



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 2012

No. 33

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 1, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KEVIN YODER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

We come to the end of a short week in which we have given thanks for and honored African American men and women whose labor, while in bondage, built this temple of freedom and democracy within which we now stand.

Now we approach a weekend during which many Members of this assembly will gather to remember a historic event in Selma, Alabama. Forty-seven years ago, brave men and women, Americans of all races, colors, and faiths, walked together to help guarantee freedoms still denied the descendants of those slave laborers.

Bless the Members of this assembly and us all that we would be worthy of the call we have been given as Americans to nurture and guarantee democratic freedoms to all that dwell in our great Nation. Help us all to be truly thankful and appropriately generous in our response.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FARR led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches from each side of the aisle.

OUR MILITARY FAMILIES DESERVE FAIRNESS

(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, earlier this week I was fortunate to chair a House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel where we had a hearing in regard to receiving information concerning the administration's military personnel budget overview for 2013.

The administration constantly preaches about fairness. Over the next 10 years, the administration has proposed cutting our military personnel by 123,000 troops and cutting civilian employees by a mere 7,000 personnel,

but destroying 130,000 jobs. It is absolutely unfair that the administration believes in drastically eliminating our troops with no substantial cuts to any other Department of our government even as we are at war with an enemy that is obsessed with death. Additionally, the administration's proposal allows an increase of TriCare health insurance enrollment fees by a possible 345 percent over the next 5 years. This kind of unfairness must stop.

I urge the President and his administration to reconsider their budget request and treat our military personnel, military families, and veterans with the fairness they've earned and the respect they deserve.

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

51ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 51st anniversary of the Peace Corps.

In just 51 years, the Peace Corps has been an unparalleled force for peace. Listen to the numbers: 139 developing countries have been served; over 200,000 returned Peace Corps volunteers and four of those are Members of Congress. Taken together, these volunteers have contributed more than 400,000 years of service in the name of peace.

I am proud to be a part of these ranks. The Peace Corps changed my life, and it continues to change the lives of both those who serve and the communities that are served.

In 2012, this call to service doesn't show any signs of slowing down. As I speak, 9,095 Americans are serving in 76 countries. This includes my constituent Chase Rollings of Santa Cruz,

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.

H1103

who is working in Ethiopia teaching the English language for a tour guide association to increase ecotourism and helping women develop honey production and dried fruit projects to promote their income. That is just the work of one volunteer.

Today, I honor Chase and hundreds of thousands of other Peace Corps volunteers past and present. Each one of you represents America's highest ideals: peace, prosperity, and friendship. Truly your service is more important today than it has ever been.

Congress must fund the Peace Corps. It is the best job in America.

SUPPORT THE FEDERAL PRICE GOUGING PREVENTION ACT

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, as Rhode Islanders and men and women across America are hard at work trying to put our country back on the right track, the threat of rising gas prices raises a specter of another difficult driving season ahead.

While our government subsidizes Big Oil to the tune of \$3 billion each year, they continue to run up record profits as hardworking families pay higher and higher prices for gas. In my home State of Rhode Island where families are struggling with an 11 percent unemployment rate and the average price of a gallon of regular gas is now \$3.79, rising fuel costs put far too many hardworking families at risk.

The Federal Price Gouging Prevention Act, which my colleague Mr. BISHOP has introduced, would help guarantee that should we face an energy emergency, middle class families are not at the mercy of Wall Street speculators every time they fill up their car. While we have to work together permanently to end our addiction to foreign sources of oil, in the short term we must act on legislation like the Federal Price Gouging Prevention Act that will help prevent Wall Street speculators from taking unfair advantage of consumers at the pump during energy emergencies.

I AM PROUD TO SUPPORT PRESIDENT OBAMA

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the pleasure of having some gentlemen from the railroad industry come and visit my office, and they let me know how their business has improved over the years.

One of the indices of an improving economy is the number of railcars filled, and that has gone up and up. Warren Buffett said it was the best indicator of how the economy is doing. The railcars are being filled, and a lot of it is because of automobile distribution and automobile production.

The automobile industry in our Nation was saved because of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and the work of President Barack Obama and the TARP, all of which have helped our economy get better and lower our unemployment rates.

As I think of the good work President Obama has done, I read yesterday about an al Qaeda arrested and stopped in Cairo, Egypt. Besides Osama bin Laden, other members of al Qaeda have been eliminated and our country is safer.

The Dow went over 13,000, which is another indicator of a burgeoning economy that is getting out of the Bush recession.

I want to say that I'm proud to support President Obama, his jobs plan, his efforts to maintain the automobile industry strong in America, and to support him in Libya and root out Qadhafi and al Qaeda in other places.

□ 0910

DIRECTING OFFICE OF HISTORIAN TO COMPILE ORAL HISTORIES FROM MEMBERS INVOLVED IN ALABAMA CIVIL RIGHTS MARCHES

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of February 29, 2012, I call up House Resolution 562 directing the Office of the Historian to compile oral histories from current and former Members of the House of Representatives involved in the historic and annual Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, marches, as well as the civil rights movement in general, for the purposes of expanding or augmenting the historic record and for public dissemination and education, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H. RES. 562

Whereas in 1965, civil rights advocates participated in three marches from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, marking a watershed moment of the civil rights movement;

Whereas the first march took place on March 7, 1965, during which 600 civil rights activists, led by now-Representative John Lewis and Reverend Hosea Williams, began a march to protest unfair voter registration practices and the shooting death of Jimmie Lee Jackson during a voter registration drive;

Whereas marchers progressed only six blocks from the Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, where many were tear-gassed and beaten;

Whereas two days later, on March 9, 1965, Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., led a symbolic march of 2,000 people to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, all kneeling there to pray;

Whereas, on March 21, 1965, with protection from the Alabama National Guard, more than 3,000 people set out from Selma again led by Rev. King, marching an average of 12 miles a day along Route 80 and sleeping in farm fields;

Whereas that group grew to 25,000 participants by the time it reached Montgomery on March 25, 1965, where Rev. King delivered one of his most venerated speeches;

Whereas as a result of this historic three-week period, Congress passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965, five months after the third march, as a recognition of the right of all United States citizens to fully participate in the electoral process;

Whereas in 1996, Congress created the 54-mile long Selma-to-Montgomery National Historic Trail along the route of this third march, starting at the Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church in Selma, crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge, and ending at the Alabama State Capitol in Montgomery;

Whereas beginning in 1998, Members of Congress have participated in an annual civil rights pilgrimage to the Selma-to-Montgomery National Historic Trail, to visit the historic sites, participate in fellowship, and recognize the achievements of the civil rights movement;

Whereas the Office of the Historian, first established in 1983, researches, preserves, and interprets the rich institutional history of the House of Representatives in order to share it with Members, staff, and the public, and serves as the institutional memory to inspire greater understanding of the House of Representatives' central role in United States history;

Whereas Members of the House of Representatives have included participants in the historic 1965 marches and in the annual pilgrimages thereafter; and

Whereas the collection of oral memories of march participants who have served in the House of Representatives, and will continue to serve in the House of Representatives, is essential to the preservation of the history of the institution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives directs the Office of the Historian to compile oral histories from current and former Members of the House of Representatives involved in the historic and annual Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, marches, as well as the civil rights movement in general, for the purposes of expanding or augmenting the historic record and for public dissemination and education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, February 29, 2012, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 562, which directs the Office of the Historian to compile and disseminate oral histories from current and former Members of the House of Representatives involved in the historic and annual Selma-to-Montgomery, Alabama, marches, as well as the civil rights movement in general.

In March of 1965, a defining 3-week period of the civil rights movement culminated with a historic 54-mile

march from Selma to Montgomery. Led by the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., it was the last of three marches that resulted in the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 recognizing the right of all Americans to participate in the electoral process.

On March 7, 1965, our colleague from Georgia, Mr. JOHN LEWIS, and the Reverend Hosea Williams led 600 civil rights activists in the first march from Selma to Montgomery to protest the shooting of Jimmie Lee Jackson, killed just a few weeks earlier by State troopers while doing nothing more than registering African Americans to vote. The march lasted only six blocks before coming to a violent end on the Edmund Pettus Bridge. In what has become known as Bloody Sunday, troopers used tear gas and clubs to beat the protesters back from the bridge. The upsetting, horrifying images of peaceful marchers being brutally assaulted by authorities brought national attention to the plight of African Americans in the South and greater resolve to those seeking equality for all.

Two days later, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., led a second symbolic march where 2,000 participants returned to the Edmund Pettus Bridge and proceeded to kneel and pray.

On March 21, this time with protection from Federal authorities and the Alabama National Guard, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., led a 54-mile march to the State capitol building. Three days later, the group that started with 3,000 participants and grew to 25,000 strong, arrived in Montgomery, where Dr. King proclaimed:

We are on the move now. Like an idea whose time has come, not even the marching of mighty armies can halt us. We are moving to the land of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the magnitude and importance of this historic event is undeniable, and its significance to American history must never be forgotten.

To commemorate these marches, Congress in 1996 created the 54-mile-long Selma to Montgomery National Historic Trail along the route of Dr. King's march, starting at the Brown Chapel AME Church in Selma and ending at the Alabama State Capitol in Montgomery.

Since 1998, Members of Congress have participated in an annual civil rights pilgrimage on the Selma to Montgomery National Historic Trail. In March of 2009, I had the privilege of participating with my wife in this event. We marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, and we were inspired by those with firsthand experiences from the events of 1965.

Documenting and sharing the experiences of Members who participated in historic and annual marches from Selma to Montgomery is critically important to the recognition and preservation of the achievements of the American civil rights movement. As I understand it, Mr. LEWIS from Georgia and the majority leader whip, Mr. MCCARTHY, will lead the 2012 congress-

sional civil rights pilgrimage starting tomorrow. It is fitting that we are here today with this resolution as another group of Members begin their journey.

I want to thank my colleagues from Alabama, Ms. SEWELL and Mrs. ROBY, for introducing this important resolution.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues not only to support the resolution but also to take part in the annual congressional Selma to Montgomery march.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0920

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleagues, Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR, Congresswomen TERRI SEWELL and MARTHA ROBY, for offering this resolution today.

I am so pleased that this resolution will preserve the oral histories of current and former Members of Congress who participated in the civil rights movement, and it will also preserve the experiences of Members who have come on the Faith & Politics Civil Rights Pilgrimage to Alabama.

Together, we have retraced the steps that were walked so many years ago and have spent time with some of the people who shaped the civil rights movement. Some of the Members who have gone on this pilgrimage were not even born during the civil rights movement, and they come to learn about our Nation's history. Many Members have come away changed by this experience forever.

This resolution will help us preserve a powerful and transformative period in American history. Without the brave and courageous souls who shed blood, sweat, and tears in Alabama and throughout the South, this would be a very different Nation today.

It is very important that Members of Congress understand and acknowledge the debt we owe to ordinary people with extraordinary vision, who, as Dr. Martin Luther King once said, "injected new meaning into the very veins of our democracy."

Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1965, 600 peaceful, nonviolent protesters attempted to march from Selma, Alabama, to the State capitol in Montgomery to dramatize to the world that people of color wanted to register to vote.

We left Brown Chapel AME Church that morning on a sacred mission, prepared to defy the dictates of man to demonstrate the truth of a higher law. Ordinary citizens with extraordinary vision walked shoulder to shoulder, two by two, in a silent, peaceful protest against injustice in the American South. We were met at the foot of the Edmund Pettus Bridge by a sea of blue—Alabama State troopers. Some were mounted on horseback, but all of them were armed with guns, tear gas, and billy clubs, and beyond them were

deputized citizens who were waving any weapons they could find.

Then we heard:

I am Major John Cloud. This is an unlawful march. You cannot continue. You have 3 minutes to go home or return to your church.

We were preparing to kneel and pray when the major said, "Troopers advance."

The troopers came toward us, beating us and spraying tear gas. That brutal confrontation became known as Bloody Sunday.

It produced a sense of righteous indignation around the country and around the world that led this Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Eight days after Bloody Sunday, President Lyndon Johnson addressed a joint session of Congress and made what I believe is the greatest statement any President has ever made on the importance of voting rights in America.

He said:

I speak tonight for the dignity of man and for the destiny of democracy. At times, history and fate meet at a single time, in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was a century ago at Appomattox. So it was last week in Selma, Alabama.

During that speech, President Johnson condemned the violence in Selma and called on Congress to enact the Voting Rights Act. He closed his speech by echoing the words of the civil rights movement, saying over and over, "And we shall overcome . . . And we shall overcome."

Congress did pass the Voting Rights Act, and on August 6, 1965, it was signed into law.

This weekend, starting tomorrow, is the 12th congressional pilgrimage to civil rights sites in Birmingham, Montgomery, and in Selma with the Faith & Politics Institute. We will remember the distance we have come and the progress we have made. We will end our time together in Selma by crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

During this trip, we see ourselves not as Democrats or Republicans or as adversaries. We see ourselves as Americans on a journey to discover our history. We all come away from this pilgrimage with a deeper appreciation of our democracy and the power of people to make a difference in our society. I am so pleased that this story will be told.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), a distinguished member of the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. PETRI. I thank my colleague from California for yielding.

I support House Resolution 562, which recognizes the importance of preserving the oral histories of current and former Representatives' personal

experiences regarding the historic Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, marches and the civil rights movement.

As a student during the civil rights movement, I had the opportunity to witness the impact the Selma to Montgomery marches had on shifting public opinions. An example of the influence the marches wielded is the fact that, 2 days after witnessing the images of the initial march in the media, President Johnson presented a bill to a joint session of Congress, which became the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Like so many others, I tried to play my own small part in support of the civil rights movement. As a member of the NAACP and as a college student, I participated in a boycott of a Woolworth's store in support of the desegregation of the chain's lunch counters in the South. During that time, Dr. King came to our college, and I had the honor to very briefly meet him.

While my direct involvement in the civil rights movement may have been limited, there are many former and current Members who have unique and inspirational stories to share about the historic 1965 marches and the civil rights movement.

We have the honor of serving with Representative JOHN LEWIS, for example, who just spoke, who is an icon of the civil rights movement. I have been lucky enough to hear him speak movingly to student groups and others about his experiences as he led the fight for racial and voter equality. It is important that accounts such as his be preserved in the historic record so that they can be shared for years to come. I believe it is important to keep the history and heritage of the civil rights movement alive by collecting and sharing these oral histories with the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and I urge its passage by the House today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, my distinguished colleague, JOHN LEWIS, for inviting me to be a part of this resolution presentation.

I think it is very important as we commemorate this event that we realize those were some dark and dangerous days and that there were both black and white people who gave their lives so that black people could have the right to vote.

There was Ms. Viola Gregg Liuzzo from Detroit, Michigan, a white lady who came down to Selma to help African Americans get the right to vote. She was shot and killed on Highway 80 in Selma, Alabama. We need not forget Michael Schwerner and Andrew Goodman, along with James Chaney, two young white men and one black man, who were shot and killed.

When we tell this story about the civil rights movement, it is important

that we tell this story right so that this is a true story of the greatness of America. It is not just a black story. It is America's story. White and black people lost their lives, gave their lives for us to have the right to vote. This is the greatness of this.

I just want to say what a privilege it is for us to have a man like JOHN LEWIS to serve with. Let us not even begin to underestimate the significant contribution of this young man—and I call him a young man—whom I serve with and you serve with. I, personally, appreciate JOHN LEWIS for taking me with him when I was a student, traveling through the South, and I saw firsthand with him what we had to go for.

JOHN, I want to say to you, thank you for taking me through that baptism of fire for it has truly made me the man I am today. I want to thank you for that, and the entire Nation thanks you and all of those.

As I said, I want everybody to remember Ms. Viola Gregg Liuzzo from Detroit, who came down, and Michael Schwerner and Andrew Goodman, these people who gave their lives.

□ 0930

I want to also thank Ms. TERRI SEWELL, who represents the area in Alabama where so much of this sacrifice took place.

This is an extraordinary pilgrimage. I was on it, have been on it, and I encourage everybody that can to go on this pilgrimage and see and experience what I call the greatness of America.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), a member of the Committees on Armed Services, Agriculture, Education and the Workforce, and she cosponsored this resolution.

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

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, today I'm so proud to join with TERRI SEWELL, another Alabama freshman Member, to offer House Resolution 562, an initiative that will preserve a collection of accounts from Members involved in the historic and annual marches from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama.

The oral histories preserved through this resolution will memorialize the symbolic events that changed the direction of the civil rights movement. What took place during three historic marches in Alabama over a 3-week period in 1965 proved to be a powerful transformation in American history. The courageous actions of so many moved our country out of an era of misguided actions.

Participants marched towards a unified goal to provide equal voting rights for all Americans. The first march, on March 7, 1965, remains, without a doubt, one of the worst demonstrations

of racial violence. Participants peacefully marching were met by a brutal and aggressive police force.

This violence was captured by the news and broadcast to family rooms all over this Nation. It quickly delivered a message to a racially divided country of unforeseen consequences caused by segregation.

Such shameless violent actions unleashed on nonviolent marchers revealed the immediate need for equal rights for citizens. Without a doubt, the days that racial voting laws were enforced for our country were among the darkest and least honorable for this Nation.

Even today, our country is still repairing from the wrongs inflicted decades ago by racial segregation. If it were not for the unwavering courage of those marching for civil freedoms, our country would be very different than the way we know it today. Their brave actions will be forever memorialized by the Selma To Montgomery Voting Rights Trail.

Our younger generations today did not witness firsthand the historic demonstrations that forged a unified Nation, myself included. Therefore, it is so important to record the testimonies in order to reveal the scope and the relevance of these civil rights events.

I am proud to introduce this resolution with Representative SEWELL to preserve the history of our democracy.

The resolution instructs the Office of the Historian to compile testimonies from current and former Members of Congress who have participated in historic or commemorative civil rights movement actions. It will tell every generation a detailed timeline of these historic moments in the civil rights movement.

Those marching for equality were among the many patriots that envisioned a better America, one free from racial discrimination.

The marches proved not only to be successful in granting equal voting rights, but an illustrative account of citizens attaining freedom from harsh discrimination. Though such intolerable actions can never be reversed, there is still dignity knowing that the participants of these marches permanently changed the course of American history.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of this bicameral resolution.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, the Democratic Leader, NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation and commend Congresswoman SEWELL and Congresswoman ROBY for their leadership in bringing this to the floor and giving us the opportunity to speak about the heroes amongst us.

In some of the darkest hours of our Nation's history, as we all know, there are stories of great courage. By preserving these stories, which this legislation enables us to do, we ensure that

those who come after us will know that the cause of equality is both our Nation's heritage and our hope.

Unsurpassed in courage in our midst is our colleague, the conscience of the Congress, Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

On March 7, 1965, as many of us all know, Congressman JOHN LEWIS was the leader of 600 peaceful, orderly Americans crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge. He was met by State troopers, tear gas, bullwhips, and nightsticks. Though he faced great prejudice and discrimination, he was not embittered; he was emboldened to dedicate his life to the cause of justice and equality.

It is a great privilege for each of us to serve with JOHN LEWIS in Congress, an honor to call him colleague. I want to speak about his leadership in taking so many Members of Congress and their families and friends across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in recent years.

I had the privilege to join him in the year 2001. After the visit, I said to him, of the 3 days we were in your district, Congresswoman ROBY, in Montgomery, Selma, and in Birmingham, and the course of the weekend, that the experience was one that every schoolchild in America should experience. We talked about Washington, DC; Philadelphia and Independence Hall; Baltimore and Fort McHenry; Boston with all of that history; New York and the rest, but this is a very important part of who we are as a country. If you want to learn about America, it's important to visit these sites to see the courage, to see the commitment to the values of our Founders that were so courageously defended and advocated for.

At this sad time, and for many of us it was in our lifetimes that this disaster was happening in our country, this ongoing disaster, the culmination of it took so many people a longer time to see. We always talk about the inevitable in the minds of some and the inconceivable in the minds of others, and how our work is to shorten the distance between the inevitable and the inconceivable. Well, it took some people a much longer time to understand what was inevitable for America, that we would be moving, gravitating toward a more perfect union. That would not have been possible without the leadership of people like JOHN LEWIS. There aren't many people like JOHN LEWIS, but who followed his lead.

There are other Members of Congress who also were leaders in the Nation's civil rights movement, and we honor all of them today. They include Assistant Leader JIM CLYBURN, who was arrested several times for his civil disobedience on behalf of civil rights; Congressman BARNEY FRANK and Congressman JOHN CONYERS, who both volunteered during the Freedom Summer; Congressman BOB FILNER, who spent several months in jail after his efforts as a Freedom Rider, and he takes great pride in being invited back to the reunion of the Freedom Riders; Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, who was an organizer of the Student Non-

violent Coordinating Committee; and Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL, who, along with Congresswoman ROBY, is a sponsor of this legislation. Congresswoman SEWELL is from Selma, and her family opened their home to travelers on the 1965 march from Selma to Montgomery.

I am sure there are more, but all of these people played a role. JOHN LEWIS, of course, an icon in our country for his leadership at that time.

□ 0940

These American heroes made history. They also made progress for our country. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this legislation to ensure that our history and the heroes of it, that that history lives on long after we are gone.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), a member of the Foreign Affairs and Judiciary Committees.

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this important legislation and commend Ms. SEWELL and Mrs. ROBY for their leadership in chronicling an extraordinary time in our march toward a more perfect Union. It seems altogether fitting, on the eve of the anniversary march commemorating what history records as Bloody Sunday and at the end of Black History Month, that we consider this resolution which will create a process for preserving the valuable oral history of those Members of Congress who were early leaders in the American civil rights movement.

There are very few giants these days in public life, but JOHN LEWIS is among them. Let me say what a privilege it has been for me these last 11 years to serve and to befriend my colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and I thank you for your leadership on this resolution.

There's also an effort in this resolution to give Members of Congress who have participated in the annual pilgrimage to Selma and Montgomery to reflect on their experiences, and I'll be very humbled to be a small part of that. I was honored to serve as the co-leader of the 10th Congressional Civil Rights Pilgrimage sponsored by the Faith & Politics Institute in March of 2010, and I can say, as my colleague Mr. LEWIS knows, it was a life-changing experience for my wife, Karen, and our three teenaged-children, and I'll forever be grateful for the experience.

We started the weekend at the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, the home church of Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. We sat in the pews as we heard Dorothy Cotton and others talk about their years in that church and how their faith in Christ sustained the cause of liberty and the cause of civil rights.

We made our way to the Civil Rights Memorial to honor and remember those who had lost their lives in the struggle for equality. But the next day, traveling with my colleague, JOHN LEWIS, to Selma to mark the anniversary of a day that changed his life and changed his Nation, March 7, 1965, known as Bloody Sunday, we will always remember.

The night before, JOHN had recounted that momentous day. He told how he and several hundred courageous activists had crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma. But it was actually being a part of the reenactment that most touched our hearts as a family. We had gathered at the Brown Chapel in Selma before we made the march, and then, along with thousands, we made our way the few short miles to the Edmund Pettus Bridge. For my part, JOHN and I walked with Dr. F.D. Reese, pastor of the Ebenezer Baptist Church in Selma at the time.

As we strolled that historic route, I was enthralled as Dr. Reese, 80-some-odd years young, recounted the day as if it had been the day before. He told me how the Edmund Pettus Bridge crests at the middle, so it was not until you all reached the top of the bridge that you knew what was waiting on the other side. And he described to me what they saw. He said, "All you saw was a sea of blue" when they crested the bridge.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman.

I turned to Dr. Reese, and I said to him, "Did you think about turning back?"

He said, "No. We had prayed at the Brown Chapel, and we decided to go on regardless."

And so you did.

It's just extraordinary to think of the beatings that took place that day. Our own colleague experienced a notorious beating at the time. But as the march that day, the reenactment came to an end, I extended my hand to Dr. Reese and I thanked him for not only what he had done for the civil rights movement, for what JOHN LEWIS had done for the civil rights movement, but for what they all had done for America. And he put his hand on my shoulder, Dr. Reese did, and he said, "MIKE, God did something here."

And so He did.

Through these extraordinary and courageous Americans, we forged a more perfect Union.

And so I rise in support of this resolution, commend my colleagues who will participate this weekend in Montgomery and Selma in this historic reenactment. I commend Congressman JOHN LEWIS, Dorothy Cotton, F.D. Reese, and all of those great Americans who on that day made the sacrifices necessary to further perfect this last best hope of Earth.

We should always safeguard this history, cherish it, and emulate their courage and bravery, so help us God.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 562, offered by Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. I wish to extend my deep appreciation to Ms. SEWELL, a native of Selma, Alabama, for introducing this timely resolution.

As we close Black History Month and near the anniversary of "Bloody Sunday" and the Selma to Montgomery, Alabama civil rights marches, it's important to remember the sacrifice of those who went before us nearly half a century ago and shed blood so that freedom could continue its march in the hearts and minds of so many Americans.

To that end, thanks to a resolution offered by Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL from Alabama, the U.S. House of Representatives is acting to preserve the valuable oral history of those Members of Congress who were early leaders in the American civil rights movement. The resolution will also document the experiences of many Congressmen and Congresswomen who have participated in the annual pilgrimage from Selma to Montgomery. It is a fitting honor of that momentous day in 1965 when my friend and colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, the legendary civil rights leader, along with Hosea Williams, led 600 brave souls across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

I was deeply honored and humbled to serve as the co-leader of the 10th Congressional Civil Rights Pilgrimage sponsored by the Faith and Politics Institute in March of 2010. My family and I will never forget that experience.

We started the weekend at the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, the home church of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Sitting in the front pew we heard from Dorothy Cotton about her years working with Dr. King. She spoke of the faith that sustained their work and the historic importance of music and singing to the movement.

We then made our way to the Civil Rights Memorial to honor and remember those who had lost their lives in the struggle for equality. The nearby museum tells the personal stories of segregation by those who lived it and peacefully fought against it. Hearing firsthand accounts of how African Americans in the South were systematically denied the right to vote, intimidated, beaten and even killed fighting for that right will never leave us.

The next day we traveled with JOHN LEWIS to Selma to mark the anniversary of a day that changed his life and America: March 7, 1965, also known as "Bloody Sunday." JOHN was personally recruited by Dr. King as a college student and his courage and moral authority continue to inspire millions.

As JOHN recounted that momentous day, he told of how he and several hundred courageous activists crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma during a march on the state capitol and were beaten by state police waiting on the far side of the bridge. The images of that day were transmitted around the world and would sear the conscience of the Nation. It set the stage for more protests and was the catalyst for Congress to enact the Voting Rights Act later that year.

We gathered for worship at Brown Chapel in Selma, and after a rousing service, we left the church to walk to the Edmund Pettus Bridge. I had the privilege to walk the entire way alongside JOHN LEWIS and Dr. F.D. Reese, pastor of the Ebenezer Baptist Church in Selma.

As we strolled the historic route, surrounded by thousands, I was enthralled by Dr. Reese's description of that fateful day. He said that when they reached the crest of the bridge and could see the other side of the river, the first thing they saw was the state police waiting to stop the march. He said, "All you saw was a sea of blue." But still they marched.

I asked if they thought of turning back when they saw the array of police. He smiled and said, "No, we had prayed at the Brown Chapel and decided we would go on regardless." And so they did.

After pausing at the base of the bridge for prayer, he told me how the tear gas and the beatings with nightsticks overtook the crowd. My friend JOHN LEWIS was among those most severely beaten.

As our march came to an end, I extended my hand to Dr. Reese and thanked him not only for what he had done for the civil rights movement, but also for what he, JOHN LEWIS and others had done for America that day. Dr. Reese replied humbly, "God did something here." And through these brave Americans, I believe that with all my heart.

Every American should know the story of Montgomery and Selma. Thanks to courageous Americans like Dr. King, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, Dorothy Cotton and F.D. Reese, these cities have become an integral part of the American story in our nation's unrelenting march toward a more perfect union.

Today's resolution further safeguards this valuable history so that it may endure throughout future generations, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of Alabama's Seventh Congressional District and a Selma native, I am proud and humbled that I could introduce this bipartisan resolution with my colleague, friend, and fellow Alabamian, Representative MARTHA ROBY. Acknowledging the historic significance of the Selma to Montgomery marches by adding the voices of Members of Congress, current and former, to the history of the civil rights movement, we are preserving an important part of the legacy that is the civil rights movement, a legacy that is important not only to black history but to American history and, thus, to world history.

It is truly a full circle moment for me. Personally, I stand here today before this august congressional body as a Member of Congress and a native of Selma, Alabama. I ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 562. I am humbled because I know that my election last year would not have been possible had it not been for the courage of Members of Congress, present and former, like Congressman JOHN LEWIS. For that, I say thank you.

This resolution directs the House Office of Historian to compile oral histories from current and former Members of Congress involved in the monumental Selma to Montgomery marches as well as the civil rights movement. These documents will be used for the

purpose of extending and augmenting the historical record for public dissemination and education. The historical accounts of current and former Members of Congress are living history. They offer an important perspective on the events of the 1960s.

The State of Alabama played a critical role and an integral part of the fabric of the civil rights movement and American history. It is a painful part of Alabama's history. But today, we stand, opening arms and welcoming the commemoration of those events, because without those events and the brave men and women who traveled all across this Nation to come to the State of Alabama during the 1960s to bring about the change that we all enjoy, black men and white men, Jews and gentiles, coming together in order to make sure that we had a more perfect Union and that America lived up to its ideals of democracy and civil liberties.

I can't imagine what it was like to be Congressman JOHN LEWIS as he walked across the Edmund Pettus Bridge. I grew up in Selma. I lived my life in Selma, Alabama. My mom and dad are still in Selma, Alabama. I cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge every time I go home to visit them. It stands as a symbol for the world of what's possible when brave white men and black men, women, and children decide to change the fate of history and, in doing so, bring about significant changes for this country.

I'm proud to represent Selma, Alabama; Birmingham, Alabama; Tuscaloosa, Alabama; the State of Alabama in this Congress. I do so humbly because of the courage and bravery of former and current Members of Congress who did the unthinkable.

□ 0950

I can't imagine being Congressman JOHN DINGELL from Michigan who first took office in 1955. He sat in this very Chamber and voted for the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 against amazing opposition from his own constituents in Michigan. He did the brave thing about voting in favor of these historic legislations.

He was not the only one sitting in this Chamber in 1965. Representative JOHN CONYERS, a black Congressman who was elected in 1965 and who still serves in this Chamber, was in this room and cast that vote for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

We need to remember and record the history of Congressman LEWIS, Congressman DINGELL, and Congressman CONYERS, and so many Members of Congress, current and past, who are alive today and preserve that history for future generations to come.

Over the next 3 years, Congressman LEWIS, we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of so many of those events of the 1960s. In fact, the mayor of the city of Birmingham is declaring 2013 the Year of Birmingham because we will be celebrating 50 years since the bombing

of 16th Street Baptist Church when four little black girls gave their lives so that I could enjoy the freedoms I enjoy today, so that we all can enjoy the freedoms that we enjoy today.

Over the next 3 years, it will be 50 years for a lot of significant 1960 events, and I am honored to join with my colleague, MARTHA ROBY, who represents Montgomery and is a native of Montgomery. Alabama has two women Members of the congressional delegation for the first time ever. Our elections in 2011 were only made possible because of the courage of so many people who sat in this body and made tough votes. To the people of this Chamber who decided that it was time to make a difference in America, I'm honored to share the cosponsorship of this legislation with MARTHA ROBY. We share a common history as proud Alabamians, a history that should be recorded for posterity.

Now, this weekend, I get the opportunity, as well as Congresswoman MARTHA ROBY and Congressman SPENCER BACHUS, to co-host with Congressman JOHN LEWIS the Faith & Politics Institute's annual pilgrimage back to Alabama. We will start this coming Friday, tomorrow, in Birmingham. We will visit the historic site of the 16th Street Baptist Church. We will walk in Kelly Ingram Park with Congressman JOHN LEWIS and walk in his footsteps. We will visit the Civil Rights Institute in Birmingham, Alabama, and then we will travel on Saturday to Montgomery, Alabama, and we will see Dexter Avenue Baptist Church where Martin Luther King was a young pastor.

We will also enjoy in the evening a dinner, a dinner in the State capitol, Montgomery, Alabama, in the State capitol. Could you imagine that almost 50 years from 1965 that white Members of Congress and black Members of Congress would be able to sit and break bread with the Governor of the State of Alabama? We will do that on Saturday. And on Sunday, I get to welcome a delegation to my hometown, Selma, Alabama; and we will reenact that great march.

We will go to my home church, Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church, where I have been a member for 30 years, where my mother is on the board of trustees. We will sit in that church. We will partake and experience that which people did 50 years ago. Then we will march hand in hand across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

I know that I would not be here if it weren't for the fact that people marched, people died, and people prayed for the opportunity that we enjoy today. I could not imagine as a little black girl from Selma, Alabama, that I would be the first black Congresswoman from the State of Alabama. But I can because they marched. I can because they died. I can because people prayed.

I ask my colleagues to join me, Congresswoman MARTHA ROBY, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and so many others

in supporting this House resolution today.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, although obviously the efforts in the civil rights movement were the culmination of efforts by people of all faiths, I find it instructive that this march takes place during the period of Lent, that in the Christian faith is a period of reflection and sacrifice as we prepare for Easter Sunday.

Last Sunday, in my home parish out in California, I recall the readings at the first Sunday of Lent were about the temptations of Christ in the desert. And we received a remarkable sermon at our church in which the theme was expressed with the words "the crown without the cross," that the essence of the temptation of Christ was whether He, as God-made man, was able to make the decision or was tempted to make the decision to accept the crown without accepting the cross, that is, to accept the kingship as Godhead without going through the demands, the terror, and the death of the cross.

I'm reminded of that today because I think of that question that JOHN LEWIS and others had as they crossed that bridge, as they reached the crest and they saw the troopers at the other side: Do you turn back and do you not accept the cross that is coming in order to achieve that which needs to be done to redeem this country and its promise of equality of all as contained in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence?

I would say that I was inspired as I was there with my wife and others on the march several years ago, STENY HOYER leading those on the Democratic side and JOHN LEWIS, of course, being a regular Member. And he wrote to those of us who reflected on that period that perhaps the most magnificent piece of literature that came out of the civil rights movement, in my judgment, is the "Letter From the Birmingham Jail" by Dr. King. I would commend to my colleagues and to others who might hear our words that they go back and take time to read those words.

Dr. King, sitting in jail, without access to any texts, wrote a magnificent epistle of his generation and our generation to the conscience of the American people. And he found no difficulty whatsoever in utilizing his heartfelt religious values and principles in extending the promise of that Christian message and the religious values that are found in our Judeo-Christian tradition to the underpinnings of our Constitution and challenged us to understand the difference between just and unjust laws and our responsibility to "render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

It is an inspiration to me now, and it has been an inspiration to me my entire life.

□ 1000

I would say to anyone who wants to understand the civil rights movement,

to understand the promise of America that was not fulfilled and will never perfectly be fulfilled but is certainly in a better state today than it was prior to the civil rights revolution, they should read those words of Dr. King and understand how that animated the civil rights movement and gave us heroes such as our colleague from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend JOHN LEWIS for yielding.

I thank JOHN LEWIS for his service to our country, to its principles, to its values, to its people. I thank JOHN LEWIS for being my friend, and I thank JOHN LEWIS for allowing me for the ninth time to walk with him across that bridge. As I do, I will be holding the hand of JOHN LEWIS and holding in my other hand the hand of my 10-year-old granddaughter Alexa.

This coming week marks the 47th anniversary of the fateful Bloody Sunday march for civil rights. I want to say to DAN LUNGREN, my friend, I thank him for the remarks he just gave. They were heartfelt and on target, and the letter from the Birmingham jail to which he referred is certainly one of the great epistles, as he referred to it, to the American people, to people of conscience, to the fierce urgency of now, which he referenced in that letter.

On March 7, 1965, our friend and esteemed colleague from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, was among the leaders of that march. It says he was among the leaders. He was the leader, he and Hosea Williams. Two-by-two they walked, some 600, with JOHN and Hosea at the front of the line. That day, in an extraordinary practice of nonviolence, he and other marchers were brutally beaten while trying to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama. They were on their way to Montgomery, the State capital, to protest the murder of a young man, Jimmie Lee Jackson, who had been shot and killed while protecting his mother during a voting rights drive. They were marching to Montgomery to say, in a nonviolent way, every American deserves the right to be able to register and to vote.

Every moment has its darkest hours when the exuberance of hope yields to the reality of difficult and painful struggle. Selma brought that reality into homes across the country. News of that Bloody Sunday awakened millions of Americans to the horrors of Jim Crow. It opened their eyes to the injustice that had cut off so many of our people from participation in their government. It made clear that while we said in our Declaration of Independence that we believed in equality, that we believed that all men, and hopefully we would now say of course all women, all people, are endowed by God with certain unalienable rights.

We were not doing that in this country. That's what that epistle from Birmingham jail was about. That's what this march was about. That march led to another march 2 weeks later that could not be stopped, one that saw 8,000 Americans from a diversity of backgrounds join together in solidarity and with a faith in the enduring promise that America provided.

JOHN LEWIS, our colleague, our friend, our brother, was one of the compelling figures of that time and of this. I've been blessed with the privilege of traveling to Selma, as I said, nine times with JOHN LEWIS, to worshipping in TERRI's church. The visit this weekend will be, I know, another instructive lesson for me and for others on how we need to be continually aware of the discrimination and prejudice that exist today; the attempts at exclusion that exist today; frankly, the attempts to not empower people to vote even today.

What happened in Selma 47 years ago ought to be remembered as a moment when America chose to fight hatred with love and put their faith in the values of our Constitution. In his memoir, which I hope all of you have read, "Walking with the Wind," JOHN LEWIS explains:

If you want to create an open society, your means of doing so must also be consistent with the society you want to create. Violence begets violence. Hatred begets hatred. Anger begets anger, every minute of the day, in the smallest of moments as well as the largest.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Ladies and gentlemen, we remember the difficult path we trod as a Nation to ensure the participation of all, and we ought to do everything we can to preserve it in our own day. It is not just history that we want to learn; it is the lesson for today that we must remember and learn.

I thank JOHN LEWIS for his leadership. I thank the thousands, black and white, young and old, rich and poor, who joined together to make America a better place.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. At this time, it's my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1965, in Selma, Alabama, now-Congressman JOHN LEWIS, our colleague, led 600 brave Americans in a march to protest for their equal right to vote like any other American, and they encountered horrific and despicable violence, preventing them from reaching their destination, the capital in Montgomery.

That day, now known as Bloody Sunday, set the stage for the landmark march to Montgomery led by Reverend Martin Luther King and bolstered by

faith and prayer. This act of leadership, courage, and bravery culminated with Congress passing the Voting Rights Act of 1965, recognizing the right of every American to participate in our electoral process.

At that time, there were just six black Members of Congress. Today, I am proud to serve with 44 black colleagues. As Reverend King said:

The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.

Mr. Speaker, today we will pass a resolution that will add the testimonies of Members of Congress, current and past, who participated in the civil rights movement and commemorative events to the historic record of the House. Their stories are an important part of our Nation's heritage and will serve as a reminder to every American of the determination and sacrifice that shaped the stronger democracy we live in today.

I would like to thank Representative TERRI SEWELL, who represents Selma, and Representative MARTHA ROBY, who represents Montgomery, for offering this resolution to preserve a powerful and transformative period in American history. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely honored to work with Congressman LEWIS to ensure that these stories will never be forgotten.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank also Representatives SEWELL and ROBY for sponsoring this resolution and Congressman LEWIS for his life.

This is a historic resolution, for the work and the memories need to be preserved. I, like Congressman SEWELL, am here because of the work of Congressman LEWIS and other civil rights leaders, making this for a better America.

I didn't think I needed to go on the pilgrimage because I'm from Memphis and I've been to the Mason Temple where Dr. King made his last speech; and been to Lorraine Motel, the national civil rights museum, on many occasions; and AFSCME hall where he rallied workers, now named for Jerry Wurf.

□ 1010

But when I went to Birmingham, when I went to Montgomery, when I went to Selma, I realized that there was much more history that I needed to know, and there was a way to be filled with the spirit of the civil rights movement, which one is when one goes to the Rosa Parks Museum, the Dexter Street Church, the 16th Street Church, the Civil Rights Institute, and the bridge.

It's hard to fathom the way the world was in 1965, but that was only a short number of years ago. This country started with a history of slavery, and it was accepted by the Founding Fathers and others as the way things were. The Founding Fathers were great men, and they wrote words that were great, but they were without absolute meaning because they accepted, as a given, that African Americans should be slaves and women shouldn't have equality. It took a civil war to change some of that, and then it took JOHN LEWIS and civil rights workers to change the Jim Crow laws that followed up, that didn't accept the outcome of the war and continued a segregated society that said African Americans weren't equal, couldn't go in public places and public accommodations and public restaurants and transit, just like others.

Well, that changed, and the people who changed that, the civil rights workers, the marchers, the sit-ins, the Freedom Riders—BOB FILNER was a Freedom Rider and was arrested, a Congressperson—those people made the promise that was given fulfilled.

It's still a work. I introduced and this House passed in 2007 an apology for slavery and Jim Crow. It took till 2007 for this House to pass it, and I appreciate the fact that when I did introduce it and it passed, that there were two Republican sponsors, but there were just two Republican sponsors.

This year, I have H.R. 3866, which recognizes all civil rights workers with a Congressional Gold Medal. I'm sorry to say that, to this date, there's not a single Republican sponsor. There should be. Civil rights is as Republican as it is Democrat. The party of Lincoln, as did the party of Kennedy, provided civil rights. And in 1965, when that Voting Rights Act passed, there were people like Everett Dirksen who cast important votes.

I urge my Republican colleagues to support this resolution, to support H.R. 3688, and honor the civil rights workers who had to fight their country for their rights and privileges.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. May I make an inquiry as to whether the gentleman on the other side, Mr. LEWIS, has additional speakers?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. We don't have any additional speakers.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. And how much time do we have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 11½ minutes. The gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and my colleague from California for his commitment, for his dedication, with all of his kind words today.

I think this resolution is saying to all of us that we have come a distance. We've made a lot of progress, and the Members of Congress participated in helping to bring about what I like to call a nonviolent revolution in America, a revolution of values, a revolution of ideas.

It is unreal, it is unbelievable. Just think, a few short years ago, in a place like Selma, Alabama, or Lowndes County, Alabama, between Selma and Montgomery, Lowndes County was more than 80 percent African American. There was not a single registered African American voter in the county. Today there's a biracial county government.

That in a city like Selma, in 1965, only 2.1 percent of African Americans were registered to vote. Today there is a biracial city government.

Or in a State like the State of Mississippi, in 1965, the State had an African American population, voting age population, of more than 450,000, and only about 16,000 were registered to vote. Because of the action of Presidents and Members of Congress, we have changed, and it's my hope and my prayer that every Member of Congress will vote to pass this resolution.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to echo the words of my friend, Mr. LEWIS. Let us have all Members vote for this resolution. It is a recognition, a simple, straightforward, symbolic resolution recognizing the efforts of so many, as embodied in the gentleman, Mr. LEWIS, and others who worked so hard to change this country for the better.

I'm honored to be here on the floor with Mr. LEWIS today. I appreciate the chance I had to be with him in this march several years ago.

I encourage all Members to take part in that, either this year or in the future, and I ask all Members to support this.

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to join with TERRI SEWELL, another Alabama Freshman Member, to offer House Resolution 562, an initiative that will preserve a collection of accounts from Members involved in the historic and annual marches from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama. It is a great honor to today stand on the House floor with my colleague, Representative JOHN LEWIS, who himself played such an important role in the Selma march.

The oral histories preserved through this resolution will memorialize the symbolic events that changed the direction of the Civil Rights Movement.

What took place during three historic marches in Alabama over a three-week period in 1965 proved to be a powerful transformation in American history. The courageous actions of so many moved our country out of an era of misguided actions.

Participants marched towards a unified goal—to provide equal voting rights for all

Americans. The first march on March 7, 1965, remains, without a doubt, one of the worst demonstrations of racial violence. Participants peacefully marching were met by a brutal and aggressive police force. This violence was captured by the news and broadcast to family rooms all over the nation. It quickly delivered a message to a racially divided country of the unforeseen consequences caused by segregation.

Such shameless violent actions unleashed on nonviolent marchers revealed the immediate need for equal rights for citizens. Without a doubt, the days that racial voting laws were enforced by our country were among the darkest and least honorable for this nation. Even today, our country is still repairing from the wrongs inflicted decades ago from racial segregation.

If it were not for the unwavering courage of those marching for civil freedoms, our country would be very different then the way we know it today. Their brave actions will be forever memorialized by the Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights Trail.

Our younger generations today did not witness first-hand the historic demonstrations that forged a unified nation. Therefore, it is important to record the testimonies in order to reveal the scope and relevance of these civil rights events.

I am proud to introduce this resolution with Representative SEWELL to preserve the history of our democracy. The resolution instructs the Office of the Historian to compile testimonies from current and former Members of Congress who have participated in historic or commemorative Civil Rights Movement actions. It will tell every generation a detailed timeline of these historic moments in the American Civil Rights Movement.

Those marching for equality were among the first patriots to envision a better America—one free from racial discrimination. The marches proved not only to be successful in granting equal voting rights, but an illustrative account of citizens attaining freedom from harsh discrimination.

Though such intolerable actions can never be reversed, there is still dignity knowing that the participants of these marches permanently changed the course of American history. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of this bicameral resolution.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H. Res. 562, which directs the Office of the Historian to compile oral histories for both the historic and annual Selma-to-Montgomery marches in Alabama.

I thank my colleagues, Representatives SEWELL and ROBY, for sponsoring this vitally important resolution.

They say those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

I can think of no lesson more valuable for all Americans to learn than the courage, justice, perseverance, and non-violence exemplified by those individuals who participated in the historic Alabama marches of 1965.

The character shown by leaders such as Dr. Martin Luther King, Reverend Hosea Williams, and our very own JOHN LEWIS, was truly remarkable.

Since 1998, Members of Congress have had the opportunity to participate in the annual civil rights pilgrimage to the Selma-to-Montgomery National Historic Trail.

It is fitting that the Office of the Historian of the House compiles oral histories from those who have participated in these historic events.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing those who fought for the civil rights we enjoy today. Let us pass H. Res. 562, so that we may never forget the lessons they have taught us.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H. Res. 562, which will instruct the House Historian to collect oral histories from Members of Congress involved in the marches from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama as well as the wider civil rights movement. This effort will preserve for generations to come the experiences of all those who had to fight to bring the realities of our nation in line with our ideals of freedom and equality. I am glad that we can all come together in a bipartisan fashion to support this important initiative.

During the historic marches from Selma to Montgomery in 1965, led by Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and my colleague Representative JOHN LEWIS, many brave protesters were brutally beaten and tear-gassed by authorities for non-violently standing up for their rights. The images of these events embodied the viciousness of racism and segregation, and raised awareness and support for the civil rights movement across the nation. This momentum resulted in increasing desegregation and the passage of the Voting Rights Act by Congress in 1965, which reaffirmed the rights of all Americans to participate in our democratic political process, regardless of race or identity. Starting in 1998, Members of Congress, led once again by Congressman LEWIS, have been participating in an annual march from Selma to Montgomery to commemorate these events and to underscore the immense positive impact that the participants in those marches had on the history of our nation.

Please join me in supporting this legislation and in recognizing my friend Representative LEWIS for his invaluable contributions to the civil rights movement. It is my hope that the histories to be compiled by this project will inspire the leaders of the future, who are following the example set by Representative LEWIS and other civil leaders. They are truly striving to make our country a more perfect reflection of the vision of our founders.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 562, "Directing the Office of the Historian to compile oral histories from Members of the House of Representatives involved in the historic and annual Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, marches, as well as the civil rights movement in general, for the purposes of expanding or augmenting the historic record for public dissemination and education."

What happened in Selma 45 years ago, is an opportunity to remember and embrace our history and its evolution. A single day in 1965 would become known as Bloody Sunday. I am proud to serve with Mr. JOHN LEWIS who led 600 brave Americans on that day, on a peaceful march for their equal rights to vote. They were met with unspeakable violence and put their lives on the line for the right to vote. This resolution will ensure that future Americans will not forget the sacrifices made by brave, courageous, Americans seeking only to have full participation in our fine Democracy.

I have had the honor of participating in the Congressional Civil Rights Pilgrimage with Mr.

LEWIS. I had the opportunity to see history come alive during my pilgrimage to Birmingham, Montgomery and Selma. I left with further appreciation for all the efforts that African-Americans have accomplished over the years.

The events that took place in Alabama were pivotal in our nation's civil rights movement. Dr. King's "Letter from a Birmingham Jail," the 16th Street Baptist Church bombing and the Bloody Sunday march were crucial experiences to America's collective psyche.

Two weeks after Bloody Sunday, under the protection of the Alabama National Guard, Dr. King was able to lead the march successfully, and in August of that same year President Johnson signed into law the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Dr. King and his committed supporters forced our nation to acknowledge the injustices committed against African-Americans.

This legislation will ensure the 54 mile route, beginning at the Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church in Selma and ending at the State Capitol Building in Montgomery, is never forgotten.

With the support of this body, generations to come can know and appreciate those early steps in the civil rights movement that began the road to making the Constitution of this country extend its rights and protections to all of its citizens.

The painful lessons learned in Montgomery, Birmingham and Selma continue to be experienced by minority populations all over the United States. The struggle for political recognition and participation continues not only in the African-American populations, but now in the fast-growing Latino community. In addition, many of the gains that can be traced back to the civil rights era are currently being targeted. We must be ever vigilant to ensure that we do not turn back the clock and instead keep moving forward to protect the rights of minorities in this country.

A long, bitter, and bloody struggle was fought for the Voting Rights Act of 1965 so that all Americans could enjoy the right to vote, regardless of race, ethnicity, or national origin. Americans died in that fight so that others could achieve what they had been forcefully deprived of for centuries—the ability to walk freely and without fear into the polling place and cast a voting ballot.

Efforts to keep minorities from fully exercising that franchise, however, continue. Indeed, in the past thirty years, we have witnessed a pattern of efforts to intimidate and harass minority voters including efforts that were deemed "Ballot Security" programs that include the mailing of threatening notices to African-American voters, the carrying of video cameras to monitor polls, the systematic challenging of minority voters at the polls on unlawful grounds, and the hiring of guards and off-duty police officers to intimidate and frighten voters at the polls.

Most Americans take the right to vote for granted. We assume that we can register and vote if we are over 18 and are citizens. Most of us learned in school that discrimination based on race, creed or national origin has been barred by the Constitution since the end of the Civil War.

Before the 1965 Voting Rights Act, however, the right to vote did not exist in practice for most African Americans. And, until 1975, most American citizens who were not proficient in English faced significant obstacles to voting, because they could not understand the ballot.

Even though the Indian Citizenship Act gave Native Americans the right to vote in 1924, state law determined who could actually vote, which effectively excluded many Native Americans from political participation for decades.

Asian Americans and Asian immigrants also have suffered systematic exclusion from the political process and it has taken a series of reforms, including repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1943, and passage of amendments strengthening the Voting Rights Act three decades later, to fully extend the franchise to Asian Americans. It was with this history in mind that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was designed to make the right to vote a reality for all Americans.

And the Voting Rights Act has made giant strides toward that goal. Without exaggeration, it has been one of the most effective civil rights laws passed by Congress.

In 1964, there were only approximately 300 African-Americans in public office, including just three in Congress. Few, if any, black elected officials were elected anywhere in the South.

Today there are more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 43 Members of Congress, the largest number ever. The Act has opened the political process for many of the approximately 6,000 Latino public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including 263 at the State or Federal level, 27 of whom serve in Congress. And Native Americans, Asians and others who have historically encountered harsh barriers to full political participation also have benefited greatly.

We must not forget the importance of protecting this hard earned right. Preserving our past and honoring those who put their lives on the line for change is the right step toward ensuring that history does not repeat itself.

Again, I thank Mr. LEWIS for his leadership. I thank him for having the courage both 45 years ago and today to be a champion of change.

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

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, February 29, 2012, the resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. 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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 562 will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules on S. 1134 and House Resolution 556.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—418

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire

Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann

Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)

Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishkek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers

Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador

Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loehsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci

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

NAYS—80

NOT VOTING—14

NOT VOTING—15

Campbell	McMorris	Payne
Cardoza	Rodgers	Rangel
Cleaver	Meeks	Sánchez, Linda
Franks (AZ)	Nadler	T.
Goodlatte	Olver	Shimkus
Kaptur	Paul	

□ 1043

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 92 I was in TS briefing. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ST. CROIX RIVER CROSSING PROJECT AUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1134) to authorize the St. Croix River Crossing Project with appropriate mitigation measures to promote river values, 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 gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) 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 339, nays 80, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]
YEAS—339

Adams	Baldwin	Berkley
Aderholt	Barletta	Bilbray
Alexander	Barrow	Bilirakis
Altmire	Bartlett	Bishop (GA)
Amodel	Barton (TX)	Bishop (UT)
Austria	Bass (NH)	Black
Baca	Becerra	Blackburn
Bachmann	Benishek	Bonner
Bachus	Berg	Bono Mack

Conaway	Connolly (VA)	Conyers
Cooper	Costa	Costello
Courtney	Cravaack	Crawford
Crenshaw	Critz	Crowley
Cuellar	Culberson	Cummings
Davis (CA)	Davis (IL)	Davis (KY)
DeFazio	Dent	DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart	Dingell	Dold
Donnelly (IN)	Doyle	Dreier
Duffy	Duncan (SC)	Duncan (TN)
Ellmers	Emerson	Engel
Eshoo	Farenthold	Farr
Fattah	Filner	Flake
Fleischmann	Fleming	Flores
Forbes	Fortenberry	Fox
Frank (MA)	Franks (AZ)	Frelinghuysen
Fudge	Gallegly	Garamendi
Gardner	Garrett	Gerlach
Gibbs	Gibson	Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert	Gonzalez	Gosar
Gowdy	Granger	Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)	Granger	Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)	Granger	Graves (MO)
Green, Al	Griffin (AR)	Griffith (VA)
Grimm	Guinta	Guthrie
Gutierrez	Hahn	Hall
Harper	Harris	Hartzler
Hastings (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Hensarling
Herger	Herrera Beutler	Higgins
Himes	Hinojosa	Holden
Hoyer	Huelskamp	Huizenga (MI)
Hunter	Hurt	Inslee
Issa	Jackson (IL)	Jackson Lee
(TX)	Jenkins	Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam	Jones	Jordan
Kelly	Kildee	Kind
King (IA)	King (NY)	Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)	Kissell	Kline
Labrador	Lamborn	Lance
Landry	Lankford	Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)	Latham	LaTourette
Latta	Levin	Lewis (CA)
Lipinski	LoBiondo	Loeback
Long	Lowey	Lucas
Luetkemeyer	Lummis	Lungren, Daniel
E.	Lynch	Mack
Manzullo	Marchant	Marino
Matheson	Matsui	McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)	McCaul	McClintock
McCotter	McGovern	McHenry
McIntyre	McKeon	McKinley
McNerney	Meehan	Mica
Michaud	Miller (FL)	Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary	Miller, George	Moore
Mulvaney	Myrick	Neal
Neugebauer	Noem	Nugent
Nunes	Nunnelee	Olson
Olver	Owens	Palazzo
Pascrell	Pastor (AZ)	Paulsen
Pearce	Pelosi	Pence
Perlmutter	Peters	Peterson
Petri	Pingree (ME)	Pitts
Platts	Poe (TX)	Pompeo
Posey	Price (GA)	Quayle
Rahall	Rahall	Reed
Rehberg	Reichert	Renacci
Ribble	Reyes	Ribble
Richardson	Richmond	Rigell
Rivera	Robby	Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)	Rogers (KY)	Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher	Rokita	Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen	Roskam	Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)	Rothman (NJ)	Royce
Runyan	Ruppersberger	Rush
Ryan (OH)	Ryan (WI)	Sánchez, Linda
T.	Sanchez, Loretta	Scalise
Schakowsky	Schilling	Schock
Schrader	Schwartz	Schweikert
Sessions	Sewell	Shuler
Serrano	Sires	Smith (NE)
Sessions	Smith (NJ)	Smith (TX)
Sherman	Smith (WA)	Southerland
Shuler	Stearns	Stivers
Simpson	Sullivan	Sutton
Simpson	Terry	Thompson (MS)
Sires	Thompson (PA)	Thornberry
Slaughter	Tiberi	Tierney
Smith (NE)	Tipton	Tonko
Smith (NJ)	Towns	Tsongas
Smith (TX)	Turner (NY)	Turner (OH)
Smith (WA)	Upton	Van Hollen
Southerland	Visclosky	Walberg
Stearns	Walden	Walsh (IL)
Stivers	Walz (MN)	Watt
Sullivan	Wasserman	Webster
Sutton	Waters	West
Terry	Watt	Westmoreland
Thompson (MS)	Waxman	Whitfield
Thompson (PA)	Weld	Wilson (FL)
Thornberry	Wen	Wilson (SC)
Tiberi	Wexton	Wittman
Tierney	Wittman	Wolf
Tipton	Wolters	Womack
Tonko	Woodall	Woodall
Towns	Yoder	Yoder
Tsongas	Young (AK)	Young (AK)
Turner (NY)	Young (IN)	Young (IN)
Turner (OH)		
Upton		
Van Hollen		
Visclosky		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1052

Ms. WATERS and Mr. HULTGREN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. COFFMAN of Colorado, MCGOVERN and OLVER

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

YEAS—417

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

Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Myrick
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Oliver
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quayle
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Reyes
 Ribble
 Richardson
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier

Stark
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Sutton
 Roskam
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner (NY)
 Turner (OH)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Webster
 Welch
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Woolsey
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NAYS—1

Capps

NOT VOTING—15

Campbell
 Cardoza
 Cleaver
 Goodlatte
 Kaptur
 Landry
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meeks
 Murphy (CT)
 Nadler
 Paul
 Payne
 Rangel
 Shimkus
 Walsh (IL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1101

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I mistakenly voted “no” on rollcall 94 when I intended to vote “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, due to a commitment off the Hill, I had to miss votes on H.R. 562, S. 1134, and H. Res. 556. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on H.R. 562, “aye” on S. 1134, and “aye” on H. Res. 556.

□ 1100

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule of the week to come.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will be meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. The last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. No votes are expected in the House on Friday.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, including a bipartisan bill dealing with countervailing duties against nonmarket economies like China. A complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider two bills focused on job creation and our creating an environment for that to happen. The first is H.R. 2842, the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act, sponsored by Representative SCOTT TIPTON of Colorado; and H.R. 3606, the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act, the JOBS Act, sponsored by Representative STEPHEN FINCHER from Tennessee. Both bills are bipartisan, and I would note that the President and many outside entrepreneurs like Steve Case have endorsed the Fincher bill.

Mr. Speaker, I'd hope that Senator REID would move expeditiously in passing the JOBS Act once this House sends it to the Senate at the end of next week.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding, and I yield back.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information, and I would say with respect to the bills that he will be offering, we have, as the gentleman knows, considered four of those bills on the floor. They passed overwhelmingly. I think they're good bills, and I look forward to supporting them again.

There are two bills which are new. One of the bills was considered when it was sponsored by Mr. HIMES. It was a good bill then, and it's a good bill now. I believe our side certainly is going to join in supporting these bills, which we think will have some positive effect on small business entrepreneurs, business formation, and capital formation. I have had the opportunity of talking to Mr. Steve Case, a good friend, and I want to thank Steve Case, as I know you do, for his role working with the White House and working with us on moving these bills forward. I think they are a positive contribution, and as

the gentleman knows, four of the bills received over 400 votes when they were first passed on the House floor not too long ago. We think those are positive steps.

So, I look forward to next week being a week in which we can vote together on something. I'm sure America does as well. Again, I want to congratulate Steve Case for the work that he has done with respect to this package.

I do want to, however, say that we do look forward to additional legislation dealing with jobs creation. We've talked about the President's jobs bill or other jobs bills that might be offered. We would look forward to those coming forward, as well.

Let me ask the gentleman: one of the jobs-related bills that we're talking about, of course, is infrastructure, in this case, the highway bill, the infrastructure bill. The gentleman did not mention that for next week. And I know he's concerned about it. We're all concerned about the March 31 date on which the highway program will run out of authorization. As the gentleman knows, there is a severe funding shortage, and it is our fear, our concern, that literally hundreds of thousands of people will lose their jobs if we do not act.

Can the gentleman tell me when he thinks we might be acting on either a big bill or an extension? I'll yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for the question.

As the gentleman knows, there's been a lot of discussion about the way forward given the fiscal reality of the transportation trust fund, and talks are continuing to ensue as we continue to watch what the other body does on this issue as well, knowing full well the March 31 deadline that we're facing.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I want to assure him that our side of the aisle looks forward to working with his side of the aisle towards hopefully coming together with a bipartisan bill which will certainly keep the program going. But from our perspective, it is more than an investment in infrastructure, which this country needs to remain competitive, but it is also an investment in job creation, which we think this bill will do as well.

The Export-Import Bank authorization, as the gentleman also knows, will be coming to a close, and Financial Services has shared jurisdiction with that. Can the gentleman tell me what the status of the Export-Import Bank is? As the gentleman knows, I think we have a joint agenda, because I think a lot of things on there are supported by both sides of the aisle, what we call a Make It in America agenda. We believe this is very important for Make It in America—encouraging manufacturing and job creation here in America. Can the gentleman tell me the status of the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank? I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. I think the gentleman

knows that both his staff and mine are in constant communication on this bill as late as I think last night and have met to discuss the options as to how we proceed forward. Again, we are very mindful of the expiration, or looming expiration, or need for, if you will, of the passage of this bill and look forward to continuing to work with him and his team to make sure that we get the resolution right and are able to proceed.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for those comments, and we look forward to continuing to work together.

The next question I would like to ask is, clearly, we're coming up on March 15 in the not-too-distant future. It's my understanding from CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, who is the ranking member of the Budget Committee, that he believes that the committee will markup a budget on the 19th with the possibility of reporting a budget to the floor on the 26th of this month.

Can the gentleman tell me, is that a schedule that he contemplates, and is that information accurate? I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. He stated this sort of series of events that we anticipate, and we look to making sure that we're doing everything to facilitate that and have the budget on the floor, hopefully, by the end of this month.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say that Mr. CANTOR and I had the opportunity to speak on the floor today. We spoke on behalf of a resolution that was passed overwhelmingly, unanimously, that spoke to commemorating the march that both the majority leader and I have participated in in the past, and I'll be participating in again this weekend, a march commemorating the march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge from Selma to Montgomery.

□ 1110

Today was a day of unity on the floor of this House in which Mr. LUNGREN and Mr. LEWIS and others expressed their thoughts, as did so many of the rest of us, about how this is a great lesson on the fact that we have not always been where we promised to be as a Nation, but that we've made progress, and a reminder that there is still progress yet to be done.

I want to thank the majority leader for his comments that he made on the floor today and for his focus on this issue.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and would say that the gentleman has been a huge supporter and participant in the pilgrimage to Alabama marking that event, that day in history, and I look forward to his participation in the process of making sure that the House Historian has the necessary information to accurately reflect the House's role, the Members of the House's role, and certainly the gentleman's role in the pilgrimage to

Alabama celebrating that event. Frankly, as he indicates, Mr. Speaker, a reminder to us all that this country didn't always get it right, but we are continuing to work together to make sure that we are that land of equal rights and opportunities for all.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and as he observes, House Members have participated in this.

There is a wonderful organization known as Faith & Politics. We believe strongly in the separation of church and State, but as I tell people, we do not believe in the separation of the values our faiths teach and the policies that we pursue. There is that discussion, and multifaiths are represented in those discussions.

As the majority leader and I are of different faiths, we are of one mind with respect to ensuring that the values of our respective faiths are realized in our public policies.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2012

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

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

There was no objection.

IT'S SOCCER TIME

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, two American soldiers were killed today in Afghanistan.

While our amazing troops are still in the rugged field of battle fighting people who kill in the name of religion, a new field is getting ready for its grand opening at Guantanamo Bay.

Finishing touches are being put on a swanky high-dollar soccer field for criminal terrorist detainees at Gitmo. And, of course, Americans are picking up the \$750,000 tab for the recreational facilities for these criminals.

Isn't that lovely?

The U.S. Government is giving these radical extremists access to the soccer field for 20 hours a day. What follows, a terrorist soccer league? These radicals should be doing hard time, not soccer time.

Our government has no business building this tropical Caribbean recreational facility for terrorists. It is disrespectful and insulting to all who are victims of these killers.

What is next at this terrorist playground, a tiki hut and bar at the beach?

This ought not to be, but that's just the way it is.

CLEAN ENERGY JOBS BILL

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Nevada's struggling out-of-work families who understand that this Nation's top priority must be putting people back to work.

One way that we can do this is by bringing clean energy manufacturing jobs to our State. My clean energy jobs bill does just that, by transforming our State's abundant wind, sun, and geothermal energy into good-paying jobs that can't be shipped overseas. It does this by getting our priorities lined up with our values.

The bill extends a 30 percent tax credit for clean energy manufacturing companies that is paid for by eliminating the billions of taxpayer giveaways to big oil companies.

Last year, Big Oil made \$137 billion in profits. They don't need our money. Unfortunately, Washington Republicans just don't see it that way. In fact, the Republicans vote time and again to protect taxpayer-funded handouts to greedy oil companies. Those are the wrong priorities for our Nation, and they are certainly the wrong priorities for the State of Nevada.

With rising gas prices, it is time to hold big oil companies accountable and make Nevada the hub of our clean energy jobs future.

I urge swift passage of this bill.

THE RISING PRICE OF GAS: THIS ADMINISTRATION MUST CHANGE COURSE

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of issues being debated here in our Nation's capital, but Hoosiers are talking about just one thing, and that is rising prices at the pump. The average price of gasoline in Indiana right now is \$3.82 a gallon. That is 10 cents higher than the national average. And it is worth noting that when President Obama came to office, the average price of gasoline nationwide was \$1.79.

This administration pushed cap-and-trade and a national energy tax that the President said would cause utility rates to skyrocket, they pushed it through regulations even though it didn't make it in the Congress, they suspended deepwater drilling in the Gulf of Mexico for a time, they placed the entire Pacific and Atlantic coasts off-limits to drilling, refused to explore Alaska, decreased production across the Western part of our Nation, and most recently rejected the Keystone XL pipeline.

With no joy in saying this, Mr. Speaker, I say rising gasoline prices

are a natural result of the policies of the Obama administration, and this administration must change course. It's time that we enact an all-of-the-above energy strategy that includes more access to America's energy reserves, more alternative energy sources, and encouragement of conservation. That's how we will tackle this crisis.

I rise on behalf of hardworking Hoosiers and everyday Americans who are struggling with the prices at the pump on this first day in March to say to this administration: Accept the Keystone pipeline, approve more domestic exploration, abandon your headlong rush toward regulation and a national energy tax, and let's give Americans real relief at the pump as this spring begins.

RECOGNITION OF BOSNIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Bosnian people as they celebrate the 20th anniversary of Bosnia and Herzegovina's independence.

As a founding member and cochairman of the Congressional Bosnian Caucus and having the distinct honor of representing a growing, vibrant community of Bosnian Americans in St. Louis, Missouri, one of the largest Bosnian American communities in the U.S., I'm pleased to recognize Bosnian Independence Day with my constituents and the people of Bosnia.

Yesterday, our caucus cochair, Representative CHRIS SMITH, and I had a meeting with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to discuss progress and continued challenges in Bosnia. I'm encouraged that the elected leaders have begun to do what is in the best interest of their country: to form a government, to begin to pass laws that will help put Bosnia on a path to membership in NATO and the European Union.

In the face of tremendous challenge, Bosnia has made great progress over the past 20 years, but there is much more to be done.

Yesterday, I urged Secretary Clinton to continue active U.S. involvement in the country and to strengthen U.S. support for the Bosnian people as they embark on a wide range of needed reforms.

I'm proud to represent thousands of Bosnians in the St. Louis region. It's with great pride that I continue to stand with them today and offer a hearty congratulations on the 20th anniversary of independence.

COMMEMORATING ALABAMA CIVIL RIGHTS MARCHES

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise to the floor

to add my appreciation in celebration of H. Res. 562, directing the Office of the Historian to compile oral histories from Members of the House of Representatives involved in the historic and annual Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, marches, and certainly those who started in 1965.

Let me first of all thank the sponsor of the bill, TERRI SEWELL, and acknowledge that I've had the privilege of marching across the Edmund Pettus Bridge for almost two decades with the Faith & Politics organization and JOHN LEWIS.

Just a couple of weeks ago, I was in Marion, Alabama, receiving an award from the Perry County organization with Commissioner Turner on commemorating Jimmie Lee Jackson Day, who was the first person shot who went to a rally that Dr. Martin Luther King held simply to express his right to vote. He was shot trying to protect his mom and his grandmother, dragged out of the place and stomped to death.

Now some 45 years later, we're able to commemorate, but we must recount the stories of those who were there and those who still march today. As we proceed to improve on voting today and end the oppression of voter IDs, it is appropriate to celebrate this resolution and to march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge this coming Bloody Sunday.

□ 1120

SHAME ON YOU, RUSH LIMBAUGH

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to say to Rush Limbaugh, "Shame on you."

Shame on you for being the hatemonger that you are. Shame on you for being misogynistic. Shame on you for calling the women of this country sluts and prostitutes, because that's what he did.

Ninety-eight percent of the women in this country, at some time in their lives, use birth control. And yet he went on the air recently and called Sandra Fluke a slut and a prostitute because she was trying to access birth control pills as a third-year law student at Georgetown.

So I say to the women in this country, Do something about this. I say to the women of this country, Ask Century 21, Quicken Loans, Legal Zoom, and Sleep Number to stop supporting the hatemongering of Rush Limbaugh, and if they do not do that, then I ask them to boycott those companies.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY BELAFONTE

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend, my brother, the one and only Harry Belafonte, whose birthday is today, his fame as a singer popularizing the Caribbean musical style with an international audience, and is best known for singing the Banana Boat Song, with its signature lyric, "Day-O." He's a movie star and was in pictures filmed with Dorothy Dandridge and then Carmen Jones, which was Otto Preminger's hit musical.

Throughout his career, though, he has been a civil rights advocate and a leader in humanitarian causes; and, for me, his close counsel and advice and support to the late Dr. Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., is something that I think will go down in civil rights history.

He's been a leader in humanitarian causes for many years. He helped organize the Grammy award winning song, "We Are the World," a multi-artist effort to raise funds for Africa when they needed it most. He performed in the Live Aid concert that same year.

In 1987, Mr. Belafonte received appointment to UNICEF as a goodwill ambassador; and following his appointment, he traveled to Dakar, Senegal, where he served as chairman of the International Symposium of Artists and Intellectuals for African Children. He also helped to raise funds with dozens of other artists in the largest concert ever held in sub-Saharan Africa. And then he went on a mission to Rwanda and launched a media campaign to raise awareness of the needs and the troubles and the nutritional challenges of Rwandan children.

In 2001, he went to South Africa to support the campaign to reduce HIV/AIDS. The next year, Africare awarded him the Bishop John Walker Distinguished Humanitarian Service Award for his efforts to assist in Africa.

In 2004, he went to Kenya to stress the importance of education for the children in that area.

In 2006, he was the recipient of the BET Humanitarian Award and was named one of the nine award recipients by AARP Magazine.

Happy birthday, Harry Belafonte. I love you, America loves you, and the entire world will always love and admire your artistic genius, your steadfast devotion to causes of justice, peace, and your enduring spirit to transform both our country and the world so it is a more compassionate, soulful, and just planet.

I'm going to yield, at this time, to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE, as much time as she may consume.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I want to thank the gentleman from Detroit, with his own august history in the civil rights movement and, as they say, he is no short man when it comes to the work that he has done. More than one that we note him for and thank him for, the hiring of Rosa Parks and the friendship with Dr. Martin Luther

King, JOHN CONYERS has proceeded with his legislative history from the time of his embracing of the 1965 Voting Rights Act; and then ongoing, where we have joined on that committee dealing with issues of police brutality, dealing with issues of voter protection, dealing with the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, dealing with the maintaining of the Constitution through one impeachment proceeding for me and two impeachment proceedings for JOHN CONYERS, we know from which he has spoken. And beyond a whole litany that I could give in terms of giving rights to people, his dear friend, Harry Belafonte, is about to approach a wonderful birthday. And since I count Mr. Belafonte both hero and friend, I wanted to join briefly for a moment.

Among some other issues that I'm going to discuss is to, again, thank a warrior for peace and justice, and one who—let me just say that he would not say "sacrifice"—one who wanted to ensure that the movement leaders, Dr. King, Hosea Williams, Andy Young, James Orange, the soldiers in Mississippi and Alabama, South Carolina, Georgia, North Carolina, and places beyond had the kind of financial and Hollywood structure that they would argue that they were not walking alone.

Harry Belafonte, a significant and monumental talent of music, a boy that hailed from the Caribbean, who came to the United States with style and smoothness of voice, still kicking, still strong, still standing for truth.

□ 1130

We know of his recent vintage that he did not mince words on wars that he thought that we should not be in, but he certainly has not traveled anywhere away from the distance of the journey that Dr. Martin Luther King walked.

As Martin fell at the age of 39 in 1968, Harry Belafonte never gave up the flag and continued that battlefront to ensure that those who could not speak for themselves were heard through his wonderful and sweet, resounding voice, his ability for lyrics, and his acting talent of the many movies that he allowed us to enjoy.

So I'm delighted, Mr. CONYERS, to join you in wishing Harry Belafonte a very happy birthday and, again, let him know that he is too long from seeing us. We saw him just recently. But anytime he wants to come to the United States Congress and share with us in our fight for justice, in the desire to pass legislation that makes sense, whether or not it is dealing with the rights of women, whether it is to fight for the overdue passage of the Equal Rights Amendment or to ensure the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act or to make sure we fund the Office of Civil Rights or we ensure that the stamping and trampling on the rights of a 96-year-old grandmother to be able to vote in the 2012 election is now stomped out because of voter ID

laws, we want Harry Belafonte to know that we welcome his voice on any of these, and we would argue vigorously that he remains in our hearts and continues to be cherished by America, but also an American hero in the historic role that he plays in our history and in our musical history and the history of civil rights.

So I want to thank you for allowing me to be yielded to as I proceed to utilize a continued part of this Special Order in this hour that I wish to do.

I want to have the appropriate break so that, Mr. Chairman, I think you are well aware that you spent your lifetime fighting for rights for women. We have done a number of legislative initiatives that have passed through the House Judiciary Committee that I've been privileged during the short time that I've been there to be on; certainly, the constant renewal of the rights dealing with violence against women has been imperative, the recognition of the court cases, such as Roe v. Wade, and the issues dealing with employment discrimination.

So it calls for an immediate response to a showman that has a show, "The Rush Limbaugh Show." It calls for a response that is bipartisan, that is humane, that really does not, if you will, pander to the schisms that many in this Congress, but many in America, think we have.

Most people don't realize that when we go home to our district, we are embracing people from all walks of life. Whether it is encountering in our service, whether or not we are engaging with our Chamber, whether or not we are at our schools, we are embracing our constituents. We are there to provide for them.

So I come to the floor just as an American that finds it very difficult that, when there are two points of view, which, in the procedure of the House—if I might explain, when a committee holds a hearing, the majority has the opportunity to select a number of witnesses. In most instances, if it is a panel of four, then the majority selects three witnesses. Courtesy says that you yield to the minority. In the House, it happens to be Democrats. As in Mr. CONYERS' Judiciary Committee when he was chairman, they were allowed a witness. Now we're allowed a witness.

In the oversight hearing on the question of dealing with the compromise of the President to ensure no religious institution ever has to engage against their view, which I will fight to the death to ensure that happens, there was a witness proposed by the Democrats of that committee, a young woman law student. The last time I heard, she was a private citizen. She was a law student, accredited or in good standing, of one of the Nation's major law schools, and she was blocked from testifying.

Shortly thereafter, the Democratic Policy and Steering Committee, which I'm a member of, led by Leader PELOSI,

held a hearing and gave this private citizen an opportunity to be heard. She was called before the Democratic Policy and Steering Committee, which is an appropriate vehicle in order to have people heard on her views about the necessity of having access to women's health. That was the framework of her testimony.

There were no accusatory words, as I understand it. There was no blaming. It was a simple, pure testimony of the detriment to blocking women from having access to health care. In fact, we have designated or determined that contraceptives have influenced and impacted the decrease in cervical cancer as addressed by OB/GYNs in this Nation. So, her testimony was a factual testimony on the basis of her experience.

And I will tell you that that happens all the time, Mr. CONYERS, when we call witnesses to provide testimony on their own experience. As I understand it, it was a civil proceeding that is now documented for Members to review, and I think that is the process of this House that witnesses are allowed to be in support of a particular position and to be against.

Let me be very frank. Sometimes the hearings get very feisty, but we're always cognizant that we're appreciative of witnesses who are willing to come before us and to, in fact, share their thoughts.

We just had one here in the Judiciary Committee, and I was delighted to see an array of witnesses, and almost to the extent it looked like we had it resolved when one of the faith witnesses said they would have no concern about any person that worked for them that secured access to contraceptives through some other way as long as it did not cause that religious entity to have to be involved. What a simple acknowledgment of how America can resolve things. So it is a resolvable question.

But lo and behold, we look to the airwaves, of which we, the Federal Government, provide, and certainly we know the Fairness Doctrine does not exist, but I might say that on the February 29, 2012, show of Mr. Limbaugh, we understand that he repeatedly used sexually charged, patently offensive, obscene language to malign the character of a courageous young woman, a private citizen not running for anything, in law school, attempting to be a contributing citizen to this country, paying her taxes, graduating. I'm sure she has a family that loves her. She just was willing to accept the call of a committee to do her duty to give testimony in her own words, to provide a life story to an issue that we are grappling with.

So I know I am standing here in the face of the Fairness Doctrine that does not require any media to offer a contravening point. Sometime in the last couple of decades we eliminated the requirement that if you said such-and-such, you needed to bring so-and-so

onto the radio or TV to say that. We're still grappling with that because this allows, of course, the maligning, the vile statements, and one cannot answer.

Those of us who are in the kitchen, we know that if you're in the kitchen, you're in the fire. Those of us who are elected, we understand that our task is simply to respond by way of our works and our deeds and to allow the national discourse to come.

□ 1140

But I rise to the floor today because of the vileness of the statements that were made by Mr. Limbaugh—and pardon me for having an enormous cold here.

So, Rush, the statements that you made, I think, are not appropriate to a private citizen who came before a hearing that was called by Members of Congress, asking to secure the appropriate balance and where she was refused in the regular order of the House. Where you're allowed to have witnesses by the majority and witnesses by the minority—it is an accepted process that no one objects to—this young lady was blocked. So the leaders of our House—Leader PELOSI, the Democratic Policy and Steering Committee, of which I am a member and support wholeheartedly—called on this young lady.

If I might, I will just deviate for a moment.

This connects to my morning visit this morning of women who thrive, and I want to acknowledge my full passion for supporting the International Violence Against Women Act that we are fighting to pass. In this morning's breakfast, we heard that one in three women will experience violence in their lifetimes. They will be prostituted; they will be sold; they will be enslaved; they will be beaten; they will be killed.

We have to stop this around the world. In my own jurisdiction, I have seen in the last couple of days and weeks men shoot their children, their wives or whole families. This is in the United States. I remember sitting down with Madeleine Albright on the border of Bangladesh, looking at the freed, recently recaptured, prostitutes who had been beaten and sold by their families for the lack of survival, and these young girls were trying to regain their dignity in life. We cannot tolerate that, so I am committing myself wholeheartedly to the passage of the International Violence Against Women Act.

I would commend Rush Limbaugh to invite us on and talk about constructive ways of helping women. I give him every opportunity to have some guest whom we can call in. I don't think that is possible, but I will challenge all of the women of the House. Let's try to dial that number and see if we can provide some light on this topic of dealing with what women face beyond the caring and having the joy of bearing a child but then sometimes raising them

as a single parent and having to have food stamps and having to have children's health insurance or the Affordable Care Act to survive and to raise these wonderful children.

How many have testified, from soldier to President, about a single parent who has brought them this far and who have said, If it weren't for my mother—some will say if it weren't for my single-parent father—I wouldn't be here today. She was a single parent. I just can't imagine why Mr. Limbaugh would carry on with this characterization.

Let me finish on this, Mr. CONYERS. It is something that has disturbed me and that reflects on my word of instruction.

I know that we have a schedule for the war in Afghanistan. I cochair the Afghan Caucus, so let me pronounce now my desire for an immediate upsurging, meaning upsurging out—speeding out, expediting—the return of our heroes home. I thank the President for his dinner in honor of the soldiers from Iraq. I have been wearing for a number of months—and I'm not sure if I still have it on. There it is—a yellow ribbon to acknowledge these soldiers who have come home from Iraq, and I look forward to many parades coming forward. But it is time to bring our soldiers home from Iraq, to thank the NATO partnership, and it is time to express outrage. I offer the deepest sympathy.

I have no problem with apologies. I am a grown person who is not diminished by saying, I'm sorry. I'm sorry that a mistake in the channel of instructions and commands allowed Korans to be burned. We all know that they were collected, first of all, because they thought they were communicating dastardly instructions that would harm either those who were the officers over the detention prison or that they were sending messages. We understand that, but there is no reason not to offer an apology. We have sacred documents from the Torah to the Bible to the Koran because there are people in the United States of different faiths. So we have no problem with that.

Yet when we have a government, as much as we try to encourage and to applaud and to support it, that allows the reckless spreading of violence and that the Taliban celebrates by permeating the population with ugliness and rioting and when you shoot point blank my officers of the United States military, enough is enough. There is no reason for me to be able to accept individuals who are there to help build up a society, in my understanding, where they are unarmed, and then you cause violence with four other soldiers. Then there are allegations that food is being poisoned. There are allegations that we can't even walk the streets.

The sadness is that women in Afghanistan have come to me and have said, We can't even walk the streets. Babies—girl children—are killed. Parliamentarians have spoken to me and

have said, I can't go home to my home district.

How would that be for my distinguished colleague, when I yield to Congresswoman CAPPS or to any of the women, to know that we cannot go home to our districts because we are in fear of being killed by the men in that region?

So I would argue that we have been valiant, that we are heroes, that we have done what we have been called to do. The Commander in Chief has, in fact, brought the demise of Osama bin Laden and other high-dollar targets, and I would believe that it is appropriate that Congress gathers. I am now looking and contemplating a resolution in which we ask for a more expedited return of our soldiers and in which we ask that the President of Afghanistan, in the appropriate way, denounce and call for the end of this violence and that the Taliban be addressed by the Afghan National Security Forces, as we have trained them.

So I would say in my closing remarks that we have much to do. Many women suffer. In this country, we can at least acknowledge that we are civilized and that we respect women and the choices they have to make, that we have respect for the faith that has its own position and that we as a Nation will insist on that firewall; but we will also have access to women's health care. It makes no sense that a talk-show host, who is on the airwaves provided by the American people and by the tax dollars, would go after an innocent law student who simply was called as an American citizen to be heard in the Halls of Congress and who had no other angst but to be able to present her life story.

I conclude, Mr. CONYERS, by saying I see that, by the men and women in the United States military, all they have asked to do is to serve their Nation under the orders of the Commander in Chief in Afghanistan. I am now saying to them that I salute them and that it is time to bring our men and women home in dignity, in health, in safety, and with their lives—for their loved ones.

Mr. CONYERS. I want to thank the gentelady from Texas for her wide-ranging comments, for her very closely held beliefs, and for her very articulate way of joining me in the dialogue this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentelady from California, LOIS CAPPS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct the RECORD. I mistakenly voted "no" just a few moments ago on roll-call 94 when I intended to vote "yes."

I do support H. Res. 556 and strongly condemn the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of religious minorities.

I concur with the resolution in calling for the exoneration and immediate release of Youcef Nadarkhani and all other individuals held or charged on account of their religion.

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

□ 1150

HONORING ANDREW BREITBART

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to observe the loss of my friend, Andrew Breitbart, at the age of 43.

In endeavoring to eulogize anyone, there is truly no more eloquent testament than their family. To his wife, Susie, and their four beautiful children, our prayers, our thoughts, and our acts are with you.

Professionally, in Andrew's prodigious genius that was his life's work, he tirelessly fought the good fight and, in the end, gave his all with every fiber of his soul to serve his fellow human beings and his country.

Numbed with shock and loss at the word of his passing, and in reflecting upon the pleasure of his company, which I and so many others shared, I do find that I am at a loss for words and will, instead, rely upon those of the poet, Rupert Brooke:

Now, God be thanked Who has matched us with His hour

And caught our youth, and wakened us from sleeping,

With hand made sure, clear eye, and sharpened power,

To turn, as swimmers into cleanness leaping, Glad from a world grown old and cold and weary,

Leave the sick hearts that honour could not move,

And half-men, and their dirty songs and dreary,

And all the little emptiness of love!

Oh! we, who have known shame, we have found release there,

Where there is no ill, no grief, but sleep has mending,

Naught broken save this body, lost but breath;

Nothing to shake the laughing heart's long peace there

But only agony, and that has ending;

And the worst friend and enemy is but Death.

Good-bye and God bless, brother Andrew. You are loved and mourned and ever remembered. You never wasted a day of our finite time called life.

I yield back the balance of my time.

DO NOT RAISE TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was talking to my good friend on the other side of the aisle, a Democrat, GREG MEEKS, and GREG said that if we would raise taxes, put taxes on the

table, that he would be willing to put cuts and entitlements and other things on the table in an equal measure; and I told him that there was no way that we could raise taxes enough to offset the things that really needed to be dealt with.

We have got to control spending. We have got to cut spending. We have got to look at the entitlements and the rules and regulations that we have to live by and make dramatic changes in government if we're going to balance the budget.

This year, we have reached over \$15 trillion in debt—\$15 trillion. That kind of goes right past most people because they can't imagine what a trillion dollars is. But \$15 trillion, just to put it in perspective, it took the Presidencies of George Washington all the way to Bill Clinton to amass the same amount of debt that President Obama has racked up in 32 months.

Now, think about that: from George Washington to Bill Clinton, the amount of money in debt that we've added has been reached in 32 months by President Obama.

We have to get control of spending. It's absolutely essential. Otherwise, we'll be in the same shape as many of those countries in Europe, like Greece.

The President's solution to the burgeoning problem is to increase taxes, as I said. So I went through the amount of taxes it would take and what we would have to do to reach the goals that the President talks about.

Now, if you raise the taxes on everybody that makes over \$250,000 to 100 percent—in other words, you take every dime that they make, 100 percent, above \$250,000—that would yield about \$1.4 trillion, and that would keep government running for 141 days. So if we took all the money that people make over \$250,000, you would still only run government for less than half a year.

If you gave the \$400 billion of profits that was reaped by the Fortune 500 companies and gave them the same 100 percent tax treatment, you could add another 40 days to the amount of time that we could run the government.

So taxing is not going to solve the problem.

Now, Herbert Hoover, when he was President, decided—a Republican—that the way to help stop the economic tragedy that was about to occur was to raise taxes on businesses and individuals, and what happened? We ended up with the greatest depression in the history of this country.

Now, President Obama said the one thing that you don't want to do during a time of recession is raise taxes, and yet that's what he's advocating and my Democrat colleagues are advocating right now: raise taxes during a time of economic recession.

When people talk about unemployment in this country, they say, well, now it's 8.2 percent. But if you look at the people who dropped off the unemployment rolls and those who are underemployed, the unemployment rate

is probably closer to 15 percent. So the figures we are getting from the administration are really not that accurate.

It's extremely important that the administration, and my Democrat colleagues here in the House and especially in the Senate, take a hard look at where we're going. The projections are over the next 10 years we're going to increase the deficit by at least \$1 trillion a year. We cannot afford that. This country will go completely bankrupt. You'll see inflation that you won't believe.

Right now the Fed is printing money to cover the expenditures that we're incurring day after day after day. That money they're using, they're buying bonds with it, Treasury bonds. So that money is not actually being seen in circulation. But the fact is that we're increasing the debt by printing money at the Fed on a daily basis. In Europe, the European Central Bank is doing the same thing with the euro. This country and the rest of the world is heading toward an inflationary problem that's going to be unbelievable.

Now, people say in this country right now we haven't seen any inflation. If you look at the figures that are coming out from the administration, inflation last year went up about 1 to 2 percent, but they're including in that figure all the new technologies that are taking place. They're not going to the grocery store.

I went to the grocery store last week and bought four apples at a cost of almost \$5. Three tomatoes cost almost \$5. If you go to the gas pump today—and my colleague from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) talked about that just a few minutes ago. If you go to the gas pump today, it's almost \$4 for a gallon of gas. So the inflation rate on staples, on things that we use on a daily basis is probably well over 10 percent, maybe even higher than that.

We don't know, but the administration says it's only 1 to 2 percent. Talk to the wives and husbands of people that are really strapped for cash right now, and you will find that it's costing them a great deal more than that on a daily basis for gasoline, food, clothes, and everything else.

It's extremely important that we get control of spending. This is not the time to raise taxes. The President has said that himself, especially back in 2008 and 2009. Yet now they are taking a different tack and saying we need to raise taxes.

□ 1200

That would be like throwing gasoline on a fire. We should not be raising taxes. We should be addressing the spending side of the ledger; and if we do that, we will get this country back on the right track.

I just got back from Europe. I took a codel over there to Brussels to meet with the finance people in the European Union to find out where they are heading, and they're heading in a very difficult direction right now. If Greece

goes belly up, it's very likely that you're going to see other countries go belly up. And we have investments in money market funds and bonds that we've purchased in those countries. And if those countries default, it's going to affect the United States as well. So we need to get our house in order so that we don't end up in the same bailiwick that Europe is in right now that could cause severe economic problems in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'll end by saying it's important to get control of spending. This is not the time to raise taxes. A poll was taken recently by the Politico magazine here on Capitol Hill, and 75 percent of the people in this country that were polled said not to raise taxes. So the people get it. I just hope that the White House will.

The United States still finds itself in a spending driven debt crisis.

The National Debt has now surpassed an unprecedented \$15 trillion dollars.

House Republicans approved a budget that would have put a stop to spending money that we don't have as well as cutting \$6.2 Trillion Dollars more than the President's budget. The Democrats blocked it.

The U.S. debt-to-GDP ratio is now officially over 100 percent (approx. 110 percent at the end of 2011).

To put the severity of this crisis into perspective, it took from the presidencies of George Washington to Bill Clinton to amass the same amount of debt that President Obama has racked up in the past 32 months.

The President's solution to the burgeoning problem his Administration's reckless behavior has caused? Increase Taxes.

The Problem, according to the President is simply that the most successful among us simply aren't paying their fair share . . .

This sentiment has most recently manifested itself in the President's proposed budget, in which he has increased taxes to the tune of \$1.5 Trillion Dollars.

The simple reality of the situation is that this is nothing more than campaign rhetoric, employed in hopes of fomenting class warfare and dividing the American people.

"You cannot tax your way into prosperity."

We learned this after the 1929 stock market crash when Herbert Hoover, a Republican, signed legislation to sharply increase taxes on businesses, who were seen as the catalyst for the market crash.

Hoover's draconian tax increases, fueled by a similar populist outcry heard today, ultimately served as the first salvo in a series of policy missteps that would ultimately lead to the Great Depression of the 1930's.

Keep In Mind That:

Even if Congress imposed a 100 percent tax, taking all earnings above \$250,000 per year, it would yield \$1.4 Trillion Dollars. That would keep the government running for 141 days.

The problem is there are 224 more days left in the year.

If we gave the \$400 Billion Dollars of profits reaped by the Fortune 500 the 100 percent tax treatment . . . We Could fund the Government for another 40 days.

It was not too long ago that President Obama himself was quoted as saying, "You do not raise taxes during a recession."

If only he had the resolve to heed his own advice.

The American people also believe that the course of action taken by Hoover and endorsed by Obama is not the right way forward.

In a recent poll in The Hill Newspaper, 75 percent of American's polled felt that, the "most appropriate top tax rate for families earning \$250,000 or more" is 30 percent or less. This would be 5 percent less than what this income group currently pays.

This is in stark contrast to the 40 percent tax rate that Obama and like-minded Democrats in the Congress have called for to enact in 2013.

When one couples this with the expiration of the Bush Tax Cuts . . . We are creating an environment where the entire tax code as we know it will cease to exist.

If we continue in this vein, in 2013:

The 8 out of 10 businesses in America that file taxes as individuals will see their tax rate go to 44.8 percent.

This will effectively kill what little growth our embattled economy has left.

Despite the top marginal tax rate varying between 35 percent and 91 percent since 1960, Federal tax collections have been between 15 and 20 percent of the nation's Gross Domestic Product every year since 1960.

From this we can infer whether taxes are high or low, people make adjustments in their economic behavior so as to keep the government tax take at 15 to 20 percent of the GDP.

History has proven unequivocally that tax rates have always had a greater impact on economic growth than they do on Federal revenues.

It is no longer good enough to kick the can down the road and make this the next Congresses' or next President's problem.

Unless we wish to bring the problems of Europe to our shores it is incumbent on us to champion responsible spending restraint; a repaired safety net; reforms that ensure real health and retirement security; and a simplified tax code oriented toward economic growth.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AFGHAN SECURITY FORCES KILLING AMERICAN SERVICE MEMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, just today we heard reports that two more American servicemembers in Afghanistan were gunned down by the very security forces they are helping to train. Unfortunately, this is not an isolated incident. Last week, two Army officers were gunned down inside the Afghan Interior Ministry. Attacks by Afghan soldiers and security forces have accounted for nearly 70 deaths since 2007.

The U.S. military did a report on this phenomenon, referred to as "Green on Blue" attacks, and determined that they are turning into a "growing systemic threat" to our military personnel in the region. These are not U.S. deaths from combat with Taliban and other insurgent groups, although some

of the perpetrators likely hold Taliban sympathies. These attacks are by the very forces our military is trying to train to take control of their own country—a significant component of the Obama administration's military draw-down strategy.

What are American forces to do when they doubt whether they can trust those who wear the uniform of an ally we are spending blood and treasure supporting? These attacks further complicate U.S. strategy.

Mr. Speaker, Congress and the Obama administration need to realize that these things are not going well in Afghanistan, and it has nothing to do with the capabilities of our troops. Not only are Afghan security forces gunning down their American advisers, terrorist and insurgent groups continue to find sanctuary in the tribal wilderness areas of Pakistan.

In January, the most recent National Intelligence Estimate painted a very bleak picture of the war in Afghanistan and the future of U.S. operations in the region. It reflects concerns that I've expressed numerous times to Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, especially the importance of understanding Afghan tribal structures and the Pakistani military and intelligence services actively cooperating with two of the mostly deadly terror networks in the region.

Last week, The Washington Post reported that U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan Ryan Crocker wrote a cable describing the fragile situation in the region. The cable described many of the problems in the region, including terrorist sanctuaries in Pakistan where militants continue training to attack U.S. forces. Ryan Crocker has a tremendous history in that region, having been Ambassador to Iraq, and also Ambassador to Pakistan.

Secretary Panetta has stated that U.S. forces are "working hard with Pakistan to improve the level of cooperation" so that terrorist groups no longer find safe haven in the country.

While I appreciate the hard work being done by our forces in the region, I'm afraid that the complexity of the evolving situation may necessitate that we take a very close examination of how we're operating.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have the answers to these extremely complicated and dangerous challenges; but last year Congress gave the Obama administration the ability to create an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group, an independent panel of five Democrats and five Republicans who love their country more than they love their political party. The Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group would put their expertise to work and offer constructive recommendations to the administration to achieve our mission and to be successful in Afghanistan.

This panel would be modeled after the Iraq Study Group, which was convened during the worst violence in Iraq. The panel was formed only after 3

years of fighting in that country. It was called the Baker-Hamilton Commission. With the Iraq Study Group, it was an amendment that I offered, and I think it made a constructive difference. It was five Republicans and five Democrats. Secretary Gates served on the commission. Secretary Panetta served on the commission, Ed Meese. Fine people, distinguished people, people of integrity and good judgment; and they came up with some good recommendations. I have urged Secretary Panetta repeatedly to embrace this tried and tested model, this time for the Nation's longest war. Five Republicans, five Democrats, all people who are no longer involved in the political process but have understanding and knowledge both from a diplomatic and a military point of that region, both with Afghanistan and with Pakistan.

U.S. forces have been on the ground in Afghanistan for over 10 years now, and it is clear that things are not going well. Given the challenges I have discussed, I find it difficult to understand why Secretary Panetta and President Obama refuse to use the authority it has right now to establish the Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group. Such a group already has the support of Congress. This bill passed the United States Congress, and I ask what harm can come from a group of independent experts looking at our missions with fresh eyes, fresh eyes on the target. Secretary Panetta and the administration gets to select the group, the five Republicans and five Democrats, so those who serve on this study will be selected by the administration, and particularly by Secretary Panetta, who I have great respect for.

It's hard for me to understand why Secretary Panetta was willing to sit on the Iraq Study Group, which was going to evaluate a war that had gone on for 3½ years under a Republican administration, but is not willing to do the same thing to have an outside group look at a war that has now been going on for over 10 years.

This would be totally bipartisan. It would be objective. It would be fresh eyes on the target. Ryan Crocker before he was appointed Ambassador to Afghanistan supported this concept, and many very patriotic Americans have, with the idea of how can we be successful in Afghanistan and also in Pakistan.

I do not know what the recommendations of the panel would be. Maybe they will examine the current policy and determine that it is the best possible way to achieve success; but the fact remains that Congress provided the resources and the authority for the Obama administration to conduct an independent review, and they are refusing as of this moment to take action.

Again, it was interesting during the Iraq war, Secretary Rumsfeld was willing to have the Iraq Study Group go forward. General Peter Pace, who was the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was willing to have the Iraq

Study Group go forward. Condoleezza Rice, the Secretary of State, was willing to have the Iraq Study Group go forward. Mr. Steve Hadley, the National Security Adviser, was willing to have the Iraq Study Group go forward. They picked two outstanding Americans—probably could not have had finer people—former Secretary of State Jim Baker and former Congressman Lee Hamilton, who was co-chairman of the 9/11 Commission, was chairman of the Intelligence Committee, and has done a lot of very good things. It was a bipartisan effort.

Again, we had people like Secretary Gates, and we had Attorney General Meese; and they came together with a very constructive proposal. And as many Members may remember, the surge was in the Iraq Study Group. It was on page 73.

So why would Secretary Panetta, who was willing to judge activities for a war gone on for 3½ years during the Bush administration, not be willing to have 10 objective people that he proposes, not that the Congress proposes, not that any partisan group proposes, but that he would propose to bring fresh eyes on the target, to look to see how we can deal with the issue in Afghanistan and Pakistan and do it in a way to make sure that we are doing everything we can to protect the men and women who are serving so honorably and so well our Nation?

□ 1210

I believe also, Mr. Speaker, that it's a moral issue, too. I believe we owe this—we owe this to the men and women who are serving, and we also owe it to the families.

If other Members care, I would ask you to look at the language and then also write a letter to Leon Panetta. Leon Panetta is a good man. I served with him here in the House. He loves his country, and I think he is working very, very hard. The people serving in the military at the Pentagon are very committed and very capable people, but like anything else, sometimes a fresh approach, or fresh eyes, again, I think would be very good for our country and something that we owe to the men and women who are serving in the military and to their families.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 19, 2011.

Hon. LEON PANETTA,
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY PANETTA: I write today concerning the U.S. mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan. My amendment, which gives the secretary of Defense the authority to establish an Afghanistan/Pakistan (Af/Pak) Study Group, was included in the House-passed FY 2012 Defense Appropriations bill. I pressed for the amendment because I believe fresh eyes are needed now to examine the situation on the ground and the overall U.S. mission.

I envision the Af/Pak Study Group being modeled after the Iraq Study Group (ISG). Both you and your predecessor Bob Gates served on the ISG and know better than

most the benefits it provided after three years of fighting in Iraq. Now that the U.S. is in its 10th year in Afghanistan, I believe a similar effort is necessary.

Before he was appointed as ambassador to Afghanistan, Ryan Crocker supported creating an Af/Pak Study Group, along with Ambassador Ronald Neumann and Jim Dobbins from the RAND Corporation. American men and women are fighting and dying in Afghanistan. If we are asking them to put their lives on the line daily, I believe we have an obligation to provide an independent evaluation of the U.S. mission. We owe our military forces nothing less.

I do not have the answers. But as you know, there is a movement building in Congress in favor of pulling troops out of Afghanistan. An amendment offered by Rep. Jim McGovern earlier this year to the National Defense Authorization Act to accelerate U.S. departure from Afghanistan was narrowly defeated 204–215. If six members had changed their vote, the amendment would have passed. I have talked to several members who voted against the McGovern amendment who are seriously concerned about the war in Afghanistan and could change their vote if the situation on the ground does not improve rapidly.

I also believe it is critical that Afghanistan be examined in tandem with the facts on the ground in Pakistan. It is clear that in order to be successful in Afghanistan, we must have a clear understanding of how Pakistan is influencing U.S. operations. Just look at the recent news from the region. Hamid Karzai's half-brother was murdered and his funeral bombed, Karzai advisor Jan Mohammed Kahn was murdered, and militants attacked and laid siege to the Intercontinental Hotel in Kabul. The enclosed article printed recently in the Washington Post states, “. . . optimism and energy vanished long ago, gradually replaced by cynicism and fear. The trappings of democracy remained in place . . . but the politics of ethnic dog fights, tribal feuds and personal patronage continued to prevail.”

The men and women serving in Afghanistan deserve to have fresh eyes look at this region as soon as possible. With House passage of the Af/Pak amendment, I ask that you use your authority as secretary and move quickly to create this study group. I have discussed my amendment with John Hamre at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and he has offered to coordinate the group with professionals with a wide range of expertise.

I would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you to discuss this important initiative and look forward to working with you to ensure we are successful in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
August 1, 2011.

Hon. LEON PANETTA,
*Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SECRETARY PANETTA: I want to follow up on my previous letter regarding Afghanistan policy and bring to your attention a book I am reading, *The Wars in Afghanistan*, discussed in the enclosed Washington Post book review. Its author, Ambassador Peter Tomsen, is a veteran of the Foreign Service and has an impressive background in the South Asia region. If you have not read his book, I highly recommend it to you. The Post review concludes: “This long overdue work . . . is the most authoritative account

yet of Afghanistan's wars over the last 30 years and should be essential reading for those wishing to forge a way forward without repeating the mistakes of the past.”

After three years of the Iraq war, the formation of the Iraq Study Group garnered the support of Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Rice, and Joint Chiefs General Pace. Our military men and women have been putting their lives on the line in Afghanistan every day for 10 years, seven years longer than when the decision was made to create the ISG to provide the independent assessment needed for U.S. policy in Iraq. I believe we owe it to our brave soldiers to focus now with fresh eyes on the target in Afghanistan.

I have spoken with Ambassador Tomsen about a framework for moving forward in Afghanistan, and he would be happy to meet with you and your team to discuss his breadth of experience there. I urge you to take him up on his offer.

Best wishes,

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
September 15, 2011.

Hon. LEON PANETTA,
*Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SECRETARY PANETTA: It was good to be with you at the Pentagon on Sunday to honor the lives lost there 10 years ago in the 9/11 attacks. I want to congratulate you on a moving ceremony that showed reverence to the Pentagon employees and the passengers of American Flight 77 that perished on that awful morning. I appreciated your comments and those of Admiral Mullen. Several of my constituents died at the Pentagon and the first U.S. service member killed in Afghanistan was my constituent. I thank you and all those who have served in public office and in uniform in the 10 years we have waged war against global terrorism.

As I waited for the program to begin on Sunday, I saw you and former Defense Secretary Rumsfeld and was struck by a vivid memory from 2005 of the events surrounding the Iraq war. We were three years into the war, the security situation in Iraq was deteriorating, and our soldiers were dying every day. As a member of Congress who voted to send our troops to fight, I believed I had the added responsibility to make sure the administration was receiving the best advice possible on our Iraq strategy.

So I proposed creating the Iraq Study Group (ISG) made up of experts outside government to bring what I called “fresh eyes” on the target. Secretary Rumsfeld, General Pace, Secretary Rice, and NSC Chairman Hadley all came to see the value in the ISG. By your participation, I think it is fair to say you also saw its benefit, and I greatly appreciated your outstanding service on the bipartisan panel. You and the other Democratic members who gave your time during a Republican administration exemplified the true meaning of service to your country.

We are now into the 10th year of fighting in Afghanistan and the challenges we face there continue. In 2001, I was the first member of Congress, along with Rep. Joe Pitts, to visit Afghanistan after the U.S. invasion, against the wishes of the Defense Department. We saw firsthand the devastation that the Taliban had visited on Kabul as well as the remnants of the U.S. Embassy that was abandoned in 1979. I have also traveled to Pakistan and seen the difficulties that country faces combating the Afghan Taliban and other terror groups. Despite the current conditions, all my experience in this region tells me that success is possible if we formulate

the right strategy to deal with both Afghanistan and Pakistan.

As with the ISG, I believe fresh eyes are needed now to examine U.S. policy in Afghanistan and Pakistan. The security situation continues to erode as evidenced by coordinated insurgent attacks on heavily fortified U.S. and NATO compounds just this week. The Taliban still finds safe haven in the tribal wilderness of Pakistan and the ISI actively funds terrorist groups.

Given these and other concerns on the ground in Afghanistan, I continue to be puzzled why you, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Secretary Clinton are not supporting the Af/Pak Study Group idea in the same manner that Secretary Rumsfeld and other Bush administration officials supported the ISG. Having the experience of serving on the ISG and now serving as secretary of Defense with a Democratic president (who I acknowledge inherited the war in Afghanistan), you are in a unique position to make this group a reality. The authorization and funding for the Af/Pak Study Group in the House-passed Defense Appropriations bill gives you the authority to create this group today.

I have to tell you that I continue to be disappointed that your staff has yet to contact former Ambassador Peter Tomsen to discuss his book, *The Wars of Afghanistan*. His book provides insightful information on the tribal structure of both Afghanistan and Pakistan and the political allegiances that underlie all actions in the region. I believe his knowledge and experience in this region would be invaluable in formatting future policy in South Asia. I respectfully ask again: please take advantage of his work and meet with him as soon as possible.

Leon, I don't have the answers on Afghanistan. Perhaps current U.S. strategy is the best way forward. But we owe it to the men and women in uniform who have served and continue to serve there—some paying the ultimate sacrifice—to know definitively. I continue to believe that fresh eyes from outside government focused on assessing the situation is the prudent action to take. I ask that you take the advice of those who support an Af/Pak Study Group, including Jim Dobbins, General Charles Krulak, Ryan Crocker, who I spoke with prior to his appointment as ambassador to Afghanistan, and other prominent Americans with experience in this region.

I believe it would be a sign of strength to appoint a study group and let the American people know that the administration is willing to examine all possible policies to achieve a successful outcome in this troubled region.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 17, 2012.

Hon. LEON PANETTA,
*Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SECRETARY PANETTA: As I am sure you are aware, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2012 contains language providing your office with \$1 million to assemble the Afghanistan/Pakistan (Af/Pak) Study Group. I request that you do so immediately.

The Los Angeles Times reported last week (article enclosed) that the most recent National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) paints a very bleak picture of the war in Afghanistan and the future of U.S. operations in that region. It reflects concerns that I have expressed in numerous letters to you over

time, especially the importance of understanding Afghan tribal and political structures and the Pakistani military and intelligence services actively cooperating with two of the most deadly terror networks in the region.

Given this stark assessment from our own intelligence community, the need to create the Af/Pak Study Group is clear. The Af/Pak Study Group's analysis and recommendations could bring needed clarity to current and future U.S. military and diplomatic operations. You supported the Iraq Study Group and lent your considerable expertise to that effort, so I am perplexed as to why you do not similarly support the Af/Pak Study Group.

Your November 3, 2011, letter to me stated that coalition troops are making progress against the Taliban and other militants and that progress is being made on our relationship with the Pakistani government and military. I have enormous respect for them and women serving our country in South Asia and acknowledge that our troops are performing their mission with bravery and resolve, however, the NIE appears to contradict your assessment.

Also enclosed is an article by the Hudson Institute's Nina Shea that discusses how Hussain Haqqani, the former Pakistani Ambassador to the United States is facing possible charges of treason for his alleged involvement in "Memogate." Shea asserts, "There is every reason to believe that the real reason Haqqani is being targeted is that he is a prominent moderate Muslim, one of the few remaining in Pakistan's government." Shea goes on to point out that Haqqani was personal friends with two men, Punjab governor Salman Taseer and Pakistan's Federal Minister of Minority Affairs Shabbaz Bhatti, whose lives were cut tragically short last year as a result of their outspoken critique of Pakistan's draconian blasphemy laws.

Increasingly we see a trend in Pakistan of moderating voices being marginalized and altogether silenced. While I appreciate that you are "working hard with Pakistan to improve the level of cooperation" so that terrorist and militant groups no longer find safe haven in the country—I am afraid the complexity of the evolving situation in Pakistan necessitates more.

The NIE's assessment could lead to support for the war in Afghanistan eroding among the American people and I feel the same sentiment will soon permeate the halls of Congress. If the president has simply decided that U.S. involvement will end in 2014 and that no further U.S. strategy is needed, he should clearly state that this is his policy and be forthcoming with the American people. If President Obama has not made a final determination on U.S. strategy going forward, I ask again, what harm can come from a group of independent experts using their experience to offer solutions for long-term success?

Following 9/11, I have supported U.S. military actions in the War on Terror. I want to see our soldiers, diplomats and Foreign Service personnel return home with their heads held high, knowing they all played a crucial role in establishing stability in South Asia where countries no longer pose a threat to our national security. I firmly believe that you can help ensure this happens by using the money made available to you to create the Af/Pak Study Group. Establishing this panel quickly will show the American people that the Obama Administration is willing to consider all possible options to achieve success in this volatile region.

I urge you to take these steps immediately before support for our mission in Afghanistan further erodes.

Best wishes.
Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 10, 2012.

HON. LEON PANETTA,
*Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SECRETARY PANETTA: I am sure you are aware of the enclosed article by Army Lt. Col. Daniel Davis that recently appeared in the Armed Forces Journal regarding the status of our mission in Afghanistan and the capabilities of Afghan National Army (ANA) forces. I am deeply troubled by the conclusions reached in Col. Davis' assessment and believe that it further underscores the importance of immediately creating the Afghanistan/Pakistan Study Group.

Col. Davis' piece tracks closely with the latest National Intelligence Estimate's assessment of current and future conditions in the region which I referenced in my January 17 letter to you (enclosed). These two assessments, coupled with the February 4 United Nations report showing that Afghan civilian casualties are increasing and the 2011 Red Team study by NATO on fratricide by ANA forces on coalition troops, lend credibility to the growing belief that U.S. strategy in South Asia is not going well.

In the interest of the soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines serving—and in many cases dying—in Afghanistan, I implore you to immediately establish the Afghanistan/Pakistan Study Group. As I have referenced in previous letters to you, Congress has provided the funding for this panel and under the law, you can select its members.

While reasonable people can disagree on specific policy options, I find it difficult to understand why the Obama Administration would not embrace a panel of five Democrats and five Republicans (modeled on the Iraq Study Group on which you and former Secretary Gates served), who love their country more than their party, putting their expertise to work and offering constructive recommendations to achieve our mission.

We owe it to the men and women serving in uniform—and the families supporting them—to have the best possible long-term strategy for success.

Best wishes.
Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

P.S. I know you care deeply about our service members serving overseas and that you and your team are doing what you think is best for our country. But I believe any objective observer would agree we need fresh eyes on the target.

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

THE ADMINISTRATION IS NEGOTIATING WITH MURDERERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there's so much going on in this country. There are so many great folks and some that are not so much. There are stories out indicating that this administration is considering releasing the Blind Sheikh. He's credited with help-

ing mastermind the first attempt to bring down our World Trade Centers. He is credited as the Islamic fanatic who issued the fatwa that was considered by the radical extremist jihadists to justify killing thousands and thousands of Americans—what they hoped would be tens of thousands of Americans—at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. One report indicated that with regard to the Pentagon, if the plane had not just brushed across a berm outside the parking lot before it hit, it probably would have gone all the way into the interior, doing a massive amount of more damage than it actually did. Because of the valiant work of so many first responders, there weren't tens of thousands killed at the World Trade Center. But we suffered the loss of 3,000 murdered because of some religious fanatics, the Blind Sheikh being one of them.

The story is out yesterday and today that the administration is considering the release of the Blind Sheikh and other American murderers so that we can obtain the complete release from Egypt of people that went there to try to help the Egyptians have free and fair elections. And in return for going there and providing the billions of dollars this country gives to Egypt and continues to give, in return, the people in charge—that this administration welcomed in charge of the Egyptian Government, as they stabbed an ally name Mubarak with whom they had written agreements—I'm not saying he's a great man; I'm saying this country, this administration, had agreements with that man, and this administration broke those agreements and stabbed him in the back. As a result, now we have Americans in harm's way, some of them in the Embassy in Egypt.

Now, the reports are that the administration is considering releasing murderers, people who planned and were complicit in murders and attempted murders of Americans, and this administration is considering releasing them and may be negotiating that.

Now, I'm hoping that this report is what this administration has done many times, and that is release a trial balloon to see how people react. And if people react violently enough—verbally, that is—against it, then they will say, hey, no, we never planned to do that. And I'm hopeful that that will be the case here. People who have been responsible for murdering and attempting to murder Americans have no business being used as bargaining chips. If the rule of law and of justice is going to mean anything in this country going forward, we cannot be bargaining with American liberty.

Now, some of us recall very well in 1979 when an act of war occurred by the people, by the Government of Iran in Tehran, against the American Embassy. Everyone's idea of international law indicates that the soil on which an Embassy exists is the soil of that country. If you attack the Embassy, then you have attacked that country. And it

was my recollection, and those of us that were stationed at Fort Benning at the time, we knew it meant that many of the people, many of us at Fort Benning, may have been sent to Iran if a war broke out. Everyone was watching to see if, as the term was used, the flag were to go up, who was going to go. Nobody was dying to go, but everyone was willing to go and die in defense of our country.

The Carter administration, instead, began pleading with the Iranian Government to let our hostages go. It was my recollection back during the time as we watched from Fort Benning, I'm not sure what the fate of those of us at Fort Benning would be, but the spokesman for the Iranian Government kept saying, the students have the hostages, the students attacked the Embassy. And it just seemed to me, as a captain in the Army at the time, do you know what it sounds like? The Iranian Government is trying to give themselves a backdoor so that if President Carter stands up and finally becomes a great leader and shows great leadership and stands up and says:

All right, you're saying that students have the American hostages? Well, then, here is the deal: An act of war has been committed, and either you release, you deal with those students and you get those American hostages released, or we're bringing the full weight of the American military against Tehran for the release of those people. And if those hostages are harmed before we get there, then we will overthrow your government and we'll leave. We're not going to nation-build. You can pick whatever government you want, it's your business, unless you attack the United States of America. Because when you attack the United States of America, it is our business. We won't nation-build, but we will take down any government of any nation anywhere that commits an act of war against us.

That's what President Carter should have done. And now these rumors swirl around, these reports from media resources that tell us they are reliable, that this government now is thinking, well, maybe we'll dodge what the Carter administration did that got President Carter defeated for a second term. Maybe if we just release murderers of Americans, maybe if we'll just give them whatever they want, they'll release these people or allow them to leave the Embassy and travel back to America, and we'll be okay.

□ 1220

Wrong. You release people who declared war on America, who declared war on the World Trade Centers, on New York City, on Washington, D.C., you release those people, you have not made America safer. You've endangered far more lives than you got released.

I like Ray LaHood. He's a good man. We haven't agreed on some things, but he's a good man. I know that. It broke

my heart when I saw that his wonderful son, who believes in liberty and freedom, was being kept against his will from leaving Egypt. He went over there to help them have a free and fair election. But from what I know—having not met Ray's son—I don't think he would want the lives of tens of thousands or millions of Americans jeopardized because this administration might be trying to avoid losing an election as President Carter did.

The thing to do is the thing that President Carter didn't try. He tried the negotiations. He offered all kinds of things. The thing to do is say: Egypt, we have given you American treasure. We supported your efforts in electing leaders. Here is the deal. We sent you people to have free and fair elections. If you're going to hold them hostage, then that is an act of war on us and we will come to Egypt.

We're not going to go to war with the nation. The whole nation of Egypt is not against America. But if the regime in power is going to take Americans who came over there to help them, who were participating in helping a process so that Egypt could continue to get U.S. funds to stabilize their country, if they're going to declare war on those individuals, then we will take out that group that is presiding and attempting to govern. We won't nation-build, but we will allow you to put whatever government you want in place. If they come against America, we will come against that government; not against the people, but against the government. We will take that government out and then you pick some other government. We don't care who it is. We don't care what kind of government you have, as long as they're not at war with America. But if you commit these kind of criminal acts of war against American citizens, against America, we will take that group out that is governing in that manner and then you find one that won't declare war on America.

That's what needs to be done, not releasing the Blind Sheikh, not releasing American murderers. That is not the thing to do. I hope and pray that tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of American lives will not be jeopardized by this administration just hoping to avoid a hostage crisis like arose in Tehran.

That arose because of a weak administration refusing to do what it should have in response to an act of war. Because what we saw after those initial periods where they said, "No, the students had them; we're trying to negotiate; we're trying to work with them," eventually they saw the Carter administration was not going to do anything, and so they began saying, "We had the hostages; we had the hostages," and started making demands and threats and things like that.

The thing to do is say, look, we want to live at peace with every nation in the world; but you declare war on Americans, we will take that govern-

ment out and let the people choose whatever kind of government they want. We should not be nation-building. You pick what government you want and we will live in peace as long as they don't declare war on us. If they do, we're coming. We'll take them out and then you pick your next government. That's what should be done, not the release of murderers, of those complicit in American murders, such as the Blind Sheikh.

I hope that enough people in America will rise up, Mr. Speaker, and make their voices heard. Don't be releasing people who declare war on America, who have American blood on their hands. We do not want to put the future of America in foreign hands that are covered with American blood. That is not the course to take.

CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

One other thing I wanted to mention before I get to a tribute, and that is with regard to the Selma march, that is with regard to the civil rights movement.

There are some in America who think people like Martin Luther King, Jr., JOHN LEWIS, others who were such participants in the civil rights movement—people see that and say that was a movement by blacks or African Americans to try to have equal civil rights. But having read a great deal about Martin Luther King, Jr., it's very clear this was a Christian minister, an ordained Christian pastor. I haven't heard anybody in the wonderful tributes that have been paid here today as we commemorate that march in Selma, I haven't heard anybody mention this.

As a Christian minister, Martin Luther King, Jr., and those who participated, did more than help African Americans move closer toward having full equality, toward equal rights. It did more than that. For those of us who were young, white Christians, for those who would come behind us as Euro Americans, white Americans, they did something wonderful for us. They created an environment in which all Christians—whites, all Christians—would be able to treat brothers and sisters as being brothers and sisters. They did a great service for all Americans.

So I will lend my voice, such as it is, in tribute for the service that was done for all Americans, and anxiously long for the day—we're getting so close—but long for the day when people are judged by the content of their character and not the color of their skin; where there are no quotas, there is no need for a Justice Department to review everything, because people are acting and treating each other in ways of equality, so that we finally achieve the dream.

ANDREW BREITBART

Now I want to turn to a tribute to a great man. This Nation and freedom has lost a great proponent and defender.

Andrew Breitbart, who was reported to have died this early morning in California, was and is an American hero of

mine. This man, in what appeared to be the prime of his life, knew that the key to keeping our endowed freedoms was shining the bright rays of sunlight on whatever issue was stealing away our Nation's prosperity and liberties.

Many came to know Andrew as the brains and the will behind the exposure of a cancer on our system that was exemplified by some of the things going on with ACORN, where they were not bothered by the thought of underage girls being placed in the bondage of sexual prostitution and they were not bothered by the idea of getting people in the country illegally for immoral and illegal purposes. He figured out a way to deal with these issues and to address what was sucking the nutrients and the life from this host country as, really, a cancer.

□ 1230

He figured out how to shine sunlight inside offices of what was happening and gave a good dose of chemotherapy to the cancer.

He also innovated ways to expose the extreme bias within many in the media that were holding themselves out as being objective. We have freedom of speech. We have freedom of the press. But there should be some degree of honesty. If someone is expressing an opinion, it should be reflected as an opinion and not as unbiased journalism.

Andrew had been in the process of exposing that, as well as so many other issues that were weakening our Nation and infringing our liberties, were deceiving rank-and-file Americans of the truth and our factual history. Andrew was serving as a clarion call to action for honorable Americans across the country to seek truth, justice, and the American way.

In visiting numerous times with Andrew, he was so excited. He could see that he was literally, and profoundly, making a difference for truth.

Often, when innovators or impassioned innovative visionary people depart this world, they have not had the benefit of seeing any of the fruits of their labor. God had favored Andrew with a glimpse of the difference that he was making.

In this book that—and I acquired this copy from the Library of Congress, "Righteous Indignation" by Andrew Breitbart—this is a new conclusion to Andrew's recent books. He wrote this new conclusion himself.

These are Andrew's words:

I love my job. I love fighting for what I believe in. I love having fun while doing it. I love reporting stories that the complex refuses to report. I love fighting back. I love finding allies and, famously, I enjoy making enemies.

Three years ago I was mostly a behind-the-scenes guy who linked to stuff on a very popular Web site. I always wondered what it would be like to enter the public realm to fight for what I believe in. I've lost friends, perhaps dozens, but I've gained hundreds, thousands, who knows, of allies. At the end of the day, I can look myself in the mirror and I sleep very well at night.

He now sleeps in the arms of God.

Andrew was being demonized by those who were profiting from their deceptions of people and their cronyism with the government. He was rallying like-minded Americans to seek and take back the liberties with which they were endowed and upon which liberties vast encroachments have been occurring.

I would like to speak straight from the heart, but I typed these lines up just moments ago because of the difficulty. It's easier to read. Let me finish with what I wrote moments ago.

Andrew had two films coming out in the near future, of which he was so proud, as he showed me and my friend, STEVE KING, here the trailers very recently. Those films can and will be quite powerful in furthering the cause of sunlight on darkness, though they may now have to be modified because of his passing.

But Andrew was so kind to be an encourager to my daughter in California, was always complimentary of her when we talked. He knew how to make a father proud.

In considering Andrew's works, the life and death of John Quincy Adams comes to mind. Adams had been elected President in 1824, first son of a former President to be so elected. In 1828, he was defeated by Andrew Jackson.

In 1830, John Quincy Adams did the unthinkable. He had been President of the United States; and yet he was driven by a God-placed feeling, a need to stop slavery in America. So after having been President, he lowered himself to run for the House of Representatives and was elected in 1830, sworn in in 1831, and served until 1848 just down the Hall in what we now call Statuary Hall. He was a driven man.

He believed God had called him, as he did William Wilberforce, to bring an end to slavery—Wilberforce in the British Isles, the United Kingdom, and Adams in America. He was concerned, appropriately, that it would be difficult to expect God to keep blessing America if we were putting brothers and sisters in chains and bondage.

He gave powerful speeches over and over down the Hall trying to convince the other Members of the House to pass bills that would end slavery, that would free slaves, and he never got it done. In fact, at one point, he had so alienated the Rules Committee, they passed a rule, he couldn't even bring those types of bills anymore. So then he had to fight the rule so he could go back to filing bills to end slavery and free slaves, and eventually he did. And he preached those powerful sermons down the Hall against slavery.

In 1846, a young man, not particularly handsome, some at Gettysburg that heard him years later said he didn't have all that pleasing a voice to listen to, he didn't have a beard at that time, but a young, skinny, some-would-say homely-looking guy was on the back row, just down the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Adams liked this guy. Adams was not necessarily referred to as being a warm and fuzzy, cozy kind of guy, easy to warm up to, a bit cantankerous at times; but he liked Lincoln.

In 1848, having spent so many years devoted to many great causes, but particularly to the cause of trying to end slavery, sitting at his desk, John Quincy Adams had a massive stroke. He was moved back into the Speaker's suite just off the floor, died 2 days later. 1848.

Thirteen years later, Abraham Lincoln was sworn in as President of the United States. It was reported that someone had asked Lincoln was there anything memorable that happened during your two brief years in the House of Representatives. He was reported to have said, in essence, not other than those powerful speeches of John Quincy Adams on the evils of slavery.

Lincoln knew it was wrong. It tore at his soul that slavery existed in America. After he lost after one term, he went back, tried to make a little money, did, practiced law, represented the railroad some, but the compromise of 1850 allowed new States to come in that would have slavery.

Lincoln had thought perhaps he was done with slavery, but he couldn't stand it. He got back involved in politics, lost, lost again, got elected President, and then helped bring about an end to slavery in the United States.

John Quincy Adams did not bring an end to slavery as he had hoped, but he profoundly affected that young, skinny, less-than-handsome-looking guy named Abraham Lincoln.

□ 1240

Andrew Breitbart is gone. That's the report. I'll be interested to see what the autopsy says.

But I can't help but think his devotion to truth, to preserving liberty will have inspired so many who will pick up that banner and potentially, as was the case with John Quincy Adams and Abraham Lincoln, do far more than Adams himself could have done, and in this day, in the years to come, do more than Andrew could have done by himself.

Though Andrew did great service to himself, his family, and his Nation, it's my prayer that his greatest contribution to this, the greatest Nation with the greatest freedoms in the history of the world, will not be those specific but amazing accomplishments he achieved, but that his greatest accomplishment will be the inspiration he was and is to so many who saw his devotion, saw his commitment, saw his goals, and will, just as did John Quincy Adams, accomplish more through those he inspired than those he could ever have accomplished individually.

At a time like this, there is sometimes a temptation to blame God and ask, why did God take such an individual so soon? Our directed comments to our Creator should instead be,

Thank You, dear God, for the gift of Andrew Breitbart. We wish we could have kept him longer, but thank You for this marvelous gift.

God be with his family, comfort his family. Andrew will be sorely missed by seekers of truth. His departure will be welcomed by those he was exposing, but they shouldn't be too comfortable. He was a patriot. He was a lover of liberty. He was a lover of family. He was a lover of God, a lover of this Nation. He was also a friend and encourager to me.

With that, I would yield to my friend, STEVE KING, from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas.

Timing of circumstances, Mr. Speaker, brought me to the floor here simultaneous with this wonderful tribute that Mr. GOHMERT has provided to Andrew Breitbart and the life and the things that he stood for and believed in. I don't know how I can add to the completeness of the message that LOUIE GOHMERT has delivered here.

I had the privilege of calling Andrew Breitbart my friend as well. I think of the last time LOUIE GOHMERT, STEVE KING, and Andrew Breitbart were in the same room, and it was over in the place that I affectionately call The Bunker, the house a couple of blocks east of the Supreme Court—very fitting, by the way—just almost within gaze of the east portico of the Supreme Court where Moses sits there looking down upon all of humanity with the tablets on his knees, with the Ten Commandments in his arms, and saying to all the world, We're a Nation of laws, not a Nation of men, and that our laws come from God, and his profound belief in that.

As we were there, I remember I was invited to a dinner over at Breitbart's. Now, some might think that a dinner with Andrew Breitbart could be somebody sitting at the table with cufflinks, for example. It's possible, but it's unlikely that there's actually going to be a table. It's more likely that there's a counter in the middle of the kitchen, and on that counter and on the counter over on the wall were refreshments of all kinds, teetotaling and nonteetotaling refreshments. On the other counter are ribs and chicken. I think the ribs were there for LOUIE GOHMERT, personally. He and I are the only two Members of Congress.

In that room was a constant din. Within that din, you'd always know what was on Andrew Breitbart's mind. Whenever he spoke, there was always an ear tuned to that, but he was very much a person engaged in the moment. He was driven to no end. I know when I walked in the room, he played a trumpet with his hand just to get the attention in that din now that I'd arrived.

But what I remember was that it was an engaging conversation about liberty and freedom and freedom of the press and truth, justice, and the American way, as LOUIE has said. When it was all

done, the refreshment bottles were empty and the ribs and chicken were bones, and we'd had one of the most engaging evenings you could ask to have in Washington, DC, and we have some here.

That, I think, does describe Andrew Breitbart's life: engaging.

I don't know who was more engaged than Andrew Breitbart. I look back at it. Just, for example, this morning I got up and I got ready to go, and I changed my pin over here and I put my Constitution in my pocket here and I put my keys in this pocket. Other than that, the only one other constant was I had to look around this morning and I couldn't find it. I went over to my backup storage, and I pulled this out and put it in my pocket this morning.

Let the record show, Mr. Speaker, this is an acorn. I've carried an acorn around in my pocket for about 2 years. I wouldn't be doing this if it weren't for the influence of Andrew Breitbart. In fact, we might not even know about the threat to the underpinnings of our Constitution, the legitimate electoral process we have in this country, if it hadn't been for Andrew Breitbart.

Hannah Giles and James O'Keefe came together and they went out and got some brilliant tape of the unconscionable activities of ACORN that produced over 400,000 false or fraudulent voter registrations. How many other false votes went up, we don't know.

But my belief is, and I believe Andrew's belief was, that the Constitution is the foundation of American liberty. But underneath that foundation that sits on the bedrock of legitimate elections, any entity that threatens those legitimate elections threatens the very Constitution itself and American freedom.

It was Andrew's brilliance that took those tapes of Hannah's and James and said, You roll these out, they will discredit you. They will attack you. You will be under the heat like you've never seen before in your life. We need to give them a little bit, and then they will attack you and say that's the only one. It's an anomaly.

Really, the tapes of the unconscionable acts of ACORN would be discredited immediately. It was Andrew who put together the strategy.

First, you have to know the man to have instant confidence that he knows, and he instantly thinks ahead. He never was, I don't think, a linear thinker. He always was a conceptual thinker. Some might go A, B, C, and maybe can get their way to Z. Andrew could go A, here's Z, and you know he knew every letter in between and how they were rearranged, and he could see the strategy in an instant and he could inspire you to step forward to that. That was part of the brilliance of Andrew Breitbart. That's one of the reasons I will carry this acorn in my pocket until they are gone.

As I sat and thought about the life of Andrew, I wrote these words down to

try to describe him, and words do not describe the man that Andrew was.

I used the words "dynamic," "brilliant," "fearless," "visionary," "altruistic," "passionate," "unconventional," "trailblazer," "patriot," "lost friend." All of those things describe Andrew Breitbart, and many, many more.

As LOUIE GOHMERT has said, his influence will be cascaded across this civilization and this culture, I believe, in perpetuity, just like the influence of John Quincy Adams has had that influence.

What I want to say also is that Andrew had a real sense of righteous indignation of when the ObamaCare debate was taking place here and an effort was staged to cast aspersions on the Tea Party as being racist. I remember in the middle of that press gaggle when they said, What do you think? Somebody was hollering the "N" word out at the Congressional Black Caucus as they walked across the grounds.

I said, Who has reported that? They named that. Who actually heard it?

They couldn't name me who heard it.

Andrew Breitbart understood that it was a manufactured story created to discredit the Tea Party and put \$100,000 on the table for anybody that could produce an audio or a video that would confirm the false allegations of racial epithets being thrown by the Tea Party at anybody. He shot that story down, and he has provided us a tremendous amount of credibility for the Tea Party in the process.

Pigford Farms, another story. The list goes on.

Andrew Breitbart understood the science behind the communications in the world. He understood the Internet before many even knew the Internet existed. He understood its potential. He had opened that up with big everything, with big ideas and global ideas and had them grounded in the full spectrum constitutional conservatism with an effort to provide protection for the rights of everybody, as God gives us those rights.

□ 1250

I am also tremendously saddened by the loss of our good friend. It's a big Breitbart family that grieves today and prays that he will be nestled in the hands of God and that his close family will be well taken care of and energized and nurtured by the profound belief that they've had the wonderful privilege to have Andrew Breitbart as their father, husband, friend, and that his influence moves on. We dedicate ourselves to the renewed effort to follow through on those efforts, and we will seek to do what we can to match and emulate the brilliance of Andrew Breitbart.

I appreciate my friend LOUIE GOHMERT for coming to the floor and starting the beginning of a national conversation about the long reach of Andrew Breitbart, and it reaches into the future. I thank Andrew for his life. I thank God for Andrew's life.

Mr. GOHMERT. In conclusion, we pay tribute to a big man, as Jesus said to the poor man of Nazareth, who has now been carried to the bosom of Abraham by the angels.

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

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 703 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 903) and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, of the following member on the part of the House to the Social Security Advisory Board for a term of 6 years:

Ms. Barbara Kennelly, Hartford, CT

HOME RULE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I come to the floor today to begin a series of half-hour conversations containing information that I believe many Members of our House simply do not have, especially considering how often the Constitution and the Framers are cited. I have no reason to believe that there is any intention on the part of any Member to deny democracy to any American citizen in our great country.

So during these half-hour Special Orders, I will be offering some evidence and information that go back to the Framers and come forward into the era when the District of Columbia was granted home rule in order to try to inform Members of the standing of the District of Columbia, which is often referred to as the "Federal district."

It, of course, is not a Federal district. It is a hometown of more than 600,000 residents, which has been granted full and complete authority to govern itself—too late, of course, but finally. It was too late in this era, but not too late in the history of the country because, as the country began, the citizens, indeed, at that time had that right.

The Framers, of course, were confronted with a dilemma. They wanted a capital to be located here in the District of Columbia, and they wanted that capital to have the same rights as any other Americans. They had had an experience in Philadelphia of some concern, when veterans had marched on that capital, about who would defend the capital. They tried to sort out this dilemma and thought they had by creating the District of Columbia—whose residents would have the same rights as every other American citizen, but

giving the Congress authority over the District. Let me indicate how that happened.

No one who has any knowledge of the history of our country can believe that the Framers fought against taxation without representation for everybody except the people who happened to live in the Nation's Capital. That would be sacrilege to say that of the great Framers of the Constitution, particularly since people from this very area, now known as the District of Columbia, went to war on the slogan of "no taxation without representation" and fought and died under that slogan. They didn't go and die under that slogan so that everybody but themselves could be freed from England and have full democracy.

It is also clear from looking at the Constitution that there were two Maryland and two Virginia signers who made clear that in the land they gave to the District of Columbia they weren't giving away their citizens' rights. So their citizens in Maryland and Virginia, during the 10-year transition period, in fact, voted for Members of this body and had the right to vote in Maryland and Virginia.

Some would call what Congress has done in the intervening years an abuse of power. I believe it is a failure to come to grips with what the Framers intended. In Federalist 43, James Madison says from the very beginning that there would be "a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages." That's, of course, the man and the document we rely on when we need some legislative history about the Constitution.

It is very important to note that the first government in the city of Washington was established in 1802 when the District of Columbia became the Nation's Capital. At that point, contemporaneous with the Constitution, there was a city council elected by the people of the District of Columbia to fully govern this city the way the districts and the jurisdictions of the Members of this body are fully governed. In 1812, the city council was permitted to elect the mayor. Before that, the mayor was appointed. In 1820 and thereafter, the mayor was elected by the people. That continued until 1871.

It should be said that the status of the District of Columbia, until home rule was granted, was constantly a part of the mix, the long, tortured part of our history about racial segregation. Many of the perpetrators who denied home rule were Southern Democrats. It was only when a Southern Democrat who chaired the "District Committee" was defeated, after the Voting Rights Act was passed, that the District was granted home rule in 1973.

So this has not been a matter of party. If anything, the Republican Party had much cleaner hands until recently when, for its own purposes, it adopted the posture of deciding that there would be home rule when it wanted and that violates every stand-

ard, every principle of the Framers and Founders when members simply step in and try to abolish democratic policy and laws enacted by a local government to which they are not accountable.

□ 1300

It's important to note that when the Home Rule Act was passed in 1973, the first line said that the purpose was to "restore" to the citizens of the District of Columbia, "restore". Those words, I think, were chosen with great meaning and understanding of history, "restore" because it was clear that the people who lived in this city had every right of every other American citizen before the city was created, that those from Maryland, Virginia, who gave the land, saw to it that these rights were preserved. Only in the political maneuverings of the Congress itself has that right been at risk, but that right has never been at risk except for Members of Congress who did not adhere to the principles of full democracy for every citizen of the United States.

The purpose of the Home Rule Act was to restore, not to create, rights. Congress can not create rights for people born in this country. The rights are given with their citizenship.

Now the District of Columbia, if one looks at the Home Rule Act, and the trends of all of the legislation preceding the Home Rule Act, was never given partial home rule except when Members of Congress from other jurisdictions decide they want to make changes in the District. That is found nowhere in the Home Rule Act, and that flies in the face of every principle of those who created the United States of America and those who died under the slogan of "no taxation without representation."

We created a very diverse democracy, and we have held it together through a principle of local deference and local control. We have people in one part of the country who detest some of the laws and policies in another part of the country, but the first thing they will do is honor local control and the right of local citizens to elect people who are accountable to them. When those who are not accountable to them want to get something done they must go to those who are, indeed, accountable to them.

Congress thought about what enacting home rule would mean. It said, there are some specific exceptions. Congress did not leave it to the discretion of Members of this body to decide what those exceptions would be. Congress, in fact, did something very specific with respect to those exceptions because it understood that once home rule is granted, there would be differences between the local legislature and the Congress of the United States. So it said, this is what we mean, and this is what we do not mean.

These limitations on the District and its council need to be rehearsed and need to be understood by anybody who

believes in democracy as a principle here in the United States, as much as we believed in it when all of us stood up for democracy in Egypt and elsewhere in the Middle East and around the world. We have got to make sure that we're not seen as hypocrites since we are the first to rise when there is democracy that is ignored elsewhere, and appear to deny it in our own country. That is something the world will never understand.

The Congress, recognizing the differences, spelled out what the exceptions would be, and you can imagine why the exceptions were there. They have almost nothing to do with anything that a local legislature would want to enact. Occasionally they do, and the District simply cannot do it because it's in the Home Rule Act, and the District does not do it because it's in the Home Rule Act.

For example, the District of Columbia cannot impose any tax on the property of the United States or any of the several States. Well, that's important because the property that is most valuable, the property that would yield the most revenue, is located in the center, the monumental core of the capital, and the District of Columbia would not have a thing to worry about if it could tax that property. It cannot be done.

The District of Columbia cannot lend the public credit, the credit of the local jurisdiction, for support of any private undertaking. The District cannot impose any tax, partial or whole, on the personal income of individuals who are not residents of the District of Columbia.

Now, I emphasize that one, because that's one that local citizens particularly resent. It's a ban on a commuter tax. What it means is, if you come into the District of Columbia to work, as hundreds of thousands do from the surrounding region, use the resources, the roads, partake of the same public amenities that residents do, nevertheless, said the Home Rule Act, the District of Columbia may not impose any commuter tax.

Well, the District, of course, resents that because there are commuter taxes all over the United States. But the District isn't asking to overturn the Home Rule Act; it's simply asking the Congress abide by the Home Rule Act. Maybe at some point Congress would want to reconsider this matter. I think my good friends of both parties from Maryland and Virginia would not want this matter reconsidered.

At the moment, I haven't heard anyone say out that this is the reason that you find people in the District of Columbia engaging in civil disobedience. It is when Congress intervenes into the local affairs of the District of Columbia. Yes, the commuter tax is a local matter, but it involves other Americans.

The Home Rule Act says Congress wants you to have as much—I'm trying to be fair—those who wrote it would say, we want you to have as much ju-

risdiction, as much authority over your own business as you can. Once you go to taxing those from another region, well, we are going to draw the line.

Well, the District resents it, but there is at least a theory for why that was done. There is no theory for trying to overturn a law of the District of Columbia simply because you disagree with it, pure and simple, no theory that can be mustered and certainly not from the Framers, who were clear that every citizen of the United States, including those who lived in the Nation's Capital, would have the full democracy they fought for in the Revolutionary War.

□ 1310

The Home Rule Act contains a height limit. Although many in the city would like to build high, the Home Rule Act recognizes that the monumental core has its own Federal meaning because that's where the monuments and the Capitol are, and they did not want those buildings which are central to our identity as a Nation overpowered by the tall buildings, even skyscrapers, we see in other big cities. But there, frankly, has not been a great deal of concern about that. Indeed, D.C. has its own height limit. The height limit helps the city when it comes to tourism. We, too, want everyone to see the monumental core, although you will find a healthy number of citizens here who would like to build as they build in other cities.

We are not trying to overturn the Home Rule Act now; we are trying to get observance of the Home Rule Act. And when you pass a law that says, for example, no District funds may be used on something because it offends your personal predilection, you then are violating the most basic principle of any democracy, and that is why I have come to the floor and will be coming to the floor throughout the year.

The District of Columbia may not enact any regulation or law having to do with any Federal court, any court of the United States. That's true of any jurisdiction. And there are a number of others. The District of Columbia cannot enact any law having to do with the National Zoo. That's a Federal zoo. I'm not sure why someone was concerned about that, but that's in the Home Rule Act. And you're not going to find the District Mayor or city council or residents going to the streets over the zoo.

They went to the streets because they passed a law that Members of this House sought to overturn—and with respect to at least one of them have succeeded—and that brings shame on our democracy, because if you were to ask the citizens of the United States or of any place in the world whether or not any Member of this body should be able to overturn a law passed by the local government of the District of Columbia in a democratic fashion, you would find almost nobody in this country who

would say yes, and you would find almost nobody in the world who would say anything but, You cannot be serious; you, who preach democracy all over the world. If these are your principles, the place and the time to apply them is right here, right now, at home.

It is interesting to know that there was a lot of controversy until finally the Home Rule Act was passed, and it is no accident that the Home Rule Act was passed during the period of the sixties and the seventies when the great civil rights laws were passed. The country came to understand that you can hardly have civil rights laws and then have people in your own capital who have no mayor, no city council, no right to vote for local government, no vote in this body and still call yourself a democracy. All of that came together in the sixties and the seventies.

I'd like to refer to two Presidents from that era, the so-called home rule era. You will find that every President of the era—in the postwar era—agreed with the notion that the District of Columbia should have unlimited right to self-government except for the express and specific exceptions in the Home Rule Act. It was Richard Nixon who signed the Home Rule Act. President Lyndon Johnson, in his message on home rule made these comments:

Our Federal, State, and local governments rest on the principle of democratic representation—the people elect those who govern them. We cherish the creed declared by our forefathers: No taxation without representation. We know full well that men and women give the most of themselves when they are permitted to attack problems which directly affect them. Yet the citizens of the District of Columbia, at the very seat of the government created by our Constitution, have no vote in the government of their city. They are taxed without representation. They are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship while denied one of its basic rights. No major capital in the free world is in a comparable condition of disenfranchisement.

He laid it straight out. How did this happen? Well, the Congress got a conscience from time to time and there were periods when the District had its full home rule. This is one of those periods. The Congress does not intervene into the life of this city—except when individual Members disagree with its actions.

Let me read from Richard Nixon, who signed the Home Rule Act:

The District's citizens should not be expected to pay taxes for a government which they have no part in choosing—or to bear the full burdens of citizenship without the full rights of citizenship. I share the chagrin that most Americans feel at the fact that Congress continues to deny self-government to the Nation's capital. I would remind the Congress that the Founding Fathers did nothing of the sort. Home rule was taken from the District only after more than 70 years of self-government, and this was done on grounds that were either factually shaky or morally doubtful.

It is morally doubtful for any Member of this body to assume he or she has the right to tell the citizens of the District of Columbia how to govern themselves unless you are a member of

the local body that governs the District of Columbia. If that is a principle which applies to your district, it must apply to mine. So we greatly resent that we are allowed to govern ourselves except when some Member decides that some matter would be controversial in his district, so, therefore, he wants to deny the District the right to carry out that matter after that matter has become a matter of local law. Every Framer would turn over in his grave to recognize that we could come to the 21st century with such provisions.

Congress took action in the 110th and 111th Congresses to remove prohibitions on the District's use of local funds for medical marijuana, for needle exchange, and for abortions for low-income women.

In the 112th Congress, Republicans re-imposed the ban on the use of local funds for abortion. Who do they think they are? They are accountable to no one in the District of Columbia. They are in straight, sure violation of every principle of the founding document.

I believe that in good faith many Members, especially newer Members, are simply not aware of this history and not aware that it is grounded in the Framers' documents themselves. That's why, instead of assuming that any Member of this body would intentionally deny democracy to any American, I think the way to proceed is for this American, this Member, this representative of the people of the District of Columbia, to come forward on occasion with information and material that I hope Members will take under advisement.

I thank the Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1320

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be recognized by you and to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

As I listened to the dialogue take place here in the last 30 minutes and the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, I'm glad she has a voice here in this Congress. And I do take an oath to uphold the Constitution, as does everyone who serves in this body, as does the President of the United States and many of our executive officers and every military personnel. I believe every State legislator takes an oath, as I did when I was in the State senate in Iowa, to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States and the State of Iowa.

As that oath takes place, I would just remind you, Mr. Speaker, that we have to have an understanding of the Constitution in order to take an oath to

the Constitution. And when we place our hand on the Bible and raise our right hand and take the oath to the Constitution of the United States, it's not an oath to a constitution as it might be reinterpreted by activist judges at a later date. It's not even an oath to a constitution that has been interpreted by the activist judges that came after the Constitution was ratified.

The oath that I take to uphold this Constitution is the oath to uphold the Constitution as it was written, as the clear text of the Constitution defines, and as the amendments, the clear text of the amendments defined, and as it was understood to mean at the time of the ratification, whether it would be the full body of the Constitution, or later on the Bill of Rights, or whether it would be the subsequent amendments to the Constitution.

No public official, no person who takes an oath to a constitution can be taking an oath to something that is amorphous, something that fluctuates and something that can change. The Constitution has to be fixed in place. Guarantees aren't amorphous, Mr. Speaker. It is no guarantee if it's amorphous. It has to be fixed in place and fixed in time.

I understand that our language changes over time, and I understand that we have people that have looked at this Constitution with disrespect and they would like to disregard the American Constitution.

If we look back through history, we will see that there was an effort that began in the late 19th century, especially when some of the liberal-thinking people emerged here and in the intellectual world. In the United States, many of those people came here from Germany and established themselves. In fact, they established themselves on the west coast. And our friend whom we expressed our deep regrets at the loss of and our deep sympathy to the family of Andrew Breitbart grew up around some of those people that were the foundation of the progressive movement in America.

These are the people that grew from socialism, the ideology of utopianism. Karl Marx put it down, and it grew from there. Lenin advanced it, and Gramsci also advanced it. It has gone on to the day where liberalism got a bad reputation, so they decided to define themselves as "progressives." It's all rooted in a Marxist, socialist, utopian ideology. And that Marxist, socialist, utopian ideology looks at the United States Constitution, the Constitution of the United States of America, with abhorrence. They reject our Constitution. They're just afraid to stand up and say so.

The clear meaning of the Constitution is something that they concluded, back in the late part of the 19th century and coming into the early part of the 20th century, that they would like to abolish. They would like to abolish our Constitution. They would like to

have a new Constitutional Convention or no Constitution and change and shape America at their will. They reject an America with individual rights that come from God. I would like to think the gentlelady from the District of Columbia and I would likely agree on that. They want an America that can always be in constant flux and constant change with no locked-down guarantees or values.

In other words, they looked at an effort to undo and repeal America's Constitution. They concluded that they could not do so because the culture of America has so embraced the Constitution of the United States that Americans would rise up in defense of the Constitution. If they tried to assault the Constitution, Americans would rise up and reject anybody that would seek to do that. So they sold us an alternative of trying to repeal and undo the Constitution and amend it out of existence.

There's another alternative, and that alternative is the one that they chose more than 100 years ago. That was the effort to redefine the Constitution, to undermine the meaning of the Constitution and turn it into this—remember the language, Mr. Speaker?—a living, breathing document. A living, breathing document is the language for an amorphous constitution, a constitution with no guarantees, a constitution that only takes reaction to the majority at the time that can be found in the House of Representatives, in the United States Senate, or a majority in the United States Supreme Court or the activist judges that by the hundreds have been appointed since that period of time during the last more than 100 years, and the law schools in America that have been populated by leftists who have been undermining the Constitution even while they teach the Constitution.

That's what we've seen here in America, Mr. Speaker.

And if the solid, conservative American people understood the flow of history and how the Constitution has been willfully undermined by active and by now self-labeled progressives, they would stand up against them everywhere they appear.

Think of a contract. The Constitution is a contract, it is a guarantee, and it is the supreme law of the land. It's defined as the supreme law of the land in the Constitution itself. When you have a supreme law, a law has to be black and white, it has to be clear, and it must be also enforced. It's impossible to take an oath to something that is amorphous, that's living and breathing.

It is now being taught under constitutional law in universities across the land that this Constitution doesn't mean what it says. That's what some of the judges say. That's what some of the law school professors say. In fact, that's what a majority of the law schools in America teach. They don't teach the foundation of American liberty, which is the clear text of this

Constitution, but they teach something that's been redefined by the courts.

And, by the way, we have course after course across the country—and I could go back to my big-ring notebook when we did the research on this—that teaches constitutional law in law school without using the basis of the Constitution. You can take the course on con law and never be required to read the Constitution. And the test questions aren't on the Constitution; they're on what they call "case law." Well, I will sometimes refer to case law. It is usually a slip of the tongue when I do that. Case law is what they say now is the Constitution. I can think of a lawyer who says: I don't have to amend the Constitution. If you give me a favorable judge and a favorable jury, then I will amend the Constitution in the courtroom.

Think of what that means, Mr. Speaker. An attack on the Constitution is taking place by activist lawyer after activist lawyer with favorable judge after favorable judge in front of a favorable jury that a lot of times just doesn't know the movement of the currents in this country and the competition that's going on between two philosophies and ideologies.

One of them mirrors the words of our Founding Fathers, the beliefs and the foundation of our Founding Fathers, that our rights come from God. No place in history have we seen that aside from the New Testament. No government was ever formed on the foundation of religious belief and believing that we have individual human rights, that these rights come from God. We're endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. I don't say "inalienable." That is a typo in the Jefferson Monument down here. It's "unalienable" rights. We're endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, and among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We all know those words. They echoed us. They are written on our hearts as Americans. And we should remember that our Founding Fathers were inspired and, I believe, guided by God to articulate the vision of the unique liberty that's endowed within each of us who is created in His image. They articulated it; they understood it; they made the argument; they laid it out in the Declaration; they fought a war for it; and they enshrined it within the Constitution itself, this rule of law.

□ 1330

How hard was that compared to our charge today, Mr. Speaker? How hard was it in comparison to the Founding Fathers identifying liberty, articulating liberty, using the language and the scholarship that they created to write on our hearts: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

As an aside, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't an accident that they delivered to us three distinct rights, not exclusive to

those three. When they said life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, Thomas Jefferson didn't just pull those things out of a hat and say, Well, let me see. Life came out first and what is the next one? Well, it is like a Chinese fortune cookie. Liberty. And the third one he pulled out is pursuit of happiness. They are carefully placed in the Declaration because they are prioritized rights.

The most important right is life, the next most important right is liberty, and the last of the three is pursuit of happiness.

Let me start with pursuit of happiness. Our Founding Fathers—and especially Thomas Jefferson—studied and understood Greek. They looked back in the history of Greece and they understood this term that I will pronounce "eudamonia." It is a Greek term that really is pursuit of happiness. It is spelled e-u-d-a-m-o-n-i-a. Eudamonia by my pronunciation. What it means is to be intellectually and spiritually whole, to pursue knowledge, to pursue an understanding of this unique being that we are with a soul, with a spirit, with an intellect, and to expand that to the maximum limit that God has given us. That was eudamonia. Pursuit of happiness wasn't a tailgate party at the ball game. Pursuit of happiness was the Greek understanding of happiness, which was developing your whole being to the maximum amount.

Thomas Jefferson placed that pursuit of happiness language in there understanding what it meant in the Greek understanding. He understood what it meant to the Americans at the time. That's been redefined since that time to now people think somehow pursuit of happiness is a tailgate party or going to the ball game or going out on the deck to light the grill or going down to the corner pub and having a drink with the guys, whatever it is that people do. Go fishing, go skiing in the mountains, that is pursuit of happiness? None of that was in the minds of the Founding Fathers. What was in their minds was the ability to have the freedom that God gave us to develop ourselves as human beings spiritually and intellectually. That was eudamonia. That was the pursuit of happiness. It was the third right, Mr. Speaker.

The second one was liberty. We understand, I think, liberty better here in America than in the rest of the world. Liberty is a component of our history and often gets conflated with the term "freedom." Freedom and liberty are two different terms, Mr. Speaker. They have two different meanings even though they are associated with each other.

You might think of freedom—as I look across outside the snowy landscape where I live, sometimes I will see a coyote run across the field and I will think he has freedom. He is out there in the wild; he can run wherever he wants to run; no fence keeps him in; he is free to chase down rabbits and any-

thing else that he wants to go after, and my pheasants I might say. He has freedom. But there is a difference between freedom and liberty. The distinction is this: liberty is freedom bridled by morality, bridled by an understanding that you have a moral obligation, a faithful obligation not to go outside those bounds that have been laid out for us. If that is the case, you have liberty. You have freedom, and the bridle that goes on freedom is the moral underpinnings that we must adhere to as Americans. That's why this Constitution works for us, we know.

So within liberty, are those rights that are defined in the first 10 amendments in the Bill of Rights? The liberty for freedom of speech, for religion, freedom to assembly and peaceably assemble for redress of grievances, the freedom to keep and bear arms, the freedom from double jeopardy, the freedom to keep and own property, the freedom to have a trial by a jury of our peers, the freedom for the powers that are not defined within the Constitution for the Federal Government to devolve down for the States or the people respectively, that is all liberty. Everything I've defined in there is liberty, provided it is within the moral boundaries.

Now I take us up the ladder of the priorities of life, liberty, pursuit of happiness—eudamonia. Pursuit of happiness is subordinated to liberty. You can develop yourself, Mr. Speaker, intellectually and spiritually in the philosophy of our Founding Fathers, provided that you don't trample on someone else's liberty. If I want to develop my knowledge base, my spiritual base, I can exercise my freedom of religion, my freedom of speech, my freedom of assembly in any way that I so choose under the rights that we have that are liberties, provided that I don't trample on the liberty of someone else.

I can't take a position that says you will be censored because I'm going to exercise my freedom of speech or you can't assemble because I don't like what you say, I'm exercising my freedom of assembly, you must not. I can exercise my pursuit of happiness, my development, my own liberties, provided I don't trample someone else's. The Founding Fathers understood that priority. In the exercise of our liberties—freedom of speech, religion, assembly, keep and bear arms, the list that I've given—Mr. Speaker, in no case can we take someone else's life in the expansion of our liberties.

If I say that there's someone that encroaches upon my liberties, therefore I'm going to take their life, I have violated the principles of the Declaration, the principles of this country, let alone the laws of the United States of America. We need to understand that the Founding Fathers laid out prioritized rights in the Declaration: life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. That pursuit of happiness cannot trample on liberty or life, and the exercise of our liberties cannot trample on life.

They understood that and that life is the most sacred. If we understand also

that life begins at the instant of conception and we need to protect that life both in law and in fact and provide for those who cannot scream for their own mercy, cannot speak for themselves, that protection for life, all of that is wrapped up in this Constitution and in the rights that the gentle lady from the District of Columbia referred to.

I go back to law schools in this land teaching Constitution law as if this Constitution is a living, breathing document and some amorphous combination of case law created by activist lawyers, activist judges, and sometimes I will say compliant juries, because they seldom see the big picture of what is going on. They have respect for what is taught in law schools; they have respect for judges sitting behind the bench. I do too.

But I will take the position, Mr. Speaker, that any judge that believes they can amend the Constitution by their policy decision on case law should not be seated on that bench. Anyone who takes an oath to the Constitution and they believe it was whatever it will be defined to mean by somebody that comes along later, they should stop and take stock of what they are about to do. That may be a violation of conscience just not thought through.

We had a major case in Iowa a couple of years ago called *Varnum v. Brien*. Seven State supreme court justices universally declared that they could find rights in the Constitution that were up to this point unimagined. They wrote unanimously that they had discovered unimagined rights in the Constitution itself.

Can you imagine a guarantee with unimagined rights, Mr. Speaker? The Founding Fathers could not have imagined allowing judges to sit on a bench who believe that they could write any decision they chose to write, that they could manufacture unimagined rights in order to get their public policy in place. But that's exactly what happened in Iowa in that case. Three of those judges were up for retention and Iowans voted them off the bench. Now there are three new supreme court justices there, and hopefully there is a reconsideration among the other four.

The unimagined rights that were inserted into the supreme court decision impose same-sex marriage on the State of Iowa. That brought about some people like my good friend Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT, who came there to help with that cause and went on the bus to help with that cause who made the constitutional argument consistently and continually. It is an example, Mr. Speaker. But we have a number of other examples of activist courts, and I'm concerned about what has happened historically.

□ 1340

And I'll make this point: that if I look through the continuum of Supreme Court cases that take us to where we are today, and we have a conscience protection piece of legislation

before this Congress, one of them may have had a vote in the Senate this afternoon, and that would be Senator BLUNT's language, Senator BLUNT from Missouri. In this Congress, it's JEFF FORTENBERRY from Nebraska, who understood conscience protection and introduced the legislation that protects the health care providers and all of us for our religious liberty. And this Congress may get a vote on it, and it may actually have failed in the Senate this afternoon is what I'm advised was about to happen. I haven't confirmed that. And it could actually be happening after I finish speaking, Mr. Speaker.

But what I see happening is that the Constitution protects our religious liberty, our religious rights, and still, this government steps in to usurp them. This executive branch steps in to usurp our religious rights.

To this extent, and I'll take you, Mr. Speaker, through this continuum that is appalling to me, and it would be appalling to the Founding Fathers had they lived through these decisions.

1965, no, excuse me; I'll go back to 1963, Mr. Speaker. There was a case called *Murray v. Curlett*, and I don't know that that is very well universally recognized, but that was the case that took prayer out of the public schools. There was an argument made before the activist court in 1963 that there was a separation of church and state, and that that separation of church and state was firm enough and solid enough that we could not pray in our public schools because that advocated for a religion.

And so I'll read to you the language that surely had to be reviewed by the Supreme Court justices. It says, Congress shall make—this is the First Amendment, Mr. Speaker—Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. And it goes on, of course, freedom of speech, the press, and the right of the people to assemble.

It says Congress shall make no law. There was no law that came from Congress that established a religion. The law that Congress made just didn't exist with religious freedom because Congress understood that the First Amendment means what it says. The textual reading and the original understanding said Congress shall not establish a religion. We're not going to be like Sweden, establishing Lutheranism as a state religion. We're going to have freedom of religion, but it shall not establish a religion. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

But if you believe in judge-made law, the Supreme Court, by that decision in 1963, *Murray v. Curlett*, outlawed prayer in the public schools by a court decision. I think it's in direct violation of the First Amendment of the Constitution. If we're going to respect judge-made law and stop praying in our public schools, that was the beginning of

the judicial activism that's begun to break down this civilization and this culture. I think those decisions needed to be made at the local school level, not at the Supreme Court level.

And I remember sitting, as a freshman in high school, and this news came to me, I was sitting in general science class. And they said now there will be no more prayer in our school. And I remember thinking, what does that actually stop? How will they stop us from praying? If the teachers decide not to, does that mean I can't? Can we not, as students? Can I not pray before a test? I needed help, I will tell you.

A thought process went through my mind. The only way that the Federal Government could prohibit prayer in the public schools would be to clear out the public schools. If we insisted on following through, they'd have to empty the schools. Otherwise, there was going to be prayer in the public schools, as well as our parochial schools. They would have to come in and march us all out of school, chain the doors shut, and post a guard to prevent prayer in the public schools.

So what did we do? We genuflected to the Supreme Court, accepted the *Murray v. Curlett* decision in 1963, stopped activity of public prayer in public schools, and we've had subsequent decisions along the way about whether students could pray, whether athletes could pray, whether coaches could pray with athletes, whether coaches could be there when athletes prayed with themselves, all of these things decided by a Supreme Court that believes in stare decisis, that there was a decision made in 1963, and that they're somehow bound by that decision, rather than looking back at the plain text of this Constitution and concluding that as long as Congress doesn't make a law establishing a state religion, or interfere with the practice of religion, then it isn't the Federal Government's business to be engaged in religious activity that takes place in the public or the private schools. But that's what happened in 1963.

Then, Mr. Speaker, 1965, we went through, at breakneck speed, went through the Constitution over here at the Supreme Court, out those doorways and off that way, breakneck speed. This was *Griswold v. Connecticut*. At that time, Connecticut and Massachusetts and multiple other States had outlawed contraceptives in their States. That meant that you couldn't go in and buy contraceptives at the drug store. The case of *Griswold* was brought against—*Griswold* brought the case against the State of Connecticut and said, your State law that bans contraceptives is unconstitutional. And they went before the Supreme Court and argued.

What are you going to base that on? How does a State not have a power that's not—all non-enumerated powers are reserved for the States or the people, respectively. So the Constitution, I say, defines that the States had that

power. But yet, the Supreme Court, in their imagination in 1965, created this right to privacy, a right to privacy fabricated out of whole cloth, didn't exist in the Constitution, doesn't exist today in the Constitution, but it exists on the lips of every law school professor that's teaching constitutional law, a right to privacy that's been created now by the Supreme Court. They say it was in this Constitution somehow but had never been discovered until the Supreme Court discovered it in *Griswold v. Connecticut*.

So it was against the law in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and multiple other States to even sell contraceptives. So the Supreme Court created a right to privacy and outlawed the ban on contraceptives in Connecticut.

I say if you lived in Connecticut in 1965 and you wanted contraceptives, you could drive across the State line, or you could move to another State. That was the vision of the laboratories of the State experiment of the Founding Fathers. States' rights, Tenth Amendment. They imposed that in 1965.

Oh, by the way, in 1972 there was a case called *Eisenstadt* that said, well—it was just married people in *Griswold* in 1965. *Eisenstadt* came along and said, well, if there's a right to privacy for married people to be able to purchase contraceptives, surely that exists for unmarried people as well. They imposed that, and the Federal Government took another reach, and now we have the foundation for *Roe v. Wade*, which turned into—the right to privacy became the foundational argument for *Roe v. Wade* in 1973, just 8 years after *Griswold*.

And they found, in the emanations and penumbras, a right to abortion. Only the right to abortion of a non-viable fetus, I might add, but the companion case was *Doe v. Bolton*. And in that case it said, But there will be exceptions to the viable fetus if the health of the mother is considered. And health of the mother was defined to be mental, physical, or familial health of the mother. And so it was an open door right to any kind of abortion, this all rooted in judicial activism, I might add.

Today, seeing what has happened in *Griswold*, and them setting aside a State law, now, to the point where the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, stepped before a press conference, a week, 2 weeks ago, on a Friday at noon, and he said, Well, okay, you know I might have gotten in a little hot water about taking away the rights to conscience of the Catholic Church and other religious institutions by telling them, through Kathleen Sebelius, that they shall provide, not just contraceptives any longer—I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't just that. It was contraceptives, sterilizations, and abortifacients, pills that cause abortion, requiring religious organizations, pro-life organizations, especially the Catholic Church, to pro-

vide that if they're going to provide any kind of health care for their employees or their patients, a direct, clear, imposition of a violation of rights to conscience.

And Father Jonathan Morris said, publicly, that you cannot force someone to violate their conscience. You keep your convictions of your conscience, even unto death. I applaud the position that he has taken. I endorse that position that he has taken.

But now, a few days after this announcement came out, and the heat came on the President, his noon press conference on that Friday, he stepped up and, instead of, let's say, legislating within the confines of the Constitution itself, the supreme law of the land, or amending the Constitution if you disagree with what it says, or even legislating from the bench, as *Griswold*, *Eisenstadt*, *Roe* and *Doe*, and many others have done, we have now a President with the highest degree of audacity I have ever seen—and by the way, he uses that term "audacity" pretty often.

□ 1350

He thinks he's legislating by press conference. He said, Well, I'm not going to impose this on you any longer, Catholic Church and others. I'm going to impose it on insurance companies. They shall provide contraceptives, sterilizations, abortifacients, abortion-causing pills, and they shall do it at no charge.

The audacity of the President of the United States to issue such a thing. And we should not comply with such an unconstitutional order from the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SHIMKUS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of surveying tornado damage in his district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 5, 2012, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5146. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting

a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5147. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5148. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8213] received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5149. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2010 Annual Report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5150. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Patent Compensation Board Regulations (RIN: 1990-AA33) received February 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5151. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — DOE Patent Licensing Regulations (RIN: 1990-AA41) received February 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5152. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — NRC Procedures for Placement and Monitoring of Work with the U.S. Department of Energy, Management Directive 11.7, DT-12-02 received February 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5153. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of proposed lease with the Government of Poland (Transmittal No. 02-12) pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5154. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting Periodic Report on the National Emergency Caused by the Lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979 for February 26, 2011 — August 25, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5155. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting report on proposed obligations of funds provided for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5156. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the fourteenth quarterly report on the Afghanistan reconstruction, pursuant to Public Law 110-181, section 1229; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5157. A letter from the Director, Office of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's Annual Sunshine Act Report for 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5158. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's report on the detailed boundary of Sturgeon Wild and Scenic River in Michigan, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1274; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5159. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change of Addresses for Regional Offices, Addition of One New Address, and Correction of Names of

House and Senate Committees We Must Notify [Docket No.: FWS-R9-NWRS-2011-0108] (RIN: 1018-AU89) received February 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5160. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations; Areas of the National Park System, Cape Cod National Seashore (RIN: 1024-AD88) received February 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5161. A letter from the FWS Chief, Branch of Aquatic Invasive Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Injurious Wildlife Species; Listing Three Python Species and One Anaconda Species as Injurious Reptiles [FWS-R9-FHC-2008-0015; FXFR1336090000N5-123-FF09F14000] received February 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5162. A letter from the Chief, Recovery and Delisting, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Bald Eagles Nesting in Sonoran Desert Area of Central Arizona Removed from the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket ID: FWS-R2-ES-2011-0069] (RIN: 1018-AX08) received February 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5163. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Issuance of Full Validity L Visas to Qualified Applicants received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5164. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report on the Tribal-State Road Maintenance Agreements for 2011, pursuant to Public Law 109-59, section 1119(k); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5165. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Housing Cost Amounts Eligible for Exclusion or Deduction for 2012 [Notice 2012-19] received February 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3606. A bill to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies, with an amendment. (Rept. 112-406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 4116. A bill to provide for regulatory accountability and for the revision of economically burdensome regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Ju-

diciary, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, the Budget, and Oversight and Government Reform, 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. MCKEON:

H.R. 4117. A bill to prohibit the use of private security contractors and members of the Afghan Public Protection Force to provide security for members of the Armed Forces and military installations and facilities in Afghanistan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRITZ (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. HAHN):

H.R. 4118. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased small business participation in multiple award contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. REYES (for himself, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 4119. A bill to reduce the trafficking of drugs and to prevent human smuggling across the Southwest Border by deterring the construction and use of border tunnels; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Homeland Security, 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. DENT (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 4120. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CHU, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 4121. A bill to provide for a program to provide Federal contracts to early stage small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FARR, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 4122. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KIND, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CHU, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEBBACH, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 4123. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to issue prospective guidance clarifying the employment status of individuals for purposes of employment taxes and to prevent retroactive assessments with respect to such clarifications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SCHILLING, and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 4124. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to States to streamline State requirements and procedures for veterans with military emergency medical training to become civilian emergency medical technicians; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. JONES, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 4125. A bill to ensure the effectiveness of the missile defense system of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 4126. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each voter registration agency in a State which requires an individual to present a government-issued photo identification as a condition of voting in an election for Federal office to provide such an identification without charge upon request to any such individual who does not otherwise possess one, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BENISHK, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 4127. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exempt certain requests by physicians for consultations by radiation oncologists from the limitation on certain physician referrals under Medicare; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. ISSA, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 4128. A bill to recognize a primary measure of national unemployment for purposes of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 4129. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4130. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Althea Gibson, in recognition of her ground breaking achievements in athletics and her commitment to ending racial discrimination and prejudice within the world of athletics; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FALCOMA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 4131. A bill to facilitate land acquisition for the consolidation of lands located within the boundaries of, or abutting the boundaries of, El Yunque National Forest in Puerto Rico, and to further the protection of the ecological integrity and biological diversity of the National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. TURNER of New York, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H. Res. 568. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the importance of preventing the Government of Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H. Res. 569. A resolution recognizing the tenth anniversary of the tragic communal violence in Gujarat, India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 4116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 and Section 5, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution; and Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Clauses 1, 3 and 18.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 4117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CRITZ:

H.R. 4118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 4119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 4122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(Article I, Section 8, Clause 3). The commerce clause states that the United States Congress shall have power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." Courts and commentators

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 4123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 4124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution, Congress has the authority to control the expenditures of the federal government.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 4125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. The Congress shall have the power to . . . make rules for the Government and Regulation of land and naval Forces . . . To make all laws this shall be necessary and proper. . . .

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 4127.

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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 4128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 1 and 18

"The Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers) . . .

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 4130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 4131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 104: Mr. DENHAM.
 H.R. 361: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
 H.R. 365: Mr. NUGENT.
 H.R. 452: Mr. REYES and Mr. MACK.
 H.R. 498: Mr. NUGENT.
 H.R. 583: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 719: Mr. HALL.
 H.R. 749: Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 890: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. CHU, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1065: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1206: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 1236: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 1265: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. WEST.
 H.R. 1283: Ms. CHU and Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1381: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1397: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 1418: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 1426: Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 1479: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1546: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 1648: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 1695: Mr. HEINRICH.
 H.R. 1699: Mr. SCHILLING.
 H.R. 1741: Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 1744: Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 1755: Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 1792: Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H.R. 1897: Mr. REYES.
 H.R. 1964: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 2003: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 2106: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PITTS, and Ms. BUERKLE.
 H.R. 2188: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 2288: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 2557: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 2697: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 2896: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. GARRETT.
 H.R. 2959: Mr. BERG.
 H.R. 2960: Mr. HALL.
 H.R. 3059: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H.R. 3067: Mr. YODER, Mr. POLIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STARK, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RUSH, Ms. HOCHUL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FARR, and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 3086: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 3091: Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 3114: Mr. DOGGETT.

- H.R. 3187: Ms. BORDALLO.
- H.R. 3236: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 3269: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
- H.R. 3283: Mr. HINOJOSA.
- H.R. 3286: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
- H.R. 3313: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 3401: Mr. COBLE.
- H.R. 3461: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. BUERKLE.
- H.R. 3511: Mr. MATHESON.
- H.R. 3515: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 3523: Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 3534: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 3596: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. PITTS.
- H.R. 3610: Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 3611: Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 3612: Mr. MORAN.
- H.R. 3661: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. NUNES.
- H.R. 3663: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
- H.R. 3676: Mr. LAMBORN.
- H.R. 3710: Mr. GONZALEZ.
- H.R. 3769: Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 3785: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
- H.R. 3828: Mr. LAMBORN.
- H.R. 3839: Ms. DEGETTE.
- H.R. 3880: Mr. SHERMAN.
- H.R. 3895: Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 3982: Mr. GIBBS.
- H.R. 4010: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. SIRES.
- H.R. 4032: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
- H.R. 4060: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. GOWDY.
- H.R. 4070: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. COBLE.
- H.R. 4094: Mrs. ELLMERS.
- H.R. 4105: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. HOCHUL, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.J. Res. 13: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. JONES, Mr. WEST, Mr. BERG, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. ROONEY.
- H.J. Res. 90: Mr. ENGEL.
- H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. RUNYAN and Mr. FORBES.
- H. Con. Res. 101: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. SCHIFF.
- H. Res. 134: Ms. BORDALLO.
- H. Res. 298: Mr. DEUTCH.
- H. Res. 506: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. CARTER.
- H. Res. 526: Mr. ENGEL.
- H. Res. 543: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
- H. Res. 559: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. WOLF.
- H. Res. 564: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. NADLER.