and compliments the important reforms that Director Williams has put in place so that the next generation of Volunteers like Kate, Karestan, and Jessica will have the safety protections; compassionate, informed support; and necessary resources they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, Peace Corps Volunteers represent the best of what America has to offer and it is only right that America offers them the best. I thank the Puzey family, Karestan, Jessica, and all the returned Volunteers and advocates who have committed themselves to making Peace Corps a better, stronger agency. The efforts of their work will forever benefit future generations of Peace Corps Volunteers.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 2009, Kate Puzey, a 24-year-old native of Cumming, Georgia and Peace Corps volunteer was killed outside of her home in Badjoude, Benin where she worked as an English teacher. She was murdered by a Beninese Peace Corps contract employee after she reported that he had raped and sexually abused students they taught together. Had the legislation we are considering here today, S. 1280, The Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act of 2011 been law when Ms. Puzey first arrived in Benin in 2007, it might have saved her life.

Today, the Peace Corps does not require its volunteers to receive training in risk reduction or in how to recognize and respond to incidences of sexual assault. And, unlike other federal agencies, Peace Corps volunteers do not enjoy whistleblower protections. It is a shame that it took the untimely death of Ms. Puzey to focus our attention on the necessity of addressing these issues.

S. 1280 directs the Peace Corps to establish sexual assault response teams made up of safety and security officers, medical staff, and a victim's advocate that can respond to reports of sexual assaults against a volunteer; requires the immediate removal of any volunteer who feels at risk of imminent bodily harm; and, requires the Peace Corps to develop and implement a process to allow volunteers to report incidents of misconduct or mismanagement, or violations of any policy of the Peace Corps in order to protect the confidentiality and safety of such volunteers.

Every year, hundreds of conscientious young Peace Corps volunteers like Kate Puzey, support communities around the world, helping those less fortunate than themselves. As with members of our Armed Forces, these dedicated global public servants deserve to know their country is committed to their safety and will do all it can to protect them.

As a cosponsor of the House analogue to this bill, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of S. 1280, in memory of the work and sacrifice of Kate Puzey and for the sake of those who choose to follow her into the Peace Corps.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1280, the Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act of 2011. This bill is named after a brave young woman who was murdered while volunteering with the Peace Corps in Benin in 2009. S. 1280 is a vital component in the effort to protect Peace Corps volunteers who are dedicated to public service, like Kate Puzey, from unnecessary and senseless violence.

In the two years since Kate's death, much attention has been focused on concerns about the safety of Peace Corps volunteers, and I applaud the Peace Corps for instituting essential improvements to their Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program in the wake of this tragedy. To implement further protections, S. 1280 will expand the Peace Corps' safety precautions in several concrete, practical ways.

S. 1280 will ensure that all applicants are provided with a historical analysis of crimes and risks in their prospective countries of service, will provide further protection for female volunteers who are particularly vulnerable while living in foreign countries, and will institute sexual run assault risk-reduction and response training and country-specific means of seeking care. It contains provisions that will protect the anonymity of volunteers who report sexual assault and allows them to report cases to the Inspector General. It will also increase government accountability in responding to sexual assault through a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, a committee of past volunteers and experts who will ensure the Peace Corps is executing best practices.

As a returned Peace Corps volunteer who served in El Salvador, I have personally witnessed the ways in which the Peace Corps provides opportunities for personal and professional development for young Americans. Dur-

ing my time as a volunteer, I was transformed from a young college graduate with little direction into a confident public servant with a passion for eradicating poverty. The pride one feels in being an ambassador for their country is immeasurable, and I will always keep the lessons I learned in the Peace Corps close to my heart. For these reasons, I continue to advocate for the expansion of the Peace Corps into double the number of countries in which it currently operates. After all, for the cost of sending one soldier to Afghanistan, we could send thirteen Peace Corps Volunteers to serve their country in the name of peace.

While my experience in the Peace Corps exposed me to myriad positive opportunities, I am aware that some volunteers have served in dangerous or threatening situations. By implementing strong safety standards and a firm protocol for handling sexual assault and harassment, women in the Peace Corps will no longer be subjected to intimidation and exposed to danger. This will enable even more volunteers to take advantage of the same opportunities for growth I did. I urge my colleagues to pass the Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act so we can continue to provide a positive and fulfilling experience for all Peace Corps volunteers.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1280, the Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act of 2011.

S. 1280 honors the memory of Kate Puzey. Kate, a 24-year-old Peace Corps volunteer from the state of Georgia, was murdered in 2009 while serving as a teacher in a village in the West African country of Benin.

Shortly before her death, Kate had reported that a foreign national, working under contract for the Peace Corps, had allegedly molested some of the young girls.

Kate had requested anonymity and confidentiality because the man's brother worked at the Peace Corps office.

Unfortunately Kate is not the only Peace Corps volunteer who has been victimized while serving overseas.

During the last 10 years, Peace Corps volunteers have reported an average of 22 rapes and 267 assaults per year.

Not only are these statistics far higher than the national average, according to 2008 data from the Department of Justice, but Peace Corps data suggest twice as many assaults occur than are reported.

S. 1280 provides much-needed reform of the Peace Corps to protect volunteers against sexual assault and other violent crimes and to care for victims of such crimes.

Specifically the bill provides risk-reduction and response training, a new Office of Victims Advocacy, confidential reporting, and other measures.

For the sake of the 8,655 Peace Corps volunteers serving in 77 countries around the world, representing the best of our country's values, often at great personal risk, I urge the passage of this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1280, "The Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act of 2011." This bill amends the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training. It requires the development of a comprehensive sexual assault policy, the establishment of an Office of Victim Advocacy, and the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory.

On October 14, 1960, during the final three weeks of the presidential campaign, candidate John F. Kennedy addressed students at the University of Michigan. He challenged these students to give two years of their lives to help people in developing countries. The root of the Peace Corps is in former President Kennedy's challenge to those students, and to us all. Since the Peace Corps was founded, more than 200,000 volunteers have served in 139 countries, helping people build better lives for themselves, and better futures for their children.

The Peace Corps mission trains the citizens of developing nations in a vast variety of skills and subjects, promotes a better understanding of Americans, and promotes a better understanding of the culture of the nation in which they are serving. Those who volunteer their service to the Peace Corps are fulfilling an unwritten commandment of service to the least among us, and their safety must be protected. The Peace Corps has served as a great vehicle of cultural exchange and awareness for the last 50 years and I applaud the organization and all of its volunteers. However, the Peace Corp must do more to address the concerns raised by current and former volunteers and establish a comprehensive sexual assault program.

At this time 234 of the 7,109 volunteers, nearly five percent of all members, are from my home state of Texas, where I represent the 18th Congressional District. These altruistic Texans currently serve people in Belize, Zambia and Kazakhstan, and other developing nations throughout the world. I commend all of the brave humanitarians serving in the Peace Corps. We must ensure that all Peace Corps volunteers receive the training they need to provide for their safety and security as they travel the world.

This bill was named after a Peace Corp volunteer Kate Puzey. Kate was serving in Benin on the Western coast of Africa when she began to suspect that some of the young girls in the village were being sexually exploited. Kate informed the School Director, who did not want to confront the suspected individual. Kate's mother reports that Kate was becoming increasingly concerned with his behavior, and in February, 2009, he confessed to Kate that he had raped two students. Because there were no clearly outlined procedures to report such complaints, Kate had no official avenue to report the disturbing information. Furthermore, Constant Bio's brother worked as an Assistant Director in local Peace Corps Headquarters, so, in late February 2009, Kate elected to travel to another Peace Corps work-station where she requested assistance from the Peace Corps Benin Director.

On March 2, 2009, Kate was emailed, confirming receipt of her report, and four days later, she was sent another email informing her Mr. Bio's contract would not be renewed, and that he would be informed why. Kate never received these emails; not having Internet access in her village, she had requested to be contacted by phone. Her confidentiality was not maintained, and her accused killer was informed of her role in his firing. On March 11, 2009, Kate was found murdered at her home in the village of Badjoude. Mr. Bio is currently in custody for this horrific murder.

Unfortunately, the tragic murder of Kate Puzey is not the only devastating event that has affected a Peace Corps volunteer. An av-

erage of 22 women reported being raped in the Peace Corps every year between 2000 and 2009. I am greatly saddened that any of our Peace Corp volunteers, our nation's representatives have suffered from the malicious crimes of sexual assault.

I am further troubled that many of these crimes have not received the attention they deserve. The victim of a sexual assault, should not be victimized again by inaction. This bill would provide men and women with the knowledge they need to report and act upon reports of sexual assault. According to the Congressional Research Service, 60 percent of volunteers in the Peace Corps are women, with an average age of 28 years old. It is essential that these volunteers are protected.

The Peace Corps was established to show the world that America's greatness is cemented in its goal to maintain world peace and friendship. Thousands of Americans have volunteered to promote these values through kind deeds in countries whose cultural attitudes and values are much different than those of America's, especially towards women. In this country, we value women's rights, and implement laws and policies to protect those rights. When those laws are violated, we go to great lengths to see that justice prevails.

We, as all Americans, value the Peace Corps. This Congress has passed legislation that makes it possible for the Peace Corps to continue doing its great work representing the essence of America's values. With this legislation, in honor of Kate Puzey, Congress will ensure that the Peace Corps will be sufficiently responsive and sensitive to victims of crime. I am pleased to support this bill, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1280.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of S. 1280, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 31

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1280) to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, the develop-

ment of a sexual assault policy, the establishment of an Office of Victim Advocacy, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate shall make the following corrections:

Amend section 8C of the Peace Corps Act, in the quoted material in section 2 of the bill, by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) SUNSET.—This section shall cease to be effective on October 1, 2018.”.

Amend section 8D of the Peace Corps Act, in the quoted material in section 2 of the bill, by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) SUNSET.—This section shall cease to be effective on October 1, 2018.”.

Amend section 8E of the Peace Corps Act, in the quoted material in section 2 of the bill—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “The President shall annually conduct” and inserting “Annually through September 30, 2018, the President shall conduct”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “a biennial report” and inserting “a report, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, and biennially through September 30, 2018,”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this section and every three years thereafter” and inserting “not later than two years and five years after the date of the enactment of this section”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) PORTFOLIO REVIEWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, at least once every 3 years, perform a review to evaluate the allocation and delivery of resources across the countries the Peace Corps serves or is considering for service. Such portfolio reviews shall at a minimum include the following with respect to each such country:

“(A) An evaluation of the country's commitment to the Peace Corps program.

“(B) An analysis of the safety and security of volunteers.

“(C) An evaluation of the country's need for assistance.

“(D) An analysis of country program costs.

“(E) An evaluation of the effectiveness of management of each post within a country.

“(F) An evaluation of the country's congruence with the Peace Corp's mission and strategic priorities.

“(2) BRIEFING.—Upon request of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate or the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the President shall brief such committees on each portfolio review required under paragraph (1). If requested, each such briefing shall discuss performance measures and sources of data used (such as project status reports, volunteer surveys, impact studies, reports of Inspector General of the Peace Corps, and any relevant external sources) in making the findings and conclusions in such review.”.

Amend section 8I(a) of the Peace Corps Act, in the quoted material in section 2, by inserting “through September 30, 2018,” after “annually”.

Strike section 8.

Redesignate sections 9 and 10 as sections 8 and 9, respectively.

Strike section 11.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 13, by the yeas and nays;

S. 1280, by the yeas and nays.

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

REAFFIRMING "IN GOD WE TRUST" AS THE OFFICIAL MOTTO OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 13) reaffirming "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States and supporting and encouraging the public display of the national motto in all public buildings, public schools, and other government institutions, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 9, answered "present" 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 816]

YEAS—396

Adams	Becerra	Boustany
Aderholt	Benishek	Brady (PA)
Alexander	Berg	Brady (TX)
Altmire	Berkley	Braley (IA)
Amodel	Berman	Brooks
Andrews	Biggett	Brown (GA)
Austria	Bilbray	Brown (FL)
Baca	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Bachus	Bishop (NY)	Bucshon
Baldwin	Bishop (UT)	Buerkle
Barletta	Black	Burgess
Barrow	Blackburn	Burton (IN)
Bartlett	Bonner	Butterfield
Barton (TX)	Bono Mack	Calvert
Bass (CA)	Boren	Camp
Bass (NH)	Boswell	Campbell

Canseco	Hanabusa	McNerney	Shimkus	Thornberry	Waxman
Cantor	Hanna	Meehan	Shuler	Tiberi	Webster
Capito	Harper	Meeks	Shuster	Tierney	Welch
Capps	Harris	Mica	Simpson	Tipton	West
Capuano	Hartzer	Michaud	Sires	Tonko	Westmoreland
Cardoza	Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)	Slaughter	Towns	Whitfield
Carman	Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)	Turner (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Carney	Hayworth	Miller (NC)	Smith (NJ)	Turner (OH)	Wilson (SC)
Carter	Heck	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)	Upton	Wittman
Cassidy	Heinrich	Miller, George	Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Wolf
Castor (FL)	Hensarling	Moore	Southerland	Velázquez	Womack
Chabot	Herger	Moran	Stearns	Visclosky	Woodall
Chaffetz	Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney	Stivers	Walberg	Woodley
Chandler	Higgins	Murphy (PA)	Stutzman	Walden	Yarmuth
Cicilline	Himes	Murphy (PA)	Sullivan	Walsh (IL)	Yoder
Clarke (MI)	Hinchee	Napolitano	Sutton	Walz (MN)	Young (AK)
Clarke (NY)	Hinojosa	Neal	Terry	Wasserman	Young (FL)
Clay	Hirono	Neugebauer	Thompson (CA)	Schultz	Young (IN)
Clyburn	Hochul	Noem	Thompson (PA)	Walters	
Coble	Holden	Nugent			
Coffman (CO)	Holt	Nunes			
Cohen	Hoyer	Nunnelee	Ackerman	Cleaver	Nadler
Cole	Huelskamp	Olson	Amash	Honda	Scott (VA)
Conaway	Huizenga (MI)	Olver	Chu	Johnson (GA)	Stark
Connolly (VA)	Hultgren	Owens			
Conyers	Hunter	Palazzo			
Cooper	Hurt	Pallone	Ellison	Watt	
Costa	Inslee	Pascrell			
Cravaack	Israel	Pastor (AZ)			
Crawford	Issa	Paulsen	Akin	Diaz-Balart	Murphy (CT)
Crenshaw	Jackson (IL)	Payne	Bachmann	Fattah	Paul
Critz	Jackson Lee	Pearce	Bishop (GA)	Filner	Renacci
Crowley	(TX)	Pelosi	Blumener	Giffords	Richmond
Cuellar	Jenkins	Pence	Carson (IN)	Griffith (VA)	Rush
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Perlmutter	Costello	Gutierrez	Speier
Davis (CA)	Johnson (OH)	Peters	Courtney	Latta	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson	Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Tsongas
Davis (KY)	Johnson, Sam	Petri	DeLauro	Lynch	
DeFazio	Jones	Pingree (ME)			
DeGette	Jordan	Pitts			
Denham	Kaptur	Platts			
Dent	Keating	Poe (TX)			
DesJarlais	Kelly	Polis			
Deutch	Kildee	Pompeo			
Dicks	Kind	Posey			
Dingell	King (IA)	Price (GA)			
Doggett	King (NY)	Price (NC)			
Dold	Kingston	Quayle			
Donnelly (IN)	Kinzinger (IL)	Quigley			
Doyle	Kissell	Rahall			
Dreier	Kline	Rangel			
Duffy	Kucinich	Reed			
Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Rehberg			
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Reichert			
Edwards	Lance	Reyes			
Elmrs	Landry	Ribble			
Emerson	Langevin	Richardson			
Engel	Lankford	Rigell			
Eshoo	Larsen (WA)	Rivera			
Farenthold	Larson (CT)	Roby			
Farr	Latham	Roe (TN)			
Fincher	LaTourette	Rogers (AL)			
Fitzpatrick	Lee (CA)	Rogers (KY)			
Flake	Levin	Rogers (MI)			
Fleischmann	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher			
Fleming	Lipinski	Rokita			
Flores	LoBiondo	Rooney			
Forbes	Loebsock	Ros-Lehtinen			
Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe	Roskam			
Fox	Long	Ross (AR)			
Frank (MA)	Lowey	Ross (FL)			
Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Rothman (NJ)			
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Roybal-Allard			
Fudge	Luján	Royce			
Gallegly	Lummis	Runyan			
Garamendi	Lungren, Daniel	Ruppersberger			
Gardner	E.	Ryan (OH)			
Garrett	Mack	Ryan (WI)			
Gerlach	Maloney	Sánchez, Linda			
Gibbs	Manzullo	T.			
Gibson	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta			
Gingrey (GA)	Marino	Sarbanes			
Gohmert	Markey	Scalise			
Gonzalez	Matheson	Schakowsky			
Goodlatte	Matsui	Schiff			
Gosar	McCarthy (CA)	Schilling			
Gowdy	McCarthy (NY)	Schmidt			
Granger	McCauley	Schock			
Graves (GA)	McClintock	Schrader			
Graves (MO)	McCollum	Schwartz			
Green, Al	McCotter	Schweikert			
Green, Gene	McDermott	Scott (SC)			
Griffin (AR)	McGovern	Scott, Austin			
Grijalva	McHenry	Scott, David			
Grimm	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner			
Guinta	McKeon	Serrano			
Guthrie	McKinley	Sessions			
Hahn	McMorris	Sewell			
Hall	Rodgers	Sherman			

Thornberry	Waxman
Tiberi	Webster
Tierney	Welch
Tipton	West
Tonko	Westmoreland
Towns	Whitfield
Turner (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Turner (OH)	Wilson (SC)
Upton	Wittman
Van Hollen	Wolf
Velázquez	Womack
Visclosky	Woodall
Walberg	Woodley
Walden	Yarmuth
Walsh (IL)	Yoder
Walz (MN)	Young (AK)
Wasserman	Young (FL)
Schultz	Young (IN)
Walters	

NAYS—9

Ackerman	Cleaver	Nadler
Amash	Honda	Scott (VA)
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Stark

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Ellison Watt

NOT VOTING—26

Akin	Diaz-Balart	Murphy (CT)
Bachmann	Fattah	Paul
Bishop (GA)	Filner	Renacci
Blumener	Giffords	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Griffith (VA)	Rush
Costello	Gutierrez	Speier
Courtney	Latta	Thompson (MS)
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Tsongas
DeLauro	Lynch	

□ 1855

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. WATT changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

Mr. DEUTCH changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 816, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 816 I intended to vote "yea." However, my return to the Chamber from a funeral that I was attending was delayed by an unexpected traffic problem.

KATE PUZEY PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER PROTECTION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1280) to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, the development of sexual assault protocol and guidelines, the establishment of victims advocates, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms.

ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 817]

YEAS—406

Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Huizenga (MI)
Adams	Davis (KY)	Hultgren
Aderholt	DeFazio	Hunter
Alexander	DeGette	Hurt
Altmire	Denham	Inslie
Amash	Dent	Israel
Amodei	DesJarlais	Issa
Andrews	Deutch	Jackson (IL)
Austria	Dicks	Jackson Lee
Baca	Dingell	(TX)
Bachus	Doggett	Jenkins
Baldwin	Dold	Johnson (GA)
Barletta	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson (IL)
Barrow	Doyle	Johnson (OH)
Bartlett	Dreier	Johnson, E. B.
Barton (TX)	Duffy	Johnson, Sam
Bass (CA)	Duncan (SC)	Jones
Bass (NH)	Duncan (TN)	Jordan
Becerra	Edwards	Kaptur
Benishek	Ellison	Keating
Berg	Ellmers	Kelly
Berkley	Emerson	Kildee
Berman	Engel	Kind
Biggart	Eshoo	King (IA)
Bilbray	Farenthold	King (NY)
Billirakis	Fincher	Kingston
Bishop (NY)	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Bishop (UT)	Flake	Kissell
Black	Fleischmann	Kline
Blackburn	Fleming	Kucinich
Bonner	Flores	Labrador
Bono Mack	Forbes	Lamborn
Boren	Fortenberry	Lance
Boswell	Fox	Landry
Boustany	Frank (MA)	Langevin
Brady (PA)	Franks (AZ)	Lankford
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Larsen (WA)
Braley (IA)	Fudge	Larson (CT)
Brooks	Galleghy	Latham
Broun (GA)	Garamendi	LaTourette
Brown (FL)	Gardner	Lee (CA)
Buchanan	Garrett	Levin
Bucshon	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Buerkle	Gibbs	Lewis (GA)
Burgess	Gibson	Lipinski
Burton (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo
Butterfield	Gohmert	Loebsack
Calvert	Gonzalez	Lofgren, Zoe
Camp	Goodlatte	Long
Campbell	Gosar	Lowe
Canseco	Gowdy	Lucas
Cantor	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Capito	Graves (GA)	Lujan
Capps	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Capuano	Green, Al	Lungren, Daniel
Cardoza	Green, Gene	E.
Carnahan	Griffin (AR)	Mack
Carney	Griffith (VA)	Maloney
Carter	Grijalva	Manzullo
Cassidy	Grimm	Marchant
Castor (FL)	Guinta	Marino
Chabot	Guthrie	Markey
Chaffetz	Hahn	Matheson
Chandler	Hall	Matsui
Chu	Hanabusa	McCarthy (CA)
Cicilline	Hanna	McCarthy (NY)
Clarke (MI)	Harper	McCaul
Clarke (NY)	Harris	McClintock
Clay	Hartzler	McCollum
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	McCotter
Clyburn	Hastings (WA)	McDermott
Coble	Hayworth	McGovern
Coffman (CO)	Heck	McHenry
Cohen	Heinrich	McIntyre
Cole	Hensarling	McKeon
Conaway	Herger	McKinley
Connolly (VA)	Herrera Beutler	McMorris
Conyers	Higgins	Rodgers
Cooper	Himes	McNerney
Costa	Hinchesy	Meehan
Cravaack	Hinojosa	Meeks
Crawford	Hirono	Mica
Crenshaw	Hochul	Michaud
Critz	Holden	Miller (FL)
Crowley	Holt	Miller (MI)
Cuellar	Honda	Miller (NC)
Culberson	Hoyer	Miller, Gary
Davis (CA)	Huelskamp	Miller, George

Moore	Rivera	Smith (TX)
Moran	Roby	Smith (WA)
Mulvaney	Roe (TN)	Southerland
Murphy (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Stark
Myrick	Rogers (KY)	Stearns
Nadler	Rogers (MI)	Stivers
Napolitano	Rohrabacher	Stutzman
Neal	Rokita	Sullivan
Neugebauer	Ros-Lehtinen	Sutton
Noem	Roskam	Terry
Nugent	Ross (AR)	Thompson (CA)
Nunes	Ross (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Nunnelee	Rothman (NJ)	Thornberry
Olson	Roybal-Allard	Tiberi
Oliver	Royce	Tierney
Owens	Runyan	Tipton
Palazzo	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Pallone	Ryan (OH)	Towns
Pascarella	Ryan (WI)	Turner (NY)
Pastor (AZ)	Sanchez, Linda	Turner (OH)
Paulsen	T.	Upton
Payne	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen
Pearce	Sarbanes	Velázquez
Pelosi	Scalise	Visclosky
Pence	Schakowsky	Walberg
Perlmutter	Schiff	Walden
Peters	Schilling	Walsh (IL)
Peterson	Schmidt	Walz (MN)
Petri	Schock	Wasserman
Pingree (ME)	Schrader	Schultz
Pitts	Schwartz	Watt
Platts	Schweikert	Waxman
Poe (TX)	Scott (SC)	Webster
Polis	Scott (VA)	Welch
Pompeo	Scott, Austin	West
Posey	Scott, David	Westmoreland
Price (GA)	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Price (NC)	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Quayle	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Quigley	Sewell	Wittman
Rahall	Sherman	Wolf
Rangel	Shimkus	Womack
Reed	Shuler	Woodall
Rehberg	Shuster	Woolsey
Reichert	Simpson	Yarmuth
Reyes	Sires	Yoder
Ribble	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Richardson	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)
Rigell	Smith (NJ)	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—27

Akin	Diaz-Balart	Paul
Bachmann	Farr	Renacci
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	Richmond
Blumenauer	Filner	Rooney
Carson (IN)	Giffords	Rush
Costello	Gutierrez	Speier
Courtney	Latta	Thompson (MS)
Cummings	Lynch	Tsongas
DeLauro	Murphy (CT)	Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1902

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 817 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 817, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 2011, I missed rollcall votes 816 and 817 because of a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 816 and "yea" on rollcall 817.

TURN THIS ECONOMY AROUND

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, since early 2009, there have consistently been at least 13.5 million Americans unemployed. Every month for more than 2½ years, millions of people have been looking for full-time jobs, and they have been waiting. They waited through months of debate over a health care bill that will cost jobs. They waited through a financial services bill that will cost jobs. They waited through bailouts and stimulus bills and debates over raising taxes, all of which will cost jobs. They waited while the House passed 15 big job-creating bills. Now the President says, We can't wait; I must go it alone.

Mr. Speaker, that's why Republicans have passed the many bills to help this country's job creators, bills to lessen the regulatory burden on businesses, to encourage domestic energy production, and to halt the spending spree in Washington that robs money from the job creators. Now the President and the Democrat-controlled Senate need to finally act on many of those bills that we have already passed and that will turn this economy around. We ask that you act immediately.

COME HOME, GOVERNOR PERRY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we've been waiting for a jobs agenda now for as long as this Congress has been in session, and I can convey to my colleagues that an easy way of attending to creating jobs is by passing the jobs bill.

Moving on, Mr. Speaker, let me thank Governor Perry for making a personal and public statement of his opposition to the State-issued Confederate license plate. Yet I would advise Governor Perry that his Department of Motor Vehicles board—nine appointed by him—have now scheduled that vote for November 10. All good-willed persons, all good-willed Texans who would oppose a State-issued oppressive license plate reflecting upon the oppression of slavery need to show up on November 10 in Austin, Texas, to indicate their opposition to such a draconian and devastating blow to the people of Texas.

I would also remind Governor Perry that the North Forest Independent School District that is now leading and educating 7,500 students, a majority minority district, has now been given a denial on its appeal, meaning an attempt by the Texas Education Agency to kill a majority minority school district in the State of Texas.

Governor Perry, come home. We need you.

□ 1910

NATIONAL TEEN DRIVER SAFETY WEEK

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, we just recently concluded National Teen Driver Safety Week, which is the third week of every October. It's a week to help create awareness and focus attention on solutions for unnecessary teen driving deaths.

Each year motor vehicle accidents stand out as the leading cause of death among American teenagers—with over 68,000 American teens dying in car crashes in the last decade alone. As the father of four young daughters, I can assure you that keeping those loved ones behind the wheel safe is an important issue for myself.

There are organizations that are meeting the challenge and are working to help address the issue of teen driving. For example, the UPS Foundation has teamed up with the Boys & Girls Clubs to introduce the UPS Road Code. It's a 10-city program to educate young and aspiring drivers about safe driving methods. Programs like these will help our communities protect our young drivers and ensure a safer commute for us all.

I thank the UPS Foundation and the Boys & Girls Clubs for their hard work and dedication to this important issue.

REPUBLICAN FRESHMEN ON JOB CREATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I have joined some of my colleagues here tonight to talk about the most pressing issue in this country, which is job creation, private sector job creation and what we need to do to get our country back on the path to prosperity and job growth.

I had a jobs conference in the Second Congressional District, my district, down in Arkansas in Little Rock a couple of weeks ago. We held it at the Clinton Library. It really was an extension of the 25 or so town halls that I've had this year in that we talked a lot about jobs. And I thought that a jobs conference would be a good idea because who better to ask about job creation than job creators. So we had five panels, over 60 panelists, and I wanted to hear from the job creators in the Second Congressional District. I asked them two main questions: What are the obstacles that you face in creating jobs, and what opportunities do you see?

As I indicated earlier, this was really an extension of what I've been talking to constituents about for the 9 months I've been in office, and even before

that. I expected I would hear answers to those questions consistent with what I have heard in town halls, in meetings in my office, and throughout the year, and I wasn't surprised.

What I heard from the over 60 panelists that gathered at the Clinton Library in Little Rock a couple of weeks ago, what I heard was uncertainty is the number one obstacle to job creation in this country—uncertainty. Now, I've heard that word used a lot since I've been here. I heard it a lot last year when I was traveling around my district before I ever came to Congress. And it was pretty clear, has been pretty clear to me, and still is, that uncertainty is the biggest problem we face.

The job creators that gathered in Little Rock at the jobs conference were from the manufacturing industry, energy industry, health care, retail, financial services, aerospace, infrastructure, construction, real estate, you name it, agriculture. We had folks from all across the spectrum, and they all indicated that uncertainty is the biggest obstacle to job creation.

What kind of uncertainty were they talking about? Well, the number one type of uncertainty cited by job creators was regulatory uncertainty. They indicated at the conference, this jobs conference, that, number one, in many instances they know new regulations are coming, but they have no idea what they're going to be. So they have no idea whether they're going to be able to comply with those by spending a little extra money, no extra money, or a whole lot.

They're also concerned about regulations that are floated. They're floated out by the agencies as a potential regulation that may or may not be implemented. And those sorts of regulations give these job creators great pause because they don't know whether they're going to have to comply with them. And it's not just one agency and it's not just one industry.

I will say that the EPA's name came up more than any other. The job creators made it very clear that there are a number of regulations coming out of the Federal agencies that they are concerned about, and the EPA has issued a number of regulations and some that are yet to be enacted that these job creators were very concerned about.

I heard from the panelists the common theme that they're not against regulations. We've always had regulations, at least since I've been around, and we're going to continue to have regulations. And we need reasonable regulations to keep our water and air clean. I have a 4-year-old and a 19-month-old, and I want them to have a clean and safe environment. But we're not talking about just regulations, reasonable regulations; we're talking about excessive, overly burdensome regulations that in some cases require such drastic steps to comply that they just run people out of business. We've dealt with a lot of those here in the

House trying to reverse some of the stuff coming out of the administration.

I heard from our energy industry, the energy corporations and the electric cooperatives—some of the panelists represented those companies—and they indicated if some of the EPA rules are implemented as they have been proposed, they could result in the shutting down of several power plants in Arkansas, with a potential impact of raising energy costs 25 percent. Now, these same panelists said, Look, we're not necessarily against this sort of regulation, the sort of regulation they're referring to, but the time frame for compliance is so short that there's no way, it's almost humanly impossible for them to comply with some of the EPA's mandates. So we heard a lot about the EPA, but not just the EPA. HHS, the Department of Labor, many other agencies here in Washington put out regulations often with no or little regard to the impact those regulations are going to have on the folks back in my district and around the country.

So regulatory uncertainty was specifically identified as an obstacle to job creation in this country. In addition to regulatory uncertainty, there's uncertainty over the health care law. Is the health care law even going to be implemented or not? Certainly I voted to repeal the health care law that passed in the last Congress. I think we need health care reform, but not the health care reform we got. Now the courts are looking at the health care law and there's a good chance in some folks' opinion and my opinion that the Supreme Court might strike the individual mandate portion of the President's health care law, the health care law that we have now. So there's a lot of uncertainty surrounding that.

There's also uncertainty over our fiscal situation. The President had a perfect opportunity to lead after his bipartisan debt commission came out with some recommendations. I don't agree with all of them, but it was a good place to start.

□ 1920

But instead, right after they came out with their recommendations late last year, early this year the President came out with his budget—no reform of Medicare to save it, no reform of Social Security to save it, no reform of Medicaid, just keep on spending. So we missed an opportunity there.

But the debt is a part of that uncertainty. The debt impacts our currency valuation, and it impacts our markets. You don't have to look far. Just look at what's going on in Europe. It's sort of like you're looking in a crystal ball, and what's going on in Europe is potentially—not identical—but potentially, in some regards, our future. That's where we're headed—more uncertainty.

So, it was very clear, after listening to all of these job creators, that the problem is not that the Federal Government hasn't spent enough money. We've spent \$1 trillion on the last stimulus at a cost of about \$300,000 per job.

Discretionary spending has gone up 84 percent under this administration. I don't think, in fact, I know, that spending is not the problem. It's the uncertainty that the job creators addressed. So what we're going to talk about here tonight is what we've been doing for the last 9 months to address the uncertainty on regulations with regard to the debt and our spending, and with regard to our Tax Code so that we can remain competitive.

What have we been doing here in this body, in the majority in the House, to address the uncertainty that I think, beyond dispute, is the biggest obstacle to job creation in this country? And I'm citing the job creators of my district. We've been doing a whole lot over the last 10 months. We passed a lot of legislation. I think we've had about 800 votes. Unfortunately, a lot of those good ideas are stacking up like cordwood over in the U.S. Senate. We pass it, send it down to them, and they stack it up. That's the way it's worked for the last 10 months or so.

I am happy to be joined by my colleagues here. I thought we'd talk a little bit about the different things that we passed that the American people would have heard a lot more about if they had been acted upon and become law. But most folks don't hear a lot about them because they go down to the other end of the building and they just sit there like that little bill sitting on Capitol Hill that some of us grew up with as a cartoon. It's just a bill, it's not a law.

I am happy to have my friends join me here tonight on the floor to talk about jobs and what we've been doing in the House over the last 10 months.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I'm proud to join him and my other colleague from Wisconsin tonight to talk about jobs and what we are doing here in this Chamber on that issue.

I listen many times to my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, and they say we haven't put forth a jobs bill, as if there's some simple fix that we here in Washington, some bureaucrat sitting in a cubicle over at the White House is going to come up with a plan that's going to cure this economy with a magic wave of the wand here in the U.S. House or in Washington, D.C.

I join my colleague in his sentiments that I'd rather be listening to the people on the front line. I'd rather be listening to the people that are in the position to really create those jobs, because I believe in a private sector-based economy. I believe it's going to be the private sector that is going to be the primary engine of pulling us out of this economic crisis that we now find ourselves—not the public sector, not more spending out of Washington, D.C. But rather, what we need to do in this House is come together to create an environment so that the private sector

can be competitive in this world economy and this world market, and it can really lead us to a better condition tomorrow so that generations of families, of American families, will have the opportunities that generations of families before us so enjoyed.

I've gone out and I've also had those town halls, and I've talked to people on the front line. And really, it boils down to some simple philosophies. We run our office here in the New York 29th Congressional District like a business. I come at this from a business perspective. Having started four businesses on my own, I've always had a business plan, and I've always had accountability metrics built into those plans. So we put forth a mission statement. We developed themes, we developed goals, and we put metrics to those themes and goals to make sure that we accomplish them. And the primary theme that we have adopted in our office is to create economic opportunity through the private sector.

How do you do that? We have adopted four main goals that we work on each day. We tackle this debt in a credible way, as my colleague from Arkansas has indicated, because it has so many indirect implications to our private-sector economy, be it in the financing world and be it in just the uncertainty of the U.S. markets. And we really have got to get a credible plan put together so that we can bring back that confidence in the American market that our job creators, the people that are going to invest in the American market, feel comfortable putting that capital at play.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. If I can mention one thing, on the issue of the debt, we don't have to solve it overnight. We didn't get in this mess overnight, and we certainly aren't going to solve it overnight. But I sort of analogize it to going on a trip. If you're going to travel from Arkansas to Washington, D.C., you don't have to get there instantly, but you need to have a roadmap. You need to know where you're going, and everybody in the car needs to have confidence that the person driving is taking you in the right direction. If you're driving from Little Rock to Washington and you start seeing signs that say "L.A. 100 miles ahead," you're going to wake up everybody and figure out what happened.

So we don't need to deal with this debt overnight, but we need a credible plan that brings us back to balance, that brings us to a sustainable path and that gives people confidence—not confidence that it's going to be fixed immediately, but confidence that the path we're on will eventually get us back to where we need to be.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. REED. I appreciate that. And what a great comment. That's exactly what I'm trying to articulate. I join my colleague and associate myself with those words, that we need a true plan that will solve this problem. And the \$14.8 trillion in debt is such a huge

problem that it's not going to be solved overnight. But we have the vision, and we have the plan. We're going to bring that certainty and confidence back to the American market.

The second point on our four-point theme in our office that we operate under is going after our Tax Code in a way that is going to make it competitive in this world economy. That means going from page 1 to the 70,000th page of the IRS code and streamlining it and doing comprehensive tax reform in such a way that simplifies it and makes it so that we are competing on the same field as competitors around the world.

The third point of our plan is to focus on a comprehensive, domestic-oriented energy policy right here, going after not only the fossil fuels in our backyard but not taking our eye off the long-term vision of the alternatives and renewables; looking at the commonsense solutions of going after our natural gas supplies, our oils and our shale formations and our tight sands formations around America but at the same time focusing on the alternatives and renewables, because we know those fossil fuels are a limited source.

□ 1930

But not only because of the national security implications that so many people in America know so well, but also looking at it from the perspective of making a competitive private sector arena in which our manufacturers and industry can compete again here right with operations in America. Because if you put those supplies in motion, you can create low-cost utility rates for 30, 40, maybe even 70, years is what the projections I've read in the reports and talking to people on the front line have articulated to me. So those decreased utility costs make our market that much more competitive when we're dealing with a world market that we now find ourselves in.

The last point that we always stress in our office is going after this regulatory burden that my colleague from Arkansas spoke about earlier. It's about not living in a world where there would be no regulations, but where there will be reasonable regulations, regulations based on a cost-benefit approach, a business approach, recognizing that with every regulation there's a cost. We're trying to achieve a benefit, but we've got to be reasonable to make sure that those costs don't outweigh those benefits. And so we've adopted that type of framework of operation in our office, and we've found some great success.

One last point I'll make before yielding back to my colleague from Arkansas is one of the stories that really resonated with me as I went through some of these town hall meetings—and we've done, I don't know, 30 or 40 of them now at this point in time—is I heard this story in August, and I'll call him Dr. Bill. He was a physician, and he had a small practice back in the 29th Congressional District. He was talking

about how he wanted to invest and expand his practice. And he went over to the bank to get the financing to build the little addition—he was going to put maybe three people, new people to work.

And I listened to his story, and he was talking about the uncertainty that my colleague from Arkansas is talking about. And I want to put a face to it because Dr. Bill, as he told me, whenever he would go to the bank historically, he would go in and he would give his financial projections as to what his practice was going to do. A lot of times he would have to footnote because we have a lot of issues here in Washington with temporary policies that have been done more for politics than for true policy.

And what I'm talking about is we're dealing with things like the SGR, the physicians reimbursement under Medicare and the doc fix that always comes in. Typically what happens, America, if you haven't been aware of it, there's a fix, a Band-Aid that's put on it each year. And what he was able to do is he was able to always go to his bank and say, you know, I know the law says that I'm going to take a 30 percent cut, for example, this year in my reimbursements under Medicare, but we all know that Congress is going to get around and eventually fix it by putting another Band-Aid on it. So then he projects out a 2 percent increase in his reimbursements for his practice.

Well, he went to the bank. He went to the bank and he said, okay, here are my financials again. I want to do this expansion. And you know what the bank told him? The bank said, you know what, we don't know what's going on out of Washington, D.C. You've been dealing with the issues in your physician practice under ObamaCare, the Health Insurance Reform Act—whatever you want to call it—we're dealing—this is the bank talking to him—under the new Dodd-Frank bill that came into existence. Those regulations are uncertain to us. We don't know what they're going to require.

And the bank told him, we're not going to accept that footnote anymore. You've got to project out what your revenues are under what the law says, and that's a 30 percent cut in your revenue. And when he went back and he did the numbers, obviously, with the 30 percent cut to his revenues, he couldn't get the financing; the bank had to say no.

So that's the real story from the front lines that we have to come to terms with down here in Washington. Our decisions, our policies have ramifications. And if we can just have some commonsense points and deal with people like Dr. Bill in a way that says we're going to adopt policy for the long term, not the short term. We're going to get away from the politics or the tax politics and get into tax policy. We're going to get into the substance of these issues and adopt certain rules and reg-

ulations and legislation that's going to go on for 5, 10, 20 years so at least people know what the rules are. I think if we do that, we're going to go a long way to improving the private economy of America. We're going to work day in and day out.

I know my colleagues share a lot of these sentiments; and I'm just here to join them, to really focus on what has to be the priority issue, and that's putting people back to work. That is what we're doing here in the House. We're not looking for the political headline of a jobs bill. We're here to talk about jobs policy and leading this country out of the recession it finds itself in through strong policy rather than politics.

With that, I thank my colleague from Arkansas for yielding.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from New York for his thoughts. Before I yield to my friend from Wisconsin, I'd like to just revisit some of what you said.

We've identified the problem as uncertainty. I think we're all confident of that based on talking to our constituents and job creators. And we, over the last 9 months, have passed a number of bills that support the different aspects of our plan to get this country moving again and creating jobs.

Number one, fundamental tax reform. We need it on the individual side; we need it on the corporate side.

Regulatory reform. We have passed countless bills that reform the regulatory process or address specific regulations.

And dealing with the debt. We've been trying to raise the issue of spending and overspending—and have raised it successfully numerous times over the last 9, 10 months. We haven't been able to do as much as we'd like; we are just one body here in the House. But dealing with the spending and forcing the Federal Government to live within its means has been and continues to be a priority.

And also, what the gentleman from New York mentioned, is the importance of energy exploration and energy development to our national security, because we want to depend on our own energy sources or at least on our friends in Canada; but it's also very important in terms of job creation. The energy development that we could have in this country could create up to, some say, at a minimum, 1 million jobs.

I was watching a new show on the networks last night, on NBC, and they had a whole segment on what's going on in North Dakota with some of the shale drilling and how there are just tens and hundreds of jobs waiting to be filled in this country, in that part of our country, because of energy exploration.

So tax reform, regulatory reform, dealing with the debt so that we can invest in infrastructure, which is so important to economic development and energy development, those are critical.

And if you want to talk about a jobs plan or what have you, or jobs bills—it's not jobs bill; it's jobs bills. We've been passing jobs bills since January. In fact, as I indicated before, they're piling up like cord wood in the Senate.

I yield to my friend from Wisconsin. Mr. DUFFY. I commend the gentlemen from Arkansas and from New York for the work you've been doing in your own districts, reaching out to job creators, listening to them about what they need to make sure they can expand their businesses and grow their businesses. I've been doing the same. Over the last couple of weeks I've done a number of different events.

I did a jobs fair in central Wisconsin; that's where my district is, central Wisconsin up to northwestern Wisconsin. We had 100 employers, and we had 1,200 job seekers come through that jobs fair. And if you looked out at the 100 folks who were there looking to hire, you didn't see too many people from the government looking to hire because the real job growth in America is in the private sector. And if you looked out over that arena of employers, they're not big businesses, they're small businesses. They have anywhere from 10 employees, some of them were as big as 100, 120 employees, but all characterized and categorized as small businesses.

I thought it was important to note that there are people hiring; but if you look at the quality and the quantity of people who need work in central Wisconsin, there is a disparity between the number of jobs that are available and the number of people who want to support their families with hard work and hard labor and a good paycheck. And so the work is not done. We have to continue pressing on to make sure that we have the environment for job growth.

As the President says, We cannot wait, and I don't know what he's referring to when he says "we cannot wait." My reference to we cannot wait is we cannot wait, as the Speaker said, for the Senate to start passing our bills that are going to put Americans back to work.

□ 1940

I did a forest policy conference. In my area, we have a large forest product industry. And the Chief of the Forest Service was kind enough to come to my district, a well-spoken, very knowledgeable individual who's spent a lot of time in the Forest Service. Rangers were there, and it was a great conversation with a lot of our loggers.

But in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest, we have 1.5 million acres, great resource in central and northern Wisconsin.

Let me tell you a story of one of the forest products individuals that came to that conference. He's an individual that owns Action Floors. They're from Mercer, Wisconsin. Now, Mercer is not, by far, the biggest community in Wisconsin. It's a small town that relies on the forest products industry and premier gym floors they make at Action Floors in Mercer, Wisconsin.

But do you think they get the wood from the 1.5 million acres in the Nicolet and Chequamegon Forest? No. Over 50 percent of the wood they use to make those floors is imported from Canada because they can't access timber in central Wisconsin. That's a shame.

Now, listen. I live in Wisconsin because I believe that we should have clean water and a clean environment. I live there because I like the outdoors. I like to use it. I want my kids to experience it. But managing forests is critical to preserving it. It's the first green industry. It's renewable. It grows back if it's managed well.

And here we have folks in central Wisconsin that can't access it. Those are real jobs. Those are real families that are impacted by the decisions that are made here in Washington, D.C. But timber being imported from Canada? Give me a break.

We had a field hearing just yesterday, Financial Services, the subcommittee was Financial Institutions. And we had some small small banks and some medium small banks, and we had small credit unions, medium-sized credit unions all in there talking about the rules and regulations that are coming from Dodd-Frank.

And if you think that these credit unions and these small banks are big Wall Street banks, I would encourage you to come to central Wisconsin. They're the furthest from a big Wall Street bank. These are people who have grown up in these communities that are helping get capital out of the bank into the hands of job creators and to homeowners, people who want to buy a car. And they are burdened by regulations and mandates and rules. They can't comply with them.

At some point, banking needs to be regulated—we all would agree with that—but let's have smart regulation. Let's make sure the capital can get out the door to those small businesses that want to expand or grow.

There's some interesting information that I think just came out from the NFIB; and if you look at the end of the last recession, 2001, to the beginning of this new recession in 2007, businesses that have fewer than 500 employees, they have created 7 million new jobs during that time frame. And 60 percent of those businesses, they'd only been in existence for 5 years. So these are new start-ups, small, that are the engine of job growth in America. Now, on the other hand, we had employers or businesses that had 500 employees or more. Those businesses had cut 1 million jobs. And the point here is job growth is coming from small businesses.

But today, we are at a 16-year low for start-ups. Businesses aren't growing. Businesses aren't beginning in this new environment. And I think it goes to what you gentlemen were just talking about. I think there's three things. One, it's access to capital. They don't have the ability to go to the bank and get a loan. There are a lot of factors

that used to be considered when making a loan in small-town America: character and cash flow and a number of considerations. What's happening today with our banks is they're just looking at the file; so when the regulators come, their file looks clean, and they can't take all the factors they used to take into consideration.

I think it's important to note that the banks and the credit unions in my district, they weren't part of the financial crisis. They had nothing to do with it. They were implementing sound banking principles in their communities that were launching small businesses that were the engine of growth in our communities. But today, they can't do that, and so we don't see that job growth take place.

They also talk about regulations, which I think you two did a wonderful job. Just to name a few, remember the 1099 bill? In ObamaCare, in PPACA, there's a 1099 piece of legislation where, if you had a transaction that was over \$600, you had to send the other individual or business a 1099. The workload, the paperwork that that puts onto a small business is unconscionable. They can't focus on doing the work of their business. They're focused on doing the work of the IRS. What we're saying here is we need reasonable, commonsense regulations that are going to help our small businesses expand and grow.

And another thing they talk about is uncertainty, and this all feeds into each other. But in here is taxes. It's health care. It's regulations.

Before I yield back, I'm going to tell you one story, and this is a story from central Wisconsin. It's an individual that I went to see. He's a small manufacturer. He has about 100, 110 people who work for him. As I was sitting in his office, he was saying, Listen, I've got a great idea. I'm going to grow my business. It's going to cost me \$1 million to make this investment. I've been in business for a long time, and I know this idea that I have is going to work. If I make this \$1 million dollar investment, I'm going to create 10 to 15 new jobs in my community. But guess what? I'm 62 years old. I look at all the uncertainty. I look at ObamaCare. I look at taxes. I look at new regulations, look at new banking regulations. He said, With all of that uncertainty in the marketplace, I'm not going to make that investment. I'm 62.

Who got hurt?

This guy has enough money. He's made enough money in the course of running his business. It doesn't hurt him because he didn't make that investment, but it hurts 15 families in that community that don't have a good-paying job. Fifteen families don't have work because he didn't take that risk, make that investment.

We have to make sure that people are encouraged to take risk, to invest and expand and grow and compete. And if they do that, we're going to see great growth in this country.

But I believe we're at a crossroads. If we don't go down the path of free markets and free enterprise, American capitalism, a system that has worked since our founding, that has created incomparable wealth in this country, I think we're going to go down a different path, and that path does not lead to prosperity. It doesn't lead to opportunity. It doesn't lead to job growth. It leads to something far less than that.

I think, in this country, we want to fight to make sure we stay on a path of prosperity and opportunity so we can pass that off to the next generation. That's worth the fight. I'm willing to fight for those principles.

In this House, we argue, and I think the American people would say probably too much. But I know there's friends on the other side of the aisle that would agree with this, that agree that we have to come together to find solutions that are going to help the private, small sector grow and put our hardworking people back to work.

So I appreciate the hour that the gentleman from Arkansas has reserved, and I appreciate the conversation and the focus that my colleagues here in the freshman class have put on job growth, not only for their own districts but for the country as a whole. And with this effort and with some cooperation, hopefully, from the White House, we're going to be able to turn this economy around, which is not us. It's actually policy that we turn over to the private sector for that job growth.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman.

Before I yield to my friend from Colorado, I just want to follow up on a few issues. We call the jobs-related bills that we've passed here that will help the private sector grow the forgotten 15 because these are the bills that made their way down to the Senate and just sat there. The only problem with that is it's not 15 anymore; it's 16 or 17 or 18. And they're not one bill. It's more complex than that. They're plural.

There are a number of jobs bills, a few of them: the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act, H.R. 872; the Energy Tax Prevention Act, H.R. 910; Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act, H.R. 1230; Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act, H.R. 1229. These are all related to job creation, getting the private sector creating jobs again, and the list goes on and on.

Now, one of those is the North American-Made Energy Security Act, H.R. 1938. Now, this bill is also just sitting in the Senate. It passed the House July 26 of this year.

□ 1950

Now, we're up here talking about bills and legislation and what have you, but speaking for me, and I think I can speak for my colleagues here, we're talking about bills and legislation and laws, but ultimately we're talking about policies that will allow folks who are hurting back in our districts who

have been out of work—we're talking about how bills that have passed into law would help job creation, which will help those folks who are still looking.

I'll give you a specific example.

There's a company called Wells Fund in Little Rock. And they make massive pipe. And they're talking about expanding. Well, what are they waiting on, or what is one of the things that they're looking at that is a potential obstacle? They make the pipe for the Keystone pipeline. Why are they in Little Rock? Because they're right there at the port of Little Rock. So they can really haul a lot of steel in those barges, and they've got a huge high-tech, state-of-the-art facility. It's an Indian-based company, lots of jobs right there. They want to expand, they want to create more jobs. They're building up that pipe.

And we've got an administration that's not sure how they feel about the Keystone pipeline that's going to allow for more energy to come from our neighbors through the north instead of from around the world? They're not sure about the Keystone pipeline that will create energy-related jobs right here in the United States?

Where I come from, the Keystone pipeline's a no-brainer. That means you don't even have to think about it. And now I read actually a few minutes ago, I got a news clip that the President now has decided that he's going to make the ultimate decision on the Keystone pipeline. If I was making that decision, I'd take about 2 seconds. It's absolutely critical that we build this both for national security and for energy here at home in terms of jobs.

Now, on the issue of regulations, I want to touch on it real quickly before I pass to my good friend from Colorado.

At my jobs conference that we had a couple of weeks ago, senior vice president Ken Kimbro of Tyson Foods—we've all heard of Tyson. My kids and I, we love the chicken. We've all heard of Tyson. Ken Kimbro, senior vice president, says this about regulations in general: "I understand the intended consequences of regulations, but it seems like we turn a blind eye to the unintended consequences of what that's going to mean to us in Arkansas, our industry, to the State of Arkansas, and to the jobs that support everything that we do. And it seems to be lost in an academic exercise without the consequence of what's going to happen. And we face it across the full spectrum of government agencies, and it's terribly frustrating because we all want to do the right thing."

Now, on the regulatory front, he's identified the problem.

I had another panelist who owns ten International House of Pancake restaurants. I love them. I like to eat breakfast there. Here's what she said, "As a business owner today, I am in a constant posture of defense." Is that what we want? We want job creators in a constant posture of defense?

So I just want to put in a plug. I have just introduced a bill called the Job

Creation and Regulatory Freeze Act. It's somewhat similar to a bill introduced on the Senate side by SUSAN COLLINS of Maine, and it puts a moratorium on all major regulations coming out of this administration until January of 2013. And my colleague on the Senate side, hers is for a year. I didn't think a year was sufficient because at the end of that year the administration could just implement regulations that are waiting.

So I say let's take it through January to Inauguration Day of 2013 because this administration has not gotten the message on overregulation.

This bill would stop major regulations being implemented, new ones, until 2013.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. I appreciate my colleague from Arkansas, my great friend, for yielding to me.

Just to add a comment. When my colleague from Wisconsin spoke and my colleague just mentioned when we talk about the Forgotten 15, now 16, we've got to be clear to the American public that those bills that came out of this House had bipartisan support. There are colleagues from the other side of the aisle that have seen the wisdom in the sound policy that's represented by those bills, and they've joined us and supported those bills going over to the Senate.

Yet HARRY REID, the Senate majority leader, has blocked, in my opinion, those bills from coming to the floor. It's time now for the Senate to act. At least bring them up and debate the issue.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. In fact, on the Keystone bill that I mentioned, H.R. 1938, that was passed on July 26, 2011, the North American-Made Energy Security Act, looks like there were 47 Democrats that joined with us on that bill. Many of our Democrats joined us in a bipartisan effort.

But again, stacking up like cordwood on the steps of the Senate.

Mr. REED. Just to conclude on this point. Now is not the time for our President to divide this country. We have had bipartisan support on these bills here in the House. I know it hasn't been reported on by the press. But that's the fact.

Now, what we need to do now rather than divide the country—when I hear comments from our President talking about how he has to break up the American Jobs Act that he submitted so that we Republicans can understand it. That's not productive conversation. We understand the jobs bill. I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle understand it, too, and that's demonstrated by the fact that there's only one sponsor of that proposed piece of legislation from the President. No other individual in this Chamber co-sponsored that legislation. I think that speaks volumes. They understand that's not good sound policy.

So now is not the time to try to divide the country with scare tactics, class warfare, trying to go after and paint the top 2 percent as the reason why we're in this situation. This is not the time to try to say, "Oh, China is the bad guy." Of course it's not the policies coming out of Washington and the overregulations and the non-competitive Tax Code or the lack of a vision for a comprehensive energy policy. Or doing the responsible thing with coming up with a credible plan to deal with the debt.

No. We have to divide this country is the rhetoric that I'm hearing on the campaign trail during this Presidential election from our President. I disagree with that.

We're here as a freshman class to really change the culture of Washington, and I think we are. We're making progress. But we've got a lot more work to do.

Let us never forget that the Forgotten 16 bills that are now on the Senate floor were done with bipartisan support. And we'll continue to work at it because I don't believe the American people are stupid. They will see through all of the rhetoric because the American people are like me. They are sick and tired of politics as usual out of Washington. That's why we ran. That's why I'm sure my colleagues who joined me today would join in the sentiment that we ran, we left our families and our businesses, to come down here and once and for all stand up for what's right.

And what is right is a strong private sector America, an America of principle based on capitalism, based on individualism, individual accountability, and responsibility. Those are the themes that we promote and that we stand here and will fight for, because if we can get those themes implemented into strong, long-term policy, America not only will survive, it will prosper for generations to come. That's my promise to you here tonight.

I again thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas and my colleagues for joining us to talk here today about this important issues.

Eastern Colorado, the district that I represent, is about 32,000 square miles. It's bigger than the State of South Carolina. And one of the greatest privileges that I have in representing that district is meeting with the people at the local coffee shops, talking to business owners at the car dealerships, talking to people who are really making our economy run, what I call the front line of our economy, ground zero for economic development.

□ 2000

The challenges that they face are no different in Colorado than they are in Wisconsin or New York or Arkansas because we have people who expect this Congress and this administration to

work together to create jobs and to create opportunities to get people back to work.

This morning when I left the house, I drove by some farmers who were picking corn out in the field. The pile of sugar beets is getting bigger right outside of town as people are digging sugar beets. Then you head up to northern Colorado a little bit further; and early in the morning, you see the drilling rigs leaving town, going out to find a new place to start their drilling operations. Closer to Fort Collins, Colorado, you see the trucks hauling the blades of new wind turbines.

People are working each and every day to make ends meet in order to put food on the table for their families. They're wondering what's happening in Washington, D.C., and they're wondering what's going on: Why can't you guys do what we do? That is, when times get tough, we find a solution; we find an answer; we do the right thing.

The forgotten 15 is our way to do just that because we have passed a number of bills to get this country back to work and to make sure that our country's job creators have the policies that they need to expand their businesses, to grow their opportunities, to put people to work.

I had a chance the other day to meet with a number of businessowners and with a number of employees at a coffee shop in my district. There were probably about 15 people around the table. We were talking about what's happening to this country from a debt perspective, from an economic perspective, about the fact that we are now in the 32nd month where unemployment has exceeded 8 percent, and about what we could do as a country to move forward again. The waitress was coming in and out, helping people at the table—taking orders, putting food on the table.

As we began to leave and I started to walk out, she came up, and she grabbed me by the shoulder. She says, Hey, I heard what you said in there. Who are you?

I said, Well, maybe I haven't done the best job of getting around and letting people know what our message is but, I said, Thanks for stopping me.

Who are you?

I said, Well, I represent the eastern plains of Colorado in Congress.

She said, How can I help get the message that you were talking about—how can I help get that message around town, around the district? What can we do to get your message out of job creation? of freeing up small businesses? to do the right thing?

I said, You know, it's going to take everybody to send those letters to the editor, to make sure that we are talking to all of our elected officials—the city councils and the other Members of Congress in our States and our delegations—about the fact that regulations when they go too far can hurt job creation, that taxes when they increase can hurt small families' and small

businesses' abilities to grow and expand. Make sure that you're expressing that. Make sure you're telling them that. Make sure you're talking about America's job creators, about our idea—the Republican plan—for job creation, what we are going to do to get this country's job creators moving again.

One of the forgotten 15 is a bill that I introduced/passed. It's the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act. It's H.R. 2021. This bill passed back on June 22, 2011, to be exact. It passed with 255 votes in support. There aren't 255 Republicans in the House of Representatives. It took both Democrats and Republicans to get to 255 votes. That bill, if it were to become law, would create 54,000 jobs around this country, 54,000 good-paying jobs around this country. It has been introduced in the Senate with a bipartisan group of sponsors, but it hasn't been acted on yet.

The Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act, H.R. 872, which is something that farmers in my district are very concerned about, passed with 292 votes on March 31, 2011. It's a bill that would make sure that our farmers, our ranchers, our communities can continue to grow and flourish in their economies; but it hasn't seen the light of day over in the Senate.

Yet those farmers who are picking corn, the people putting together the wind turbines, the men and women out on the drilling rigs don't wonder why the forgotten 15 haven't passed. They wonder why Congress can't get its act together, why this President can't work with us to find the solutions this country needs. That's why we are here tonight, talking about our commitment to this country, about our commitment to our country's job creators, to the men and women who have struggled far too long in looking for work. It's so that we can find opportunities for them and their families so they can get back to work with the jobs that they need to survive.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from Colorado. I just want to make a few points, and then I'll yield to the gentleman, my good friend from Wisconsin.

First of all, I want to make clear that the number of the bill that I have just introduced, the Job Creation and Regulatory Freeze Act, is H.R. 3194.

Earlier, we were talking about commonsense regulations, and I want to mention one regulation. I had a constituent fly to D.C. to discuss something with me. She lives outside my district, this businesswoman, but she has numerous stores in my district. She has 300 stores in four States. They're convenience stores. She came to me and met with me in my office right up here in the Longworth, and she had some other folks with her. They told me the problem that they have with horses coming into their convenience stores.

I said, Excuse me?

She said, Yes. We're being told by the Department of Justice, through the

Americans with Disabilities Act, that we have to let horses/ponies come into our stores if someone wants to bring a horse or a pony into the store.

I asked, Why would anyone ever need to bring a horse or a pony into your convenience store?

They said, Well, apparently, it's not common.

I didn't think it was common, because I'm 43, and I've never heard of anyone taking a horse into a convenience store; but she told me, in the way some folks rely on seeing eye dogs, some other folks in the country rely on horses for balancing or for whatever other service that horse provides, maybe guiding them. I'm not sure of all the details. The validity of that aside, I took her at her word that people were in the practice of taking horses into stores.

She said, Look, I've got liability problems here potentially. People are going to bring horses in. They might kick somebody; they may be dirty; they may dirty up the store; they may knock things over.

I said, Okay. If someone relies on a horse, that's fine; but why do we have a Federal regulation on this?

I've never even heard of it. We have people being paid to draft rules that deal with horses going into stores. I almost couldn't believe it. So I did a little research with my staff. Sure enough, she wasn't kidding. She wasn't making this up. ADA, title III, regulation 28 CFR, part 36, section .36.302: "Modifications in policies, practices, or procedures." There is a provision entitled, "Miniature Horses":

A public accommodation shall make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures to permit the use of a miniature horse by an individual with a disability if the miniature horse has been individually trained to do work or perform tasks for the benefit of the individual with a disability.

Now, if individuals have to rely on horses for balance or guidance or whatever, then that's absolutely fine. I just find it incredible that the Federal Government is telling a businessowner, who has never in her life even heard of a horse coming in a store, that she has to comply with this and has to make sure that there is room for a horse to get in—or a pony or a miniature horse. I just think that this is where common sense comes in. We obviously can't regulate for every contingency, but apparently we're trying to.

□ 2010

So I'm taking a closer look at this to try to get some more information, but I think it's one that at first impression tells me we need to apply a little more common sense with regard to regulations.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. I thank my friend for yielding.

As we look at what's happened recently, as the President has come out

with his jobs bill proposal—and, frankly, many who analyze it would say this is stimulus number two. It's just another government spending program hoping the government borrowing and spending will lead to economic growth and wealth and jobs. And if you look at it, I think the President is saying, I want to do something. And I say, I don't want to do necessarily "something." I want to do the right thing so we can create economic growth and prosperity and wealth and jobs.

This is my concern of what's happening right now: I think the President came into office talking about hope and change and job growth and job creation, and he implemented stimulus number one. And from that, it didn't work because it's never worked. Government borrowing, government massive spending doesn't create jobs. But that was his sell to the American people.

Now as we roll into the second phase, I think this is the campaign phase, the political phase. So instead of focusing on policies that bring the bottom up, that help give hardworking folks a good-paying job or a good-paying opportunity, he is now focusing on class warfare. I think that's the wrong way to go. Our policies that we are implementing, that we passed and have sent to the Senate are policies that will create jobs.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman, I thank all my friends for being here tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

CBC HOUR: VOTER IDENTIFICATION LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak about voter suppression bills that are pending or are already signed into law in a number of States across this land. They have only one true purpose, which is to disenfranchise eligible voters.

Many of my colleagues will be joining me this evening, and I would like to begin by yielding to my good friend, Mr. RUSH HOLT, from the State of New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend and colleague from Ohio.

I am pleased to come to the floor tonight to talk about a serious issue: whether the voice of the people will be heard. As citizens of this Nation, the voting franchise is not just our constitutional right; it is the right through which all other rights are secured, our primary voice in how this country is run. And right now around this Nation, there are people who are working actively to disenfranchise specific sectors of our citizenry.

How is this happening? Well, this year, in 38 States, there is legislation

being considered or, in some cases, already approved to make it more difficult for citizens to register to vote, making it impossible to vote early, and to require identification that serves to eliminate or restrict voting for large numbers of people. Restrictions on voter registration have placed such burdens on groups organizing community-based voting drives—such as the League of Women Voters—that several organizations have suspended voter registration drives in some States due to the onerous nature of the legislation.

Now, if there were a threat of voter fraud as the proponents of these laws assert, it might make sense, but there is no threat of voter fraud. Are there rampant cases of impersonation, voting as someone else? No. Voter fraud is not rampant. There are not numerous cases of impersonation. There may be isolated instances, sure, of alleged voter fraud, but to disenfranchise millions of people because there are a few cases is really contrary to the American system of government.

In 23 States and the District of Columbia that allow voters to show both photo and nonphoto ID, such as a utility bill or a bank statement, there is no evidence of voter impersonation, no evidence that fraud is occurring. It's a phantom menace of fraud that is the basis for a well-funded movement around the country making it difficult for eligible voters to cast their votes.

Are photo ID laws prohibitive? Yes, they are. A recent report by the Brennan Center for Justice of NYU law school concluded that the newly enacted State laws affecting more than 5 million eligible voters will disproportionately disenfranchise young, low-income, elderly, and minority voters. In 2006, the Brennan Center completed a nationwide survey of voting-age citizens and found that African American voters are more than three times as likely as Caucasians to lack a government-issued photo ID.

Restrictions on registration, limits on early voting, and photo ID requirements at the polls all serve to discourage young, low-income, minority, and elderly voters from participating in their constitutional right to vote. Should they reach the polls and successfully cast their ballot, of course we have to ask whether their vote will be counted accurately.

In the past, literacy tests and poll taxes were used to selectively allow certain citizens to vote and to exclude others. Those laws were and are illegal. We should make sure that they remain illegal in the 21st century. 21st century poll taxes, which, in effect, these restrictions are, seek to suppress the voices of people who have a right to vote and whose voices should be recorded because we need their wisdom at the polls.

Now the motto should be, "Everyone Counts." And there's much to be said—and we'll say this at another time—about making sure that every vote

that is cast is counted. Election auditing can be used to ensure that voting errors are minimized, performing a check on the results recorded by electronic voting machines against a verifiable record, paper record of the vote.

But tonight we want to talk about the systematic disenfranchising of people who are citizens, who should be voting, and whom we should want to vote.

I am pleased that my friend has taken this time tonight, and I am certainly pleased to join you.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman so much for his insight.

I now yield to someone who I know, coming from the State of Wisconsin, has a great deal of experience in this area, my good friend, the gentlelady from Wisconsin, Ms. GWEN MOORE.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much, Representative FUDGE, for putting together this Special Order to talk about voter suppression laws.

I was first elected in 1988; and 2 years after that, in 1990, I began a career from that point on, up until this very day, fighting against these voter suppression laws. And the reason that I began my career that early is because our now-Governor of the State of Wisconsin led the effort to require voter ID, very strict forms of voter ID, in order to suppress the votes of certain members, certain populations in the Wisconsin community. So I am ashamed to announce today, Representative FUDGE, that Wisconsin has joined the map of shame. It is one of seven States in red here on the map of shame that have very stringent voter ID laws in order to be able to vote.

Having debated this issue for many years, I know what the basic arguments for this are, and they're all discredited.

□ 2020

We have heard such arguments from our Governor, who was then a State representative, that if you need a voter ID to buy liquor or to buy medicine or to get a Blockbuster's video, surely you should need a voter ID for something as important as voting. I think that that is demonstrably a problem with that line of thinking. There is no more fundamental right than the right to vote. You don't have the right to drink liquor, Representative FUDGE. You don't have the right to get a video from Blockbuster. And, shamefully, you don't have a right to health care. You don't have a right to get a prescription drug. But you do have a right to vote, so the bar ought to be extremely high to disenfranchise voters.

Now, we are discouraged on this floor and in this House from questioning the motivation of people who offer legislation. And in that same light, I question the motivation of those people who say that we must have this kind of legislation.

The Wisconsin attorney general's office found that in a 2-year election fraud task force investigation that

there were 20 instances of possible voter fraud out of 3 million votes cast in 2008, the year that President Barack Obama ran, which is 0.0007 percent, and not a single one of these cases would have been prevented had the person had a voter ID. If it was a felon who had voted, your driver's license doesn't say "felon" on it. There was not a single case where a photo ID would have prevented these discrepancies. So I began to wonder about the motives of those who have said that we must have this law. Who are they trying to disenfranchise?

In the State of Wisconsin, 17 percent of white men and women don't have this kind of ID; 49 percent of African American women don't have this kind of ID; 55 percent of all African American males don't have this kind of ID; 46 percent of Hispanic men don't have this kind of ID; 59 percent of all Hispanic women don't have it; 66 percent of African American women ages 18 to 24 don't have this ID; and 78 percent of African American males ages 18 to 24 do not have this kind of ID.

In addition to this, there's a cost to getting the paperwork, the underlying paperwork to get a photo ID. You have to pay \$20 for a replacement birth certificate, and in some States, you have to have a photo ID to get a birth certificate. And there are other costs.

In Wisconsin, a place where the largest number of these African American and Hispanic men and women who don't have this photo ID reside, there is no Department of Motor Vehicle station, Congresswoman FUDGE, that is open, has evening hours or weekend hours, so the burden of getting this kind of ID is great.

I do realize that I need to yield back my time, but I just want to mention that this would also have a terrible impact on our young, college-age student voting population. This bill would require that they use a college ID that doesn't exist in the State of Wisconsin. There have been no moneys provided for the universities, none of which have this kind of ID to do it, and it would be a terrible burden on our elderly population who may want to vote absentee and would have to provide a Xerox copy of a photo ID. So for all those elderly Wisconsinites who have Xerox machines in their homes, you will be able to vote absentee from your home.

With that, I thank the gentlelady for yielding and thank you for this Special Order.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you so much.

I just want to say both my friend, Congresswoman MOORE and my friend, Congressman HOLT, have basically put into context the fact that any time you have to jump over a hurdle or pay to get something to vote, it is a poll tax.

I now want to yield to someone from my home who has been an advocate for voting rights and someone who knows the issues very well because we are facing them in Ohio, the gentlelady from Ohio, my friend, Congresswoman BETTY SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. Congresswoman FUDGE, I thank you for your leadership. You have been tremendous in this fight, and it is a fight that unfortunately we didn't ask for, but we must fight on behalf of the American people.

There is nothing more important, there is nothing more American than the right to vote. You know, at a time when government officials from all levels of government should be focused on getting America back to work, unfortunately, we are seeing this scourge of voter disenfranchisement, legislation springing up State to State across this country, and we've heard a little bit about that already today.

So over the past century, our Nation, as we expanded the franchise and knocked down all of the barriers that were so hard fought to increase electoral participation, in 2011 that momentum abruptly shifted. We've heard here tonight about how State governments across the country enacted an array of new laws, making it harder to register to vote in some States, and some States requiring voters to show government-issued photo identification, often of a type that as many as 1 in 10 voters do not have. Other States, like our State, have passed laws to cut back on early voting, a hugely popular innovation used by millions of Americans. Two States reversed earlier reforms and once again disenfranchised millions who have criminal convictions. But these new restrictions fall most heavily on a specific population.

These would be insidious. Any attempt to prevent somebody from exercising their right to vote, of having the voice at the ballot box, would be insidious, but when you look at these laws, you start to see a pattern emerging. There is an effort to target voters who appear, who people think, some people think, may have a tendency to vote for one party over the other party. So voters who are being perceived as Democratic voters are being targeted by these laws. And why do I say that? What is the basis for me saying that? Because we have seen where these voter ID laws fall most harshly.

We heard from the gentlelady from Wisconsin making the case, but it's really important. Let me just tell you a couple of examples. In Tennessee, 96-year-old Dorothy Cooper, a lifelong voter, attempted to secure the new ID that she would need to vote in the next election. When she arrived at the DMV, she was turned away because despite having her birth certificate, current voter registration card, and a copy of her lease, she did not have a marriage license—she was 96—a marriage license, to verify the change of name.

In Texas, thanks to a new voter ID law, students may not use their school-issued photo IDs to vote, and we saw this in Ohio as well, an effort to try and restrict student IDs as a valid form of identification to vote.

So in Texas, while Texans who possess concealed weapons permits are allowed to use their permits to vote,

those with student IDs are not. This justification just seems a little bit arbitrary. And according to one State representative, it's that: "Texas, you know, is a big handgun State so everybody has almost got a concealed handgun license over 21." That was the argument that was given for that distinction.

But the bottom line is this. We are here on the floor tonight because we have people—we've seen the protests out there. We know that there are those, and they are holding signs, and they say: "We are the 99 percent." We see the plight that our middle class families are facing throughout this country, but I think it's worthwhile to bring up that idea about the 99 percent, and I'll tell you why. Because the reality is there are those in this country who have a lot of power, and that's what that 99 percent and the upper 1 percent is about, right? And they have a lot of voice. You know why? Because they have a lot of money that they use to make their voice heard. But the truth is, the upper 1 percent that controls so much of the power and so much of the money in this country still only controls 1 percent of the vote—unless the deck is stacked.

□ 2030

And so that 99 percent needs to have access to the voter box, because that is the place that we are all equal. So I am proud to stand with you to fight back against these efforts to suppress the vote and to stand up for democracy—democracy that was fought for and is still being fought for by our men and women in uniform.

I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank you. And now you can see why in Ohio we are going to defeat everything they bring to us that restricts our right to vote.

I would yield to one of my newer colleagues, one who's from a State where the Voting Rights Act was designed to protect the people of her State, my colleague from the great State of Alabama, the gentlelady, TERRI SEWELL.

Ms. SEWELL. I thank the gentlelady from Ohio for leading this wonderful Special Order hour, and I rise this evening to express my concerns about the voter ID legislation being passed in States across this country. The State of Alabama and other States have passed a law that requires voters to use a photo to ID to be valid.

Now I believe that these types of voter ID laws are really implemented in order to discourage and delay full voter participation in communities across this Nation. It has been alleged by some that voter ID laws are needed to prevent fraud and protect voters who are being victimized. Some political pundits have been taking shots at my own district in Alabama, in particular, alleging blatant voter fraud.

Now I have received numerous feedback from my constituents to the contrary. In fact, my constituents attest

that they are offended at the very thought that these voter ID laws are allegedly about voter protection. The fact is that these voter ID laws are about voter suppression, not voter protection. These laws are in search of a problem that does not exist. Between 2002 and 2005, just 24 people were convicted of or pled guilty at the Federal level to illegal voting.

The reality is that 11 percent of U.S. citizens, or more than 21 million Americans, do not have government-issued photo identification. Also, as many as 25 percent of all African American citizens of voting age do not have government-issued photo IDs. Voter ID laws have a disproportionate and unfair impact on low-income individuals, racial and ethnic minorities, senior citizens, voters with disabilities and others. Many of these individuals do not have government-issued ID or the money to acquire one. It is our obligation as legislators to work to ensure that all American citizens are given the opportunity to express their opinions by using the ballot box. The right to vote is especially sacred in my district where people marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma for the right to vote.

As the daughter of a stroke victim who is now wheelchair-dependent, it is frightening to think that had this law in Alabama been in effect during my election, my very own father would not have possessed a valid photo ID because his driver's license has expired. His struggle is indicative of the struggles of so many disabled Americans who will be disproportionately affected by this law. We cannot stand idly by while citizens across this country are being disenfranchised and discouraged from exercising their right to vote.

Now let me be clear. Voter fraud should not be tolerated and, if discovered, should be prosecuted. Voter fraud is a serious crime. A person who commits voter fraud in a Federal election risks spending 5 years in jail and having to pay a \$10,000 fine, and rightfully so.

We can all agree that our current elections system is in need of some repair. However, the current debate about voter ID and voter fraud distracts us from the real problems with our elections system. We need a progressive system that encourages voting through same-day registration and early voting laws, laws that would make it easier for citizens to exercise their right to vote. The government should be in the business of encouraging, not discouraging people from voting.

As Americans, we can do better. And as legislators, we owe it to the people that we represent to make sure that we do. We cannot compromise the integrity of our democratic system and reverse the enormous progress that our country has made by implementing laws that will seek to discriminate. Now, in protecting my constituents in the Seventh Congressional District of

Alabama and in this Nation, I will continue to work with my colleagues and Representatives like Congresswoman FUDGE to make sure that we vigilantly ensure that States' voter ID laws protect and not suppress all voters.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentlelady.

I yield to someone who certainly we all know has been so involved in voting rights and a person on whose shoulders I stand, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. JOHN LEWIS.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I want to thank the gentlelady from Ohio for holding this Special Order. Congresswoman FUDGE, thank you very, very much. You are making a lasting contribution to this discussion, to this debate.

Voting rights are under attack in America. Quietly, gradually, State by State, the right to vote that many people died for has been taken away. Sometime ago, some of us came to this floor, I believe this past summer, to warn the American people about this dangerous trend. No one, but no one, seemed to be listening. But today, we can no longer ignore this trend.

Congressman HOLT said just a few moments ago that the Brennan Center released a report that shows that voting law changes in States across the country will make it much harder for more than 5 million voters to exercise their constitutional right to vote. In 2011, we should be ashamed.

Today, we should be making it easy, simple and convenient to vote. Instead, we are creating barriers and making it more difficult for citizens to vote. There's not just one law, but many types of laws that are disenfranchising millions of voters: voter ID laws, proof of citizenship laws, barriers to registration, elimination of early and absentee voting, and making it harder to restore voting rights for people who have paid their debt to society. These laws are barriers to an inclusive democracy. They are a disgrace, and they are a shame to our democracy. We continue to step backwards toward another dark time in our history.

We cannot separate the dangerous trend across this Nation from our history and the struggle for the right to vote. Before the passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965, not so long ago, it was almost impossible for some citizens to register and vote. Many were harassed, jailed, beaten and some were even killed for trying to participate in the democratic process. In the 1960s, people stood in what I like to call immovable lines trying to register to vote. People waited day in and day out, only to be turned away and told that voters were not being registered on that day.

The same thing is happening today. States are passing laws to restrict voter registration and are doing away with the same-day voter registration. There is no reason that we cannot make it easy and convenient for people to register to vote. Ten years ago, the

Carter-Ford National Task Force on Election Reform called the United States' registration laws "among the world's most demanding" and blamed those registration laws for low voter turnout. Because of registration problems, 3 million American citizens tried to vote in the 2008 Presidential election, but they could not vote. And with these new laws restricting voter registration, the problem would get even worse.

□ 2040

One of the most dangerous voting changes is the new voter ID requirements, which are disenfranchising millions of American voters. Approximately 11 percent of voting-age citizens in the country, or more than 20 million individuals, do not have a government-issued photo ID. Today, too many States require a photo ID in order to vote.

Each and every voter ID law is a real threat to voting rights in America. Make no mistake; these voter ID laws are a poll tax. I know what I saw during the sixties; I saw a poll tax. And you cannot deny it; these ID laws are another form of a poll tax. In an economy where people are already struggling to pay for the most basic necessities, there are too many citizens who will be unable to afford the fees and transportation costs involved in getting a government-issued photo ID.

Despite all of the new voter ID laws across the country, there is no convincing evidence—no evidence at all—that voter fraud is a problem in our election process. The right to vote is precious, almost sacred, and one of the most important blessings of our democracy. Today we must stand up and fight.

The history of the right to vote in America is a history of conflict, of struggle for that right. Many people died trying to protect that right. I was beaten and jailed because I stood up for it. For millions like me, the struggle for the right to vote is not mere history; it is experience. We should not take a step backward with new poll taxes and voter ID laws and barriers to voter registration and voter participation. We must ensure every vote and every voter counts.

The vote is the most powerful, non-violent tool or instrument we have in a democratic society. If we allow our power to vote to be taken away, we will be facing the need for a new movement and a new nonviolent revolution in America to retake the same ground we won almost 50 years ago. We must fight back.

Thank you again for giving us a voice, giving us a way to fight back.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you so much for the history lesson we just received.

As you know, there are many things going on in the State of Ohio, and that's why I'm joined tonight by another one of my colleagues from the great State of Ohio, my friend, and someone who as well has fought very,

very diligently to make sure that everyone has their right to vote, and that is Congressman TIM RYAN.

I yield to the Congressman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentlelady.

A few weeks ago, we had the opportunity of having Congressman LEWIS in Youngstown and then up into Cleveland. And to sit here and listen to him talk about it, it's not words on a piece of paper. As he said, it's not history; it's his experience. And for us in any way, shape, or form to listen to him and to remember the struggles that a lot of people went through in order for Americans to have the right to vote—all Americans to have the right to vote—this seems so petty and so ridiculous that there would be a movement among a conservative group of people across the country to literally try to disenfranchise American citizens.

Now, we all get caught up in the political games, but my goodness gracious, how far are you going to go? You've got Citizens United that says you can spend money left and right in corporations, unlimited funding, and we're seeing it in Ohio now. And then they take this money and they start pushing initiatives like this one, where you are going to literally carve out a part of the electorate that doesn't necessarily vote for your interests because you'll win the game that way. And so these provisions in Ohio now, we're coming up on an election on Tuesday, you can't vote in person stopping Friday night, the weekend before the election. That doesn't make any sense.

Come on, guys. This is not a game. This is an essential right that we have in the United States of America. And you're going to say, well, one in four African Americans doesn't have a government ID; let's carve them out. This fits that category. Oh, if you make under \$35,000 a year, you're twice as likely to not have a government ID; let's put you over there. If you're a senior citizen, if you're elderly and you don't drive anymore, you fit into that category, too. All right, let's put this in 38 different States—or however many—and figure out how we lock them out of the political process or put barriers up.

This is not right. Come on. These people have served the country, worked in the country, served in the military, and all of these other things, contributed, and now you're going to say, well, we're going to put up a few more barriers for you not to be able to vote. It's not right.

I'm getting the sense in Ohio and back in my district that people are really starting to understand that there is a movement to stack the deck against the working class people to reduce their ability to participate in the political system, and I'm not making this up. Right in Ohio, we have a huge initiative right now on Issue 2 that is about taking collective bargaining rights away from police, fire, teachers, nurses, and public employees, a bunch

of corporate money coming in to support it. You have this initiative in Ohio to limit people's right to vote—primarily people who would vote Democratic—national money coming in to support it; cuts being made to make college more expensive; cuts being made to mental health and all of the programs that would lift up these very people.

So I'm happy to join the gentlelady here from Cleveland to say that, one, I'm thankful for you doing this and, two, the work is not yet done. And the American people who have no other choice, now they're taking to the streets. And that may be the only way to get it done, because you can't compete with the hundreds of millions of dollars that are being spent on these initiatives, coordinating these initiatives, and pushing them in States without us, the average folks, trying to push back a little bit. That's what this is about. And I will guarantee you, at the end of the day, when you look at the poll results for Issue 2, for example, people are waking up to see that they're trying to stack the deck against them further, and we're not going to allow that to happen.

I thank the gentlelady.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you so much. And I do thank my colleague from Ohio because we are going to continue to stand together and we're going to win.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman DANNY DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio not only for yielding, but for convening this discussion this evening.

I was speaking to a group of young people a couple of days ago, and they wanted to know why did we think this whole question of voter suppression was such a big deal. They said, But doesn't everybody have the right to vote? And of course it was necessary to convey to them some of the experiences that people like Representative LEWIS and others have had.

All of us recognize, from a historical perspective, the evolution of the development of our country. Of course when we started, there were only a few people who actually had the right to vote, and they were the individuals who made most of the decisions. Ultimately, we fought a war, and after the war we saw the expansion of opportunity; and yet there were millions of individuals who were denied the same opportunities that others had.

People often ask about Southern States. And you don't pick up on any State, but I remember reading the history of Mississippi, where in 1890 the State of Mississippi devised a system that effectively disenfranchised most African Americans or blacks who were there and adopted a system that other States picked up. But you've got to remember that at that time African Americans made up 58 percent of the population in the State of Mississippi. They elected delegates, and the delegates who were elected—134—consisted

of 133 white men and one black, or one African American.

I am afraid—and I wish that it wasn't so—that there are cynical efforts to manipulate and control and prevent individuals from having the opportunity to exercise the most important franchise in a free and democratic society, and that is the right to help make decisions. And sometimes it's done in so many ways. There's an old saying that if you fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me.

□ 2050

There are places where the polling places just got changed. People have been accustomed to voting at the Johnson school, and all of a sudden they wake up and it's time to vote and they're now voting at the American Legion Hall. Well, they don't know where the American Legion Hall is; they just go to the Johnson school. And once they get there, they can't vote, then they decide that they'll go on to work or do whatever else it is that they're going to do, and they will miss voting that day.

Poll taxes sound kind of way out and farfetched. But I actually grew up in rural America. It is true that I live in Chicago, a magnificent city, probably the most magnificent city in the United States of America and many other places throughout the world.

But I grew up in rural Arkansas, and there was a \$2 poll tax. My parents paid a \$2 poll tax. Now, the average person who worked in an agrarian environment at that time, the wages were \$4 a day. Four dollars a day. That's what people earned driving tractors. That's what they earned chopping cotton. That's what they earned baling hay.

And to take \$2 out of \$4 that you might earn working a whole day to go and get registered to vote? Well, that meant, for all practical purposes, that many of the people, not just African Americans, mind you, but many of the people who were low-income were not going to participate because they couldn't afford to pay \$2 to register to vote.

And so I join with all of my colleagues who say that this issue is most important, that we must watch it, keep our eyes and hands on it. And we have to make sure that even in places like where I live, I can recall voter suppression during one Presidential election where the whole idea was simply not to vote. People were not going to vote for a different political party at the time. But if they didn't vote, that was the same as voting for the other guy.

So don't fool us. We kind of know what's happening.

I thank you for calling this Special Order.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you so much, my friend.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. AL GREEN.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Representative FUDGE. And thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Friends, although the faces change, the fight remains the same when it comes to the black vote. The Emancipation Proclamation didn't do it. The 13th Amendment didn't do it.

Although the faces change, the fight remains the same. In 1870, the face was that of President Ulysses S. Grant, and the fight was the 15th Amendment and the right to vote. It passed. Although it passed, the faces changed but the fight remained the same because in 1944 it was the NAACP and a great lawyer, Thurgood Marshall, that took *Smith v. Allwright* to the Supreme Court of the United States of America, and they won that case, which eliminated the white primaries in the State of Texas, by the way, in Harris County.

The faces changed but the fight remained the same because it was in 1953 that the NAACP had to go back to court to eliminate the white pre-primaries imposed by the Jaybirds in the State of Texas.

The faces changed but the fight remained the same, because even though we eliminated the white primaries, the white pre-primaries, in 1965 the faces were those of the marchers at the Edmund Pettus Bridge on what we now know as Bloody Sunday. They were beaten back to the church where they started the actual march. The faces of those marchers happen to include the Honorable JOHN LEWIS, Member of Congress.

In 1965, the face was that of LBJ, President of the United States of America. He had the opportunity and did sign the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The faces changed, but the fight was still the same. We had to have a Voting Rights Act, notwithstanding all of the amendments to the Constitution, and notwithstanding *Smith v. Allwright* and *Terry v. Adams*.

In 2006, the faces changed. George Bush, President of the United States of America, reauthorizes the Voting Rights Act because we still find that there are cases of invidious discrimination when it comes to voting in the United States of America.

The faces changed, but in 2011 the fight remains the same. The faces are those of the 25 percent of African Americans who don't have photo IDs, the faces of the 18 percent of elderly persons 65 or older who don't have photo IDs.

The faces have changed consistently, but the fight is still the same. We still have to fight for this precious right to vote; and this is why we're here tonight, to make sure that we all understand, and the message goes out and the clarion call is there to those who would help us and make sure that on election day we protect the right to vote.

Notwithstanding the fact that the faces have changed, the fight remains the same.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you, Congressman GREEN. And he's right, the fight remains the same.

I yield now to my classmate and friend from the great State of New York, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative FUDGE, for bringing us together this evening on a very important discussion, one that focuses on the fundamental underpinnings of this democracy, the ability to vote, right to vote, and encouraging voters to come to the polls.

This sort of effort that is being taken seriously by far too many as a form of reform is discouraging. This is an attempt, I believe, to discourage folks from voting across this country, from an effort that is somewhat presented in this description of going after voter impersonation fraud which, obviously, is something that everyone would be concerned about. But the element here is not to do that.

No one can point to this overwhelming evidence that there is this voter impersonation fraud that gets addressed by this sort of approach. What we have here is denial. It's a denial that may impact as many as 5 million Americans.

At a time when we should encourage a thoughtful democracy, encourage participation, this focuses on many who would be disenfranchised. Those who are of lower socioeconomic strata, those who are persons with disabilities, the minority community, the elderly community, those are the targeted forces here. And it is an outright attempt, I believe, to dissuade those who are eligible from voting.

And if we can move forward and encourage people to vote and spend the resources that would be required in the individual States to go and develop this ID system, we could spend those dollars in a better way to go after fraud in a more targeted fashion.

This, I think, is an underhanded approach to taking the voter population that currently exists out there, reducing it, and placing a hardship on people, many of whom do not have IDs. It is suggested that some 11 percent, or 20 million Americans, don't have those IDs, government-issued IDs that would be required with the reform effort that's under way.

So we need to see this for what it is. We need to encourage policy that will enhance the numbers of those voting and go after fraud in a very targeted way. This is not the answer.

There is no fundamental proof. There is no proof positive that it will attack and discourage the voter impersonation fraud out there. It simply doesn't happen.

Again, Representative FUDGE, thank you for leading us in what I think is an important discussion on far too many situations out there that are being taken forward in a way that will be counterproductive.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you, Congressman TONKO. I appreciate it.

Now, the dean of the Ohio delegation, my friend from Ohio, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, a leadership Congresswoman from Ohio, for bringing us together this evening on the important question of voter suppression. And I would like to say for the record that the stability of each of our communities and our Nation rests on the fragile reed of trust, trust of the people, that trust enshrined in our right to vote, and our obligation to do so.

Today, in fact, we passed a resolution that is stated over the Speaker's rostrum: "In God We Trust." Yes, trust. And John F. Kennedy reminded us that here on Earth God's work must truly be our own.

Trying to prevent voter suppression is our work. In Ohio, we see new forms of voter suppression in the works as we watch the redistricting process unfold, the districts in which we will run as Members of the House and Senate in Ohio, whether it's for Congress or our legislature, Ohio, a home-rule State that values community, that values where people live. We call it a home-rule State. Where we live matters.

And yet we see in the redistricting what's happened in Ohio, a State losing population. The population hasn't grown as fast as other States. Of 88 counties in Ohio, 62 county lines completely violated.

□ 2100

What does that do? It moves people around in a district that has no bearing to their community. Hundreds and hundreds of precincts cracked. You go in to vote, as Congressman DAVIS said, you think you're in one precinct, well, gosh, you might even be in the wrong school. Who's going to let you know, especially if you've lost your job and you aren't living where you were before?

We see entire towns in Ohio's redistricting that's proposed by the Republican Party of Ohio hacked apart for no reason, for no sensible reason. Canton, Ohio, is a shadow of its former self. Akron, Ohio; Toledo Ohio—the list goes on.

Let me say that voter suppression discourages voters, especially during this time of economic recession when so many foreclosures have made it more difficult for people to have a home base.

So I would say to the congresswoman, thank you so much this evening for giving us this time to prepare us for the elections of 2012 so that we can in fact prepare to avoid voter suppression in every form that it existed before and in every new form that is being created today. Thank you, Congresswoman FUDGE, for your leadership on this important issue of giving every American their full rights so we can restore trust in the government of the United States.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you very, very much, Congresswoman KAPTUR.

Now, to my friend also from the State of Texas, the gentlelady from

Texas, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady from Ohio for her leadership after spending some time with her on the floor listening to the voter suppression occurring in Ohio. I'm grateful for this opportunity. I want to thank the Whip for his leadership on voting rights, election rights, for any number of sessions, starting as early as the election in 2000, when we were brought to confront the issue of voter improprieties.

Let me first of all say that we are seeing the ugly head of the suppression of votes rising across America. Forty States have implemented voter ID laws.

Let me explain to the voters: Voter ID can only respond to voter impersonation. Statistics will tell you that most voters do not show up at the polls trying to be somebody else. In addition, most voters will have a voting card. Now you will suppress those who are elderly, disabled, young, who do not have a State-issued voter ID.

In my district alone this past week-end, I met a woman who was 97 years old in a wheelchair who had attempted to get her voter ID with a photograph pursuant to Texas law that she thought was in place now. It was a difficult challenge. Her relatives went with her, and she could not get her voter ID. I made a commitment that my office would go with her because of the extensive requirements and the intimidation and fear.

But it is also in the State of Texas that we are hearing that many polling people who are in charge of elections for this November 2011 have confused the precinct judges so much that they have even told them that the voter ID law will be in place as of November 2011, and it doesn't go into effect, if it does, until January of 2012—again, to suppress voters, the elderly and minority voters.

I would encourage and ask the Justice Department to be diligent on reviewing all of these voter ID laws. Texas is now being reviewed and it has not been pre-cleared. We ask the Justice Department to declare that it is in violation of the Voting Rights Act.

Let me say that voting is a precious right. I want everyone to be able to vote. And it is documented that fraud is very limited in voting. To eliminate same-day registration, there are no grounds to suggest that there is fraud that occurs in same-day registration.

From the oppression of those who could not vote because of a poll tax, because of counting of the jelly beans in a jar, all of that leads to the oppression that keeps people from voting.

So I stand today on the floor of the House to say we will never give up the fight. We're going to fight these voter ID laws. We're going to fight these laws that are going to intimidate our voters. Intimidation, fear, and oppression will not survive this election of 2011 or 2012. We are going to stand with you,

and the Department of Justice will be reviewing on behalf of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I thank you.

Ms. FUDGE. Our Whip has joined us. Before he speaks, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman HANK JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank my colleague, Congresswoman FUDGE, for organizing this Special Order, and also my Whip, STENY HOYER, for being intimately involved in this.

The right to vote is a fundamental right. And this right is under attack. It's the Tea Party Republicans that have raised the false specter of voter fraud at the polls. Study after study documents that most, if not, all voter fraud occurs during the absentee voter process. And the Tea Party Republicans have done nothing to alleviate that voter fraud.

Instead, they've declared open season on in-person voting.

Now, why would they do that? They have the nerve to claim that their voter ID laws will protect the elections that are allegedly riddled by fraud. But they're really trying to fix a problem that does not exist.

All across America oppressive voter suppression ID laws are propping up. My home State of Georgia is one of the States of shame. It has strict voter ID laws. And earlier this year, more than 30 other States introduced legislation to require government-issued IDs for voting.

The requirement that all voters present a government-issued photo ID, or if you live in Texas a concealed carry permit, before being able to cast a regular ballot will disproportionately disenfranchise minorities as well as seniors, the disabled, students, and poor people who are less likely to have or carry a photo ID.

These voter ID laws are a blatant attempt by Tea Party Republicans to influence the outcome of the upcoming elections, and we cannot let them get away with it.

We'll fight and fight hard to make sure that all voters eligible to vote can vote.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you so much.

Now, we would have the Whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). Congressman HOYER is taking the lead on this as well, and we thank you for being here tonight.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my colleague from Ohio, Congresswoman FUDGE.

I'm honored to be on the floor with JOHN LEWIS, who came close to losing his life to make sure that Americans could register and could vote.

Mr. Speaker, we're a year away from an election, one that will shape the course of our Nation for years ahead. The choice we make will be pivotal. And in order to make certain that it reflects the direction our people want to take, we ought to do everything we can to ensure that all who have the right to cast a ballot can do so.

□ 2110

Equal access to the ballot is the most fundamental right we have as Americans. It is what preserves our democracy and instills confidence in our system of government. Some of our greatest national struggles have been over suffrage—from votes for African Americans and women to votes for the young people who risk their lives for us in uniform. The right to vote, however, is today, as we have heard by so many, under threat in a number of States seeking to place obstacles in front of minorities, low-income families, young people, and seniors seeking to exercise that basic right to vote.

They claim we need to crack down on an epidemic of voter fraud that does not exist. There is simply no evidence of any widespread voter fraud. As many as a quarter of African Americans do not have the necessary forms of identification now being required by some States. Data from the nonpartisan Brennan Center for Justice shows that African Americans and Latinos make use of early voting at a far higher rate than other groups, especially opportunities to vote on the Sunday before election day. At the same time, there has been an assault on voter registration.

The right to vote does not exist for political expediency. It is a constitutional right and a moral right for all of our citizens. It is the pride of America, this American franchise. For that reason, we are vigorously pursuing ways to protect an American's right to vote by drawing attention to efforts which attempt to restrict that right. We will be working closely with the Congressional Black Caucus, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and with voting rights groups across the country. Throughout our history, Mr. Speaker, Americans have given their lives to protect the right to vote. It is worth fighting for. It is our fight.

I thank Congresswoman FUDGE for her leadership, and I thank all those who have spoken tonight and will be speaking out every day, every week, every month to ensure that every American not only has the right to vote, but does, in fact, have America's willingness to facilitate the casting of that vote.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, let me just close by saying this:

To all of the Governors in all of the States that have passed this legislation, please understand it is time for you to do the right thing.

To all of the Secretaries of State and all of the State legislators who have by design gone out and tried to keep predetermined people from voting, do the right thing.

Anybody who cares about democracy in this country or who cares about the reputation of this country and the way that we handle our business, please know that it is time to do the right thing. If you care about the generations that follow us, then do the right thing.

For the veterans who are coming back—who are homeless, who don't have addresses—for the people who don't drive, for the sick, for the disabled, for the elderly, for the children, do the right thing.

I would say to all of the people who have been on this floor tonight, we all understand the gravity of the problem. We are just saying to all of these States on the map of shame, it is time for them to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about voter suppression bills pending or already signed into law in a number of states. They have only one true purpose—to disenfranchise eligible voters.

This is a clear attempt to prevent certain predetermined segments of the population from exercising their right to vote. Students, the elderly, minorities and those for whom English is their second language are all targets.

Many of the bills, including one that was signed into law in my home state—Ohio, include the most drastic voting restrictions we have seen since before the Voting Rights Act.

These bills will not allow address changes at the polls and end volunteer-run registration drives. Twenty-one million citizens would be unable to vote because they do not have state-issued photo identification. We would say good-bye to same-day voter registration and hello to difficulty casting an absentee ballot.

There is no doubt that there is a concerted voter suppression effort underway in this nation. In the first three quarters of 2011, nineteen new restrictive laws and two new executive actions were enacted. At least forty-two bills are still pending, and at least sixty-eight more were introduced but failed.

If these bills were to become law, the effects would be catastrophic. These new laws would make it significantly harder for more than five million eligible voters to cast ballots in 2012.

Under these pending voter suppression laws, we can only imagine how many Americans would not have had the opportunity to vote in 2008. The two-hundred and two thousand voters who registered through voter registration drives in 2008 would find it extremely difficult or impossible to register under new laws. The sixty thousand voters who registered in 2008 through Election Day registration would not have registered or voted under pending laws.

Think about how many felons had their right to vote restored in 2008. Many of the pending state bills would make it virtually impossible for hundreds of thousands of rehabilitated citizens to ever vote again.

These numbers prove that votes will be suppressed in 2012. These laws are nothing but a ploy to give Republicans a political edge by suppressing the votes of many who voted Democratic in 2008.

The proponents of these voter suppression bills claim wide-spread voter fraud. I am here to tell you there is no truth to their assertion. A statewide study in Ohio found that out of nine million votes cast, there were only four instances of ineligible persons voting or attempting to vote in 2002 and 2004.

An investigation of fraud allegations in Wisconsin in 2004 led to the prosecution of 0.0007 percent of voters. From 2002 to 2005,

the Justice Department found, only five people were convicted for voting multiple times. Millions of voters cast votes each election. The minimal amount of voter fraud that occurs does not warrant the restrictive bills that are moving in the states.

I fought Ohio's voter suppression bill, HB 194. Now voters will cast their vote to decide whether or not HB 194 will become law. We placed the peoples' right to vote back into their hands. I also fought Ohio's voter photo ID legislation. Due to pressure, the Republicans decided to delay moving forward with the legislation. I will continue to fight to protect voter's rights across the nation. We cannot be silent.

I urge you to speak out against what we know to be a concerted effort to suppress votes. People died for our right to vote. People were slain to create the franchise we enjoy today. I will not let their deaths be in vain.

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

AMERICAN BEDROCK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANNA). 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. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's always my privilege and an honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor. As is often the case, I come here and hear the end of the debate that has gone on before me and feel compelled to address it from a bit of a different perspective.

As I listen to the gentlemen and the gentleladies talk about the right to vote, I think it would be important for us to remind the body that there has to be a qualified voter. It isn't that everybody has a right to vote. You have to be old enough for one thing, and you need to be an American citizen for another. As I've watched things change over my adult lifetime, the integrity of the vote has been damaged.

The gentleman from Maryland made the statement that there is no evidence of any widespread voter fraud. I know that it's difficult to put this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, but I would hold this up as, let me just call this, evidence number one:

This is an acorn. It's an acorn that I carry in my pocket every day. I carry it there every day to remind me of what that organization ACORN has done to the integrity of the vote in the United States of America. How much more widespread would you have to be than operations going on in nearly all, if not all, of the 50 States—the major cities—and millions of dollars spent to pay people to go out and fraudulently register voters? There are over 400,000 fraudulent voter registrations that this acorn symbolizes that they have admitted to going out and purchasing on a commission basis: We're going to pay you to get these fraudulent voter registrations. Oh, they can be legitimate, but they can also be fraudulent, and ACORN didn't differentiate between

the two. They just paid out in commissions. They violated the laws of the State of Nevada, and they violated the laws of the State of New York.

This Congress shut down the funding to ACORN, and the national organization of ACORN collapsed. So for the gentleman to say—and I quote—there is no evidence of any widespread voter fraud, I think there is massive evidence of widespread voter registration fraud, and from that flowed fraudulent votes as well.

We have watched the integrity of the voter registration and the election system be undermined over the last generation in almost a calculated way. Issue after issue has eroded the integrity of the qualified voter in these ways: motor voter during the Clinton years. If you show up for a driver's license—and we know how well that works. How many of the—I think it's 15 of the 19—September 11 hijackers had driver's licenses, that breeder document for false identification? You show up for a driver's license, and they say to you in their native language, Do you want to register to vote? If you answer in the affirmative in any language, they put you down and register you to vote.

People don't understand that they're bound by perjury laws. We don't know about the prosecutions that may or may not be taking place. It's not considered to be as serious an offense by, let me just say, the Department of Justice as it should be. After all, they have their prosecutorial discretion. They have testified before the Judiciary Committee, where I serve, that they select which laws they want to enforce and which ones they do not want to enforce.

With regard to voting rights in the civil rights division of the Department of Justice, we know how that works. They have a policy that has been testified to under oath under several different scenarios that they will not move a voting rights case if it damages a minority. That's the policy of the Department of Justice, and it's the policy of the most recently departed Loretta King, who found that, in Kinston, North Carolina, that voted like 70 percent of the communities in America to have nonpartisan local elections for mayor and city council, they voted to abolish the partisanship and go to nonpartisan elections. So that would be a common practice, and 70 percent of the cities and municipalities have done that. But in Kinston, North Carolina, they were forbidden by the Department of Justice because, if you read the Department of Justice's agent's letter on that—and that was Loretta King—African Americans—no, she said “blacks”—wouldn't know who to vote for if they didn't have a “D” beside their names. Therefore, she forbid them from abolishing partisan elections in a city council and mayor's race in Kinston, North Carolina. That's one example.

There is another example of the intimidation that took place with the

New Black Panthers of Philadelphia, who were standing out there, calling people “crackers,” smacking their billy clubs in their hands, taking an offensive posture in paramilitary uniforms. That’s all on videotape—most of America has seen that—and we saw this Justice Department write off the case. The case was made. The convictions were there. This Justice Department canceled those convictions and released everyone except for the one individual, the most egregious violator, who got the tiniest little message. He got an injunction: Don’t do this again right here in this city at least for the short term. That was the injunction.

Tom Perez, the Assistant U.S. Attorney, testified under oath that that was the most severe penalty that they could have under law. Not true. Under oath, he uttered words that were not true, and we should bring him back before the committee and call him to account for this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want every American citizen who is qualified to vote. I don’t want anybody slowed up at the polls and intimidated because of any reason. But to imply that people are denied their right to vote in this country as if this were 1960 all over again really is a false premise to establish this on. We’re all about legitimate voters, and I’m all against illegitimate voters that erode the vote and dilute the vote of the legitimate voters.

□ 2120

I just mentioned motor voter. Absentee ballots themselves have been stretched out, and they can pass through numerous hands, and the various States have different policies. And whenever a ballot goes from one hand to another hand to another hand, it opens up the opportunity for fraud. I can remember a case in Iowa where near the end of the election, they found 444 ballots, absentee ballots that had not been turned in yet that were—where did they find them? Oh, Democrat campaign headquarters; 444 absentee ballots. So, Mr. Speaker, there is an example of the election fraud. I would call it widespread voter fraud that is taking place. There are convictions in Troy, New York, for example.

I also listened to testimony before the Judiciary Committee by the Secretary of State of the State of New Mexico who had to admit under oath that if I were working the election board and am a resident of New Mexico in good standing and am registered to vote, if I went in to work and figured that I would vote at the end of my shift, and somebody walked in, and they said that they are STEVE KING—me—and they lived at my address, whatever it might happen to be in New Mexico, even if they alleged that they were me, and I am working the board, I can’t challenge them by law in New Mexico. That’s a law that encourages voter fraud.

So what happens when they call up an hour before the polls close and they

say, Sally, we know that you voted, but your husband, Joe, is registered to vote, and he’s not been in to vote yet. Can you send him down? And Sally says, Well, no. Joe is in a truck in Maine. He isn’t going to be voting. And 15 minutes later, somebody shows up and says, I’m Joe, and he votes as Joe. How do you catch that? How do you police that? I suggest you do so with a picture ID, a government-issued picture ID.

We need to have a number of things go on. We have people voting on the rolls that—dead people are voting. People are voting in New York and voting in Florida; that happened in the year 2000. We know about those cases. When you have fraud within the States and that fraud flows over State lines, and when people get in buses and take a ride across a State line and go into the polls, and they vote same-day registration in voting, it opens up the door again for fraud. And the people that want to game it and invest money in it are marginally winning those close elections.

So this acorn that I carry in my pocket every day, it isn’t because I have such an abiding dislike for ACORN, as an entity. But it’s because I understand—and I want the American people to understand—what happens to the United States of America if the people that are perpetrating widespread voter fraud get their way. And it’s this, Mr. Speaker: the Constitution of the United States is the foundation of this country. It is the foundation of our law. It is the supreme law of the land, coupled with Federal law that’s written within the guidelines of the United States Constitution.

We often look at it, if we hold on to the Constitution—because if we fail, our Republic will fail and collapse as well. And I embrace the Constitution. I hold on to it. I have one in my pocket every day, and I refer to it on a regular basis. But there’s something underneath that Constitution.

When you think of the edifice of a building, and you go down and you build a foundation, a foundation on sand, for example, or a foundation on something unstable, no matter how good your foundation is—the Constitution—no matter how good that foundation is, if it’s on unstable soil, it will collapse. No foundation can be sustained just by the strength of the foundation itself. And the underpinnings, the bedrock upon which this foundation of our Republic, called the Constitution, sits is free elections, honest elections, legitimate elections, elections where qualified voters, American citizens go forth and redirect the destiny of the United States of America.

But they have to be free elections. They have to be open elections. They have to be legitimate. They have to be fair. And we cannot have noncitizens voting. We cannot have fraudulent votes. We can’t have dead people voting. We can’t have transients that are not American citizens voting. If that

happens—and it is happening—and if America loses confidence in the election system that we have, this bedrock that upholds our Constitution collapses. That bedrock of legitimate elections collapses. And if it does, the Constitution itself falls with it, Mr. Speaker. That’s why it’s important that we have voter registration lists that are free of duplicates.

And where the States have laws prohibiting the voting of felons—like Iowa, for example—free of felons, free of deceased—free of deceased, duplicates, and felons, we require a picture ID, and we need to require that the Secretary of State certify that the registered voters are citizens, and we need to enforce it, and we need to police it. And we need to say to the Department of Justice and the attorneys general within the States that have jurisdiction to bring these cases, that you must set this as a high priority.

Prosecutorial discretion, when there’s an assault on the bedrock that is the underpinning for the foundation of the United States, the Constitution, when that assault comes, it must be enforced to the fullest extent of the law. And this society and this culture and this Congress should rise up and demand that we have legitimate elections in this country.

When you think, Mr. Speaker, that a single State and a handful of votes, 537 votes in the State of Florida in the year 2000, determined the President of the United States—it may well have been for the next 8 years rather than the next 4 years—and each recount of those votes in Florida came back to the same or a very similar total—there’s not a legitimate argument any longer that Al Gore really won that race. He did not. History cannot write that. Even the recount down by The Miami Herald comes back to George Bush winning marginally by very nearly the same number that the Secretary of State certified by 537 votes.

But how many votes in Florida were fraudulent votes altogether? How much closer was that election because of election fraud? How many people voted in Florida that also voted in the State of New York? How many deceased voted? How many felons voted? We’ve got some records of those. And even though the felons that are voting that we know of are not in great numbers, this could have come down to a handful of votes. This could have come down to one vote. And if a State doesn’t have a legitimate election process, and that State’s electoral votes determine the President of the United States, and we would stand here and argue that anybody that came into the polls should be allowed to vote because, if not, their vote might be disenfranchised even though they took no responsibility to register themselves to vote, to go to the right polling place to vote, that they should be motor voted and same-day registration voted and walk into any precinct and vote, and that can be sorted out after the fact.

That happened in my State. My former Secretary of State, Chet Culver, who later became Governor, amazingly gave the order that anybody could vote in any precinct at any time, and they would sort that out afterwards. So the election that he presided over—where Iowa is the first-in-the-Nation caucus, we were the last in the Nation to certify the vote. And he is the one that also supported an executive order to grant the felons the right to vote, even though a State statute specifically prohibited such a thing.

I came to talk about a different matter, Mr. Speaker, and I will endeavor to do that. But legitimate elections with integrity in our voter registration rolls, requiring citizenship, and devoid of duplicates, deceased and felons, where the law applies and a picture ID where the people that maybe can't figure out how to vote under the rules that every other citizen can meet, such as a picture ID, will pop out their picture ID to rent a movie, for example, or to get on an airplane is another example. They can have their picture ID, but they can't be bothered to show up with that.

When we're choosing sometimes by a handful of votes the next leader of the free world within the jurisdiction of the States, that if one single State has a corrupt election process, even one that isn't as clean as it can be, even one that's just sloppy where illegitimate, illegal voters cancel out the votes of the legitimate voters and, thereby, by a marginal vote—like we saw in Florida, perhaps—change the results in that State and by doing so shift the electoral votes over to one side or the other for the Presidency, and America gets a President that we really didn't vote for because we didn't have integrity in the voting process.

□ 2130

And we could watch, not so much just the fraud, but if America loses confidence in the electoral system, if we don't have faith that the decisions of the American people emerge through the election process, then we lose confidence in our Republic altogether, and that's when the United States, our Constitution, could collapse, Mr. Speaker.

So this is a high and important goal that we have. And ACORN was cut off from Federal funding by a massive outpouring of votes in the House and the Senate. When they saw what was going on inside ACORN, even some of the strongest left wing Democrats that sit over here voted to cut off the funding to ACORN.

I had introduced the first amendment to cut off ACORN about 4 years earlier, but I'm going to carry this in my pocket because they're reforming. They're reforming in localities and cities and States across the country again. They're coming back, some of the same faces with a little bit different names. They're organizing, by the way, in the Occupy Wall Street effort in New York.

Should've known. You know, we could have called that shot early from the beginning.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a couple of comments in a transitional discussion here. I didn't set myself up with a segue, and so I'll just jump right into it, that is, I have the privilege to represent a good part of Iowa here in the United States Congress. And I've had the privilege to be involved in and engaged in the first-in-the-Nation caucus process for quite a long time now.

It came about somewhat in this way, and that would be an Iowa legislature from years gone by decided to establish the first-in-the-nation caucus. A lot of the rest of the country didn't pay much attention to it. It didn't attract the Presidential candidates in the fashion that they would have envisioned early on.

But in 1976, a little-known candidate and low-profile candidate for President who was the Governor of Georgia, Jimmy Carter, came to Iowa. He saw that opportunity that the first-in-the-Nation caucus provided and Jimmy Carter spent a lot of time in Iowa. He traveled the State and got to know people. He built a network and organization and friendships within the State. By the time the caucus rolled around in 1976, Jimmy Carter won the caucus in Iowa, which was a surprise win. People didn't see it coming. The polling didn't show it. And that surprise win was a springboard that launched Jimmy Carter on to the nomination of the Presidency out of this little-known, first-in-the-Nation caucus we have in Iowa.

And the State law that was introduced says that we shall be the first competition in the Nation, and it automatically moves the State of Iowa forward if any other State moves their date. This year it will be on January 3. So it's earlier than usual, earlier than I would like; but it will be a significant competition that evening that will give the country the first look at what Iowa activists think about who should be the next President of the United States.

Taking us back in history also, something to reflect on, and that would be Jimmy Carter in 1976 won the nomination because of the springboard of the Iowa caucus. If he had lost the Iowa caucus, I don't think we would have heard of Jimmy Carter after that. His campaign very likely would have died. That was 1976. That was the year, by the way, that Ronald Reagan challenged unsuccessfully Gerald Ford for the nomination of the Presidency.

Well, 4 years later, Ronald Reagan was a player in the Iowa caucus, but he didn't work Iowa very hard. George H.W. Bush did work Iowa very hard, and Bush won the caucus in Iowa. Reagan expected to, but he took Iowa for granted and George Herbert Walker Bush won the caucus in Iowa in 1980, and then Ronald Reagan had the pressure on him when they went to New Hampshire. And there in New Hamp-

shire Ronald Reagan had the famous line: I'm paying for this microphone, and he pulled the microphone forward, and that was the shot. That was the vignette that went around the country and around the world, and it exemplified the authority with which Ronald Reagan came to the debate and the authority with which he had governed as Governor of California and the authority with which he would later on become the best President of the 20th century. But that moment in New Hampshire was a moment for Ronald Reagan that launched him out of New Hampshire and on to the nomination and on to the Presidency.

But if you'll remember, Mr. Speaker, Gerald Ford was under serious consideration for the nomination as Vice President of the United States. And I'm actually glad they didn't make that decision. A former President as a Vice President would be too much friction, too much conflict, and not enough room for the new President to operate. But George Herbert Walker Bush was nominated and became the Vice President under Ronald Reagan, for two terms, 1980 through 1988, or 1981 through 1989 would be another way to describe that. And was, of course, the nominee and was elected to become the President of the United States.

So I would just speculate, Mr. Speaker, that had it not been for the Iowa caucus victory of George H.W. Bush, he very likely would not have been named the Vice Presidential candidate since he ran a competitive nomination competition against Ronald Reagan. Gerald Ford was not named Vice President; George H.W. Bush was. He became Vice President for 8 years, and then President for 4 years. And would we have had a President George W. Bush? Had we never had Bush 41, we maybe would never have had Bush 43.

So the continuum of history has shifted itself dramatically on the results of what was prior to that time a very low-profile, not-very-significant caucus in Iowa. Now since that period of time, it has been leveraged up again and again and again. And in the last caucus, we saw what happened with Barack Obama emerging. His movement began in Iowa. Iowa gave him his launch to New Hampshire. It wasn't my choice, obviously, Mr. Speaker; but there's a legacy that will play itself out again January 3 of this year.

I'm watching all of the Presidential candidates, and I'm watching how they perform and how they resonate with the voters. I have said since January, concluded that it was a slow start on the Presidential race. You know, most people weren't yet clamoring for a Presidential race. I thought we should start seeing and we should be seeing more activity, and so we did some things to initiate Presidential activity in the State, including hosting a Presidential event on March 26 at the Marriott Hotel in Des Moines. That seemed to galvanize and launch this caucus process.

A number of the Presidential candidates came there and made their presentations, and we intermixed it with good thinkers on policy issues of the day. That was one of the things that took place. But even then, as I listened to the Presidential candidates, and as I have the privilege to talk with them and get to know them, and it is an extraordinary privilege to know these Presidential candidates in this way, I like them all. I respect them all. Mr. Speaker, every one of them, in my opinion, would make a better President than the one we have. I will have no hesitation about endorsing and campaigning for the eventual nominee.

But there have been a couple of things missing. One of them is an economic policy plan. As I listened to the candidates, they would talk about what they would repeal, but I wasn't hearing very much about what they would do on the proactive side. So I even toyed with this idea, Mr. Speaker, and the idea of advancing some of those repeals in my own way. But as I watched the Presidential candidates, they want to tweak the tax policy some and they all want to repeal ObamaCare. I think that looks like plank number one in the platform of the nominee or any of the candidates as they compete for the nomination going forward. Plank number one, repeal ObamaCare.

Then they have their tax cut plan and how they would structure the taxes. But I have not seen all year long a significant economic proposal. One of those that has emerged now that people can identify with is Herman Cain's 9-9-9 plan. The 9-9-9 is a bumper sticker that does get people's attention. They can remember it. It has a unique ring to it, and it causes them to pay attention and look into it and understand each of the three components. Well, there's a marketing brilliance in the 9-9-9 plan. I'm going to try to avoid discussing the economic components of it, but there's a marketing brilliance.

Then Mitt Romney had, prior to that, a 59-point plan. Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I can't get through 59 points. What I can't memorize, I can't defend and explain. But subsequent to Herman Cain's 9-9-9 plan, then Rick Perry's 20/20 plan. Let's see: cut, balance and grow, or pretty close to that. I call it the 20/20 plan—that also caught people's attention—to go to a flat tax. Steve Forbes is one of the advisers on it. It looks like Art Laffer is one of the advisers on Herman Cain's 9-9-9 plan. Both are very respected economists.

□ 2140

I'm one who goes for a fair tax, so it's hard to move me on these other policies. But we're starting to see now the

Presidential candidates differentiate themselves on their economic policies.

But, Mr. Speaker, what I bring this up for is that I'm looking yet for a candidate for the Presidency who can articulate a vision for America on what their view is, what their vision is on how to take America to the next level of our destiny. What does America look like in a generation if they're able to bring their policies into play and lead with the bully pulpit of the Presidency of the United States? What does America look like? What are our fundamental principles that can be inspired by a President with that kind of vision? And how does that mesh in, how does that couple with the policies that they would advocate?

I take you back, Mr. Speaker, to Ronald Reagan, again, who for his entire political career talked about America as the shining city on the hill. He didn't talk about the shining city on the hill that he promised we were necessarily going to have. He said, America is a shining city on a hill and standing strong and true on a granite ridge. That is pretty close to a Reagan quote. It may not be exactly right, Mr. Speaker, but this gives you the concept. All of his political life, he had the vision for America as a shining city on the hill. He articulated it. When we heard it from him, maybe we didn't see it with the clarity that Reagan did, but we knew he saw it with the clarity. That was the vision thing. That is what inspired America to come behind Ronald Reagan, and that's what inspired America to become, again, this resurgent Nation where the malaise speech was put behind us and the imagination, the hope and the robust future for America unfolded from the Reagan administration. That's the biggest reason why we see him as the greatest President of the 20th century.

The next President of the United States needs to articulate a vision, needs to tell us what America looks like, what are our foundational principles, how they will refurbish those pillars of American exceptionalism, how they can strengthen the measures of life and marriage, how they can strengthen the family, that basic building block of our civilization, and how they can restrengthen the constitutional understanding. I want to hear from Presidential candidates how they would make appointments to the Supreme Court of Justices who will read and interpret the Constitution, the text of the Constitution, to mean what it was understood to mean at the time of ratification.

We have a President who is intentionally nominating activists to the Federal courts. It's a tragedy that those kinds of judges would remove the

understanding of the Constitution from the American people. And so far we've kind of moved forward accepting the idea that the people in the black robes understand more about what's written and what is meant in this Constitution than other people.

All of us in here took an oath to this Constitution. Our Federal workers take an oath to this Constitution in the executive branch. Our troops all do the same thing, and many of our State officers do the same thing. You can't take an oath to a Constitution that is living and breathing. You can only take an oath to a Constitution that means what it says. And some of them take the oath and set about seeking to amend it de facto, amending the Constitution by redefining it.

I want a President who understands the pillars of American exceptionalism, who can articulate them and can transfer them into the future as the timeless values that have gotten us to the present; one who can articulate the great, great difficulty of moving to a balanced budget, how we get a balanced budget amendment that will guide this Congress so we can be bound by our obligation to our constituencies; one who has an understanding of foreign policy; and one who has a full and complete tax plan that transforms America.

All of those things are things that fit within the vision. And the vision, right now, is what I've tuned my ear for. And I'm hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that we will be able to hear this vision come from the Presidential candidates and, before we get into January, that we'll understand or hear with that clarity from the next President what their shining city on the hill speech is for us.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 2, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during 2011 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO FRANCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 8 AND SEPT. 11, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Janice Robinson	9/08	9/11	France		1,598		1,149				2,747
Kerry Stockwell	9/08	9/11	France		1,598		1,149				2,747
Committee total											5,494

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JANICE ROBINSON, Oct. 6, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

PAUL RYAN, Chairman, Oct. 21, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JO BONNER, Chairman, Oct. 7, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Ruben Hinojosa	6/25	6/27	Italy		1,326.00		(³)				1,326.00
	6/27	6/29	Georgia		448.00		(³)				448.00
	6/29	6/30	Lithuania		319.00		(³)				319.00
	6/30	7/2	Russia		393.00		(³)				393.00
	7/2	7/3	Portugal		287.00		(³)				287.00
Committee total					2,773.00						2,773.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

SPENCER BACHUS, Chairman, Oct. 19, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Chairman, Oct. 14, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Chairman John L. Mica	6/26	6/29	Belgium		1,191.00						1,191.00
Hon. John Duncan	6/26	6/29	Belgium		1,191.00		958.39				2,149.39
Hon. Tim Holden	6/26	6/29	Belgium		1,191.00						1,191.00
Hon. Bill Shuster	6/26	6/29	Belgium		1,191.00						1,191.00
Hon. Laura Richardson	6/26	6/29	Belgium		1,191.00						1,191.00
Jim Coon	6/26	6/29	Belgium		1,191.00						1,191.00
Jimmy Miller	6/26	6/29	Belgium		1,191.00						1,191.00
Holly Woodruff Lyons	6/26	6/29	Belgium		1,191.00						1,191.00
Giles Giovinnazzi	6/26	6/29	Belgium		1,191.00						1,191.00
Jean Flemma	6/26	6/29	Belgium		1,191.00						1,191.00
Clint Hines	6/26	6/29	Belgium		1,191.00						1,191.00
Hon. Tim Holden	6/29	7/1	Israel		932.00						932.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2011—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bill Shuster	6/29	7/1	Israel		932.00						932.00
Hon. Laura Richardson	6/29	7/1	Israel		932.00						932.00
Total for page 1					15,897.00		958.30				16,855.30
Chairman John L. Mica	6/29	7/1	Israel		932.00						932.00
Jim Coon	6/29	7/1	Israel		932.00						932.00
Jimmy Miller	6/29	7/1	Israel		932.00						932.00
Holly Woodruff Lyons	6/29	7/1	Israel		932.00						932.00
Giles Giovinnazzi	6/29	7/1	Israel		932.00						932.00
Jean Flemma	6/29	7/1	Israel		932.00						932.00
Clint Hines	6/29	7/1	Israel		932.00						932.00
Chairman John L. Mica	7/1	7/3	Bratislava		472.60						472.60
Hon. Tim Holden	7/1	7/3	Bratislava		472.60						472.60
Hon. Bill Shuster	7/1	7/3	Bratislava		469.30						469.30
Hon. Laura Richardson	7/1	7/3	Bratislava		469.30						469.30
Jim Coon	7/1	7/3	Bratislava		469.30						469.30
Jimmy Miller	7/1	7/3	Bratislava		469.30						469.30
Holly Woodruff Lyons	7/1	7/3	Bratislava		469.30						469.30
Total for page 2					9,815.70						9,815.70
Giles Giovinnazzi	7/1	7/3	Bratislava		469.30						469.30
Jean Flemma	7/1	7/3	Bratislava		469.30						469.30
Clint Hines	7/1	7/3	Bratislava		469.30						469.30
Hon. John Duncan	8/26	8/29	United Kingdom		1,546.00						1,546.00
	8/29	8/31	Germany		833.15						833.15
	8/31	9/2	Austria		880.98		819.30				1,700.28
Total for page 3					4,668.03		819.30				5,487.33
Grand total for pages 1 thru 3					30,380.73		1,777.60				32,158.33

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN L. MICA, Chairman, Oct. 20, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JEFF MILLER, Chairman, Oct. 12, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAVE CAMP, Chairman, Oct. 24, 2011.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3689. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Retail Foreign Exchange Transactions; Conforming Changes to Existing Regulations in Response to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act received September 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3690. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Intergovernmental Review received October 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3691. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final

rule — Guaranteed Loan Fees (RIN: 0560-AH41) received September 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3692. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Biomass Crop Assistance Program: Corrections (RIN: 0560-AI13) received September 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3693. A letter from the Deputy Director for Policy, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received October 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3694. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the De-

partment's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement; Administering Trafficking in Persons Regulations (DFARS Case 2011-D051) (RIN: 0750-AH41) received October 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3695. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement; Accelerate Small Business Payments (DFARS Case 2011-D008) (RIN: 0750-AH19) received October 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3696. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement; Definition of "Qualifying Country End Product" (DFARS Case 2011-D028) (RIN: 0750-AH21) received September 28, 2011, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3697. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Risk-Based Capital Standards: Advanced Capital Adequacy Framework-Base II; Establishment of a Risk-Based Capital Floor (RIN: 3064-AD58) received September 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3698. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-109, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3699. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries; NMFIS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Shark Management Measures [Docket No.: 110120049-1485-02] (RIN: 0648-BA69) received September 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3700. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Standard for Granting an Inter Partes Re-examination Request [Docket No.: PTO-P-2011-0037] (RIN: 0651-AC61) received September 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3701. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Implement the Prioritized Examination Track (Track I) of the Enhanced Examination Timing Control Procedures under the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act [Docket No.: PTO-P-2011-0039] (RIN: 0651-AC62) received September 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3702. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation for Marine Events; Mattaponi Madness Drag Boat Race, Mattaponi River, Wakema, Virginia [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0744] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3703. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Apache Pier Labor Day Weekend Fireworks Display, Atlantic Ocean, Myrtle Beach, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0713] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3704. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2011-48) received October 5, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3705. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2011-47) received October 5, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3706. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service,

transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance on Electing Portability of Deceased Spousal Unused exclusion Amount [Notice 2011-82] received October 5, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3707. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Voluntary Classification Settlement Program [CASE-MIS Number: NOT-118310-11] (Announcement 2011-64) received September 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3708. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — October 2011 (Rev. Rule. 2011-22) received September 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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 Ms. PINGREE of Maine (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OLVER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KIND, Mr. SABLON, Ms. HAHN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LUJAN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 3286. A bill to promote local and regional farm and food systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 3287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to loans made from a qualified employer plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. HEINRICH):

H.R. 3288. A bill to authorize the President to remove commercial satellites and related components from the United States Munitions List subject to certain restrictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 3289. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide clarification relating to disclosures of information protected from prohibited personnel practices; to require a statement in nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements that such policies, forms, and agreements are in conformance with certain protections; to provide certain additional authorities to the Office of Special Counsel; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Homeland Security, for a period to be subse-

quently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 3290. A bill to provide for the issuance of a veterans health care stamp; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3291. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to community-based organizations and local redevelopment agencies operating in low-income communities to promote increased access to and consumption of fresh fruits, fresh vegetables, and other healthy foods among residents of such communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, 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. AMODEI (for himself and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 3292. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in Nevada except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire (for himself and Mr. GUINTA):

H.R. 3293. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) to issue, at no cost to the United States, a military service identification card to persons who served in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 3294. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide funding flexibility for transportation emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3295. A bill to amend the charter of the Archeological Institute of America with respect to the principal office of the corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 3296. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 with respect to grants for economic adjustment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 3297. A bill to temporarily expand the (V) nonimmigrant visa category to include Haitians whose petition for a family-sponsored immigrant visa was approved on or before January 12, 2010; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 3298. A bill to establish the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 3299. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to apply to retiree-only health plans the extension of dependent health coverage for individuals through 26 years of age provided for by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BACA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 3300. A bill to establish the Federal Interagency Working Group on Reducing Poverty which will create and carry out a national plan to cut poverty in American in half in ten years; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 3301. A bill to modify the purposes and operation of certain facilities of the Bureau of Reclamation to implement the water rights compact among the State of Montana, the Blackfoot Tribe of the Blackfoot Indian Reservation of Montana, and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 3302. A bill to create private sector jobs by simplifying the tax code, increasing domestic energy production, reforming government regulations, and strengthening workforce training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, Rules, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 3303. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand the Operation Hero Miles program to include the authority to accept the donation of travel benefits in the form of hotel points or awards for free or reduced-cost accommodations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 3304. A bill to permit the Delegate from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to designate depository libraries; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 3305. A bill to establish a meaningful opportunity for parole or similar release for child offenders sentenced to life in prison, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. TOWNS):

H. Res. 450. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week beginning on November 14, 2011, as National School Psychology Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 451. A resolution honoring Shirley Anita St. Hill Chisholm on the 87th year of her birth; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BACA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KIND, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CRITZ, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STARK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DELAURIO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. PETERS):

H. Res. 452. A resolution recognizing the importance labor unions play in ensuring a strong middle class by advocating for more equitable wages, humane work conditions, improved benefits, and increased civic engagement by everyday workers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are sub-

mitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine:

H.R. 3286.

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 Defense 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 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 3288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the authority delineated in Article I section I, which includes an implied power for the Congress to regulate the conduct of the United States with respect to foreign affairs.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 7, to establish Post Offices and Post Roads, in combination with Article I, Section 8, clause 18, To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Further, Congress has the authority to issue postal stamps pursuant to Article I, Section 8, clause 3, granting Congress the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 3291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 3292.

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 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. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 3293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 14, of Section 8, of Article I

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 3294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: "The Congress shall have the Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 3296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1. "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 3297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill, the Haitian Emergency Life Protection Act of 2011 (The Help Act), is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 3298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority to enact this legislation can be found in:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1),
Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3).

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 3299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 3300.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 3301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 3302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8. The Congress shall have Power To law and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense . . .

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes . . .

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 3303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 3304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 3305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 66: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 104: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 176: Ms. HAHN and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 186: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 283: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 284: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 373: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 436: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. WEST.

H.R. 466: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 623: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 689: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 721: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 724: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 735: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 798: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 873: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 890: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 891: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 973: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 1004: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1037: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1041: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1110: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 1116: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1167: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1173: Mr. PENCE, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1179: Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 1182: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1190: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1193: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1195: Mr. PETERS and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1206: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 1236: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1239: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1254: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 1285: Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.R. 1330: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1340: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. RIVERA.

H.R. 1370: Mr. SCHILLING and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 1398: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1448: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1474: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1489: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1546: Ms. MOORE, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 1558: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1591: Mr. WEST.

H.R. 1612: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 1621: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1633: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1653: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1654: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 1681: Mr. WELCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1738: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 1744: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 1746: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1755: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1792: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1860: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1905: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. TURNER of New York, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1958: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

H.R. 1964: Mr. KEATING, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1966: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1970: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2026: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2030: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2040: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 2052: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2063: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2085: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2086: Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 2092: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 2105: Mr. TURNER of New York.

H.R. 2131: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2139: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 2164: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 2214: Mr. LANDRY, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 2232: Mr. WEST.

H.R. 2245: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2277: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 2287: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2288: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2299: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 2307: Ms. FOXX and Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 2334: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 2337: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 2369: Mr. TURNER of New York and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2387: Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 2407: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2459: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2471: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2478: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 2505: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2514: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2528: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 2541: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 2543: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2569: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. BERG, Mr. BARROW, Mr.

- PETERS, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H.R. 2571: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 2580: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 2606: Mr. TURNER of New York.
 H.R. 2655: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BOREN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 2659: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 2662: Mr. YODER and Mr. HULTGREN.
 H.R. 2674: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 2679: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 2697: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 2705: Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 2706: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 2716: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 2751: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 2770: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 2779: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 2821: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. BONNER, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. RICHMOND.
 H.R. 2829: Mr. LANKFORD.
 H.R. 2866: Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H.R. 2874: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 2875: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 2880: Mr. RUSH, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 2885: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. GUINTA.
 H.R. 2886: Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 2888: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
- H.R. 2898: Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H.R. 2966: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 2970: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 2972: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 2977: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 2998: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 3018: Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 3021: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 3042: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 3046: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 3066: Mr. NUNNELEE.
 H.R. 3074: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H.R. 3083: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 3086: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 3102: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 3126: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 3130: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 3133: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3145: Ms. NORTON and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 3158: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 3159: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 3181: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 3186: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 3189: Ms. NORTON and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 3203: Mr. WALDEN and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 3213: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 3218: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 3245: Mr. BENISHEK and Ms. BUERKLE.
- H.R. 3257: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 3262: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 3265: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. CARDOZA.
 H.R. 3268: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 3272: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. WOLF.
 H. Res. 98: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KIND, and Mr. MARKEY.
 H. Res. 177: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H. Res. 220: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LEVIN, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H. Res. 282: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H. Res. 376: Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. REICHERT.
 H. Res. 429: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. MARINO, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COLE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H. Res. 432: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
 H. Res. 433: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. CRAVAACK.
 H. Res. 445: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.