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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, January 24, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Virginia Foxx to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

LET’S GET REAL ABOUT THE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DeFazio. Well, by all accounts we’re finally going to get serious about the mountain of debt that’s been built up over the last 10 years that we’re going to leave for our kids and grandkids—nearly $14 trillion, a number that’s hard to actually understand.

Now, I’m hopeful it will really be a serious discussion, but it can’t be as long as the Republican rules stand. The Republicans have said that if you reduce income to the government that doesn’t count toward the debt or the deficit. You have to borrow the money—probably from China—and it goes on the debt for our kids and grandkids. But they don’t count that because it’s your money. We’re giving it back to you. Except, of course, we’re still spending more than is coming in.

Now, I’m all for looking at the expenditure side, and there are a lot of places I’d like to cut. Republicans have put some of them off-limits.

We can’t look anywhere in the Pentagon who is still acquiring through cost-plus contracts weapons that were designed to fight during the Soviet era. We’re wasting a fair amount of money over there. It’s well documented.

The Pentagon is the only agency of the Federal Government that can’t be audited. Every other agency is audited. Most of them get good grades. The Pentagon, they say maybe within 5 years they will have an accounting system that could be audited. Come on. And we’re going to exempt them from scrutiny and review and cuts?

The war in Afghanistan, they’ve exempted that from cuts. They want to spend about $200 billion this year on the wind-down in Iraq and the war in Afghanistan. But that’s off the table as far as Republicans are concerned.

And Social Security they say is off the table, and that’s good. Medicare is off the table. They just added to the costs of Medicare with legislation they passed last week, but that doesn’t count either. That was exempt.

So what’s left? Well, we’re going to have, because of the tax cuts adopted in December, a $1.6 trillion 1-year deficit. Now, if we were only going to get to a balanced budget this year with cuts, that would mean eliminating the entire government of the United States of America. We’d still make our Social Security payments. And we wouldn’t be able to exempt the Pentagon, which they want to do, if we wanted to really get to $1.6 trillion.

No more Border Patrol. No more Homeland Security. No more Coast Guard. No more Postal Service. No more Centers for Disease Control. Department of Education, gone. They wouldn’t care much about that. Park Service I guess would probably sell off the parks to the highest bidder. I don’t know.

So you can’t be serious and stand here and say we’re going to put this hand and tie it behind our back, which is the revenue side. Oh, and by the way, if we give millionaires and billionaires tax cuts and reduce our income, that doesn’t count. If we allow corporations to continue to use overseas tax loopholes to avoid paying a responsible level of taxes here in the United States, that doesn’t count. Can’t close any loopholes. That would be bad. No.
They just say we're going to do it all in cuts. It's an impossible task.

But I worry even though they say they've exempted Social Security that's not really their game plan. Because for the first time this year, we will be able to spend money to put into Social Security. Never been done since the program was created. It's always been funded by its own tax.

But this year, the Republicans cooked up an idea—which President Obama bought into lock, stock, and barrel—to reduce the Social Security tax under the guise of giving people back their money and putting people to work. Every Member of Congress will get over $2,000 in tax breaks this year because of that one provision. Every millionaire and billionaire will get over $2,000 in tax breaks. Working people will get a tax break, too—and they can use a tax break—but there are better ways to do it, less costly ways to do it, and ways to do it without jeopardizing the future of Social Security.

So part of the borrowing this year, a couple of hundred billion dollars of that borrowing this year is going to be from China, the government will borrow, to re-engage into the Social Security trust fund.

So I fear the Republicans are going to say, “Well, wait a minute. We can’t subsidize that Social Security thing.” And oh, by the way, you can’t reduce the taxes and run Social Security on its own income. So they’re creating some impossible scenarios here.

I’m hopeful the President will chart a better path, one that doesn’t go after Social Security. Social Security didn’t create, until this year, one penny of the debt of the United States but this year it will create $200 billion of debt for the United States. A very bad precedent set by a bipartisan problem—the Republicans and President Obama and some few Democrats.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Let’s get real about the deficit.

GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, as one who is firmly in the camp of not just supporting the benefits but the necessity of government regulation, I nonetheless welcomed the President’s recent op-ed in the Wall Street Journal and his executive order to review the regulations on a case-by-case basis.

This is a unique opportunity to re-frame at least part of the regulatory debate to satisfy both sides and better serve the public. The area of opportunity lies in creating a new generation of environmental protections that are performance based. Pioneering efforts to protect the environment, like the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, were regulatory based that worked well for their time. Public health requirements, citizen expectations have evolved. Subsequent efforts have become more difficult, expensive, and time consuming.

Having these agencies dictate specific is not necessarily providing the most imaginative, timely, nor cost-effective solutions.

There is an alternative to rules-based procedures, command-and-control rules process. Such a model would give latitude to parties on how they comply with the regulatory action as long as they met or exceeded the requirement.

In Oregon, we were able, some years ago, in partnership with the EPA and the State Department of Environmental Quality, to work with a major industrial presence in our community, Intel, on a plant expansion where latitude was granted for air quality compliance. The company made an enforceable commitment to the requisite changes in environmental regulations, but the environmental agent regulators did not micromanage how the company complied. The result? Clean air with less cost and time.

There are countless opportunities for this principle to save time, money, and create innovation, and importantly, the potential to reduce opposition to the regulatory process itself: building trust and confidence, partnerships between the regulator and the regulated with more control, more flexibility, producing a cleaner, safer environment.

This requires first and foremost an administration that can be trusted to act in good faith because too often, regulatory reform is a tactic of those who are simply opposed to the regulation in its first instance.
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This approach will only invite fierce opposition to watered-down protection. The Obama administration has established its environmental credentials and should be able to avoid, or at least lay to rest, that sort of concern.

There are two other necessary elements. The standards must be clear, and the parties must be both responsible and have the capacity to be held accountable. Nothing must allow the protection in question to be undercut. Indeed, it may be reasonable for performance-based approaches to require higher standards and environmental protection. And we certainly don’t have to suspend current rules or regulations. Just give an alternative path for compliance that we can always fall back upon if people fail short.

Once it’s clear that we can produce the environmental or other desired protections on a performance basis, perhaps we can tackle redundant regulatory processes. For instance, California has arguably more stringent environmental regulations than the United States Government itself. Can we figure out a way to apply that single, more stringent standard rather than forcing individuals, government agencies to comply with both?

In sum, it’s always helpful for an administration to make sure our efforts at government regulation are effective and relevant. By all means, eliminate the unnecessary or the ineffective. What is more important, however, is to usher in a new era of performance-based protections to improve regulations, save money, and protect the public welfare.

THE BUDGET AND SUSTAINABLE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. As we begin this great debate over what our priorities are, it’s worth reflecting on an article that was written nearly 3 years ago in the Sunday Times of London by Nobel Prize-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz and his associate Linda Bilmes. Here is what they write:

“The Bush administration was wrong about the benefits of the war”—talking about the Iraq war—“and was wrong about the costs. The President and his advisers expected a quick, inexpensive conflict. Instead, we have a war that is costing more than anyone could have imagined.

“The cost of direct U.S. military operations—not even including long-term costs, such as taking care of wounded veterans—already exceeds the cost of the 12-year war in Vietnam and is more than double the cost of the Korean War.

“And, even in the best case scenario, these costs are projected to be almost 10 times the cost of the first Gulf War, almost a third more than the cost of the Vietnam War, and twice that of the First World War. The only war in our history that cost more was the Second World War, when 16.3 million U.S. troops fought in a campaign lasting 4 years, at a total cost, in 2007 dollars, after adjusting for inflation, of about $5 trillion.”

They go on to write that, “With virtually the entire Armed Forces committed to fighting the Germans and Japanese, the cost per trooper, in today’s dollars, was less than $100,000.” That’s in 2007 dollars. “By contrast, the Iraq war is costing upward of $400,000 per trooper to fight a costly and largely unsuccessful war that is costing more than anyone could have imagined.”

“Most Americans have yet to feel these costs.” This was written almost 3 years ago. “The price in blood has been paid by our voluntary military and by hired contractors. The price in treasure has, in a sense, been financed entirely by borrowing. Taxes have not been raised to pay for it—in fact, taxes on the rich have actually fallen. Deficit spending gives the illusion that the laws of economics can be repealed, that we can have both guns and butter. But, of course, the logic is not repealed. The costs of the war are real even if they have been deferred, possibly to another generation.”
That from Joseph Stiglitz and Linda Bilmes almost 3 years ago.

One of the biggest causes of our soaring debt and economic insecurity ends up being Pentagon spending. The budget for the Pentagon consumes more than half our discretionary spending. We have seen countless stories of U.S. taxpayer dollars going unaccounted for in Iraq and Afghanistan. We have had countless high-profile hearings on contractor fraud and the lack of oversight at the Department of Defense.

According to the Friends Committee on National Legislation, 39 percent of our income tax dollars last year went to Pentagon spending on past and current wars. And Stiglitz, again, has said that the Iraq war “didn’t just contribute to the severity of the financial crisis . . . it kept us from responding to it effectively. Increased indebtedness meant that the government had far less room to maneuver than it otherwise would have.” So what we have is the U.S. financing war on borrowed money.

We must examine our connection between soaring debt and these two wars, the war in Iraq and war in Afghanistan. Between 2003 and 2008, the U.S. debt increased by almost $1 trillion. A quarter of that debt is directly attributed to the war in Iraq. The cost of the war in Afghanistan has been over $455 billion to date, and the deadline for that keeps sliding past 2014.

Now, in the nationalpriorities.org, they talk about a sustainable defense. And one report says that there are options for reducing military spending, saving nearly $1 trillion over the next decade without adversely impacting U.S. national security interests. So we can have a strong defense, but we’re spending so much money, we’re undermining our ability to be able to provide for the American people here at home. And we have to start taking care of things here at home.

What will we sacrifice? Will we sacrifice the education of our children for these wars? Will we sacrifice Social Security for these wars? Will we sacrifice Medicare or Medicaid for these wars? Will we sacrifice our infrastructure for these wars? Or will we say the war in Iraq was based on lies; let’s bring these troops home? Will we say that Afghanistan is a hopeless, corrupt mess and it’s time to bring our troops home, and then begin to use the resources of our country, those resources that are hard-earned taxpayer dollars, use that money for things here at home? Let’s have that debate as we talk about cutting the budget.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule 1, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

After recess

The chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, You are without beginning or end. We begin each formal session of this law-making Chamber with reflection on Your Holy Word and prayerful petition.

This representative government, Lord, is laden with great expectations and innumerable problems; so in the early hours we seek Your light and inspiration to set priorities and shape proper means to achieve common goals of legislation.

In this information age surrounded by media opinions, kindly lead us to the essential truth on all the issues.

In the evening, before we take our rest, Lord, help each Member find the time for grateful prayer to renew love and loyalty, lest we be consumed by work or become tepid due to debate and criticism. Renew us in our commitments to be faithful both in love and service.

In the beginning and in the end of each passing day, may we draw closer to You now and forever. Amen.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana 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.

NLRB Threatens Voters of South Carolina

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. Speaker, this week I was startled to read in Free Times a brief by Corey Hutchins that the National Labor Relations Board announced plans to sue South Carolina and three other States because voters approved ballot amendments in November.

In South Carolina, more than 85 percent of voters chose “yes” on an amendment to give employees the constitutional vote by secret ballot on union representation. This threat is an insult to the voters of the Palmetto State, and it is an insult to the sacred right of secret ballot. Sadly, this is an underhanded admission by the administration that union bosses want to evade voters and deny Congress its right to stop Card Check, which has forced unionization of workers.

It’s an admission workers know that today union leaders are more focused on their own personal enrichment with union dues than the rights of workers.

Fortunately, South Carolina is a right-to-work State where workers are protected, new jobs are created, and we respect the votes of all citizens. I commend the efforts of South Carolina Representative Eric Bedingfield and Senate Majority Leader Harvey Peeler for sponsoring the amendment.

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

Honoring Private First Class Zachary Salmon

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Private First Class Zachary Salmon, an Army Cavalry Scout with the 1st Battalion, 22nd Cavalry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division. On January 12 of this year, he was killed in action in Kunar province in Afghanistan after insurgents attacked his unit. This past Friday, he was laid to rest in Lawrenceburg, Indiana. Just 21 years old, PFC Salmon enlisted in the Army 3 years ago as a way to provide for his then-newborn son, Noah, whom he adored.

While I never had the honor of meeting him in person, I learned at his wake this past Friday that he exhibited all the best qualities of our men and women in uniform: a patriotic sense of duty, a strong desire to help others, and a keen awareness of his weighty responsibilities as a man in uniform. Known to his friends as “Fish,” he also had a bright sense of humor and a huge heart. In addition to his son, Noah, PFC Salmon leaves behind his mother and father, his stepfather, his brother, and two sisters. We all owe a debt today to PFC Salmon for making the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of our country.

Thank you, PFC Salmon. May God watch over you, little Noah, and the rest of your family.

The National Debt—No Department Should Be Exempt From Belt-Tightening

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

The national debt is now near $15 trillion. As a result, our economic future is uncertain. We cannot continue to spend more than we can afford to pay interest on the debt, or else risk raising the interest rates and slowing our economy. As a country, we need to fix our fiscal house. We need a dailypersonal spending plan to help put our fiscal house in order.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the Administration to support legislation that would freeze discretionary spending for the next 10 years and authorize a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. We must work together to solve the problem of our national debt.
Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, later today we will vote on a resolution to reduce Federal non-security spending to the 2008 level or in some cases less. This is a very good first step if we follow through and abide by this resolution. However, we need to make sure that these cuts are real and not simply cuts that will be reinstated later in an end-of-the-year omnibus spending bill.

More importantly, I want to add my voice to the growing chorus that is saying loud and clear that nothing should be left off the table. There is waste in every Federal department and agency, and the waste in the Defense and Homeland Security Departments is huge. No department should be given a free pass and made exempt from cost savings and belt-tightening.

We have a national debt of over $14 trillion, a mind-boggling incomprehensible figure. Even The Washington Post, which has usually supported every Federal spending program imaginable editorialized recently, "It's time to stop worrying about the deficit—and start panicking about the time to stop worrying about the definable." And start panicking about the time to stop worrying about the definable, editorialized recently, "It's time to stop worrying about the deficit—and start panicking about the time to stop worrying about the definable." It's time to stop worrying about the deficit—and start panicking about the time to stop worrying about the definable, editorialized recently, "It's time to stop worrying about the deficit—and start panicking about the time to stop worrying about the definable."

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, last week the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission held a hearing on the plight of Christian minorities in Iraq and Egypt. In the wake of the devastating attacks targeting Christians in both countries, it is clear that religious minorities in the Middle East face a serious threat that must be addressed. This recent spate of violence has driven many Christians and other religious minorities to flee the lands they have inhabited for centuries and attempt to emigrate to the West. If the international community fails to speak out, the prospects for religious pluralism and tolerance in the region are bleak.

President Reagan once said that the U.S. Constitution is "a covenant that we have made not only with ourselves, but with all of mankind." I believe the United States has an obligation to speak out for the voiceless around the world.

This week I will introduce, with other Members, a bill which would require the administration to appoint a Special Envoy for religious minorities in the Middle East and South Central Asia in order to make this issue a foreign policy priority, and I ask my colleagues to join me.

---

THE LEAVING ETHANOL AT EXISTING LEVELS ACT

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about legislation that I will reintroduce that will put a pause on the Environmental Protection Agency's actions in moving forward with a waiver for an increase in the amount of ethanol in gasoline.

Currently gasoline contains a 10 percent blend wall. In October of this past year, the EPA granted a waiver for the allowable amount of ethanol to increase to 15 percent.

I have questioned their decision to move forward with a waiver for E15. I was wholly dissatisfied with the response they gave in a briefing last fall. They deferred to the Department of Energy's research. Does the EPA not employ its own scientists and experts? Is it the EPA's position that it is incapable of doing its own research?

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the problems that occurred in 2008 with food-to-fuel diversion and the resultant increase in price in commodities. I don't believe the EPA has done its due diligence. And certainly they haven't provided information that would disprove any fears about the use of E15 causing mechanical failures and fires, particularly in smaller engines.

My bill will allow for a pause and allow for more assurances to be met that the blend wall in the blend wall for ethanol will be safe. The security of the public's well-being should be paramount in this issue.

---

CALLING FOR A SPECIAL ENVOY ON RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, last week the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission held a hearing on the plight of Christian minorities in Iraq and Egypt. In the wake of the devastating attacks targeting Christians in both countries, it is clear that religious minorities in the Middle East face a serious threat that must be addressed. This recent spate of violence has driven many Christians and other religious minorities to flee the lands they have inhabited for centuries and attempt to emigrate to the West. If the international community fails to speak out, the prospects for religious pluralism and tolerance in the region are bleak.

President Reagan once said that the U.S. Constitution is "a covenant that we have made not only with ourselves, but with all of mankind." I believe the United States has an obligation to speak out for the voiceless around the world.

This week I will introduce, with other Members, a bill which would require the administration to appoint a Special Envoy for religious minorities in the Middle East and South Central Asia in order to make this issue a foreign policy priority, and I ask my colleagues to join me.

---

HONORING TODD BUCH

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Middletown Community Foundation and to honor one of my constituents from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Mr. Todd Buch.

Each year, the Middletown Community Foundation honors a local resident with the Humanitarian of the Year award. The Middletown Community Foundation is a nonprofit organization created to improve the quality of life for individuals who live and work in my hometown of Middletown Township, Bucks County.

This year it is the Humanitarian Award that is being presented to Mr. Todd Buch. Todd is the president of McCafferty Auto Group in Langhorne. Todd and his family have been generous and enthusiastic supporters of their community for decades, and his award from the Middletown Community Foundation is very fitting. Todd's business achievements alone have been impressive, with his dealership substantiating hundreds of jobs in Bucks County. Todd's contributions to the community have gone beyond his leadership in the business community.

---

MEDICAID

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, most States, including my own State of Pennsylvania, are facing significant budget problems this fiscal year. The fiscal situation in some States eerily resembles Greece and Ireland.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government is adding fuel to the fire with new Medicaid mandates that could cost the States billions of dollars. ObamaCare mandates that States gradually have to start picking up the tab. Second, the Federal Government will at first pay for the benefits of these new enrollees, the States will gradually have to start picking up the tab. Second, the Federal Government will only help cover the cost of benefits, not the administrative costs associated with all these new enrollees. Since some States will be forced to nearly double their Medicaid rolls, this will certainly hit their budgets hard.

We cannot forget that 49 of 50 States are required to balance their budgets every year. They will face the grim choice of discontinuing their Medicaid program, raising taxes, or slashing other essential government services.

We have talked a lot about ObamaCare bankrupting the Federal Government, but we can't forget that it could drive States over the cliff at the same time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule 1, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

---

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro
expanding again. Strong growth and job creation will increase tax revenues and provide greater resources that are needed; but, Mr. Speaker, that's only half of the equation. Economic growth is critically important. We need to do it so that we can put the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury to deal with those essential items that are there, but it is half the equation.

We can't get back onto firm ground with sound fiscal standing unless we have a balanced budget. Some of this can be accomplished by eliminating waste, fraud and abuse. Everyone is always in favor of eliminating waste, fraud and abuse. And what is the best way to do that? Robust oversight. Robs to streamline Federal spending and make better use of taxpayer dollars, but we have to acknowledge up front that hard work and painful cuts lie ahead. We all know that this is not going to be an easy task, but it is absolutely essential. Just as families and small businesses across this country have been forced to cut back during these difficult economic times, we here in this institution are going to have to do the same. That's the message that we got last November that brought people like my Rules Committee colleagues, Mr. Scott, who is sitting next to me on the floor here, that's the message that has been carried here.

Some Federal programs, Mr. Speaker, are wasteful and duplicative and deserve to be cut. There will be others that have merit, but which we simply cannot afford at the current levels. We have to be honest about that. We have to engage in a responsible debate about what our priorities must be.

What we cannot do is allow this debate to degenerate into false accusations about the other side's intentions. And I'm going to repeat that, Mr. Speaker. We need a spirit of free-flowing, rigorous debate that we need to have degenerate into these accusations that we so often seem to hear around here.

There is no one in this body who wants to gut funding for key essential programs, like veterans' programs, or like education, child nutrition. No one wants to gut these programs. So I think it's important for us to state that. And there is no evidence that any proposal out there would undermine things like support for our Nation's veterans.

We are all entering into this debate with good faith, good intentions, and a commitment to responsibly address the need to implement fiscal discipline. We will have to make hard choices, but that process will not be served by unfair or disingenuous accusations. We also recognize that this will be a lengthy process. We are just beginning what is going to be a 2-year process focused on this.

Today's underlying resolution, the measure that we're going to be considering through this rule and then on the floor tomorrow, is merely the first step in this ongoing effort to bring our Federal budget back into the black. Our committees will have to conduct extensive oversight, as I mentioned earlier, of Federal programs. We will have to deal with spending for fiscal year 2011 spending, which the last Congress failed to do, before we can even begin to deal with the coming fiscal year.

The underlying resolution that we have before us today lays down a marker for reducing fiscal year 2011 spending, which the last Congress failed to do, before we can even begin to deal with it. It's the first step in this ongoing effort to bring our Federal budget back into the black. Our committees will have to conduct extensive oversight, as I mentioned earlier, of Federal programs. We will have to deal with spending for fiscal year 2011 spending, which the last Congress failed to do, before we can even begin to deal with the coming fiscal year.

Today's underlying resolution, the measure that we're going to be considering through this rule and then on the floor tomorrow, is merely the first step in this ongoing effort to bring our Federal budget back into the black. Our committees will have to conduct extensive oversight, as I mentioned earlier, of Federal programs. We will have to deal with spending for fiscal year 2011 spending, which the last Congress failed to do, before we can even begin to deal with the coming fiscal year.

As this process proceeds, rank and file Members of both political parties will have the opportunity to participate in our effort to address these very tough decisions.

Through constructive debate, we can finally begin to impose real accounting and discipline on our Federal budget. In concert with pro-growth policies—and I said to me the most essential thing is implementing pro-growth economic policies—but going hand-in-hand with these pro-growth policies, Mr. Speaker, this effort will put us back onto the path of economic recovery and job creation.

Today's rule sets the stage for the start of that effort. I'm going to urge my colleagues to support this rule and demonstrate their resolve to tackle runaway Federal spending in a serious way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule. So much for an open process, and so much for a free flow of ideas. I also believe that the provision for reducing fiscal year 2011 spending, which the last Congress failed to do, before we can even begin to deal with the coming fiscal year.

Once again, the Republican majority is choosing to ignore the single most important issue facing the American people: jobs. My Republican friends have instead brought forth a resolution, H. Res. 38, that they tout as some sort of spending reduction measure. In fact, the resolution doesn't cut a single dollar—not one dime—from the Federal budget.

I think if this were a good-faith effort, there would be some numbers in this resolution. Instead, the resolution says that we should "assume non-security spending at fiscal year 2008 levels or less" without defining "non-security" spending or specifying exactly what those levels might be. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this is a budget resolution without any numbers, which is why it is so meaningless.

We are told that the numbers are on their way, that the Congressional Budget Office will tell us on Wednesday of this week what the impact of this resolution would be if it were actually put into place. So why are we here
today debating this issue? Why can’t we wait until Wednesday when we have the numbers? The answer is as plain as the calendar on the wall: it’s politics, pure and simple.

The Republican leadership has scheduled a vote on a resolution just before President Obama addresses the Nation in his State of the Union Address. That way, they’ll have a fresh set of talking points for their response to the President. They’ll be able to say, “Look how serious we are about cutting spending.” It’s a cheap shot, of course, they haven’t cut anything.

Another problem with the resolution is that it reinforces the terrible precedent that the Republican majority established in their rules package at the beginning of this Congress. Under those rules, a single Member of Congress, the chairman of the Budget Committee, has the authority to determine spending levels for the government for the rest of the year.

Now, some of my colleagues, I have a great deal of respect for the current chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. Ryan. But I strongly disagree with the notion that he and only he should determine something as fundamental as the Federal budget, the Republican friends promised.

Mr. Speaker, we have to vote in this House to change the name of a post office. But we can’t have a vote on how much we should spend on education, on food safety, on infrastructure, on environmental protection, or on medical research? That’s a far cry from the openness and transparency that my Republican friends promised.

Last week in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment to this resolution that would have allowed the other 435 Members of the House the opportunity to vote on this critical issue. But my Republican colleagues defeated my amendment on a party-line vote.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, the resolution that ends defense spending from the budget axe. We hear all the time from my friends on the other side of the aisle that everything should be on the table. Why then would they take hundreds of billions of dollars of potential savings off the table right out of the gate? Even Speaker Boehner in a recent interview said, “I believe there’s room to find savings in the Department of Defense.” Well, if that’s true—and it most certainly is—then why do we allow this resolution treat defense spending as sacredUTO? Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the Federal budget, the Republican majority is not off to a good start. Their budget ceilings, the spending ceilings the Republican majority established in their rules package at the beginning of this Congress. Under those rules, a single Member of Congress, the chairman of the Budget Committee, has the authority to determine spending levels for the government for the rest of the year.

Now, some of my colleagues, I have a great deal of respect for the current chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. Ryan. But I strongly disagree with the notion that he and only he should determine something as fundamental as the Federal budget, the Republican friends promised.

Mr. Speaker, we have to vote in this House to change the name of a post office. But we can’t have a vote on how much we should spend on education, on food safety, on infrastructure, on environmental protection, or on medical research? That’s a far cry from the openness and transparency that my Republican friends promised.
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Mr. VAN HOLLEN. We asked them. Why don’t we have the number? They said, Well, we’ve got to wait for CBO.

We are pleased to hear the newfound respect for the CBO numbers, but here’s my point. That’s going to happen within 24 hours of tomorrow. Twenty-four hours. We could have a budget resolution at the end of the day, with the number, so everyone could decide what the ceilings are going to be. No, we’ve got to do it tomorrow. Why? State of the Union address. Great press release.

Now, I’ve heard my colleagues say they’ve got to do this because there was nothing in place in the House from a budget perspective. Well, in fact, the House last year passed a budget enforcement act. I’ve got it right here. It’s got a number in it. It’s got a number in it like these budget documents have.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to ask my friend, what was the vote in the House on that budget that my friend was just talking about?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I don’t remember the exact vote, but it passed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DREIER. It was deemed. There was never a vote in this institution on it, Mr. Speaker.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. There was a vote on a resolution in the House.

If you want to talk about deeming—

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

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

Let me say that I think that one of the things that we have to recognize here—and I am happy to engage in rigorous debate, and I’m happy that we have not at this point had any of our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about the prospect of starving children, throwing people out of schools, depriving veterans of access to the things that they need. So I express my appreciation to my colleagues, because when we were up in the Rules Committee, that was the tenor of the discussion that took place upstairs.

Mr. DREIER. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, is that, in 1974, the Congress put into place legislation known as the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act. I happen to believe that that needs to be overhauled, because Democrats and Republicans alike recognize that the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act has been a failure, an abject failure. And I’ve been working with my friend from Maryland, the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee, and Mr. Ryan, the chairman of the Budget Committee, as well as the chair and ranking member, Messrs. CONRAD and SESSIONS, in the Senate on the notion of our working together in a bipartisan, bicameral way to bring about an overhaul of the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act.

Now, one of the reasons that I believe it is essential is that last year was the first time ever that we have not seen a budget passed. It was at a time since implementation of the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act. And, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the crocodile tears that are being shed so often on this House floor, I think it’s important to note that last year we were in a position where we’re having to make the kinds of tough decisions that we are.

My friend from North Charleston, my very, very thoughtful colleague is a new member of the Rules Committee, has been raising with me some very simple and commonsense questions about the process that we have been going through. One of the things that he just said was that he thought that the Budget Act was defined in such a way, that we need to recognize that, at this moment, are beginning the process, we are beginning the process of cutting spending. This is going to be a 2-year struggle. So this is not going to be the end of our effort to try and rein in wasteful Federal spending.

I know my friend had some thoughts on that, and I would be happy to yield to him if he would like to either pose a question or offer any comments that relate to either the health care bill and the vote that we just had or any other issue.

I yield to my friend from South Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Question for you: Is it the first time since 1974 that the House has operated without a budget?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, I thank my friend for giving me the opportunity to repeat what I just said so that we can underscore it.

Never before have we failed to have a budget. And yet, for the first time in 36 years, that happened.

That’s why I believe that we have a chance to work, Democrats and Republicans together, with our colleagues in the other body to bring about real reform of the Budget Act itself.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

When you think about the repeal of the national health care bill, is that not a savings of $2.7 trillion, at least the elimination of a $2.7 trillion hole or an abyss on an entitlement program? Does it not reduce the debt by $700 billion? Are these not real numbers? And if we really wanted a number, if we were looking for the number, would they not have passed a budget last year?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, let me say that my friend is absolutely right.

Throughout the debate that took place last week, we heard that, in fact, repeal of the $2.7 trillion health care bill would end up costing $230 billion based on the numbers provided to us by the Congressional Budget Office’s estimates. We kept hearing that, and in one of the exchanges we had with Mr. PENCE, only in Washington, D.C., can bringing about the elimination of a $2.7 trillion expenditure actually cost money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the thing that we need to point to is not only the smoke and mirrors that went into the recommendations that were provided, whether it is dealing with the CLASS Act, which the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee has described as a Ponzi scheme—he used that term to describe it, whether it’s that—or, to me, the most important thing to point to is the fact that in that measure there is a three-quarter of a trillion—Mr. Speaker, that’s three-quarters of a trillion—dollars tax increase that is being posed along with the mandate.

So my friend from North Charleston is absolutely right, Mr. Speaker, when he points to the fact that we were, in fact, saving dollars with the action that we took last week, and we are committed to ensuring that people have access to quality, affordable health insurance by allowing for the purchase of insurance across States lines, pooling to deal with preexisting conditions, associated health plans so that small businesses can get lower rates, the idea of meaningful lawsuit abuse reform, which the President of the United States talked about last year in his State of the Union message.

I mean, these are the kinds of things that we believe can immediately drive the cost of health insurance down, health care down itself and at the same time we can disengage the Federal Government’s dramatic involvement in this.
So my friend from North Charleston is absolutely right and I appreciate his, as a small businessman, coming to this body, bringing the common sense that he is sharing with us.

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

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

I am glad my friends on the other side of the aisle are happy that they voted to repeal the affordable health care bill, but I will tell you that there are real people in this country who are benefiting from the real protections in the bill who are quite anxious about the fact that there are people who want to remove the protection, for example, that prohibits insurance companies from discriminating against people with preexisting conditions. There are parents who can keep their kids on their insurance until they are 26 who are actually feeling some benefits from this health care bill. They’re not too happy that the Republicans want to repeal all of that. And on top of that, the CBO said it adds considerably to the deficit.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that my colleague from California, who care about the health reform, we were using CBO numbers, actual numbers that were provided by the CBO to say that we have a $230 billion reduction in the deficit in the first 10 years and a trillion dollars beyond that. We’re giving them actual numbers from the CBO to talk about deficit reduction.

But I don’t see any numbers on this budget resolution that’s on this floor today and tomorrow. I call it the “budget illusion,” because it contains no numbers, no specifics, and worst of all, no ideas for job creation or economic recovery, and it doesn’t even include a serious plan to reduce the deficit.

This is not the way to manage the budget. It’s worse than arbitrary. It’s like budgeting with blindfolds on. It gives no thought, no reasons, no real discussion on how the cuts would be made and what the ramifications would be. Worst of all, the Republican resolution doesn’t contain any idea on economic recovery. It doesn’t even include a serious plan to reduce the deficit.

We gave you numbers with the health care reform that would actually reduce the deficit. This is a numberless budget, nothing at all.

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Frank).

Mr. Frank of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was unclear in my own mind which was worse, the terrible procedural abuse of this resolution or the serious substantive flaw, but I then realize they come together because it is procedurally outrageous so as to protect a substantive grave flaw.

First of all, it is a major piece of legislation and it’s not amendable, just like the health care bill. You may remember, Mr. Speaker, what people on the Republican side said about open rules. It will be a fond memory but apparently not a reality.

We have a very important piece of legislation subject to no amendment. I chaired a committee for 4 years and never would I have brought a bill to the floor with such an impact and had no amendments in order whatsoever. But I understand why they don’t want an amendment, because it would reveal the grave flaw. This says reduce non-security spending to the level of 2008. In other words, exempt about half of discretionary spending. All security, I assume you would spend no money on.

Now we have a war and we have to defend the people who we put out there. I have to say those who talk about shuttering the government down— I don’t know what they are going to tell the Afghanistans who are out there being shot at—but we have got tens of billions that we are spending subsidizing our wealthy allies in Europe and Asia.

The argument that you exempt military spending from budget discipline is one of the reasons we are in the terrible hole we are in. Now it is clearly indefensible to argue that you would exempt military spending from budget discipline. So how do you defend it? You defend it by not allowing an amendment that would bring it forward.

Why, Mr. Speaker, are we not able to say, well, not just non-security and maybe non-security shouldn’t go down to the level of 2008 but ought to go down somewhat or ought to be limited somewhat. This is part of a philosophy that puts pressure on all of the domestic spending, everything that affects the quality of life in America.

Now by “security,” by the way, I mean police officers in the streets of the cities I represent and firefighters and bridges that won’t collapse. But that’s not security as it’s defined by the Republicans. That’s the kind of spending that will be severely cut.

Instead of one or the other, the Pentagon. We have Mr. Gates, a Bush appointee, kept on wisely by Mr. Obama, saying it’s time to start to reduce the military, The Republicans have attacked him for that.

So let’s be very clear. There cannot be a sensible, comprehensive, balanced approach to deficit reduction when you follow this philosophy, not only totally exempt the military, but don’t even allow an amendment that would make it something that you could talk about.

The notion that you give all this power to one person is also very interesting. I guess what we are learning is, then, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Ryan) has been somewhat more courageous than some others in what he has talked about. I disagree with him.

So apparently what we are learning today is that the Republican Party has the courage of Paul Ryan’s convictions. I wish they had the courage to let us debate whether or not military spending should be included.

Mr. Dreier. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to say to my friend that again this is just the first step in a long process which will allow the kind of free-flowing debate that we are talking about. Now my friend will recall that never before have we gone through the appropriations process the way we did the last 2 years, that being, when my friend and I arrived here in 1981, and when it came to the issue of spending, the Republican side said we had the option to bring it up on the House floor and offer an amendment to the appropriations bills.

And I will tell you that it’s our intention to once again have that kind of debate that we had all the way up until the last 2 years. I assure my friend that our goal of having a freer flowing debate is important.

The second point I would like to make, and then I will yield to my friend, is that while my friend has continually said that we didn’t make amendments in order to this measure, there were no amendments submitted to the Rules Committee that would have given us the opportunity to do that.

We did make an amendment in order that modifies this, that came from Mr. Scott in the Rules Committee, that actually said that we should get to ‘08 levels or less, and it is true. My friend from Worcester did make in order an amendment by Mr. Van Hollen, but, as I said, there were no amendments that had been actually submitted to the Rules Committee.

So that vote was taken by the Rules Committee. That decision was made.

Mr. Frank of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Dreier. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. Frank of Massachusetts. I’m a little puzzled. You said no amendments were submitted, but Mr. McGovern did actually make one on that exempt the Pentagon. Why did that not qualify?

Mr. Dreier. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, what I would say is that amendments submitted to the Rules Committee we do not actually have. I mean my friend knows very well that when it comes to the Rules Committee, when we are getting ready to report out a rule, there are amendments that are submitted. There was one amendment that was proposed by Mr. McGovern. The Rules Committee chose not to make that amendment in order.

There was an amendment that did, in fact, bring us to lower spending—
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DREIER. If I might complete my statement. I think I control the time here.

It is very important to note that we did have a record vote that was considered in the Rules Committee by Mr. SCOTT which actually brought us to lower levels. It said 2008 levels or less.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. First of all, I think the Record will show the gentleman has just amended his statement about amendments because he said no amendments were offered, then he later said—and I would ask people to look at the RECORD tomorrow. He then said, Oh, an amendment was offered. His first statement was no amendments were offered.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I re-

Mr. FrANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DREIER. Of course. I have yield-

ted three times to my friend, and I know that Mr. MCGOVERN has lots of time.

The gentleman from San Diego has asked to be recognized. I have had an exchange with him. And now I would like to deduce that I am not deduced from San Diego (Mr. BILBRAY), and then if Mr. MCGOVERN chooses to yield time to my friend, I am happy to en-
gage in a discussion with him again.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, let me say as somebody who had the privilege for 18 years to be in local government, I think those of us in the Federal Gov-

erment to concentrate on our re-
sponsibilities—defending our borders, defending our national security. Those of us that served at local government could have said those issues are much more appropriately and have a lot less burden.

But I really want to speak about the opportunities we have to work in a bi-
partisan effort. When we talk about the budget, we have to deny Americans the right to live in the United States unless they buy certain insurance, why aren’t we talking about doing cost reductions like California has done, not exactly a right-wing legis-
lative solution?

MICRA has had an impact on the cost of insurance on physicians that an OB/GYN in Los Angeles pays 30 to 40 percent less for insurance than the same doctor in New York. Now, you can’t tell me the cost of living is that much different, except for the fact that Sacramento has recognized that tort reform and limitations of trial lawyers’ impact on health care is an essential one. If the legislature in California can agree to maintain that, why can’t we work together to address those issues?

If we’re talking about wanting to re-
cede costs, why didn’t the health bill allow Americans, rather than taking away the rights to live in the country, the freedom to buy across State lines? That is well within our jurisdiction as a Federal body.

Why didn’t we give freedom the an-
swer to be able to reduce costs rather than talking about taking away the rights of Americans to live here? That is a real scary concept that we can’t join on tort reform—and let’s face it, the liability issue is sort of an inter-
esting one. The Federal Government and States should address those issues that say that somebody who is—

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my friend 1 additional minute.

Mr. BILBRAY. Let me point this out. I know this because I was at the county supervising a health care system and supervising the health care system for over 3 million people.

The Federal Government has special protection for physicians if they’re in community clinics that we do not give to other physicians. The Federal Gov-

erment’s accommodation where somebody on Medicaid has more right to sue their physician than the men and women in uniform in this country. And I challenge you to tell me how it’s justifiable that, if somebody doesn’t pay for their medical care in the mili-
tary, they don’t get to sue their doctor, but somebody who is on welfare and public assistance, they get to sue them.

Can we talk about bringing those issues together and addressing the ability for a lawyer to get into an oper-
ating room is not as important as the right or the need of physicians to be able to do their job that is so essential?

And I want to close with this. We have not been talking about health care in the last year. We’ve been talk-

ing about health insurance. And the crisis that’s coming down this pike is that in 10 years you may be able to call the phone and they won’t be able to find a doctor unless you call 1-800 and get it over the phone.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ap-

preciate the gentleman’s comments, al-
though I have allowed Mr. VAN HOLLEN, who is our ranking member on the Budget Committee, a substitute. That was rejected.

There was also an amendment offered by Mr. Hastings of Florida which would have allowed Mr. VAN HOLLEN, who is our ranking member on the Budget Committee, a substitute. That was rejected. There was also an amendment for an open rule so that we could have a free and open debate, and that was rejected. So there were amendments that were offered, and they were rejected.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for a point of clarification.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. First, I want to address this notion that po-
lice officers in our local streets pale in signi-
ficance to the military. We have troops in Western Europe where our W~

ulled. I think those of us in the Federal Gov-
erment to hire police officers as it

are jurisdictions and priorities that we

need to set.

Some people believe that it is as much a responsibility of the Federal Government to hire police officers as it is to maintain a military. I’m sorry. The constitutional line for those of us who are mayors and county chairmen recognized that we need the Federal Government to concentrate on our re-
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If we’re talking about wanting to re-
cede costs, why didn’t the health bill allow Americans, rather than taking away the rights to live in the country, the freedom to buy across State lines? That is well within our jurisdiction as a Federal body.

Why didn’t we give freedom the an-
swer to be able to reduce costs rather than talking about taking away the rights of Americans to live here? That is a real scary concept that we can’t join on tort reform—and let’s face it, the liability issue is sort of an inter-
esting one. The Federal Government and States should address those issues that say that somebody who is—

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my friend 1 additional minute.

Mr. BILBRAY. Let me point this out. I know this because I was at the county supervising a health care system and supervising the health care system for over 3 million people.

The Federal Government has special protection for physicians if they’re in community clinics that we do not give to other physicians. The Federal Gov-

erment’s accommodation where somebody on Medicaid has more right to sue their physician than the men and women in uniform in this country. And I challenge you to tell me how it’s justifiable that, if somebody doesn’t pay for their medical care in the mili-
tary, they don’t get to sue their doctor, but somebody who is on welfare and public assistance, they get to sue them.

Can we talk about bringing those issues together and addressing the ability for a lawyer to get into an oper-
ating room is not as important as the right or the need of physicians to be able to do their job that is so essential?
I would just urge people to read the Record tomorrow. Read his statement that no amendments were offered and read what the gentleman from Massachusetts said and see where the truth lies.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say what it is that I said. What I said is there were no amendments submitted to the Rules Committee. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we meet this afternoon, there are 15 million Americans without a job. And this debate represents yet another wasted opportunity for us to come together and address the real number one issue of the country, which is putting people back to work.

The debate also represents a curious lack of clarity as to what exactly the majority is proposing. And there are words in this resolution, but there aren't numbers. So I did some research of my own about numbers. Let's take FBI agents, for example. Now, the resolution says that security spending is exempted, but it doesn't define security spending. When we passed the budget for FBI agents here, that budget is Commerce, Justice, Science budget, so I don't know whether this is within security spending or not.

But here is what I do know. Here is what I do know. In the present fiscal year, if we maintain the budget that we've been living under since October 1, we are on track to spend $7.6 billion on FBI agents. If we do what the resolution says, which is to go back to what was spent in 2008, we would spend 22 percent less than that, or $6.5 billion.

If you look at the average salary of an FBI agent, that would mean we would have to make do with 1,720 fewer FBI agents than we do today.

Now, I would be happy to yield to the sponsor of the resolution for him to tell me whether or not that is true. If this passes, are we going to have that level of reduction in FBI agents?

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Obviously, and it has been indicated early on, we are not going to see across-the-board cuts. That goal, I would say to my friend, is to get to '08 levels, and I believe that we can preserve the FBI.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the chairman has said we won't have across-the-board cuts. That, of course, means that we are going to find larger cuts than 22 percent in other areas of the Justice Department budget. The court system? Enforcement of the immigration laws? The other things that the Justice Department does? The resolution says nothing about what those would be, so I think we can be critical on another area.

For the budget year that we are in, we are spending about $5.8 billion a year on FBI agents at the National Institutes of Health. If we do what the resolution says, we will cut by 22 percent and spend $4.6 billion on cancer research. The average cancer research grant is about $350,000. That would yield a good 10,000 fewer cancer research grants. If we are not going to have an across-the-board cut, I would again say: Where else in the National Institutes of Health will we cut? Research for Alzheimer's? Research for diabetes? Research for other areas? The resolution says nothing.

And here is what a prominent American has to say about resolutions like this:

"You can't fix the deficit or the national debt by killing NPR or the National Endowment for the Humanities or the Arts. Nice political chatter, but that doesn't do it. And I'm very put off when people just say let's go back and freeze to the level 2 years ago. Don't tell me what you're going to cut to a level. That usually is a very inefficient way of doing it. Tell me what you're going to cut, and nobody up there," meaning Capitol Hill, "yet is being very, very candid about what they are going to cut. Fix this problem."

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ANDREWS. The author of that quote is not a Democratic Member of the House. It is not a White House spokesman. The author of that quote is retired Secretary of State Colin Powell who said yesterday: "Tell me what you're going to cut."

The minority doesn't want to grapple with that problem, which is why there are no amendments made in order, no numbers in the bill, and no reason to vote for this amendment.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself a minute and-a-half to respond to my friend with a couple of comments.

First, this is about job creation and economic growth. Today we live with an economy where there is a tremendous degree of uncertainty, and we know right now that there are job creators, investors, who have resources on the sidelines. I don't believe that there is anything that we could do—well, there are a number of things that we could do that may be as important, I mean, reducing the tax burden on job creators, opening up new markets around the world. But one of the things that I think is critically important for us to do is to begin getting our fiscal house in order so that that will provide an incentive for job creation and economic growth.

The next point I would like to make is that while I congratulated my friends, Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for not engaging in the sky-is-falling threats about what might happen down the road, or actually determining what would happen, I have to say that I was a little concerned and I have come to the conclusion that if one can't prioritize, Mr. Speaker, they resort to demonizing.

The fact of the matter is that we are beginning a process that will see us for the first time in 2 years have a free-floating debate on appropriations. When my Majority colleague, with the National Institutes of Health and the FBI, I believe those are important priorities that Democrats and Republicans alike want to fund.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

My friend has concluded that somehow he knows exactly what will be cut on this resolution. My friend has concluded that he knows exactly what level is going to be cut when it comes to the National Institutes of Health and the FBI. There are, as we move ahead with this appropriations level debate that is coming in the next several months, we obviously will be in a position where we will be able to, Democrats and Republicans alike, establish our priorities.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. First of all, I am most assuredly not demonizing the gentleman. I think the gentleman speaks with great sincerity.

What I am saying is that the gentleman said I know exactly what is going to be cut. No one knows exactly what is going to be cut. Can you tell us, Mr. Chairman, where in the NIH budget you are going to make up the difference for not cutting cancer research by 22 percent?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, let me say that obviously it does not have to be done within the National Institutes of Health, the notion of saying that it has to be cut there. We have seen a doubling in the level of funding under President Bush for the National Institutes of Health, Mr. Speaker, and I think that there are areas where we can bring about cuts.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

We can do that without in any way jeopardizing the important priorities that we have.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the chairman, and he is correct that in the NIH
budget it could come from Labor or Health and Human Services. And I would ask him: In that bill, where will you make up for not cutting the cancer research by 22 percent? I would be happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

What I would say is that this is the beginning of a process which will allow us, with a free-flowing debate on appropriations, to do just that. The country survived at 2008 levels.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, this is what General Powell was talking about: tell us where to cut, and we get verbiage, but no real answer.

Mr. DREIER. May I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself 15 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

Our priority is to get the economy back on track and to create jobs. We know very well that getting our fiscal house in order is going to be essential if we are going to have the job creation that both Democrats and Republicans want.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair of the Appropriations Committee. And there are no numbers in this bill. So we are very, very concerned about what numbers might exist out there.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. My question, Mr. Speaker, is simple: Do you think it matters that it's $120 billion or $80 billion?

Mr. DREIER. I will yield in just a second.

So I would say to my friend that we do very much want, Mr. Speaker, to have a chance for this institution—and I hope Democrats will join in support of the first step in a process that will allow the Budget Committee to do its work, the appropriators, and, through the appropriators, the full House—Democrats and Republicans alike—to establish those priorities.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I will yield in just a second.

We are going to see your committee proceed with establishing the broad 302(a) allocations, and that big number will be determined. In this institution, Democrats and Republicans alike—and, again, we haven't seen it in the last 2 years, unfortunately, because we shut down the appropriations process; but we are this year going to allow Members the opportunity, allow Members under a privileged resolution on the appropriations bills, to actually participate in establishing those priorities. That is going to be a joint effort.

Mr. DREIER. Out of respect for my friend, I yield myself 15 seconds and I am happy to yield to my friend.
board cuts is not something that is being considered here. We are pursuing 2008 levels, and I believe that that’s what this resolution says. We hope very much that we can get to lower levels of spending, and I suspect that some Members on the other side of the aisle hope to join us in working together in that effort so we can get our fiscal house in order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I would remind my colleagues, when they read the resolution, that it is 2008 levels or less, so it muddles the number even more.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I oppose this resolution. I oppose it because I think its provisions with respect to our own economic recovery and the production of jobs is offset tremendously by its passage.

But I want to focus my time on the limited question but the very important question of what is in and what is not in security funding, because security funding, as has been pointed out, is exempted from the requirements to go back to fiscal year 2008 functions or less.

The chairman of the Rules Committee, when asked at the Rules Committee whether foreign assistance, diplomacy, and development were part of security, was that part of the exemption?—he said no.

My definition—me, DAVID DREIER, chairman of the Rules Committee, out of which this resolution comes—is as we have outlined in here: This is discretionary spending—other than defense, military construction, VA, and homeland security.

I assume the gentleman’s interpretation is one he still holds to less than a week later.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I will say to my friend that that is the definition of “security spending”: defense, homeland security, VA, and military construction.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. BERMAN. Thank you.

Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman for reaffirming that position. I now want to take a look at what that means.

That means not exempt from these drastic cuts are: weapons in training to build the capacity of key partners in the fight against terror in Yemen, in Pakistan, in the Philippines. That’s all part of our security assistance package, part of our international affairs budget; financing for the purchase of U.S. military equipment to ensure Israel’s qualitative military edge; defense, military equipment to ensure the United States has the tools necessary for the foreign policy of the United States to successfully accomplish the goals of the United States.

In Afghanistan, they’re cuts that would mean an end to the civilian surge. It would force the military to perform civilian jobs. The reductions would harm four Provincial Reconstruction Teams and forward operating bases, security forces and police training, explosive ordnance disposal, counternarcotics and poppy eradication programs.

In Iraq, the state programs that would be harmed by virtue of the gentleman’s definition of “non-security funds” that have to be dramatically cut back are: training for Iraqi police and soldiers that fund the full spectrum of national security efforts, including vital pre-conflict and post-conflict civilian stabilization programs.

He was reinforcing a message that had also been communicated, on several occasions, by Secretary Gates, when he wrote: “The diplomatic and developmental capabilities of the United States have a direct bearing on our ability to shape threats and reduce the need for military action. It is my firm belief that diplomatic programs as part of a coordinated strategy will save money by reducing the likelihood of active military conflict involving U.S. forces.”

Admiral Mullen penned a personal note at the end, which read: “The more significant the cuts, the longer military operations will take, and the more and more likely we are to lose our money and risk.”

President Bush, when sending up his war-time supplemental request in FY 2006, integrated diplomatic and military spending. He asked Congress to provide “the Resources to Win the War on Terror.”

With our military leadership, this Congress, and even former President Bush is clear: U.S. civilian agencies must be fully resourced to prosecute the fight against terror effectively. A cut to the 150 billion harms U.S. national security and puts American lives at risk.

And yet, the Chairman of the Rules Committee explained, during consideration of this resolution, that “security spending” does not include diplomacy and development. He said, “No, my definition, my definition is, as we have outlined in here: it’s discretionary spending other than defense, military construction, VA, and homeland security.”

The resolution itself does not define what is security or non-security, but the authors say they do not consider diplomacy and development part of our national security budget.

Before voting on this resolution, I would urge my colleagues to think about what the practical implications would be of major cuts in the international affairs budget.

In 2008, the vast majority of U.S. assistance to Iraq was provided by the military. This year, at long last, we are withdrawing the remainder of our troops, and handing over the job to civilians. If we cut our diplomatic and development budget for Iraq, then all the investments we’ve made, and all the American lives that have been lost, will be in vain.

The civilian presence costs only a tiny fraction of what we were spending on the military. But this resolution would make that civilian presence impossible. The proposed cuts will mean snatching defeat from the jaws of victory.

Returning to the past would also mean violating our Memorandum of Understanding with Israel, under which we pledge to help Israel maintain its qualitative military edge against
those who seek its destruction. Do my colleagues suggest we renounce on our commitment to Israel?

In Afghanistan and Pakistan, we cannot defeat violent extremism by military power alone. As Secretary Gates recently said, “without development we will not be able to be successful in either Iraq or Afghanistan.” Our military strategy in Afghanistan is often described as “clear, hold, and build.” How can we succeed if there is no one to do the holding and the building?

Foreign assistance programs protect us even outside the areas of active combat or potential conflict. Our efforts to stop the spread of HIV/AIDS and other deadly diseases, counter the flow of illegal narcotics, prevent proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, reduce human misery and halt environmental destruction, all help to protect the safety and security of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we can’t afford to go back to the isolationist, unilateralist policies of the past. Let’s not go back to a period when America’s standing in the world was at an all-time low.

Whether it’s finding new markets for U.S. goods and services, addressing climate change, sharing the burden of peacekeeping, enforcing sanctions against Iran, or improving travel and communications, we need to build strong international relationships.

We all remember the period when the United States tried to go it alone, unwilling to cooperate with other countries and demonstrate global leadership.

Let’s not go back to the bad old days when the U.S. turned away from the rest of the world, and lost so much of its influence and respect.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the very difficult budget and economic situation that confronts us. There is no doubt that well-crafted reforms will help us to use our foreign assistance dollars more effectively and efficiently, and ensure that aid goes to those who need it. That is why I am continuing my efforts to develop legislation to modernize our foreign assistance policies and programs.

But what we need to do, as one conservative blogger has suggested, is “to mend it, not end it.” Comparatively speaking, diplomatic blogger has suggested, is to “mend it, not end it.” Mr. Speaker, we need to not cut funding, but to make greater investments in these programs when he wrote, just a few months ago, “there are millions on treatment who cannot be abandoned. And the progress in many African nations depends on the realistic hope of new patients gaining access to treatment... On AIDS, to stand still is to lose ground.”

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the most obvious and damaging implications of reducing the international affairs budget to 2008 levels. This resolution would set the stage for reckless cuts that endanger our national security, abandon our national interests and throw Americans out of work, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members will remain seated.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this institution, Democrat and Republican alike, knows full well that the American people are hurting. We have an unemployment rate that is at 9.4 percent. We have, in my State of California, a 12½ percent unemployment rate. I see my friend Mr. Lewis here on the floor. In the Inland Empire of California, the unemployment rate is 14 percent. People are out there making very, very tough decisions, and the economic uncertainty that exists today is playing a big role in diminishing the kind of investments that we need to create jobs. This resolution is a very simple one. It says that we shouldn’t spend money we don’t have. We shouldn’t spend money we don’t have. That’s what we’re saying as we begin this process. Those are the decisions that families are making across all this country. They’re not spending money they don’t have. In fact, we’ve seen, because of this economic downturn, lots of families today saving more than they have knowing what the budget number is. I don’t know why that’s such a radical idea. And accountability means that everybody in this House should be able to vote yes or no on whatever that number is. It shouldn’t be up to one person to unilaterally determine that number. This budget process that the Republicans have put together politicizes unnecessarily a budget process and sets, I think, a lousy precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I’m going to urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will modify this rule to provide that immediately after the House passes this rule it will take up an amendment to exempt cuts in funding for the FBI’s counterterrorism program. My Republican colleagues said they won’t cut programs that protect our Nation’s security, but the resolution itself doesn’t even bother to define “non-security spending.” And the definition have heard on the other side of the aisle would not include the FBI’s counterterrorism program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials in the Record immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, a “no” vote on the previous question will allow the House to consider an amendment exempting cuts in funding to the FBI’s counterterrorism, an amendment that will ensure we do not sacrifice our Nation’s security in this post-9/11 world.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote “no” on the previous question so that we can ensure that we continue to protect this Nation from terrorism.

With that, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this institution, Democrat and Republican alike, knows full well that the American people are hurting. We have an unemployment rate that is at 9.4 percent. We have, in my State of California, a 12½ percent unemployment rate. I see my friend Mr. Lewis here on the floor. In the Inland Empire of California, the unemployment rate is 14 percent. People are out there making very, very tough decisions, and the economic uncertainty that exists today is playing a big role in diminishing the kind of investments that we need to create jobs. This resolution is a very simple one. It says that we shouldn’t spend money we don’t have. We shouldn’t spend money we don’t have. That’s what we’re saying as we begin this process. Those are the decisions that families are making across all this country. They’re not spending money they don’t have. In fact, we’ve seen, because of this economic downturn, lots of families today saving more than they have...
in the past because they don’t want to get themselves into this position that the Federal Government is.

We’re going to have to make some tough choices around here. It’s not going to be easy. No one is saying that it’s going to be easy. But this issue is the question of how we are going to do the very important work that we’re going to debate tomorrow. H. Res. 38, simply says that we are going to go to 2008 levels or less, because frankly 2008 levels, as far as I’m concerned, were too high. I believe that we need to cut back even more.

Now, I want to hear this argument that we are going to decimate research into very important diseases out there. We began the debate, as I said in the opening, not going there, but we did go there. And, as I said, if you can’t prioritize, you end up demonizing and creating this great deal of fear that is out there. Or the FBI is going to close down if we go to ’08 spending levels. Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously that is not the case. This institution, this bureaucracy, is going to continue to do the work that we do.

And so the way that we are going to do it—have come here to do, and we do know that with adequate oversight—which is our constitutional responsibility—and focusing, yes, on those three things that Democrats and Republicans alike say, reuse, reduce, recycle, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But we do know that with adequate oversight—our job is to encourage and then to bring the resolution, H. Res. 38, to the floor. I urge their support of this measure. I hope very much that we will have Democrats joining with Republicans for this very commonsense approach to do exactly what these 87 new members on the Democratic side of the aisle—and I suspect even some of the nine new members on the Democratic side of the aisle—have come here to do, and that is to rein in this wasteful government spending that we have seen.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Res. 43, “A rule providing for consideration of the Republican Budget-less Resolution.”

Through the American Recovery Act of 2009 (stimulus bill), Congress threw out a massive amount of money to those who were on the verge of losing their jobs and to create jobs for those who were unemployed. We have received numerous reports from our constituents and the Administration of the positive impact the stimulus funding is having on our economy. Yet, we know there is still more work to do. This bill will undermine and erode the many sacrifices Americans have made to adjust to the downturn in the economy. This bill is turning America backwards in the wrong direction.

The new proposal of the House Republican Study Committee (RSC) to cut and then freeze non-defense discretionary spending at 2008 levels from 2012 through 2021 would mean cuts of more than 40 percent in education, environmental protection, law enforcement, medical research, food safety, and many other key services.

For example, the U.S. Environmental Protection Administration (EPA) funding at the FY2008 enacted level of $8.76 billion would be 39 percent below that level, or $430 million less. For the Department of Transportation, $7.46 billion enacted for FY2008 vs. $6.29 billion enacted for FY2010. The major- ity of this decrease below the FY2010 appropri- ations would be the result of a $2.04 billion decrease within the State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) account, and a $665.8 million decrease in environmental Pro- grams and Management (EPA) account.

The decrease within the STAG account would be attributed primarily to funding for capitalization grants for the Clean Water and the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds (SRFs), although numerous other grants also are funded within this account. The SRF fund- ing specifically supports local wastewater and drinking water infrastructure projects, such as construction of and modifications to municipal sewage treatment plants and drinking water treatment plants to comply with the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act, respectively.

Furthermore, the EPA account funds a broad range of activities involved in EPA’s de- velopment of pollution control regulations and enforcement, to facilitate compliance with standards, and enforcement of these require- ments across multiple environmental media, such as air quality and water quality.

This proposal would represent the deepest annual cut in funding for these programs in re- cent U.S. history. It would remove substantial purchasing power from a weak economy, thereby costing hundreds of thousands of jobs and raising risks of a double-dip recession.

If imposed across the board, such a cut would mean 42 percent less for healthcare for veterans; 42 percent less for K–12 education; 42 percent less for protecting the environment; 42 percent less for the FBI, Drug Enforcement Administration, and border security; 42 percent less for the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Preven- tion; 42 percent less for food safety and inspec- tion; and so on.

Specifically, in my Congressional District, the 18th Congressional District of Houston, Texas, two active Light Rail construction projects are underway. These projects exemplify urban mobility, jobs, economic prosperity, energy independence and sustainable growth for the city of Houston. The projects are com- monly referred to as the North Corridor Line and the Southeast Corridor Line. It is critical that these projects continue so that the con- struction can proceed and the benefits of the light rail system be available to the traveling public as soon as possible. In the FY2011 ap- propriations legislation that passed the House of Representatives, we were able to secure $150 million for Houston METRO. However, we were unable to preserve this funding in the legislation that passed the Senate, which re- sulted in the House-passed Resolution passed by Congress at the end of last year not including this funding or any other funding for specific New Starts projects for Houston METRO. I want to ensure that my constituents are in a position to feel their families, to secure em- ployment and further their higher education by preserving this important funding.

I represent an international energy hub and global business city. Twenty-six companies on the 2010 Fortune 500 list maintain their head- quarters in Houston and many more have ad- ministrative operations located in Houston. More than 3,000 firms conduct international business in over 200 countries, making Hous- ton a truly global city. Houston is also a bur- geoing leader in the information technology, nanotechnology, aerospace, and health care industries.

To adopt this resolution would be crippling my District and eliminating the guarantee through these projects of thousands of jobs for Houstonians. It is factual that Houston’s exper- tise in global business and energy will provide the southwest region with an economic boost that will ensure the United States remains an international economic leader.

Consequently, the House majority, of course, could decide to meet its overall target for non-defense discretionary spending while protecting one or more of the programs and services listed above. But, a cut of less than 42 percent in, say, education or environmental protection would necessitate even more draconian cuts in, say, food safety and border secu- rity.

Our Border States are frustrated and in need of targeted assistance. Over the last year, I attended a number of different hear- ings, meetings with local and state officials, and press conferences on immigration, comba- ting drug trafficking, and the border, and in almost all instances, I have heard the same comment: Border States are frustr- ated. The deeply misguided Arizona Law, (SB 1070) for example, is an expression of that frustration. Unless we want to see more resources for investigators and detec- tors, who are helping our Border States, must do more to help our Border States, which are vital to securing our nation and up- holding our immigration laws, and helping local and state officials secure our Border States.

The United States continues to fight the bat- tle against the powerful drug trafficking organi- zations that have plagued our sister cities just across the border with violence. We have been fortunate thus far that for the most part the violence has not spilled over into the United States, but we cannot pretend that it is being insulated forever. Instability abroad, especially on the border, is a danger to stability at home, and we have a vested interest in helping our neighbors to the southwest combat the crimi- nal organizations that have threatened the safety of their citizens and brought drugs into our country.

First of all, we need to provide more “boots on the ground” to help secure our borders. While deterrence through additional personnel is essential to improving security, several of a backlash, we in the federal government must do more to help our Border States, which are vital to securing our nation and up- holding our immigration laws, and helping local and state officials secure our Border States.

The United States continues to fight the bat- tle against the powerful drug trafficking organi- zations that have plagued our sister cities just across the border with violence. We have been fortunate thus far that for the most part the violence has not spilled over into the United States, but we cannot pretend that it is being insulated forever. Instability abroad, especially on the border, is a danger to stability at home, and we have a vested interest in helping our neighbors to the southwest combat the crimi- nal organizations that have threatened the safety of their citizens and brought drugs into our country.

First of all, we need to provide more “boots on the ground” to help secure our borders. While deterrence through additional personnel is essential to improving security, several of
lacking. These rural areas, and the people who live there, are in many cases the most vulnerable to human traffickers and drug traffickers.

There is a desperate need for Border States to receive the necessary support to effectively secure our borders from threats and ensure a safe and stable environment for border residents. More robust, well funded, and well resourced law enforcement systems are exactly what our Border States and residents demand.

It is quite disappointing that we cannot accurately evaluate this resolution because it does not really provide a clear breakdown of the $100 billion in cuts it claims for the 2012 budget. The first $80 billion in savings would be to “Replace the spending levels in the continuing resolution (CR) with non-defense, non-homeland security, non-veterans spending at FY 2008 levels.” That, obviously, is incredibly vague.

This legislation would end federal subsidies for Amtrak, which basically means the end of train travel in the United States. This resolution would end federal involvement in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which would, as Ezra Klein says, likely plunge the mortgage securitization market into chaos and send housing prices skidding again. It would repeal the federal support for state Medicaid budgets that has plugged the gap for many states with budgets hit hard by the recession, meaning many poor people would likely lose their access to medical care.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposition to H. Res 43.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, which provides for consideration of a resolution to reduce what is being called “non-security” spending to 2008 levels.

That resolution, H. Res. 38, sends a very damaging message that the Congress will not stand up to protect those programs that are absolutely essential to jobs and the economy. It also rejects a key principle that military leaders and Presidents of both parties have clearly recognized: Foreign assistance and diplomacy are essential to United States national security.

That principle has been honored on a bipartisan basis ever since the tragic events of September 11, 2001. On that terrible morning, Americans woke to the realization that while the Cold War was over, their safety and security could be threatened by much less sophisticated means. The ideologies and the weapons of terror could not be thwarted by military power alone.

In 2004 the Republican-controlled Congress passed the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which was supported by all the Members who are now in positions of leadership in this body. The Speaker, the Majority Leader and the Budget Committee Chairman all voted for it.

The bill, now Public Law 108-458, states: “Long-term success in the war on terrorism demands the use of all elements of national power, including diplomacy, military action, intelligence, covert action, law enforcement, economic policy, foreign aid, public diplomacy, and homeland defense.”

In continuing the war on terrorism, the United States must assign to economic and diplomatic capabilities the same strategic priority that is assigned to military capabilities.

In fact, the portion of the bill that makes these findings is known as the “9/11 Commission Implementation Act of 2004.” It states: “The legislative and executive branches of the Government of the United States must commit to robust, long-term investments in all of the tools necessary to carry out the foreign policy of the United States to successfully accomplish the goals of the United States.”

All of the tools necessary—that includes diplomacy and foreign assistance, which would be slashed under this resolution. The 9/11 Commission Implementation Act of 2004 goes on to say that these investments “will require increased funding to United States foreign affairs programs.”

In May of this year, Ambassador Mullin, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, wrote to then-Speaker Pelosi regarding proposed cuts to the international affairs budget. The opening paragraph stated: “We are living in times that require an integrated national security program with budgets that fund the full spectrum of national security efforts, including vitally important pre-conflict and post-conflict civilian stabilization programs.”

He was reinforcing a message that had also been communicated, on several occasions, by Secretary Gates, when he wrote: “The diplomatic and development capabilities of the United States have a direct bearing on our ability to shape threats and reduce the need for military action. It is my firm belief that diplomatic programs as part of a coordinated strategy will save money by reducing the likelihood of active military conflict involving U.S. forces.”

Admiral Mullin penned a personal note at the end, which read: “The more significant the cuts, the longer military operations will take, and the more at risk we are.”

President Bush, when sending up his war time supplemental request in FY 2006, integrated diplomatic and military spending. He asked Congress to provide “the Resources to Win the War on Terror.”

The message from our military leadership, this Congress, and even former President Bush is clear: U.S. civilian agencies must be fully resourced to prosecute the fight against terror effectively. A cut to the 150 budget harms U.S. national security and American lives at risk.

And yet, the Chairman of the Rules Committee explained, during consideration of this resolution, that “security spending” does not include diplomacy and development. He said, “No, my definition, my definition is, as we have outlined in here, this is discretionary spending other than defense, military construction, V.A. and homeland security.”

The resolution itself does not define what is security or non-security, but the authors say they do not consider development part of our national security budget.

Before voting on this resolution, I would urge my colleagues to think about what the practical implications would be of major cuts in the international affairs budget.

In 2008, our majority of U.S. assistance to Iraq was provided by the military. This year, at long last, we are withdrawing the remainder of our troops, and handing over the job to civilians. If we cut our diplomatic and development budget for Iraq, then all the investments we’ve made, and all the American lives that have been lost, will be in vain.

The civilian presence costs only a tiny fraction of what we were spending on the military. But this resolution would make that civilian presence impossible. The proposed cuts will mean snatching defeat from the jaws of victory.

Returning to the past would also mean violating our Memorandum of Understanding with Israel, under which we pledge to help Israel build a $5 billion defense budget against those who seek its destruction. Do my colleagues suggest we renege on our commitment to Israel?

In Afghanistan and Pakistan, we cannot defeat violent extremism by military power alone. As Secretary Gates recently said, “without development we will not be able to be successful in either Iraq or Afghanistan.” Our military strategy in Afghanistan is often described as “clear, hold, and build.” How can we succeed if there is no one to do the holding and the building?

Foreign assistance programs protect us even outside the areas of active combat or potential conflict. Our efforts to stop the spread of HIV/AIDS and other deadly diseases, counter the flow of illegal narcotics, prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, reduce human misery and halt environmental destruction, all help to protect the safety and security of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we can’t afford to go back to the isolationist, unilateralist policies of the past. Qualifying spending to 2008 levels takes us back to a period when America’s standing in the world was at an all-time low.

Whether it’s finding new markets for U.S. goods and services, addressing climate change, sharing the burden of peacekeeping, enforcing sanctions against rogue nations, or improving travel and communications, we need to build strong international relationships.

We all remember the period when the United States tried to go it alone, unwilling to cooperate with other countries and demonstrate global leadership.

We’ve finally begun to turn that around. Let’s not go back to the bad old days when the U.S. turned away from the rest of the world, and lost so much of its influence and respect.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the very difficult budget and economic situation that confronts us. There is no doubt that well-crafted reforms will help us to use our foreign assistance dollars more effectively and efficiently, and ensure that aid reaches those who need it. That is why I am continuing my efforts to develop legislation to modernize our foreign assistance policies and programs.

But what we need to do, as one conservative blogger has suggested, is to “mend it, not end it.” Comparatively speaking, diplomacy is a far more effective, efficient, and, much, save us money over the long run.

International affairs funding helps promote U.S. exports and saves U.S. jobs. Our economy can’t grow without creating and expanding new markets abroad. Our diplomats help to identify export opportunities, help American companies navigate foreign political systems, and level the playing field for American products around the globe.

We should also keep in mind that international affairs accounts for just one percent of the budget. Even if we eliminated such spending entirely, it wouldn’t balance the budget and it wouldn’t make a dent in our national debt. But it would devastate our economy and our national security.
As Secretary Gates said last fall, “Development is a lot cheaper than sending soldiers.” In places like Haiti and Sudan, we provide assistance not only for purely humanitarian reasons, but also because a failure to do so could lead to chaos and bloodshed that would be far more costly in the long run.

Going back to 2008 levels of global AIDS funding would mean ending antiretroviral treatment for people who are currently receiving it. It would mean abandoning pregnant women who risk transmitting HIV to their newborns. It would mean fewer orphans and vulnerable children will get care and support, and fewer people in poor countries will get HIV counseling and testing.

President Bush made clear not only the need to not cut funding, but to make greater investments in these programs when he wrote, just a few months ago, “there are millions on treatment who cannot be abandoned. And the progress in many African nations depends on the realistic hope of new patients gaining access to treatment... On AIDS, to stand still is to lose ground.”

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the most obvious and damaging implications of reducing the international affairs budget to 2008 levels. If we let this resolution pass, it would set the stage for reckless cuts that endanger our national security, abandon our national interests and throw Americans out of work, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the debate on the reduction of non-defense and security spending, a visit to recent history reveals a telling connection between our soaring debt and the two wars our country is waging.

The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation estimates that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have cost the average American family of four almost $13,000 last year. We know from our constituents when we return to our districts that the average American family of four cannot afford that. They cannot afford to pass the costs of maintaining the status quo on to their children or grandchildren.

Nobel Prize winning economist and author of The Three Trillion Dollar War, Joseph Stiglitz, tells us the war in Iraq added substantially to the federal debt. This was the first time in American history that the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by the government cut taxes as it went to war.

Moving past the costs of waging war, there are the costs of providing returning veterans with the care they need. When these costs are factored in, the costs of health care and benefits for veterans significantly increases the $3 trillion price tag to nearly $5 trillion.

It is time to question the way we enhance our national security and our economic security. It will be a grave mistake to miss this opportunity. The facts tell us that the policies we have been pursuing in recent years have led us further from the very goals we claim to be working toward. The facts tell us that it is fiscally irresponsible to continue defense spending at current rates.

By ignoring this responsibility—by pretending that it doesn’t exist—we fail to heed the lessons from our economic decline. The costs of maintaining the status quo are great. The moral and human costs are even greater. The matter referred to by Mr. McGovern is as follows:

The vote on the previous question is defeated, Mr. Speaker, on that I yield to the gentleman who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereafter.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair until 6:30 p.m., a period not longer than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECESS

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

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.
VOTES WILL BE TAKEN IN THE FOLLOWING ORDER: ORDERING THE PREVIOUS QUESTION ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 43, BY THE YEARS AND NAYS; ADOPTION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 43, IF ORDERED.

THE FIRST ELECTRONIC VOTE WILL BE CONDUCTED AS A 15-MINUTE VOTE. REMAINING ELECTRONIC VOTES WILL BE CONDUCTED AS 5-MINUTE VOTES.
PERSONAL EXPLANATION
Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was told that I was unavoidable absent for votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall votes 17 and 18.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, today I missed rollcall vote No. 17 on "Ordering the Previous Question" regarding H. Res. 43, and rollcall vote No. 18 on agreeing to H. Res. 43. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on both votes.

TRAGEDY IN ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA
(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform my colleagues of a tragedy that took place in St. Petersburg, Florida, this morning. Two St. Petersburg police officers, Sergeant Thomas Bahtinger and Officer Jeffrey Yaslowitz, were killed in the line of duty as a Deputy U.S. Marshal, whose name I cannot release just yet, was seriously injured while serving a warrant this morning.

This is a sober reminder that the men and women who serve us as law enforcement officers put their lives on the line every day. In the past 24 hours alone, 11 law enforcement officers across our Nation have been shot in the line of duty.

It is my hope that my colleagues will keep the families of Sergeant Bahtinger and Officer Yaslowitz and our Deputy U.S. Marshal in their prayers during this difficult time. It is also a good time to say thank you for all of those who serve us in uniform at home or abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their service and wish them well in the future.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF DICK WINTERS
(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Shakespeare penned the words that gave title to a true story of the 101st Airborne during World War II. In "King Henry V," he wrote: "We few, we happy few, we band of brothers: For he today that sheds his blood with me "Shall be my brother."

Stephen Ambrose wrote a book that became the miniseries, "Band of Brothers." Dick Winters was part of that story. Actor Damien Lewis brought his character to life in the series, but for Pennsylvanians, Winters was a real-life hero, and his story, the stuff of legends. Winters died in Campbelltown, Pennsylvania, He was 92.

On D-day, June 6, 1944, Winters and his men parachuted in to take on a German artillery nest on Utah Beach. His troops from Easy Company fought through the Battle of the Bulge, the liberation of a death camp at Dachau, and made it to Hitler's Eagle's Nest at Berchtesgaden.

Winters never sought fame, never thought of himself as a hero, and characteristically he asked that his funeral be private. But as Tom Hanks put it, "When the world needed heroes, he served in a company of heroes."

Pennsylvania and the Nation mourn the loss of this "brother."

COMMENDING MAYOR JOE GURECKY
(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Mayor Joe Gurecky, a statesman and a friend, for his service as the mayor of Rosenberg, Texas.

Mayor Gurecky has served his citizens for 16 years, first as a council member, then as the mayor from 1999 to 2011, making him the longest continually serving mayor in the history of Rosenberg. Mayor Gurecky recently announced that he was not going to seek reelection.

Joe Gurecky practiced four of the basic ideals of fiscal conservatism: accountability, fighting excessive spending, reducing taxes, and providing a safe community for his beloved city.

During his 12-year tenure, Mayor Gurecky oversaw a fourfold increase in property values and a 40 percent decrease in crime while simultaneously lowering taxes on the residents of Rosenberg.

Mayor Gurecky will be missed as the mayor. I thank him and his wife, Doris, for their service and wish them well in the future.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Jess Smocek joined the Peace Corps in 2004 and went to Bangladesh to help that Third World country. Soon after arriving, a group of local men groped her sexually, however. She reported the improper conduct, but no one did anything. While in Bangladesh, Smocek felt unsafe and continued to report the hostile environment to the Peace Corps. But no one did anything.

Later, a group of criminals kidnapped her, beat her, raped her and abandoned her in an alleyway. And no one did anything. In fact, for political reasons, the Peace Corps did everything it could to ignore and cover up the dastardly deed, blaming the crime on the victim.
Rape is not the fault of the victim. It is the fault of the criminal. And according to ABC News, over 1,000 rapes and assaults occurred in the last 10 years against American women working for the Peace Corps. But apparently no one is listening.

Those days need to end, and it’s time for justice for Jess Smochek, because justice is what we do in this country.

And that’s just the way it is.

EPA DISREGARDS STATES’ RIGHTS

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I’m very troubled by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia’s decision to allow the Environmental Protection Agency to disregard States’ rights in implementing the Clean Air Act by seizing control of greenhouse gas permitting activities in our State of Texas. The EPA’s regulatory interference in the State permitting process will have a very detrimental effect on jobs and the economy of not just Texas, but potentially the entire Nation.

The authority for EPA’s action is grounded in the agency’s “endangerment finding,” which is based on controversial scientific conclusions regarding the threat and impact of climate change. EPA’s pursuit of job-killing regulation is the last pact of climate change. EPA’s pursuit of making smart investments where all Americans can benefit and prosper, you’re going to be disappointed. And if you have a faithful deficit hawk who thinks the EPA’s regulatory interference in the State permitting process would reduce the deficit, you’ve been hoodwinked.

In the runup to the midterm elections, Republicans promised that if they won the House, they would cut $100 billion. They didn’t have a plan, but $100 billion sounded like a good number. Well, it is now months after the election, and they still don’t have a plan, no specifics, no baseline number. And boy, are they running away from that $100 billion commitment as fast as possible.

The Republicans do have a list that includes over 100 cuts that completely disregard the economic and social impacts the cuts would have. Mr. Speaker, budgets are about values. They are a moral document. In general, you are either in favor of making smart investments and helping the less fortunate—so, you’re smart and compassionate—or you demonize collective government and it’s everybody for himself, laissez-faire capitalism.

The Republican Study Committee’s list of budget cuts shows us which side of the values equation the Republicans are on. They want to preserve hundreds of billions of dollars for corporate tax breaks but take away student loans from tens of thousands of students. They want to keep building weapons systems that the Pentagon doesn’t want, but they cut historic preservation. They want to encourage the offshoring of jobs to cut programs that help our exporters.

Mr. Speaker, we are a month into the Republican leadership of this House, and we haven’t seen a single move toward creating jobs. We are a month into the Republican leadership of this House, and we don’t have a budget number. We haven’t had a hearing, and we have no budget proposal that can be honestly debated.

Cutting the budget is no easy task, and I strongly urge the Republicans to end the political theater and think about our country’s values and priorities when it comes to laying out the budget. Let’s have an open, fair, and transparent discussion of job creation. The talk of shifting all of the costs of Medicaid onto the States is foolish. You know the poor will suffer with that kind of a proposal. So let’s work together toward a responsible budget that reflects that we are both smart and compassionate.

BRING OUR TROOPS HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor again tonight, and I have said that I intend to be on the floor each and every night that I can be on the floor to talk about bringing our troops home from Afghanistan.

I hope tomorrow night when the President gives the State of the Union, he will say that the time to start bringing our troops home in July of 2011. I say that we need to bring our troops home, and I hope that he will start bringing our troops home in July of 2011. The reason I am somewhat concerned, there have been leaders in both parties, primarily on the Senate side, who have said that they think that they need 4 more years in Afghanistan. Well, you know, that might be a dream, but that is all it is, a dream. You’re not going to change history. History has spoken many, many times, from Alexander the Great to the English to the Russians, that Afghanistan is a vast country of many, many tribes, and they never have had a national government, and they will not under Karzai. He is corrupt. He is very corrupt.

So I hope that the President will stick to his timetable of bringing our troops home beginning in July of this year, and that he will be not swayed by anyone who says just 4 more years. I say that for this reason: I am on the Armed Services Committee, and I remember a few years ago when they were telling us, these generals would come in—and I respect each and every one of them—and they would say to us: Well, we’re making progress. We’re training the Afghans to be policemen. We’re training the Afghans to be soldiers.

Well, we are 10 years later, and we are still training. How much more can you do? It is costing us $3 billion a month. And more important than the money is the lost lives and the broken bodies of our men and women in uniform.

Recently I had the opportunity, the privilege, to go to Walter Reed in Bethesda. Mr. Speaker, for the first time before I walked into this young soldier’s room, I was told one of the major that escorted me that he has no body parts below his waist. They have all been blown away.

Then I had an opportunity to see a machine sergeant during the same visit who had been amputated four times, and on the fourth tour, he had his left leg blown off. What in the world are we trying to do? Why don’t
we understand from history: nobody is going to ever conquer Afghanistan. So, therefore, I hope the President will stay to his word and start bringing our troops home.

We are spending $8 billion a month in Afghanistan, and yet, throughout America, including my district, the Third Congressional District of North Carolina, we can’t even fix the roads. We can’t even fix the schools because we are spending money we don’t have that we are borrowing from the Japanese, the Chinese, UAE and other countries.

It is time that this Congress speaks up and listens: 63 percent of the American people say it is time to get out of Afghanistan. So I hope that the President will speak tomorrow night about Afghanistan. I hope he will say that he intends to start bringing our troops home this year.

Mr. Speaker, I have here photographs of marines from the Camp Lejeune area, which is in my district. They are young, anywhere from 19 to 38 years of age, who have given their life for this country. And yet many times I wonder here in Congress why don’t we bring up this issue of bringing our troops home from Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, I want to thank you for giving me this chance to speak. I want to thank those who are on the floor, I hope you join us, Ron Paul, and myself and Jimmy Duncan on our side, who have been saying that it is time to bring our troops home. Let’s join together in a bipartisan way and start talking about bringing our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, as I do each and every night, as I think about the pain that I have seen at Walter Reed and Bethesda, I think about the families who are burying their loved ones now who have died in Afghanistan, that it is time to say to God, God please continue to bless America.

Mr. Speaker, development aid gives the kind distributed by USAID as a centerpiece. Instead of a military surge, let’s have a civilian surge. Wherever there is poverty and deprivation around the world, we need to be there with assistance that promotes stability and keeps terrorism from taking root in the first place. I’m talking about everything from debt relief to democracy promotion, to human rights, to sustainable development, to education, especially including education for women and girls.

Mr. Speaker, development aid gives the American people a lot of bang for the buck, and it actually costs pennies on the dollar. It represents a microscopic portion of the Federal budget. Yet development aid has great influence when it comes to creating the conditions for global stability and global peace.

If we are serious about national security in the 21st century, if we are serious about projecting moral authority and honoring American values, then we must dramatically increase humanitarian aid, and we must not cut it. If we are serious about deficit reduction, it is time to address the real waste and excess—the Pentagon—which has enjoyed a blank check for far too long.

So I applaud the majority if they are truly prepared to cut military spending; but so far, I hear more talking points than serious proposals. I have to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that it is all talk until it is not, and if the majority party wants to do something that would advance our security goals, while dramatically reining in Federal spending, then they should join me in a call to immediately bring our troops home from Afghanistan.

SMART SECURITY: INCREASE DEVELOPMENT AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, in the last several weeks, there have been several articles published by officials from the Federal Reserve system. This is a little bit unusual because usually all of anybody who criticizes them and are critical of me in particular. In these articles, they are trying to discredit anybody who disagrees with their policies, and they are very defensive of this.

They have argued the case that they should have total secrecy. In total secrecy, I claim they have tremendous power to do the things that they want to do, and it has only been recently that the American people and this Congress have awakened to this. Although we did not get a full audit of the Fed last year, we did get a partial audit of the emergency funding, but still the Fed’s argument is they have to have total independence while the American people believe there should be transparency.

The Fed’s argument is that they literally are the saviors of the economy, that they came in as an emergency when the markets were crashing, and that they were able to rescue the entire world economy by their injection of hundreds of billions, if not trillions, of dollars.

The fallacy of all this is that they may have rescued some banks and that they may have rescued some big businesses, but they didn’t rescue the American people. The consequence of all this has been high unemployment, people losing their houses, and people who can’t pay their mortgages.

So, in their claim that they prevented a deep depression, they have had to take corrective action. The Fed made sure that the banks were bailed out. This prevented a depression for some very wealthy, well-connected people on Wall Street, who were making a lot of money anyway in the bubble period of time. Now the people who are suffering the most are the average people, who have had to suffer the consequences of the Federal Reserve policies. This is a policy that punishes the innocent people and that actually rewards the guilty people and the people who were the beneficiaries.

You know, the very people who are claiming that they have solved all of our problems are the very ones who created the problems, and they never...
since 1974, the National Catholic Education Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops have provided exemplary leadership in conceptualizing and organizing Catholic Schools Week. This year, it is celebrated from January 30 through February 5. The theme this year is "Catholic Schools—A Plus for America," which celebrates the fact that Catholic schools are an added value, a plus for our nation.

By always emphasizing the necessity of a well-rounded educational experience and instilling the values of giving back to the community and helping others, America's Catholic schools produce graduates that have the skills and strength of character needed by our businesses, governments, and communities. Nearly 95 percent of Catholic schools have a service program, and in 2009 their students contributed about half a million hours of service to their communities and parishes. My own desire to serve was fostered by dedicated teachers throughout my formative years at Catholic schools.

Today, over 2.1 million elementary and secondary students are enrolled in over 7,000 Catholic schools. Catholic school students, of course, surpass other students in math, science and reading in the three grade levels tested by the NAEP test. The graduation rate for Catholic high school students is 99 percent, with 97 percent going on to college or technical school. We continually hear disturbing reports about our national test scores, but these statistics are truly remarkable and should be commended.

Catholic schools are also known for embracing students from all walks of life and are highly effective in providing educational opportunities for minority students and disadvantaged youth. Almost 15 percent of students at Catholic schools are not Catholic. Over the last 30 years, the percentage of minority students enrolled in Catholic schools has more than doubled. Despite exceptional results, the success of Catholic schools does not depend on selectivity, as they accept nine out of every 10 students who apply.

Now in addition to producing well-educated students, Catholic schools save American taxpayers billions of dollars every year by lowering the number of students in already overburdened public schools. We estimated that taxpayers in the Chicago area alone save over $1 billion because of Catholic schools and approximately $20 billion nationwide. The importance of these savings is undeniable to American taxpayers, especially now, while many State and local governments are struggling with budget gaps.

I was born and raised and lived in the Chicago archdiocese, which still has one of the most successful school systems in the country. More than 90,000 students attend 258 schools. In my district alone, there are seven Catholic high schools and about 50 grammar schools, including one of the best in my
home parish of St. John of the Cross in Western Springs.

My own Catholic education in Chicago gave me the knowledge, discipline, desire to serve and love of learning that enabled me to earn my doctoral degree and become a teacher before being elected to Congress. In recognizing Catholic Schools Week, we pay a special tribute to dedicated teachers and administrators who sacrifice so much, in many cases working for less than they could earn elsewhere.

Many of my favorite memories are of teachers, including many nuns who taught me the value of faith and service. Throughout the United States, millions of others have similar memories of their dedicated sisters, priests and lay teachers who gave their hearts and souls to touch the lives of their students.

Mr. Speaker, next week I look forward in attending Catholic Schools Week even in my district to deliver the praise, support and gratitude that they deserve. I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

BLM MISMANAGEMENT OF WILD HORSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last week, at the request of a lady named Madeline Pickens, I met with Mr. Bob Abbey, who is the head of the Bureau of Land Management, to talk to him about dealing with the wild horses, the mustangs that roam out west in the western States. The Bureau of Land Management has somewhere between 35,000 and 40,000 of these mustangs that roam out west in the western States. The Bureau of Land Management has somewhere between 35,000 and 40,000 of these mustangs because they're part of America's heritage, and they want to protect them as much as possible. Toward that end, she bought two ranches, the Spruce Ranch, which has 14,000 acres in it, and the ranch next to it in Nevada, the Warm Creek Ranch, which has about another 4,000 acres; and then she got permits for another 550,000 acres so that she could control these horses. She would have them injected so that they can't reproduce; therefore, they wouldn't have to worry about an expanding population of mustangs, but they wouldn't have to worry about them being killed. The Bureau of Land Management wants to move them a thousand miles, where her ranch and her permits are within just a few miles of where the horses are right now.

Now, when I talked to Mr. Abbey last week, he said that they couldn't reach an agreement with Ms. Pickens, that there'd have to be some major changes made over at the Bureau of Land Management in order for them to facilitate what she wants to do. This is another bureaucratic nightmare that we in this Congress should not—and I don't believe will—put up with. And I'm going to ask the Appropriations Committee to cut the budget of the Bureau of Land Management because they're wasting the taxpayers' money with millions and millions and maybe hundreds of millions of dollars. Last year, the government spent about $14 million managing private livestock on Federal public lands, and they only collect $21 million for grazing rights. So they lost at least $123 million per year. And some people estimate that they lose as much as $500 million a year, half a billion dollars, by keeping these grazing lands in private hands where people get them for almost nothing. $21 million was what the fee was that they lost last year.

So they're losing as much as $500 million; they're moving these horses up to a thousand miles, and they're doing it for no good purpose other than the bureaucracy wants to keep control of them.

Now, the reason Ms. Pickens started this organization to protect these mustangs was because, in 2008, the Bureau of Land Management said, well, they weren't sure they could take care of all of these horses—they have almost 40,000 in these pens right now—so they were thinking about killing them, euthanizing, starting to kill these horses.

Well, the people who love these mustangs and love the West the way it was don't want this to happen. So they came up with this organization to deal with the problem in a realistic way so that the horses wouldn't be killed. The organization they started when they heard they were going to euthanize them was called Saving America's Mustangs, and they offered to enter into a contract with the Bureau of Land Management to relocate at least 90% of these horses into these lands that they just bought and got permits for so they wouldn't have to be shipped to these pens a thousand miles away.

Now, it makes absolutely no sense to me, at a time when we're fighting fiscal problems in this country—we've got trillions of dollars in debt, and unless we start cutting spending, we're going to see this country go into bankruptcy. Moody's has already said they may have to reevaluate the bond rating for the country.

Let me just end up, Mr. Speaker, by saying it seems to me that we ought to be frugal with the public's money. We ought to cut the Bureau of Land Management's budget so that we can conserve the money and save the mustangs. That's what this is all about—a humane way of treating the mustangs in this country, which are a part of our heritage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DeFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I'm joined this evening by my friend from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. Pallone), and tonight we want to talk about the economy. We want to talk about what's happened over the last 2 years, how the United States economy has pulled itself out of the Great Recession and moving towards a much, much brighter future.

Earlier today, or actually yesterday, it was reported that our esteemed majority leader on the opposition side issued a statement taking credit that in just 3 weeks, the return of the Republican Party to the majority in this House has led to an astounding improvement in the economy. Well, that's kind of like—I don't know how exactly to describe that as to say that's just an overemphasis of the facts and a complete distortion of what actually has happened.

In the previous 2 years, as the Obama administration and the majority then
held by the Democrats, my colleagues, worked to pull the American economy out of the Great Recession, the Republican minority voted “no” on every single bill to address the problem of the economy.

Starting with the American Recovery Act, the stimulus bill, not one Republican voted for it, even though that bill clearly, by all economic studies, created or allowed to continue well over 2 million jobs in this Nation. Infrastructure projects that were in my district and in every other district of this Nation were funded by that piece of legislation—yet not one Republican vote.

In the effort to reform Wall Street and to create a stable banking system in this Nation, once again, not one Republican voted. On all of the jobs bills, not one Republican vote. On every single piece of legislation that was passed, not one Republican—or only a handful of Republicans voted for those bills that actually stopped the Great Recession and began to return America to employment.

Now, really our subject matter for tonight is Make It In America. But before I get there, the comments that were made by the new majority leader deserve a complete analysis.

This is a chart of private sector growth that goes back to December of 2007 when the Great Recession began. And you can see here the decline of private sector jobs, 2007, 2008, until January of 2009, when the new Obama administration came into power.

At that point in January of 2009, the Recovery Act was passed and then followed by other pieces of legislation that turned the American economy around. And so the job loss began to taper off so that here we are in December of 2009, we began to see private sector job growth. These are not government jobs. These are all the private sector job growth.

So that beginning in the fall of 2009, we began to see the private sector come back to life and no longer shedding jobs but, rather, adding jobs. And every quarter since that time, all of 2010 and again now in January of 2011, we are continuing to add private sector jobs.

So the fact of the matter is—and you can say whatever you want to say—but at some point you really need to look at the facts. The facts were that every major bill to restart the American economy the Republican Party opposed in this House either by a unanimous “no” vote or by just a handful of Republicans voting for those pieces of legislation.

So that’s really where we are today, is the situation where we are beginning to see the American economy come back. Job one for all 435 Members of this House, job one is jobs for Americans. American jobs now, not later. Our total emphasis must be on American jobs now.

And to bring those jobs back, one of the principal issues that the President will be talking about tomorrow is jobs and make it in America. It’s high time that we can go once again to auto dealerships, to WalMart or Target and find “Made in America” on the products on those shelves. That will be a very strong manufacturing Nation, and in the strength of manufacturing we find America’s economic strength.

And so we are setting out, as we did last year, a set of policies that will rebuild the American manufacturing sector. And we call it the strategy to Make it in America, American jobs now in the manufacturing sector because manufacturing matters. This is where the great middle class jobs are to be found, in the manufacturing sector.

And actually back to the original thing I was talking about, General Motors, flat on its back, Chrysler, flat on their back, about to go bankrupt. The Obama administration for 2 weeks of Congress stepped forward and poured billions of dollars into those companies, stabilizing General Motors and tens of thousands of companies that were providing parts and services to General Motors and Gen-Motors back healthy, strong, and reentering the private stock market.

America, our public investment is now being recouped as General Motors once again becomes a strong, vibrant part of the American manufacturing sector.

How many Republicans supported that? Nary a vote. Nary a vote. But we have General Motors and Chrysler back on their feet, once again providing great manufacturing jobs. That’s the theme of tonight’s discussion, How can America make it? By making it in America, rebuilding the great manufacturing industries of America.

Joining me tonight is my colleague from the great State of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAGENHART, and we are continuing our discussion. So with permission of the Speaker, we would like to carry on a colloquy here. FRANK?

Mr. FALLOONE. Thank you. First of all, I wanted to thank my colleague from California for coming down here tonight and many nights and talking about the Make it in America agenda and why manufacturing matters. And the fact of the matter is that manufacturing, there was a recent report out that said that in the last year that we were in the minority for the first time more jobs were created in manufacturing than were lost. And I think that was the first time in 10 years. And we had, as you know, I think you mentioned over a million private sector jobs created in 2010. It’s not like I’m talking about how wonderful everything is, because I know that it’s not. I know that unemployment continues to be high, and many of my constituents talk to me all the time about how hard it is to find a job and how difficult it is for them to make ends meet; but the fact of the matter is that we are improving things. And we are beginning to see signs of the recovery; and most importantly, we are actually seeing more manufacturing jobs. So anybody says to me, well, you can’t make things in America anymore, I simply say look at the facts. The facts are that manufacturing jobs are on the rise.

And to bring that back, I was amazed today because I came down to the floor, we came in, I guess, we had debate around 5:15 and then we voted around 6:30, and I look at the agenda for the week, and we’re going into the fourth week of the Republican majority in the House, and to my knowledge not a single thing has been done or has been proposed to be done this week that would actually create jobs or address the economy.

In fact, I was listening to the debate on this budget resolution, and one of your colleagues from California, Mr. DREIER, started talking about the deficit and health care, the health care repeal again. You know, for 3 weeks, or for 4 weeks of the 30 or so weeks of Congress, we had the tragedy with our colleague GABBY GIFFORDS, but for the last 3 weeks all the talk has been about repealing health care reform, which of course is not going to happen because this Senate’s never going to vote it up and the President is never going to sign it. So it’s a complete waste of time. And he was talking again about how that’s going to reduce the deficit, the repeal would reduce the deficit. I got up and I said, well, it’s just the opposite. The CBO, which at least has provided us with numbers—your budget resolution that’s coming up tomorrow that the Republicans have never, any of our colleagues have ever proposed to the Senate’s never going to happen, because the health care reform actually reduces the deficit over the next 10 years by $230 and a trillion dollars in the second decade. And I said, you know, what is your plan? What is the Republican plan to reduce the deficit? What is the Republican plan to create jobs? What is the Republican plan to help the economy? And I don’t see anything.

I mean, all I see is, again, 3 weeks on repealing health care reform, now some budget resolution that has no numbers about, you know, what the budget’s actually going to be, and nothing to indicate how it’s really going to create jobs or reduce the deficit. And then I saw that on Wednesday we are taking up a resolution which when we repeal the Affordable Care Act, the President’s going to take the corporate giveaway, because what it means is that if we do have public financing of the Presidential elections, then we are probably going to rely more and more on these corporate ads, these secret corporate ads that were used this last November that we don’t even know where the money came from. It’s all corporate money. And, again, I don’t see anything being done by our Republican colleagues to address the issue of jobs.

Now, on the other hand we have the President and you, Mr. GARAMENDI,
Mr. GARAMENDI. Right, and I think it was through neglect on manufacturing. They focused on the service sector, primarily the financial services. They ignored agriculture, they ignored manufacturing, and now we are paying the price. Even though we have a third of the manufacturing jobs in this country, we are still perched as number one in the global race. However, if we are to allow that neglect to continue, we would eventually fall out of the number one position.

So the 4.6 million jobs lost, manufacturing jobs lost due to that neglect, that trend has to be turned around, and I was so delighted to hear the President speak to a progressive agenda, a proactive quality, to the tone he was establishing at that center with his speech. He talked about the strength of America’s manufacturing and how we can impose a strong uplift for the middle class of this country.

You know, the 4.6 million jobs that preceded this administration. I think that’s an important message that was shared by this President, and the Nation accepted that speech. It was shared across this country, and it was emanating from GE, from the floor, from the factory floor where innovation and invention were coming from the working class on the assembly line.

So, Representative GARAMENDI, you are going to address two Make it in America bills. Maybe you should talk about that, and Mr. Tonko can talk about the President’s speech in your district. But all our focus is on creating jobs, and I don’t hear anything from the other side of the aisle, from the Republicans on this issue.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. Tonko, for pointing out the facts. The facts are that 4.6 percent of the manufacturing jobs in this country, which is jobs, how are we going to create jobs.

You are quite correct, our colleague from the great State of New York, which was and is and will be an even greater manufacturing center, General Electric, Schenectady, New York. You wouldn’t know where that is, Mr. Tonko, would you? If you do, please join us and tell us about it.

Mr. TONKO. We flew up from Washington on Air Force One and then returned with the President because we had our jobs conference in Maryland.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You and I had this conversation on the floor of the House. We discussed American manufacturing in making it in America. But I can see you came back charged up from that visit.

Mr. TONKO. We are charged up. We are fired up.

Mr. GARAMENDI. General Electric and the great Erie Canal manufacturing sector is about to rise up, but I am not going to take second fiddle to your place because I represent the manufacturing part of California, and we, too, know that we have the potential to really drive the American economy forward, the innovation economy.

One thing you said when you harkened back to the space race and President Kennedy calling upon us to explore the heavens; his next statement, not in the inaugural address but shortly thereafter was, we will put a man on the Moon within a decade. And the Federal Government collected the resources of this Nation and met that challenge, and within a decade, we, Americans, were on the Moon.

The lesson here is the focused attention of America on a goal, and in that case and in this case the investment that America must make to succeed. It was an American investment. A lot of tax dollars went into that.

But not only did we put a man on the Moon, but we created an enormous industry that gives us everything from, I don’t know, the ability of this iPhone to work, satellite, all of the great technologies that we have, many of the great technologies we have today on communications and travel and defense technology, science and technology that has strengthened every dynamic of life.

Here, fast forward some 40 years later, some 40-plus years later, a rather youthful President is challenging a nation to enter a global race, this time on the issue of American innovation economy. We should have within us the fortitude to go forward and invest in a way that allows us to empower our working families, the middle class of this country, through investments in sound manufacturing that enables us to build it in America, make it in America again and be proud of that.

So, Representative GARAMENDI, thank you for bringing us together this evening to voice our support for the President’s vision, for the vision that we share as a caucus in this House, I think it’s the empowering vision that enables us to go forward with a Make It in America mantra that enables us to take pride in the economy and the resources associated with that policy to truly make a difference.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, Representative TONKO, I think you were at the President’s speech there in your district.

Mr. TONKO. We flew up from Washington on Air Force One and then returned with the President because we had our jobs conference in Maryland.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You and I had this conversation on the floor of the House. We discussed American manufacturing in making it in America. But I can see you came back charged up from that visit.

Mr. TONKO. We are charged up. We are fired up.

Mr. GARAMENDI. General Electric and the great Erie Canal manufacturing sector is about to rise up, but I am not going to take second fiddle to your place because I represent the manufacturing part of California, and we, too, know that we have the potential to really drive the American economy forward, the innovation economy.

One thing you said when you harkened back to the space race and President Kennedy calling upon us to explore the heavens; his next statement, not in the inaugural address but shortly thereafter was, we will put a man on the Moon within a decade. And the Federal Government collected the resources of this Nation and met that challenge, and within a decade, we, Americans, were on the Moon.

The lesson here is the focused attention of America on a goal, and in that case and in this case the investment that America must make to succeed. It was an American investment. A lot of tax dollars went into that.

But not only did we put a man on the Moon, but we created an enormous industry that gives us everything from, I don’t know, the ability of this iPhone to work, satellite, all of the great technologies that we have, many of the great technologies we have today on communications and travel and defense
It was the solar technologies, it will be the wind, the energy technologies, it will be transportation. When one talks about transportation, you have got to figure out some way to get to and out of the cold of the middle America.

Joining us today in the warm 20-degree Fahrenheit temperature of Washington, D.C. is Representative ELLISON from the upper Midwest, where it is somewhere below zero.

Mr. ELLISON. Somewhere. But you know what, Congressman, although the weather is cold, our spirits are warm. Every time we hear about Making it in America.

This campaign that we are on—

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thought you were going to talk about Green Bay and the Packers and all of that.

Mr. ELLISON. You know why, if the Vikings aren’t in it. I don’t know.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That’s right. You are from Minnesota and the Minnesota Vikings aren’t in it, I think.

Mr. ELLISON. I think the Vikings for the NFC north, hey, hope springs eternal next year, right? But we are happy to see the Green Bay Packers and the Bears fight it out, definitely. We are known as the black and blue division, and they definitely played hard.

But the truth is we are used to making things in the Midwest, whether you are talking about from Pittsburgh to Detroit, Cleveland, to Milwaukee, to Minneapolis, we make stuff in the Midwest as you do in the West in California, and as they do in the East in Congressman Tonko’s district, Congressman from upstate New York. The fact is that manufacturing and making things is an American value.

But, Congressman, the thing I want to say is that this campaign of Making it in America, before we make anything, we have to believe that we can make things in America again.

We have to believe that we can compete on quality, we can compete on efficiency, and that the goods manufactured by American workers are among the best in this world and can be better. It’s not a matter of belief, it is a matter of commitment, and it is a matter of vision.

So we set forth a vision, Congressman, and we say that, you know what, in this great Nation we can forge these, we can make this steel, we can build the roads.

We can have a vision that this country can build things that the whole world needs and wants. And if we have that desire, that innate desire at the cellular level, we will begin to see the innovative capacity of this country making the windmills, making the semiconductors, making the cars, making anything and everything. But it’s a matter of vision, it’s a matter of will, it’s a matter of commitment. And that vision and will has to be backed up by sound policy, hard work, and the spirit of entrepreneurship. And if these things come together we can certainly do it.

But I believe on this House floor, and in shops across America, unions and in management, people are saying. You know what? We can make stuff in America. America is still the world’s leading manufacturer. That’s important to bear in mind. We can’t forget that we are still the world’s leading manufacturer, and we have the highest quality steel, the best technology, the strongest workers.

But you know what, when people want to be penny-wise and pound-foolish, they might want to offshore jobs because they say, well, maybe we can get somebody to do it for less.

But can you get somebody to do it better? And the world wants something that’s quality. The world wants something that’s made well, that’s made right. And that’s what Make it in America is all about.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me pick up on a couple of those themes before I turn back to the congressman.

A lot of this has to do with the will, the desire, and the determination to do a task. It also has a lot to do with policy, which you just said, policy. For example, before last year, there was a policy in America that American corporations would get a tax break when they shipped a job offshore. Hello?

Mr. ELLISON. Bad policy.

Mr. GARAMENDI. What did you say, Congressman?

Mr. ELLISON. Bad policy.

Mr. GARAMENDI. American corporations received a tax reduction when they shipped a job offshore. In this House, a bill was introduced. It eliminated that tax deduction, bringing back $12 billion annually to the Treasury, helping the deficit. Our Republican colleagues voted “no.” They wanted to continue that tax break. We need to understand that we make our choices. They have decided that tax breaks are important. One example of a policy to use our tax system to help or to hurt American workers, just one. No support from our Republican colleagues to end that tax break. This is about policies that will drive this nation forward.

We are going to spend the next 30, 40 minutes here focusing on some of those policies and investment. Mr. Tonko talked about space. That was an investment the American people made, and it paid off big-time, whole new industries, millions of jobs were created.

Mr. PALLONE. I’m glad you talked about the district, I want to talk about my district, and I also want to talk about Mr. Tonko and his district and what the President did last weekend because, as you know, it was a GE plant that he visited in Schenectady.

But in addition to that, the president of GE is the guy that President Obama has now tapped to be the head of the Council on Jobs and Competitiveness. And he wrote an opinion piece in The Washington Post talking about what he wants to do, which I wanted to reference because it harks back.

I wanted to mention my district first and just say briefly that we in my district pride ourselves on being the invention center of the country, or the birthplace of some of the things.

And when the President talks about transportation, it will be the solar technologies, it will be the wind, the energy technologies, it will be transportation.

Mr. PALLONE. I’m glad you talked about R&D, because I know he’s going to talk about that tomorrow. And of course it’s going to involve some money that’s going to have to be spent by the Federal Government, but it is a wise use of funds. Maybe we’re going to have to cut somewhere else in the budget in order to fund things that create jobs; but we are going to, as I said, with a laser beam look at things that create jobs.

Now, let me just give you an example of big manufacturing, and also I should say big research, in my district is with the pharmaceutical industry. J&J is headquartered in New Brunswick, Johnson & Johnson is in my district. And one of the things that I read about, that I was told actually, the other day was that the President has decided to create a new R&D function, if you will, within the FDA because he has realized that a lot of the drug companies have lagged a little bit in a lot of new research, and that’s important. One example of a policy to use our tax system to help or to hurt American workers, just one. No support from our Republican colleagues to end that tax break. This is about policies that will drive this nation forward.

We are going to spend the next 30, 40 minutes here focusing on some of those policies and investment. Mr. Tonko talked about space. That was an investment the American people made, and it paid off big-time, whole new industries, millions of jobs were created.

Mr. PALLONE. I’m glad you talked about the district, I want to talk about my district, and I also want to talk about Mr. Tonko and his district and what the President did last weekend because, as you know, it was a GE plant that he visited in Schenectady.
give us some money and more resources, if you will, into that R&D function, which will create more jobs and boost up the existing pharmaceutical industry.

The same is true, I understand when he was at GE that GE plants were turbines or something that are being used for a project in India. So these are going to be shipped overseas. And my understanding is you talked about 1,200 American manufacturing jobs and more than 400 American engineering jobs just for this GE plant.

I will yield to you, but I want to come back to what the president of GE is saying about this council.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. Thank you, Representative PALLONE. The importance I think of hosting an event like that which the President joined is that we can showcase that there are great things happening. For one, we are not going to submit to this notion that manufacturing is dead in America. I cannot believe this spirit is there. We rectify all the time, for one, for any moment submit to that logic or that thinking. As the President was hosted by GE, specifically by its CEO, Jeff Immelt, and so many others believe in that same spirit and in the creative genius, leaders, labor leaders like the late Joe Battaglino who was a union voice for GE workers, Helen Corinne in the past, all of whom fought for the dignity of the worker because that worker was providing the intellect to take us to the next plateau.

And so what they talked about here was the fact that not only are American workers producing a high-quality turbine, but were also exporting to places like India.

And as the President said in his speech, we have bought many a Chinese good in this country. It is time for China to buy our products. And I think he is setting a good tone so that there is this fairness that is associated with the trade out there and that we as a Nation not only need to make it in America, but we have to put an emphasis on exporting. And when those emphasis are put into play, we will then prosper as a Nation.

You talk about the turbine and the manufacturing going on at GE, but the President was also updated with right next door and the activity right next door which is an advanced battery manufacturer. And it's not the traditional lithium ion of which many people speak as the cutting-edge battery.

This one that GE is creating can deal with heavy fleets, specifically helping that niche of battery application. It can be used for energy generation. And then perhaps one of its greatest functions, it can be used to store intermittent power. So if we reach to the sun, the soil, and the wind to produce our energy needs, and it has an intermittent nature, then we must add into that supply of energy because of the storage potential of this new battery.

And then they also have, across the street from this plant, GE's global renewable energy center. And what they're doing there is doing this global strategy on renewables. And so the turbine blades that are manufactured there, all of this in that cutting-edge technology that just create jobs, made in America, exporting around the world, but also growing our own energy independence and our energy self-sufficiency, which to me is a strategic bit of policy.

So this is about Republicans fighting Democrats or Democrats competing with Republicans. This should be America moving forward with a progressive plan, with a laser-sharp focus joined with the message of the President to make certain that we compete not with each other but with other nations. Is it robust? Probably. Is it very hard-fought? Most likely. But we've got to be in it, and we have to have the passionate resolve to do so. And we make the key functions like education, higher education, basic research, R&D and modernization of our manufacturing centers.

People will tell me when they hear this manufacturing thing, they said we can't compete. One of the ways will do it cheaper. We don't have to do it cheapest. We need to do it smartest—smartest. And when we do it smartest, we win. We sharpen our competitiveness, and we can win on the global scale.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think Mr. PALLONE would like to come back and pick up this investment strategy that you talked about.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We can do those things, but we have to have wise public policy accompanying the spirit of America. The desire for opportunity and the desire to better ourselves has to be accompanied by wise public policy. For example, right now many of those jobs are going to China. Solar buses and solar and wind turbines that are manufactured overseas. Our tax dollars are going overseas to support the foreign industries. Those tax dollars ought to be brought back home to support American-made equipment, whether it is a bus or a train or a photovoltaic system or the like. That is one of the bills that I have introduced. It is very simple. If it is our tax money, use it to buy American-made equipment. If you want to buy your own money, buy whatever you want to buy, but not our tax money, whether it is solar buses or the like. Just some little policy tweaks that will support the innovation that comes from General Electric or from Joe Schmidt's new photovoltaic system that is invented out in the Silicon Valley.

I notice that our esteemed leader has joined us, Mr. STENY HOYER, who is now whip of the Democratic caucus.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to call to the attention of my colleagues, as the four of you have done so well tonight and in nights past, we just had a very significant conference on the eastern shore of Maryland. In that conference, we discussed the agenda that we call Make It In America. Make It In America, as I am sure you explained earlier in the evening, I heard much of what you had to say, not all, but Make It In America is not just about changing the rules of making it. There are a lot of Americans who are not sure that they, or at least their children, are going to make it.
In addition, Americans overwhelmingly respond, and we hear a lot of talk about listening to the American public. I think that is something we ought to do, but they overwhelmingly respond that their belief is in order for us to continue to be the great economic engine for opportunity in this country, it will be necessary for us to continue to make things in this country. To make it in America, whatever “it” is. In addition to that, to grow things in America, as we do so well, and sell them not only but also in the country. That’s the President’s focus on doubling our exports. He knows, as we know, that if we are not making things, the possibility of doubling our exports is zero.

I believe that people around the world respect and want to buy American products. Unfortunately, we are not making as many products as we used to. The President has asked Jefrey Immelt of GE to head up a task force which looks, in effect, to enhance our ability to make it in America, to grow jobs in America, to grow good paying jobs with good benefits in America.

The American people understand that if we don’t do that, 20 years from now the United States of America will not be, as it is today, the economic engine of the world. It is true our competitor in some sense in China is growing, but they still have a far way to go before they match the United States’ ability to produce goods and services.

The founder of Intel, Mr. Grove, has written an article about how we need to make it in America; his point being that we are the center of innovation, inventiveness, and development in the world. But his point is then made that in too many instances we are inventing products, innovating how they can be used, developing them, but then bringing them to scale—that is, manufacturing for consumption on a broad basis—overseas. His premise is, and I agree with him on this conclusion, that if we continue to do that, that our inventors and innovators will migrate to where the product is being taken to scale or, in other words, manufactured for large-scale consumption.

I am hopeful that Republicans and Democrats can join together in this Make It In America agenda. We passed a number of pieces of legislation in the last Congress that were supported on a bipartisan basis, some of which have already been signed by the President, because on both sides of the aisle there is an understanding and I think a commitment to create an environment in which it is possible to make it in America and profit by doing so.

I think we are all harkened by the fact that Ford has brought plants back from Mexico and China, that Whirlpool has brought plants back, GE has brought plants back, as well as others, and decided to manufacture things here in America and do so profitably; that they can make a quality product here with skilled labor, well-educated labor that will produce a quality product, higher productivity, and therefore result in profits.

I want to congratulate particularly the gentleman from California, a former State leader in California, still a great leader from California, but he has come to this House just a few years ago to succeed Ellen Tauscher, who became Assistant Secretary of State. He has done an extraordinary job in a very short period of time, and his focus on this Make It In America is unsurpassed. I assure my colleagues, I want to thank him for his leadership and focus. And I want to thank Mr. ELLISON and Mr. PALLONE and Mr. TONKO for their focus, because I think we are on the right track on this.

I think our Republican colleagues hopefully will join us as partners not to take partisan credit for this but that America will be advantaged, America’s people will be advantaged. The reduction of our deficit as we grow the economy will be advantaged, and we will see an America that is on the rise in terms of growing our economy, creating jobs, good paying jobs, and opportunities and future for our people.

So I congratulate and thank the gentleman from California, the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from New Jersey, and the gentleman from Minnesota for their leadership and communication to the American people of what this Make It In America agenda is all about.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentleman from Maryland. You have been a long, long time leader in this House and on the subject of jobs and economic opportunity. I thank you very much for your kind comments.

Mr. GARAMENDI. For me, my work on this actually began in the mid-1980s, in California, where we developed a state plan, a California plan, competitive in this century. Well, this century is now here. We are 10-plus years into this century, and we have a big task.

We said back then in the work that we did that we needed to do six things: You have to have the best education. That’s a public investment that pays off over and over and over again.

Then you have to have the best research and development. That’s the innovative economy that our President is talking about. So the research and the innovation go together.

From that, you create the opportunity to make the new things—to manufacture the new electric cars. General Motors was flat on its back, about to disappear, when the Obama administration and Congress stepped forward and brought General Motors back. Now the innovation of an electric car—the Volt—is in place. It’s going to happen, and we’re going to capture the next round of automobile manufacturing.

Infrastructure is another great and absolutely necessary investment. If you take that infrastructure and if you apply the Make It In America theme—the steel, the trains, the buses, the bridges—America made for America’s future, it’s possible. You also have to change. You can’t do what you did yesterday.

Those are the strategies that pay off.

We need to add to that an energy strategy that frees America from the grips of the petrol dictators.

This is all of our future. This is what we want to do, and this creates the opportunity for Americans, for all Americans, to make it. Making it in America, that’s what we all want.

I notice that my colleagues have stood up here.

Mr. ELLISON. Congresswoman ELLISON. I don’t want to go long because I do want to hear from all of our colleagues, but I just want to mention two quick points. I was inspired by Minority Whip HOYER as he spoke.

Two points:

One is that manufacturing has historically been the high-wage sector for American workers. The middle class was essentially built because we were making things. The higher wages associated with manufacturing employment have been proven to be much higher than your average service jobs. So manufacturing is definitely in the interest of American workers and middle class people, and it is something that I think we should get a lot of support for from around the country.

The other thing is that, in order to really bolster a strong manufacturing sector, we need a strong infrastructure. There are over $1 trillion in infrastructure needs around our country just to keep pace with maintenance. I’m talking about making sure the gusset plates on these bridges are working, that there’s not the rust and the crumbling of concrete, and making sure that the bridges and the roads are safe. I’m talking about basic infrastructure.

Now, if we really want to go beyond that by building the transmission lines so that we can move power around and all the new innovative infrastructure—that smart grid—then there is a lot more to do.

The point is that I just want folks to know, before I leave it to our colleagues, that manufacturing is good for the middle class and also the attendant and connected jobs that you need to support manufacturing, like infrastructure development. There are also high-wage jobs that we need to invest in so that we can put America back to work.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, tomorrow night on this floor, the President of the United States will be here for his State of the Union Address. He has already signaled that he is going to talk about the innovation economy—that he’s going to talk about infrastructure, and he is going to talk about creating jobs—making it in America.
So, as we prepare for that, I noticed our colleague from the great State of Texas has joined us.

Please.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I want to thank the gentleman from California, Mr. HOYER, who coined the phrase, as we were beginning to speak to the American people, of how important it is for us to go back to our roots.

I am also delighted to be able to be here with the gentleman from Minnesota, the gentleman from New Jersey, and the gentleman from New York.

But I want to spin it in a different way.

I want us to reclaim America’s genius. I could go back, of course, to the Model T or maybe even to Thomas Edison, with the light bulb. There is an excitement about being able to build, create, and invent—frankly, when I came to Congress, I wondered why we were not making submarines anymore. As you will know, we had a shipbuilding industry in Virginia and, of course, in Mississippi—because genius also is part of building. You must have the kind of technology, the kind of expertise to make it the best equipment you possibly can have. That’s what I sense that, and there is an excitement when young people can be part of the genius of America.

I come from Houston, Texas. We are one of the new starts in light rail, and we have been trying to get there for about 30 years. We are just about there when we would be on the precipice of funding for light rail. Yet at the same time, as we talk about putting tracks down, there is a technology of the new light rail cars. We need to, in fact, build these cars here in the United States. Many people view Houston as the energy capital of the world. You don’t know that we have wind and solar businesses that are headquartered in my congressional district. The point is, of course, that the turbines, unfortunately, are not built here.

My point is, when the President so appropiately makes the point about investing in America and also of building infrastructure, he is speaking the language of capturing the genius of America.

I would just hold this up because I think this is an example of where we are going. We are going onward and upward. The red is the past administration, which is when no jobs were created or maybe a minimum of a million. We can see we have had some hard times. We don’t ignore the fact that we have been in a hard, hard recession. But look where we’re going. How can we go backwards? How can we not create new jobs?

We in Houston would really like to be part of not sending our tax dollars overseas. We want to be able to build buses, railcars, ferryboats, submarines, and large-sized ships, if you will, because that is capturing the genius of America.

So let me thank the gentleman for yielding. I am hoping the President will wish us, Mr. HOYER and to all who are here on the floor that he is going to go forward on his investment in infrastructure and in recapturing the genius of America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much. Indeed, if it’s our tax dollars, they ought to be spent to buy things that are made in America.

We’re going to do a lightening round here. We’ve got about 6 minutes, and we’ve got about five of us.

So, Mr. HOYER, our whip. Mr. HOYER. I’ll try to take a minute.

Let me say what I think is so good about this agenda Make It In America. It is an agenda that, unlike some, brings us together and doesn’t divide us. From Republicans, Democrat—people all over this country understand that, if we are going to be a great country, as we are today, and if we are going to remain so in the future, it will be because we continue to be a manufacturing country, a country that makes it in America.

I have talked to the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, and organized labor. This is an agenda item that will bring labor and management, business and workers together to cooperate so that America will continue, not only to make it in America, but to do so in an expanding way rather than in a shrinking way. We’ve been doing some growth in the last few months, in the last year, in the last 2 years, in the last 3 years, but not enough. We can do more.

Make It In America is the agenda for the future.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much.

Our colleague from the great State of New York and Schenectady.

Mr. TONKO. I again thank the gentleman from California.

Look, I am ecstatic about the President’s choice of Jeff Immelt, the CEO of GE, to be the chair of the Council on Jobs and Competitiveness. We can probably remove a lot of the struggle that occurs on this House floor by listening to the business minds out there, who will advise us about the strength that we can provide private sector jobs here.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentleman from New York. Let’s hear what New Jersey has to say.

Mr. PALLONE. I’m really excited about the President’s speech tomorrow because I know he’s going to stress the whole idea of investment and innovation.

He talks about the fact that right now many of the corporations in this country are actually sitting on a lot of profit. I mean, in the last year or so many of them have actually made quite a bit of money. And we want them to reinvest that money in creating private sector jobs here. But one of the points he makes, and I talked a little bit about it tonight, is that the Federal Government has to incentivize all of this. In other words, I used an example with the drug companies that the Federal Government, by doing some research on new drugs, can incentivize the drug companies in my district to do more and create more jobs. But there is also an educational component to it as well. We need to do more in terms of education.

It’s no surprise that in the middle of this pharmaceutical industry in my district sits Rutgers University. There is a lot of money through the stimulus act, for example, that went to Rutgers to do R&D that is then taken up by the drug industry. So it’s part of a whole package, and I am very excited about it. And I just wanted to thank the gentleman again for all that he has done on this.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much for joining us.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, why don’t you take 1 minute and I will take 1 minute and we will wrap this thing up.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you so very much.

I just thought of something that I did want to add to the discussion. First of all, GE is an inherently American company. I applaud the selection that allows a creator to move forward to create jobs for all of America. But I want to keep in mind that manufacturing is the employer of all people—women, persons with college education, those that are in the trades, men, and young people. So families can be hired by manufacturing. And it is particularly important to me that women have the equal opportunity, particularly since we passed the pay equity bill in the last Congress.

But, finally, I also look forward to small and medium minority women-owned businesses partnering with large businesses to create jobs because small...
businesses and minority-owned businesses can create jobs and be part of the infrastructure of jobs. 

So if the President speaks tomorrow, I hope he speaks for all of America, that all will have an opportunity to retrieve the dream by the opportunity to make it in America. I thank the gentleman for having us this evening.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We have always thought of America as being the land of opportunity and it has to be the land of opportunity for everyone in this country, wherever they may be, whatever their status may be. And we know that if we are able to rebuild the manufacturing base in America, small companies, large companies, entrepreneurs and inventors will all participate in it.

So the Make it in America effort will be a bipartisan effort. And if we put our minds to it, it will be a successful effort, and America once again will be in the forefront.

Mr. Speaker, we yield back our time, and we thank you.

**EPA's War on Texas**

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

Mr. CARTER. I thank the Speaker for allowing me this time. I am pleased that I can bring up some issues that I think are important.

The title of this is "The EPA's War on Texas," but this is about a lot more than Texas.

I think that most people probably don't realize that a lot of the rules and laws that, especially if they're in business, but even in your own personal life, that seem to touch closest to home would think they were done by a vote of this Congress in some form or fashion where we decided that this is good for whatever the rule is for your life or for your business or for the good of our Nation. But, in fact, many of these rules actually come from regulatory agencies. These agencies are given rule-making power, and those rules actually have the power of law.

And so a body of employees of the United States—and a few of them are political appointees, depending on the agency. Some of them are appointed each term by the administration, but most of these people are civil servants who work for civil service and these agencies. There are agencies across this land that take certain sections of our lives and make rules about them—the rule-making authority is given to them by Congress—and the EPA is one of those agencies, the Environmental Protection Agency.

A situation has arisen in Texas which is not good for Texas, but it's about America. The last couple of years I have been talking about the rule of law and the fact that we try to set up a system in this Nation that has basic fairness and that there are certain things that are right and certain things that are wrong. When we do that, we don't expect one group to impose its will upon another group inappropriately; but what has happened to Texas, I would argue, is an overstepping of a regulatory agency.

To talk about this, I'm going to have to start off by giving you—so that you understand it not only affects the lives of Texans, but it directly affects the lives of those every single day, not just in Texas, but every single day in America. So if the President speaks tomorrow, I hope he speaks for all of America, that all will have an opportunity to retrieve the dream by the opportunity to make it in America.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying that carbon emissions are the new deadly medicine for this country; and if we don't do away with them, it's going to destroy our ability to live on this planet. Al Gore and others are the lead folks on this, and they think it's very important. That debate has been going on now for 4 to 6 years in this Congress, and an attempt has been made to pass what's called cap-and-trade legislation. In fact, by one vote, I believe it was, cap-and-trade, under the Democratic administration of the last session of Congress, was passed out of this House.

Cap-and-trade went nowhere in the Senate, and so it never became law. But its purpose was to cap the emissions and tax folks accordingly. That's very simple, much more complex than that. But basically this Congress, made up of the Senate and the House, rejected as a unit the concept of cap-and-trade.

The Environmental Protection Agency decided that even though pretty much America had spoken that carbon emissions were not something that they wanted to impose harshness upon folks about, they decided, well, we don't care what they want, we want the carbon emissions.

So they, starting in December, I believe, of last year, they started issuing new regulations about carbon emissions. And then they started passing them on through the Clean Air Act to the various States.

A situation has arisen in Texas which is not good for Texas, but it's about America. The last couple of years I have been talking about the rule of law and the fact that we try to set up a system in this Nation that has basic fairness and that there are certain things that are right and certain things that are wrong. When we do that, we don't expect one group to impose its will upon another group inappropriately; but what has happened to Texas, I would argue, is an overstepping of a regulatory agency.

To talk about this, I'm going to have to start off by giving you—so that you understand it not only affects the lives of Texans, but it directly affects the lives of those every single day, not just in Texas, but every single day in America. So if the President speaks tomorrow, I hope he speaks for all of America, that all will have an opportunity to retrieve the dream by the opportunity to make it in America.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying that carbon emissions are the new deadly medicine for this country; and if we don't do away with them, it's going to destroy our ability to live on this planet. Al Gore and others are the lead folks on this, and they think it's very important. That debate has been going on now for 4 to 6 years in this Congress, and an attempt has been made to pass what's called cap-and-trade legislation. In fact, by one vote, I believe it was, cap-and-trade, under the Democratic administration of the last session of Congress, was passed out of this House.

Cap-and-trade went nowhere in the Senate, and so it never became law. But its purpose was to cap the emissions and tax folks accordingly. That's very simple, much more complex than that. But basically this Congress, made up of the Senate and the House, rejected as a unit the concept of cap-and-trade.

The Environmental Protection Agency decided that even though pretty much America had spoken that carbon emissions were not something that they wanted to impose harshness upon folks about, they decided, well, we don't care what they want, we want the carbon emissions.

So they, starting in December, I believe, of last year, they started issuing new regulations about carbon emissions. And then they started passing them on through the Clean Air Act to the various States.

Now, I'm telling you this because it's going to have a direct effect on your price of gasoline go up at your pump, you have to realize that there can be a direct relationship between what's going on in the market and what happens to the prices for the American consumer.

Tommy Thompson, what has happened in Texas. When they created the Clean Air Act, they gave the EPA the ability to promulgate rules and standards for air quality. But the act specifically says that the local authorities and the States have a better means of policing up this act than the Federal Government. So the implementation of the rules, of the standards set by EPA, will be done by the States rather than the Federal Government, and each State is to come up with a plan.

And that bill was passed, I believe, in 1974 or 1976, something like that. Anyway, it was in the 1970s, and it had nothing to do with carbon. It had to do with noxious gasses and other really really gasses that were in our air and reducing the air quality, and the standards were important.

And each State had the ability to structure their permitting system to fit the needs of their State and then submit that permitting system to the EPA for approval. And the EPA would say, Yeah, I think that's a good system, or, No, we don't think it's a good system.

One of the things that happened when they put together this Clean Air Act and set these emission standards was what they call a grandfather clause. And companies that were already in existence long before the time of the passing of this act were grandfathered out of the act. So basically some of these big refineries, electricity power plants, manufacturing facilities, automobile plants had been around long enough that they would be grandfathered in some certain areas on these requirements, standards, and the requirement for permitting under the law. That was just the way this act was written.

So Texas had a lot of—Texas is the largest energy producing and energy manufacturing State in the United States and has the largest refinery capacity in the United States. I used to be able to name the refineries in Texas, but I'm afraid I'd fall way short today. But needless to say, there are a multitude of refineries and manufacturing facilities just in the Houston area alone and in Corpus Christ and in other parts of our State, both great, gigantic refineries and midsize and small refineries and manufacturing facilities. And they're all dealing with, basically, the hydrocarbon industry. The oil and gas industry is the base product that they are refining, manufacturing things from and so forth.

So in Texas, looking at what it would take not only to make new regulations about carbon emissions. And then they started passing them on through the Clean Air Act to the various States.

Now, I'm telling you this because it's going to have a direct effect on your price of gasoline go up at your pump, you have to realize that there can be a direct relationship between what's going on in the market and what happens to the prices for the American consumer.

Tommy Thompson, what has happened in Texas. When they created the Clean Air Act, they gave the EPA the ability to promulgate rules and standards for air quality. But the act specifically says that the local authorities and the States have a better means of policing up this act than the Federal Government. So the implementation of the rules, of the standards set by EPA, will be done by the States rather than the Federal Government, and each State is to come up with a plan.

And that bill was passed, I believe, in 1974 or 1976, something like that. Anyway, it was in the 1970s, and it had nothing to do with carbon. It had to do with noxious gasses and other really really gasses that were in our air and reducing the air quality, and the standards were important.

And each State had the ability to structure their permitting system to fit the needs of their State and then submit that permitting system to the EPA for approval. And the EPA would say, Yeah, I think that's a good system, or, No, we don't think it's a good system.

One of the things that happened when they put together this Clean Air Act and set these emission standards was what they call a grandfather clause. And companies that were already in existence long before the time of the passing of this act were grandfathered out of the act. So basically some of these big refineries, electricity power plants, manufacturing facilities, automobile plants had been around long enough that they would be grandfathered in some certain areas on these requirements, standards, and the requirement for permitting under the law. That was just the way this act was written.

So Texas had a lot of—Texas is the largest energy producing and energy manufacturing State in the United States and has the largest refinery capacity in the United States. I used to be able to name the refineries in Texas, but I'm afraid I'd fall way short today. But needless to say, there are a multitude of refineries and manufacturing facilities just in the Houston area alone and in Corpus Christ and in other parts of our State, both great, gigantic refineries and midsize and small refineries and manufacturing facilities. And they're all dealing with, basically, the hydrocarbon industry. The oil and gas industry is the base product that they are refining, manufacturing things from and so forth.
could get out under a grandfather clause—police up those facilities, too.

The people in Texas got together and they came up with a concept called flex permitting, and here’s the way it works:

Let’s just take a refinery. Baytown has a gigantic refinery that I have visited. They passed a rule that says there’s lots of sources of emissions from some form or fashion inside of a refinery, comes from a little thing the size of a faucet to great big smoke stacks can be emitting something into the air. So what we want them to do is take that site and reduce their emissions down to the standard that is required by the EPA. And so we’re going to let them, so long as their site reduces emissions and meets the goals set up by the Clean Air Act—not every individual place that emits will have to have a permit, but just one permit to cover the whole site. And then as the site reduces emissions, it all falls under one permit, and it’s called a flex permit. So it allows the refinery to go in, fix this first and then fix this second and this third and this fourth; and find the big bad ones first and fix those, and then work down to fix the plant.

And by the way, there is a recent letter from the EPA saying that Texas has met and exceeded the standards under this flex permitting.

But then along comes greenhouse gasses, and they passed the rule about carbon emissions. And they say, Now you have to put that under your permitting system.

And the other 13 States plus Texas were kind of taken aback by this. But Texas said, No way. We don’t think you should be imposing carbon emission standards on us when the Congress refused to impose these standards. And they, as I understand it, started contesting this in the court.

So here’s where the rub comes in. The EPA then announces to Texas, We don’t approve your flexible permitting system, the refinery industry in your State is now out of compliance, and you are going to have to have a new permitting system, and we’re taking over how that’s going to work—even though the act says Texas, or any State, shall be people who administer there. Now, you may say, Well, that’s not too bad. There’s a kicker here. Texas created this permitting system in 1994, and at that time, they have been asking EPA to tell them yes or no. Do you approve it or do you approve it? And tentatively, they sort of said, Well, we’ll approve it, but we’re going to study it and look at it. Five years ago, this flexible permitting system has been in place.

And now as the disprove of carbon emissions comes along, to batter Texas into compliance, they have depermitted the whole State. They’ve announced they depermitted the whole State. Now, the State went to court and at least got a stay on that temporarily. But think about that. If you had something that you were doing that the government said, Now we’ll have to approve that to do it, and you say, Fine, here’s what we’re doing; would you please approve it or disapprove it, and they waited 15 years to do it, and then when they did they’re disapproving it they say, Oh, by the way, we plan to go back and fine you for the last 15 years for carbon emissions—that’s what I understand it’s going to be—something is wrong with this picture.

I’m joined by my good friend and fellow judge, LOUIE GOHMERT from Texas, and I’d like to hear his take on this. And if I got anything wrong, he can tell me about it.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. I appreciate your yielding.

And not only do you not have anything wrong, but the Clean Air Act that the EPA is supposedly acting under, but they’re actually violating, and this rule that the EPA now controls is “the primary responsibility of States and local government.”

While the national EPA office is supposed to set the overall priorities, States are supposed to have, under this bill that they are supposedly acting under, the States have considerable leeway in their “implementation plans.” That’s what the States are supposed to do. And for all these years, when the EPA all of a sudden changes their instructions, States are normally given three years. Because what we’re talking about is when the EPA says now shut down, you are talking about jobs. And I realize this is all part of the President’s war on jobs. And it’s working well. First, the moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico has really decimated Louisiana and many of the Gulf States as he has declared this war on jobs and eliminated many jobs there in the Gulf region. But what is happening here, as you freeze out refineries, as you declare war on drilling and activity in the Gulf of Mexico, we are now starting to see that effect on everybody else.

And it’s one thing to stand up and say, and I am sure we’ll hear tomorrow night about how the President cares so much about the working poor in America, and that’s who he’s out for. But the trouble is, don’t watch what’s said, watch what’s done. And as we watch the price of gasoline continue to go up, and up, and up, the people that are most devastated by that are not the massive companies that can pass these costs on, they’re the people that are trying to get to those jobs that have lost jobs left. So those that hadn’t already lost their jobs are going to have to deal with this problem.

The EPA, the regulation chief, Gina McCarthy, just a couple of weeks ago testified that they had no choice but to seize control of the permitting. I mean this is the Federal Government just deciding that even though the bill under which she is acting says the States and local government have primary control, she’s decided to seize control. This is the Federal Government at its worst, at its most dictatorial, doing what democracy says you will all do, that they couldn’t pass the bill, and now they’re coming on and doing this with a totalitarian dictatorship.

Now, might as well put “czar” beside Gina McCarthy’s name. She’s the last czar. Just hadn’t called her that because the name’s become unpopular. But now she has seized control of the State and local permitting under the act. She noted “statements in the media” by Texas officials and their legal challenges to EPA’s greenhouse gases, but she cited no legal basis for the takeover. And what’s more just really offensive is the fact that what in essence they’re saying is in 1992, according to this Wall Street Journal article, in 1992, before there was ever any regulation of carbon dioxide, carbon emission, and unfortu- nately Gina McCarthy, as she says anything, she’s a pollutant, she’s a polluter, we need to shut down polluters like folks that are breathing out carbon dioxide. You know, it used to be a joke, Judge, that the government has gotten so overreaching that the next thing they’re going to regulate the air you breathe. And now we’re here. And that’s what’s happening.

In 1992 there were no carbon dioxide concerns. And now they’re using the fact that in 1992 Texas was not regulating carbon dioxide as a reason to take over what the Clean Air Act says must be done by the States and local governments. So it’s pretty ridiculous. The Wall Street Journal says these words: “The takeover was sufficiently egregious that the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals issued an emergency stay on Thursday suspending the rules pending judicial review. One of the key reasons in need of legal scrutiny is the permitting takeover as an interim final rule that is not open to the normal and Clean Air Act-mandated process of public notice and comment.” As the article says, so much for transparency in government.

But I guess when you declare a war on jobs, you declare a moratorium on drilling activity, you devastate the hardworking folks in America that are trying to produce energy, and what didn’t kill them then you turn right around and take over control of State environmental responsibilities so that you can finish going through with your war on jobs.

Mr. CARTER. And you know, this flex permit’s whole purpose was to use common sense and meet the environmental standards without shutting down facilities and losing jobs. That’s why they came up with the flex permit. It allowed them, if they met the standards for the repairs and fixes in integral parts and not stop until the whole thing is in compliance and have a permit for every faucet in the building...
that needs to be adjusted or fixed. But rather let them fix the problem as it goes along.

And we are the model for meeting the air quality act, the model. I mean most States aren't in as good of compliance as this Texas under the flex permit system. And yet exactly as my colleague has pointed out, because of this carbon emissions dictatorship and because they're saying you will do as I say or else, the position that's being taken from the EPA that the States are sort of the kind of people that just bow up when people say that like that, so we said “no,” and we are in this fight. And I think we are in the fight to win. Because I think anybody would say it would be totally unfair for EPA to sit and ponder their duty to approve a plan and spend 15 years looking at it and not do anything with it, and it's meeting its standards, and all of a sudden, bingo, because of this they're taking over our permitting.

I am going to be joined by a gentleman that is probably the most knowledgeable man in Congress about the workings of this particular act. Mr. JOE BARTON, former chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a leader of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and now our Texas expert on all things energy and all things environmental. Mr. BARTON, I yield you so much time as you choose to use.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Thank you, Congressman CARTER. And I want to thank you and Congressman GOHMERT and some of the other Texans who may have been here before I got here. I have been at a Young Guns dinner, which is why I'm late. But I did not want to fail to take advantage of this opportunity. I want to thank you for hosting this Special Order.

I want to kind of set the predicate here in terms of those kind words that Judge CARTER just said about me. I have been in the Congress 26 years. I have been on the Energy and Commerce Committee 24 years. I have been a congressional observer or delegate at all large to all the major global warming climate change conferences, or COPs, council of parties. I was at Kyoto when Vice President Gore came over and made his famous speech, and then on behalf of President Clinton agreed to sign the Kyoto Accord, which the U.S. Senate never took up.

Mr. GOHMERT took it was a part of the congressional delegation that then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI took to Copenhagen last year, where President Obama came and pleaded that there be a conference agreement, which then Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton agreed to fund with dollars that the U.S. Government didn't have. So I was at Buenos Aires. I mean I have been to all the major conferences as a congressional observer or delegate.

I chaired dozens of hearings on global warming, authored bills, was an original cosponsor and passed the—I helped to vote for and support the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990. So I have been involved in this issue for a number of years. Let me say this: CO₂ is not a pollutant under the criteria as put forward by the Clean Air Act. It's not one of the named criteria pollutants like SO₂ or ozone. It is necessary for life as we know it.

The term “greenhouse gas,” if you just think what a greenhouse is, self-enclosed, in this case the world, and the greenhouse gases are what create the atmosphere and help trap the heat so that life can exist. CO₂ is a trace gas, it's about ¼ of 1 percent of the atmosphere. Man-made CO₂, called anthropogenic CO₂ is, I don't know the exact percentage of the total, but it is less than 50 percent.

So what has happened in the last 10 to 15 years is this theory of global warming and climate change needed a bogeyman, and they chose CO₂. They have developed these models that show as CO₂ levels rise in the atmosphere over time the temperature rises.

It is a fact that CO₂ is rising, but it is not necessarily a fact that that rise is causing temperature rise. In fact, there is quite a bit of data that would indicate that CO₂ rises as a consequence of temperature rising, so it is a follower, not a leader in that.

So in any event, this administration, the Obama administration, when they came into office in January of 2009, began a process, or accelerated a process, to determine that CO₂ was a danger to the atmosphere or a danger to the health of the U.S. population. And they, within 90 days, issued an endangerment finding where they said that since CO₂ was a danger to public health, they had the right to regulate CO₂, and they began to promulgate these proposed regulations.

What does that have to do with the Special Order this evening? The Environmental Protection Agency has made a decision—and I think a political decision—to be punitive towards Texas and has gone down, and I am sure Judge CARTER and Judge GOHMERT have pointed out that they have revoked over 100 existing air-quality permits, some of which have been on the books since the 1990s, for sites and facilities in Texas.

Those permits are for more than CO₂. They are not, they are required by the Clean Air Act to regulate SO₂ and NOₓ and ozone, things of this sort. They revoked all of those. The EPA has also issued, I don't know the right word, Judge, threats, warnings to the State of Texas that Texas must begin to implement some of these proposed regulations on CO₂. In both cases, I think the EPA is acting without the law being on their side; and in the case of the CO₂ regulations, I am very confident they are acting without the law being on their side. So what those of us who represent Texas here in the Congress, in conjunction with our Governor, Lieutenant Governor, the Texas House, the Texas Senate and the Attorney General of Texas, are saying is before we go any further, let's see what the real facts are. Let's see, has Texas, as a regulatory entity, through the Texas Council of Environmental Quality, TCEQ, failed in its obligation under the Clean Air Act to, to implement the terms of that act?

I think the answer is Texas has not failed. I think the answer is, if you look at the record, air quality and the criteria pollutants that are specifically regulated by the Clean Air Act is improving in Texas. We have two or three or four, I guess we have, the EPA have, the TCEQ, has non-attainment areas. El Paso is a non-attainment area. Houston-Harris County is a non-attainment area and Beaumont-Port Arthur, I believe, are still listed as a not. So we have four areas that have been non-attainment under the specific criteria of the Clean Air Act.

In all of those, the State of Texas has submitted what are called state implementation plans, SIPs, and those have been accepted, I think with one exception by the EPA, both regionally and nationally. Under those SIPs, and that is important, and if the EPA were not to keep changing the standard, we would be in attainment in all four regions. But each time we have gotten close, in the DFW area, for example, to be in attainment, they have tightened or changed the standard and said that we were in noncompliance.

So what we are doing this evening under Judge CARTER and Judge GOHMERT's leadership is saying let's begin to have a debate about what the facts are. The first fact that everybody watching this and listening on the floor needs to know is air quality in Texas is improving. The TCEQ, Texas legislature, has done an outstanding job in implementing the terms and conditions which we have passed here in Washington.

Number two, the State of Texas, working with industry, has adopted a flexible permitting program where we work with industry and say here is the standard you need to meet. Here are the various ways you can meet it; let's work together.

And that's worked very well. Compliance costs in Texas are below the national average. Industry seems that. Industry is coming to Texas. People are moving to Texas for its quality of life. I am sure you all pointed out that Texas has led the Nation in job creation. Texas has led the Nation as one of the leading States in terms of population increase. Now, you cannot be doing all those good things and then be derelict in air quality if, in fact, air quality is improving and water quality is improving.

So what I want a dialogue on what the facts are, both on the criteria pollutants under the Clean Air Act and on CO₂, which is a greenhouse gas. And I would hope, Congressman, that we do
Mr. BARTON of Texas. About two-thirds.

Mr. CARTER. Two-thirds. Two-thirds of the refining capacity is in Texas. And all of a sudden as this dispute between EPA and Texas rises its ugly head, it's talking over this permitting, and industry itself is saying, look, we just want to know what to do. We are at a loss of what to do. And we are willing to work. Industry is saying to them, tell us what the new permit is. Tell us how to do this. What's going to happen? And there's a lawsuit pending, and all this stuff. Now the speculators, I think, are starting to say, oh, the price may be going up again. You tell me. Has the price of gasoline gone up in the last 3 months? Does it look like it's going to continue? I'm not saying this is the cause, but I think I can argue it's one of them.

What Texas does with industry is the perfect example of government and industry working to fix a problem together. That's what we thought we were going to get from the Obama administration when he started out. Instead, we have government working against itself in its administration, and because of that we start to see it at every level. And by the way, if you think it's just in this particular area, just a little fact: Last year, the Federal Government issued a total of 3,316 new regulations, an average of 13 rules a day. Seventy-eight of the new rules last year were major rules. A major rule is a rule that will result in an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more, a major increase in cost or prices for consumers, or significant adverse effect to the economy. And we had, just last year, 78 of those rules, plus an additional 3,000-plus more rules that were passed.

And I bring this all up, and I will yield to my friend in just a moment, because I want to talk about one of the solutions that we are looking at. It's a little known thing that is now coming to the forefront. It's called the Congressional Review Act. Back in 1996 under the Contract with America, Advancement Act of 1996, as part of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act, they created the Congressional Review Act, this is Public Policy Law PL 104–121. It allows the Congress to review and vote to increase the energy efficiency issued by the government agencies and by passage of a joint resolution overrule that regulation. The process is the Federal agencies shall—not that word, that means they have to, although I don't think they allies—and report to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General a comprehensive report on any major proposed rule. Congress has 60—that's legislative—the Senate must vote on the CRA before the year's disapproval if 30 Members of the Senate approve having a vote. Only 30 Members are necessary to have a vote in the Senate.

So this is a tool where we can, in our small way, be a part of this fight on behalf of Texas. And we will be following this procedure that is set out in this act, and we will be attempting to have, and will have, a vote on this House rule. And when people hear the "taint fair" factor in this particular rule, it's going to be a strong vote.

And I yield the time to Mr. GOEMER. That he wishes to take.

Mr. GOEMER. Well, my friend indicates it's unfair for Texas. But as former chairman of Energy, Mr. Barton, notes, with about two-thirds of the refining capacity for the whole country being in Texas, what this means is regardless of how anybody feels about Texas, I know there are a lot of people that don't care for the State, but regardless of how people feel about it, when two-thirds of the refining for the gasoline they put in their cars is coming from the State of Texas, and the EPA has declared war against Texas, violating the laws of this land in order to politically stick it to Texas, the price that will be paid is by rank and file folks across the country. And, as I have seen, manufacturers—I had colleagues across talking about jobs, jobs—the things that this administration are doing are killing jobs. They were going to create all these jobs and create all these jobs, and then they did such a terrible job of creating jobs, in fact, we were going in the wrong direction. So then they went to talking about jobs, jobs—the things that this administration are doing are killing jobs. They were going to create all these jobs and create all these jobs, and they had this terrible job of creating jobs. We’ve got a war declared on those who make their living in the gulf coast area, a drilling moratorium. People are still not able to drill, and that has affected so many jobs. But when the price of gasoline continues to go shooting up because this administration is doing everything they can to stifle the energy and make it harder for people to get cheaper gasoline, people are going to make their voices heard. And what I don’t think the administration understands is the timing of all this is going to be such that it's going to be coming around next year, in fact, we were going to adversely affecting people's pocketbooks and jobs. Employers can't count on the price of fuel being where they need it, and a lot of businesses are saying, this is something we can't do business with, the EPA and the uncertainty of the requirements.

And what it reminds me too, is in our Natural Resources Committee with
the Democrats in control they were always able to bring more witnesses. That’s just the way procedure works around here. Whichever party is in the majority, they get to bring more witnesses that will say what their position is. They brought a witness to the Natural Resources, Energy, and Environment Committee hearing that, gee, we really need to stop drilling off the coast and basically everywhere. But he said there were over 200 million families in the world that make their living from fishing; and if we allow drilling off the coast to continue, it’s going to kill off fishing for all those 200 million families. Well at my turn, I pointed out, you’ll be glad to know that we heard those things in Texas, I did growing up, that if you allow platforms off our coast, then it’s just going to kill off all the fishing off the coast of Texas and in the gulf. It turns out, I told the witness, he would be glad to know, that those platforms become an artificial reef. Fish proliferate around those areas. So if you allow platforms off our coast, they take you out to platforms because it’s done so much good for fishing. And I said, as far as you’re concerned about the oil that was leaked after Katrina, not one barrel came from any of those platforms, some of which were totaled. They came from onshore tanks which really were the place where tankers bringing oil from overseas came in and unloaded it. Some of that was hit by the hurricane and leaked. And he said, well, you are in a separate category, what he said, I guess the real problem is this: If you produce oil or gas onshore, offshore, wherever it is, at some point it’s going to be burned, and it may be it’s in an engine, wherever, that produces carbon, the carbon goes in the air, and eventually the rain brings it down either into the ocean or on the land, and it’s washed into the ocean. That puts more carbon in the ocean, and as you have more carbon in the ocean, eventually the pH increases, and eventually you keep doing that long enough, the pH will increase enough, everything dies in all the oceans, and so that’s when people can’t fish. That’s what this administration is basing all of their opposition to drilling and production of fossil fuels on.

We all agree we ought to be moving off of fossil fuels, but it we would literally be drilling on Federal offshore areas, Federal onshore areas and designate a percentage of the proceeds of our Federal royalty to go toward development of alternative fuel, we don’t run the jobs off, we don’t run the poor folks that are just working on it in that area. As we fight the fight for our national security, it’s not just an oil and gas issue. It’s about improving. The Clean Air Act gives the Federal Government, through the Environmental Protection Agency, the right to preempt States when the States either don’t implement the Federal regulations on the Clean Air Act, or if the States simply turn it back and ask the Federal Government to take over. So the EPA does have the right under certain circumstances to preempt State implementation.

But in this case, I would postulate, and each of you are former judges before you became Congressmen, that since the State of Texas has complied and there is a debate about whether CO₂ should be regulated under the Clean Air Act, which is a separate issue, that the Federal Government has overstepped its bounds to come in and unilaterally, against the wishes of the State of Texas, repeal these permits and require that they all be resubmitted and not only resubmitted, but resubmitted in a very specific way.

The State of Texas air quality permitting program, I think has been flexible, says we will regulate an entire site, and as long as you are under that cap, you can implement new equipment and new procedures as long as your emissions stay the same or go down. And under that Texas program, Not the big monstrous refineries, the little bitty mom-and-pops. Some of those mom-and-pops are a chain of mom-and-pop stores that are all over the State and soon to be all over the country. They are small businesses to come and prosper. Not the big monstrous refineries, the little bitty mom-and-pops. Some of those mom-and-pops are a chain of mom-and-pop stores that are all over the State and soon to be all over the country. They are small businesses to come and prosper. Not the big monstrous refineries, the little bitty mom-and-pops. Some of those mom-and-pops are a chain of mom-and-pop stores that are all over the State and soon to be all over the country. They are small businesses to come and prosper.

The State of Texas air quality permitting program has been flexible, says we will regulate an entire site, and as long as you are under that cap, you can implement new equipment and new procedures as long as your emissions stay the same or go down. And under that Texas program, Not the big monstrous refineries, the little bitty mom-and-pops. Some of those mom-and-pops are a chain of mom-and-pop stores that are all over the State and soon to be all over the country. They are small businesses to come and prosper. Not the big monstrous refineries, the little bitty mom-and-pops. Some of those mom-and-pops are a chain of mom-and-pop stores that are all over the State and soon to be all over the country. They are small businesses to come and prosper.

I really respect and thank you, Congressman CARTER, for holding this Special Order. I will tell our friends in Texas that may be watching that this Special Order is not the end; it is simply the beginning.

Mr. CARTER. That’s right.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Those of us who support this initiative support it because we believe you can have improving air quality and improving water quality and increase jobs and economic output. It is not an either-or. It can be a win/win. But if we adopt the EPA’s shortsighted, mandatory, very specific command-and-control attitude, you are, as Congressman GOHMIERT said, you are going to destroy jobs, destroy the economy, reduce output, and not get very much increased environmental quality now.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I believe the Governor pointed out that of the million new jobs created in America in the last 5 years, 3 years, something like that, 850,000 of them were created in Texas. We are a dynamic economy; and we are a dynamic economy because we have had the foresight of all working together to make jobs, to improve the environment by using logical, commonsense methods of doing this thing. Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman would yield, common sense, we are beginning the redistributing process now, and the State of Texas is going to gain four additional congressional seats which means our population between 2000 and 2010 has increased approximately 3 million people. My question to you: Would people be coming to Texas if the quality of life was deteriorating, environmental quality was decreasing, or would they be coming to Texas because it is a better place to live and it has economic opportunity?

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, that is exactly what is going on. Mr. BARTON. They are all indications. You can stop your new neighbors and ask them why they came, and they will tell you because Texas is where things are happening. It is where you have a tax structure where we can prosper in business, and yet it is a fair tax structure. You are doing things right so that rather than throwing up roadblocks to new businesses, you are throwing up enhancements to make it easier for new businesses to come in and prosper. Not the big monstrous refineries, the little bitty mom-and-pops. Some of those mom-and-pops are a chain of mom-and-pop stores that are all over the State and soon to be all over the country. They are small businesses to come and prosper.
fight. This is going to affect power plants around the country that are operating under natural gas, coal, oil, any kind of hydrocarbon. This is just the tip of the iceberg of what is going to happen in this arbitrary decision by the rule of the Congress and the American people.

We have had 2 years of doing things against the desired will of the American people, and the American people spoke in the last election. It is time for us to make commonsense decisions and do what makes sense. It makes no sense to let people operate under a system that works for 15 years and then come in and say implement this immediately. We are not giving you 3 years to implement it. You will do it now. And when we said, no, wait a minute, let's play by the rules, they say, Fine. We never did get around to giving you the official letter approving your flex permit system, so here is your official letter. It is denied. Because you are not doing anything about it, we are going to come in and take over your permitting system.

I don't think the average American thinks that is the way anybody ought to operate. It is not the way that I think anybody ought to operate. I would be surprised if it is not the way that a majority of the people in this House think these agencies ought to operate.

You know, we always hear the idiot, crazy things and they come out in the newspaper and you will see some of them. But just to let you know it is not just in this industry where new regulations are going to be going strange; there is a proposed regulation that is going to be affecting Texas for sure and a whole lot of other States in this union; they want to regulate dust.

So, if you've got a dusty road, driving up to your ranch house or to your personal house, they want to come in and regulate the dust that kicks up in the summertime, when it's hot, behind your car.

The solution they came up with for this in California—California, the place where they have the drought in the Central Valley, a shortage of water—is to water down your road every day. Take the water you need for the plants and for people, and squirt it on the road to keep dust from going up in the air.

Like Mr. GOHMERT said, we used to laugh and say, someday, the government is going to regulate the air we breathe and the food we eat. Lo and behold, EPA against the Texas, for right now.

So this is just the beginning. As Joe said, this is just the beginning of bringing this to the attention of the American people—this regulation, what they're doing to Texas—and of standing up for the Texas who are standing up for our State's compliance record and standing up for our State's ability to create an environment where people can have a job and where they can pay their own way—and good industry jobs. We're standing up for those people. We're making sure that we don't lose those great jobs in Texas because of this regulatory agency.

This is only the beginning of the fight. The line is going to come. We're going to fight, not only this regulation, but many, many more. We will be bringing them up to let the American people see that the regulators can be dictators.

I just want to correct one thing Mr. GOHMERT said. We're no longer having a moratorium on drilling. I was told today by one of my constituents that we're having a permanentum. They said, Oh, yes. Where the moratorium's lifted, you just have to get a permit.

So far, there haven't been any permits.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I just want to make one nonscientific comment. I flew this morning from DFW Airport up to Reagan Airport to attend this session of Congress. The DFW area is home to approximately 3 million people, hundreds of power plants, lots of industry, electronics, general aviation, defense. I flew into Washington, which has almost no industry. The air was clear at DFW. When I came into Reagan, I looked out the window, and I thought, man, I mean, I don't want to be disrespectful to our international friends over in Poland, but it did remind me of the last time, which was several years ago, I flew into Warsaw, and the air was so thick you could see it. I don't know what the issue is here in the Washington region today, but when we flew into Reagan, it was noticeably hazier and browner flying in than it was when I left DFW, where the air was absolutely crystal clear.

Now, that's nonscientific, but I would invite anybody who we've got an air quality problem in Texas to go to Dallas or to go to Houston. Drive out along the Houston ship channel. Go down to Corpus Christi, outside the major refineries on the gulf coast, and you'll see a lot of you won't see is air pollution that's caused by industry in Texas. Their compliance record is excellent, and they've got the facts to back it up.

Mr. CARTER, I thank you. At this time, I yield back what little time I have, and remind everybody that the stars are still big and bright deep in the heart of Texas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. EMERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material;)

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. LIPTINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPURT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material;)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today and January 26.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and January 26.
Mr. TURNER, for 5 minutes, January 26.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 44 minutes) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 25, 2011, at 10 a.m. 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:

172. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle; Additions to Quarantined Areas [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0011] received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

173. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pine Shoot Beetle; Additions to Quarantined Areas [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0072] received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

174. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle; Additions to Quarantined Areas in Massachusetts and New York [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0014] received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.


176. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Priorities For Discretionary Grant Programs [Docket ID: ED-OS-2010-0011] (RIN: 1894-A400) received January 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

177. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report for FY 2010 of the Department's Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
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:

(The following action occurred on January 3.)

Mr. BERNAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs, Legislative Review Activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the 111th Congress (Rept. 111-73). 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. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. COBB of Georgia, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 397. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care and Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 and to take meaningful steps to lower health care costs and increase access to health insurance coverage without raising taxes, cutting Medicare benefits for seniors, adding to the national deficit, intervening in the doctor-patient relationship, or instituting a government takeover of health care; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 398. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll, during active-duty service abroad in the Armed Forces, the periods of time to file a petition and appear for an interview to remove the conditional basis for permanent resident status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the House Judiciary.

H.R. 399. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 2002 to provide for a period to be subsequently determined by the Secretary, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PLAKE:

H.R. 400. A bill to require certain warning labels to be placed on video games that are given certain ratings due to violent content; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 395. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. BLumenauer):
H. R. 402. A bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and new job creation through the establishment of a National Infrastructure Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER:

H. R. 403. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense to use only human-based methods for training members of the Armed Forces in the treatment of severe combat and chemical and biological injuries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H. R. 404. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the credits for alcohol used as a fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation, and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H. R. 405. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish additional goals for airport master plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JONES:

H. R. 406. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to permit candidates for Federal office to designate an individual who will be authorized to disburse funds of the authorized campaign committees of the candidate in the event of the death of the candidate; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JONES:

H. R. 407. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to determine and disclose the costs incurred in taking a Member, officer, or employee of Congress on a trip outside the United States so that such costs may be included by the Member, officer, or employee is required to file with respect to the trip under applicable law or rules of the House or Senate or the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MACK, Mr. FLEMINING, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. BACHMANN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GINGRITY of Georgia, Mr. HURLSMANN, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado):

H. R. 408. A bill to reduce Federal spending by $2.5 trillion through fiscal year 2023; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, the Budget, Rules, Appropriations, Agriculture, House Administration, Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. LOEBACK of Iowa, Mr. BORDALLO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LATTU, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ROSS of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEMKEN, Mr. CLEAVRE, Mr. COURTY, and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H. R. 409. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a plan to provide chiropractic health care services and benefits for certain new beneficiaries as part of the TRICARE program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FAIR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRISOLAY, and Mr. SHEIKMAN):

H. R. 410. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for compensation to States incarcerating undocumented aliens charged with a felony or two or more misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. AUSTIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BILHAY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BRACKEN, Mr. BORRNER, Mr. BOUTSFANY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. CAPTIN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COHLE, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DÍAZ-BALART, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLEMINING, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GARTNETT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GINGRITY of Georgia, Mr. GORMHAYRT, Mr. GOOD-LATTE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HALL, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HESSARLING, Mr. HERBERGER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINCH, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LÁTOURETTE, Mr. LATTU, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUCKSKEMAYER, Mr. MANZUOLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. McCaul, Mr. MCCINNICK, Mr. McKEON, Mr. MICA, Mr. GAYGAY of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUBAUER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FENNE, Mr. FITTS, Mr. FLATTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICK of Georgia, Mr. RIBBERG, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mrs. SCHMIT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. STEARNs, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. J. Res. 22. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the United States from owning stock in corporations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LOEBACK, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa):

H. Res. 49. A resolution providing Capitol-flown flags for recipients of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H. Res. 50. A resolution providing for enclosing the visitors’ galleries of the House of Representatives with a clear and bomb-proof wall; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. MERKS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WATERS, Mr. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BORDALLO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JEFFCOE of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HINCHRY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. NORTON, Mr. GRISOLAY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BUTTFIELD, Mr. BERMER, Mr. CLARKE of New York, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H. Res. 51. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following bills and resolutions are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GINGRITY of Georgia:

H. R. 5. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, as health care-related lawsuits are activities that affect interstate commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H. R. 394. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, and Section 1 of Article III of the Constitution.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H. R. 395. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. R. 396. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. HERGER:

H. R. 397. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.
and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act, which include several specific provisions that exceed the powers granted to Congress by the Constitution, illegal. Repeal of these laws is consistent with the Tenth Amendment, which reserves to the States and to the people those powers that are not delegated to the United States by the Constitution.

Division A (Sections 101 and 111), Title IV of Division B, and Division F are enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, which grants Congress the power to collect taxes to pay debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Division B (except Title IV), Division C, Division E, and Division G are enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which grants Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce.

Division D removes the federal government from the doctor-patient relationship consistent with the rights and powers reserved to the states and the people under the Ninth and Tenth Amendments.

Division E (Section 601) protects the right of the people to free exercise of religion under the First Amendment, and the right of the people to equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H.R. 399. Cooper has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 399. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8 include the power to “establish uniform Rule of Naturalization,” which has been interpreted to also include regulation of immigration.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 400. Cooper has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 401. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 2 of Section 5 of Article I of the Constitution, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 402. Cooper has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 403. Cooper has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 1, 14, and 16), which grant Congress the power to provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States; to make rules for the Government and the Regulation of the land and naval Forces; and to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. PORTENBERRY:

H.R. 404. Cooper has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 405. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
H.R. 1: Mr. Municipal Corporation, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution; Congress shall have power to Regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

GRAVES 003 seeks to add an additional goal for Airport Master Plans under Section 47101 of Title 49, United States Code.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 406. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 407. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

H.R. 409. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The power of Congress to make rules to provide for the common defense, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 410. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 411. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The power of Congress to make rules to provide for the common defense, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, subsection 4 and Amendment XIV.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.J. Res. 22. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article V of the United States Constitution, Constitutional Amendments.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. Amash, Mr. Corley, Mr. Gosar, Mr. Griffith of Virginia, Mr. Mack, Mr. Petri, Mr. Rivera, Mrs. Roby, Mr. Ross of Florida, Mr. Smith of Nebraska, Mr. Walberg, and Mr. Walden.

H.R. 4: Ms. Sewell and Mr. Owens.

H.R. 21: Mr. Grimm.

H.R. 136: Ms. Kelly and Mr. Kiehne.

H.R. 17: Mr. Huebert, Mr. Binkley, and Mr. Kline.

H.R. 8: Mr. Rehberg.

H.R. 96: Mr. Thomson and Mr. Posey.

H.R. 97: Mr. Bucshon, Mr. Tiberi, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Griffith of Virginia, Mr. Graves of Georgia, Mrs. Bachmann, and Mrs. Miller of Michigan.

H.R. 104: Mr. Huizenga of Michigan and Mr. Higgins.

H.R. 121: Mr. Young of Florida, Mr. Biele, Mr. Conaway, and Mr. Posey.

H.R. 127: Mr. Crawford.

H.R. 136: Mr. Grimm.

H.R. 152: Mrs. Myrick.

H.R. 153: Mr. Chaffetz, Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Rieber, and Mrs. Bachmann.

H.R. 154: Mr. Bucshon.

H.R. 158: Mr. Merhau, Mr. Filner, and Mr. Writeman.

H.R. 205: Mr. Young of Alaska and Mr. Cole.

H.R. 234: Mr. Fleming, Mr. Nunnlecker, and Mr. Duncan of Tennessee.

H.R. 260: Mr. Young of Florida and Mr. Cravack.

H.R. 263: Mr. Kucinich, Mr. Stark, and Mr. Grijalva.

H.R. 264: Mr. Cohen.

H.R. 266: Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas.

H.R. 287: Mr. Filner, Ms. Woolsey, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Schiff.

H.R. 287: Mr. Walberg and Mr. Turner.

H.R. 308: Mr. Gutiérrez, Mr. Sires, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Markley, and Mr. Filner.

H.R. 330: Mr. Grijalva.

H.R. 333: Mr. Platts, Mr. Turner, Mr. Costello, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Sires, and Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California.

H.R. 338: Mr. Walberg, Mr. Rogers of Alabama, Mr. Young of Florida, Mr. Casy, Mr. Luetkemeyer, and Mr. Nunnlecker.

H.R. 359: Mr. Olson, Mr. Lucas, Mr. Paul, Mr. Nunnlecker, Mrs. Ellmers, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Miller of Michigan, Mr. Chaffetz, Mr. Lattea, Mr. Hanna, and Mr. Luetkemeyer.

H.R. 363: Mr. Cicilline and Ms. Hirono.

H.R. 371: Mr. Hensarling and Mr. Gibbs.

H.R. 384: Mr. Carnahan, Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California, and Ms. McCollum.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. Klink and Mr. Ross of Arkansas.

H.Con. Res. 9: Mr. Young of Florida.


H.Res. 20: Mr. Polis.

H.Res. 35: Ms. Fudge, Mr. Butterfield, and Mr. Clarke of Michigan.

H.Res. 36: Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California, Ms. Fudge, and Mr. Richmond.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. DANIEL E. LUNGREN OF CALIFORNIA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on House Administration in H.Res. 239 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of Rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. DANIEL E. LUNGREN OF CALIFORNIA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on House Administration in H.Res. 49, the “Staff Sergeant Salvatore A. Giunta Medal of Honor Flag Resolution”, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of Rule XXI.
PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

1. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Miami, Florida, relative to Resolution R-10-0567 urging the members of Congress to introduce legislation opposing cultural exchanges between Cuba and the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 359
Offered By: Mr. Peters
AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 2, line 23, strike “Treasury.” and insert “Treasury, to be used only for reducing the deficit.”.

H. RES. 38
Offered By: Mr. Jordan
AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike: “for the remainder of fiscal year 2011 that assumes non-security spending at fiscal year 2008 levels or less.”
Add: “that provides a total non-security fiscal year 2011 allocation that is at least $100 billion less than provided for in House Report 111–565.”
REPEALING THE JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW ACT

SPEECH OF
HON. TIM HUELSKAMP
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 2011

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, since the misleadingly-named “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act” was signed into law last year, Americans have uncovered more reasons to oppose it. For all the talk of “reform” that accompanied its passage, the law will actually entrench the worst aspects of our broken system, driving out-of-control costs even higher and taking health care out of the patient’s hands and giving control to the government.

Contrary to what they were told, taxpayers have learned that the true cost of the law is closer to $2.6 trillion over the next 10 years, and will add more than $700 billion to the deficit. Accounting gimmicks that included scoring the bill using 10 years of revenue but only 6 years of new spending and double-counting of Social Security payroll taxes, CLASS Act premiums, and Medicare cuts made it seem like this program would land the country in the black, but will only result in more red ink.

As a result of this law, employers across America have discovered that onerous reporting requirements will force them to file 1099 forms for every vendor with which they do $600 worth of business. An accountant in my district just told me that he will have to expand his staff by 25 percent to accommodate all of his extra paperwork. This is not the type of job creation America envisioned.

Furthermore, when employer costs of insuring employees goes up, Americans will lose their private insurance plans, and will be forced to go on to government plans. This will also add to the deficit. Additionally, businesses and labor unions alike have realized that Obamacare is a bad deal, and at least 222 have sought waivers from having to comply with the law. HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius has approved special privilege exemptions for dozens of labor unions and the American Medical Association.

Mr. Speaker, since the misleadingly-named “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act” was signed into law last year, Americans have uncovered more reasons to oppose it. For all the talk of “reform” that accompanied its passage, the law will actually instill a love for reading in the children of Chicago’s Independence Park neighborhood, and inspired a life of service in all of her colleagues.

Ms. Dunne began her career with impressive educational merit. She has Masters degrees in English, Special Education, and Library and Information Science. With this background, Margaret joined the Independence Park branch of the Chicago Public Library, where she would spend her entire career as the Children’s Librarian.

Throughout her career, Margaret has worked to reach as many children as possible through visits to classrooms, parks, and daycare centers. She has also been instrumental in programming the Chicago Public Library’s Summer Reading Program, which encourages children to continue reading during their summer vacations. Her exciting summer reading themes have delighted and inspired children, consistently making the Independence Park Library’s Summer Reading Program one of the most successful in Chicago.

Judge Bradley has continually given of his time and service to the people of this area, especially to its youth. Judge Bradley’s non-profit organization, the Pro Players Education Foundation, has provided over $1,000,000 in scholarships and grants to the teachers and students in Carroll ISD.

Judge Bradley also founded Northeast Tarrant County’s first Teen Court, allowing high school students to be tried in a court and jury of their peers, encouraging a better understanding of the judicial system. Judge Bradley’s non-profit, the Pro Players Foundation, benefits disadvantaged children.

Today, Judge Bradley receives the Lifetime Community Service Award presented by Southlake Style Magazine in recognition of his exemplary contributions to the city of Southlake. It is my great privilege to recognize Judge Brad Bradley for the generosity and commitment he has shown to the people of Southlake and surrounding areas.

HONORING MARGARET DUNNE

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the long and distinguished career of Margaret Dunne. For over 25 years, she has instilled a love for reading in the children of Chicago’s Independence Park neighborhood, and inspired a life of service in all of her colleagues.

Ms. Dunne began her career with impressive educational merit. She has Masters degrees in English, Special Education, and Library and Information Science. With this background, Margaret joined the Independence Park branch of the Chicago Public Library, where she would spend her entire career as the Children’s Librarian.

Throughout her career, Margaret has worked to reach as many children as possible through visits to classrooms, parks, and daycare centers. She has also been instrumental in programming the Chicago Public Library’s Summer Reading Program, which encourages children to continue reading during their summer vacations. Her exciting summer reading themes have delighted and inspired children, consistently making the Independence Park Library’s Summer Reading Program one of the most successful in Chicago.

HONORING JUDGE BRAD BRADLEY AND HIS 25 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, the Honorable Brad Bradley. For more than 25 years, Judge Bradley has made innumerable professional and philanthropic contributions to the people and communities of Northeast Tarrant County.

Judge Bradley has continually given of his time and service to the people of this area, especially to its youth. Judge Bradley’s non-profit organization, the Pro Players Foundation, has provided over $1,000,000 in scholarships and grants to the teachers and students in Carroll ISD.

Judge Bradley also founded Northeast Tarrant County’s first Teen Court, allowing high school students to be tried in a court and jury of their peers, encouraging a better understanding of the judicial system. Judge Bradley’s non-profit, the Pro Players Foundation, benefits disadvantaged children.

Today, Judge Bradley receives the Lifetime Community Service Award presented by Southlake Style Magazine in recognition of his exemplary contributions to the city of Southlake. It is my great privilege to recognize Judge Brad Bradley for the generosity and commitment he has shown to the people of Southlake and surrounding areas.

INSTRUCTING CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO REPORT LEGISLATION REPLACING THE JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW

SPEECH OF
HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 2011

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the long and distinguished career of Margaret Dunne. For over 25 years, she has instilled a love for reading in the children of Margaret Dunne. For over 25 years, she has instilled a love for reading in the children of
Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the members of the Vintondale Veterans of Foreign Wars post, the needle arts club of the Nanty Glo Senior Center, and the In-Stitches Sewing Club of the SS. Gregory and Barnabas Roman Catholic Church for their concerted effort to comfort our wounded troops and their families.

Together, these groups recently provided 100 handcrafted blankets to wounded service members at Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda right before the holiday season.

Organized by Joseph Gresko and Charles Sago, two members of Post 5211 VFW, the project was part of a tradition in helping veterans and active duty service members. Mr. Gresko and Mr. Sago requested the assistance of women in the community to knit these comforting gifts for our brave men and women. Marge Younkin, and her fellow members of the needle arts club at the Nanty Glo Senior Center, and Eleanor Chromy, and her fellow members of the In-Stitches Sewing Club of the SS. Gregory and Barnabas Catholic Church, answered the call. With a donation from the church's Altar and Rosary Society and contributions of yarn from other individuals, these women set out to work.

Their efforts not only touched the lives of the service members that received the blankets, but also earned the participants recognition as “Persons of the Week” in the local newspaper, the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat, for their generosity and care. Performing this act of kindness for our brave men and women was not about receiving accolades for these individuals. As Mr. Sago has stated, these gifts are reminders that there are people these individuals never knew who truly appreciate what they have done.

Upon delivering the blankets to our wounded service members, I let them know that these gifts were a token of our appreciation for the service and sacrifice they have made, and continue to make, on behalf of a grateful nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the individuals in the Johnstown community who generously dedicated their time, talent, and heart for this worthy project.

HON. MARK S. CRITZ OF PENNSYLVANIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Resolution 9, which instructs authorizing committees to develop legislation replacing existing healthcare laws. While I applaud the majority’s intention to finally present their own comprehensive solutions to the health care crisis in this country, I note that they don’t need a resolution by the entire House to do so. Committees can develop legislation on their own at any time. Moreover, I reject the idea that the Patients Protection and Affordable Care Act must be “replaced.” The PPACA represents a century’s effort by people of all political persuasions to give people the peace of mind that comes from knowing they have access to affordable care. No law is ever perfect. Certainly, all legislation can all be improved and I welcome the opportunity to further the progress made by the 111th Congress on health care reform.

Furthermore, current law meets most, if not all, of the goals identified in today’s resolution. Since health care reform passed, the economy has grown, more than a million jobs have been created and thousands of small businesses have used the tax credits being offered to employees coverage for the first time. In order to foster competition and choice, the Department of Health and Human Services recently established a website where people can compare policies and when the exchanges launch in 2014, individuals and small businesses will select from a wide range of carriers competing for their business. Patients now have the right to choose their own primary care physician and women don’t have to ask permission to see an obstetrician. Insurance carriers cannot arbitrarily deny care and patients have a robust right to appeal when company bureaucrats over ride doctors. Children cannot be denied coverage for pre-existing conditions and soon all Americans will enjoy that protection.

When PPACA is fully implemented, 32 million people will have coverage who never had it before, millions more will be able to afford coverage more easily, and seniors will not pay so dearly for prescription drugs. All of these actions can be done while extending Medicare solvency by twelve years by reducing waste, fraud and abuse and while slashing the deficit by $1.4 trillion over the next twenty years.

The Republican plan introduced in the House last session would cover just 3 million more Americans by 2019—leaving 51 million Americans uninsured in 2019. That plan reduced the deficit by $68 billion over the next 10 years—far less than the law we passed—and offered none of the cost savings and consumer protections that make health care reform work for all Americans. I sincerely hope Republicans offer more substantial solutions this session.

Finally, one goal of today’s resolution that I must take issue with is the provision regarding abortion. Nothing in the PPACA allows for taxpayer funded abortions and I would strenuously object to any new laws that further restrict a woman’s right to choose or allow medical professionals to deny legitimate services based on their own religious beliefs. There is no reason why the healthcare options for women partaking in insurance exchanges should be any different than they are for women who can afford coverage on their own.

HON. HOMER CARRIE BROWN OF FLORIDA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, January 20, 2011

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Resolution 9, which instructs authorizing committees to develop legislation replacing existing healthcare laws. While I applaud the majority’s intention to finally present their own comprehensive solutions to the health care crisis in this country, I note that they don’t need a resolution by the entire House to do so. Committees can develop legislation on their own at any time. Moreover, I reject the idea that the Patients Protection and Affordable Care Act must be “replaced.” The PPACA represents a century’s effort by people of all political persuasions to give people the peace of mind that comes from knowing they have access to affordable care. No law is ever perfect. Certainly, all legislation can all be improved and I welcome the opportunity to further the progress made by the 111th Congress on health care reform.

Furthermore, current law meets most, if not all, of the goals identified in today’s resolution. Since health care reform passed, the economy has grown, more than a million jobs have been created and thousands of small businesses have used the tax credits being offered to employees coverage for the first time. In order to foster competition and choice, the Department of Health and Human Services recently established a website where people can compare policies and when the exchanges launch in 2014, individuals and small businesses will select from a wide range of carriers competing for their business. Patients now have the right to choose their own primary care physician and women don’t have to ask permission to see an obstetrician. Insurance carriers cannot arbitrarily deny care and patients have a robust right to appeal when company bureaucrats over ride doctors. Children cannot be denied coverage for pre-existing conditions and soon all Americans will enjoy that protection.

When PPACA is fully implemented, 32 million people will have coverage who never had it before, millions more will be able to afford coverage more easily, and seniors will not pay so dearly for prescription drugs. All of these actions can be done while extending Medicare solvency by twelve years by reducing waste, fraud and abuse and while slashing the deficit by $1.4 trillion over the next twenty years.

The Republican plan introduced in the House last session would cover just 3 million more Americans by 2019—leaving 51 million Americans uninsured in 2019. That plan reduced the deficit by $68 billion over the next 10 years—far less than the law we passed—and offered none of the cost savings and consumer protections that make health care reform work for all Americans. I sincerely hope Republicans offer more substantial solutions this session.

Finally, one goal of today’s resolution that I must take issue with is the provision regarding abortion. Nothing in the PPACA allows for taxpayer funded abortions and I would strenuously object to any new laws that further restricted a woman’s right to choose or allow medical professionals to deny legitimate services based on their own religious beliefs. There is no reason why the healthcare options for women participating in insurance exchanges should be any different than they are for women who can afford coverage on their own.

LET’S HELP ALL AMERICANS ACHIEVE THE AMERICAN DREAM OF HOMEOWNERSHIP

HON. BOB FILNER OF CALIFORNIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced the Homebuyer Tax Credit Renewal Act of 2011 (H.R. 330), which will reinstate both the $8000 first-time homebuyer credit and the $6500 long-time homebuyer credit for a period of 1 year.

According to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), 479,622 homebuyers claimed the credit in 2009. While the numbers for 2010 are not yet available, there is no doubt that the tax credit was instrumental in helping many first-time buyers achieve the American dream of homeownership by increasing down-payments and lowering monthly mortgage payments.

Homeownership is one of the best ways for working Americans to accumulate assets for retirement and to ensure neighborhoods are stable and well-maintained. Homeowners are also able to benefit from tax deductions like the mortgage interest and property tax deductions.

Homeownership also benefits children in numerous ways. Children of homeowners score better on academic tests; graduate at a higher rate, have fewer behavioral problems, and enjoy a better social environment. Living in an owned home is also a predictor of future success, as homeowners’ children earn more than renters’ children, are less likely to be on welfare, and are more likely to become homeowners themselves.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

WE MUST DEBATE ABOUT VIOLENCE IN OUR SOCIETY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH OF OHIO IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has long labored under a stigma of violence. An estimated one in four women will experience domestic violence in their lifetime. 30% of all students through grade six will experience bullying, either as victims or perpetrators. Domestic violence, spousal abuse, child abuse, violence in our schools, gang violence, racial violence and violence against those we perceive to be different than us remain prevalent.

So what should we do?

What if we had an organized approach to dealing with violence in our society? What if we treated violence as a phenomenon that could be addressed, diminished and resolved?

We have always been told that war is inevitable. That violence is inevitable. We must challenge these notions. Government has a role in creating an organized approach to addressing violence and to create structures to lessen violence and its impact on our lives.

We cannot wait for more tragic events to occur to force us to examine issues of violence here at home.

WE MUST DEBATE ABOUT VIOLENCE IN OUR SOCIETY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH OF OHIO IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has long labored under a stigma of violence. An estimated one in four women will experience domestic violence in their lifetime. 30% of all students through grade six will experience bullying, either as victims or perpetrators. Domestic violence, spousal abuse, child abuse, violence in our schools, gang violence, racial violence and violence against those we perceive to be different than us remain prevalent.

So what should we do?

What if we had an organized approach to dealing with violence in our society? What if we treated violence as a phenomenon that could be addressed, diminished and resolved?

We have always been told that war is inevitable. That violence is inevitable. We must challenge these notions. Government has a role in creating an organized approach to addressing violence and to create structures to lessen violence and its impact on our lives.

We cannot wait for more tragic events to occur to force us to examine issues of violence here at home.
There is no time like the present to begin, again, the debate about violence in our society. I intend to facilitate this debate with a proposal I will soon bring forward.

JUSTICE FOR LAULI'I
HON. BOB FILNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a private bill (H.R. 354) on behalf of a remarkable young man, Laulii Matu'u.

Laulii was born dead and was abandoned by his birth-family in Western Samoa. Laulii lived on the streets until age 10 when Greg Lewis, a U.S. citizen, took him in, taught him sign language, and cared for his medical needs. In 1992, Mr. Lewis was appointed as legal guardian to Laulii, but it took 14 years before Greg was finally able to bring Laulii to the U.S. Laulii is in danger of being deported because his humanitarian visa has expired. Laulii has no family or ties to Western Samoa, deporting Laulii would be a travesty of justice! My bill will grant Laulii permanent U.S. residence.

REPEALING THE JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW ACT
SPREECH OF
HON. JEFF FLAKE
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 2011

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 2, legislation repealing the massive health care law passed last year.

Obamacare creates an unfunded mandate for states that took federal stimulus funds for Medicaid. This unfunded mandate will cost states like Arizona hundreds of millions of dollars. It also ties their hands from changing their Medicaid programs to prevent them from becoming unaffordable.

States must be allowed to tailor their programs as they see fit in order to ensure their long-term sustainability.

There are claims that repealing Obamacare would lead to massive deficits because it is supposedly paid for, but I would like to point out one item that was intended to raise revenues in order to help pay for the health care law that is already facing repeal. The health care bill includes a requirement that small businesses file a report every time they spend more than $600.

This filing requirement went into effect at the end of last year and I am among a considerable bipartisan effort seeking to repeal it.

Time and time again, we pass a law that is supposedly paid for . . . only to find out that the supposed pay-fors aren’t worth the paper on which they were written.

Sadly, when all of the budget gimmicks and fiscal hijinx are accounted for, provisions like these in Obamacare aren’t paid for at all.

In fact, the House Budget Committee Chairman recently noted that the true cost of Obamacare to taxpayers is more than $700 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that something must be done about the rising costs of health care, but Obamacare is not the answer.

This is a bad law: we need to just start over and enact healthcare reforms that improve quality and control costs.

TRIBUTE TO STEVE HAMANN, EL CAJON 2010 CITIZEN OF THE YEAR
HON. DUNCAN HUNTER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, it’s with a profound sense of appreciation and respect that I rise today to acknowledge the contribution of Steve Hamann to the San Diego community. Steve was recently named 2010 Citizen of the Year for the city of El Cajon, which I am proud to represent in Congress. Each of the candidates in the running for Citizen of the Year would have been an excellent choice, but Steve’s tireless work and charity on behalf of so many others puts him in a class by himself.

Anyone who knows Steve understands that his purpose is not derived from self-motivation. His commitment to helping others showcases his good nature and moral character, demonstrated through more than 16 years of charity work, where he raised millions of dollars for numerous causes. All of it on donated time and without compensation—a mark of true dedication and purpose.

Such an extraordinary level of involvement is why Steven is known around East County San Diego as the “Auctioneer Extraordinaire.” He has spent countless hours hosting events each year—more than 80 in one year, in fact—and, thankfully for all of us, he shows no sign of slowing down anytime soon. A member of the Rotary Club of El Cajon, Steve embodies theRotarian motto of “Service above Self.”

The list of organizations Steve lends his time and efforts to support is long, but certainly worth noting is his work with the Boys and Girls Clubs of East County, Stoney’s Kids, St. Madeleine Sophie’s Center, the East County Salvation Army, the East County Chamber of Commerce, the El Cajon Community Development Center, the El Cajon Elks Lodge, the Heartland Boy Scouts, the Cajon Valley Union School District, the Grossmont Union High School District, the Grossmont Cuyamaca College District, the Mother Goose Parade, the Home of Guiding Hands, the El Cajon Recreation Department, the East County YMCA, the Grossmont Hospital Foundation and the Olaf Wieghorst Museum.

Aside from his sterling reputation, I got to better know Steve as the moderator for the El Cajon Elks Lodge’s Annual Auction for the El Cajon Foundation. Steve’s dedication and purpose.

The evidence is in his work, hours dedicated to helping others, and results. Steve serves as an excellent example to others too, reminding us all that a little time and attention to helping others goes a very long way.

I cannot say enough about Steve. He is an ambassador for our community and, without question, makes El Cajon a better place for each one of its residents. I want to thank Steve for his work and congratulate him on the Citizen of the Year award. His wife of 32 years, Lorraine, and his children Sarah and Ben, undoubtedly share Steve’s enthusiasm and good nature. I want to extend my thanks and appreciation to them too.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Steve Hamann and wishing him continued success in all future endeavors. The El Cajon community and our nation benefit from Steve’s leadership, as well as others who commit their lives to causes bigger than themselves.

FAIR TAXES FOR SENIORS
HON. BOB FILNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced the Fair Taxes for Seniors Act (H.R. 331), which will provide a one-time increase in the capital gains tax exemption on the sale of a home for citizens who are 50 years of age or older. Passing this bill will give many seniors the additional money they need for nursing home care, medical costs, and other retirement expenses.

The Fair Taxes for Seniors Act doubles the current exemption by providing a one-time increase to $500,000 for a single person and $1 million for a couple that can be excluded from the sale of a principal residence for taxpayers who have reached the age of 50. Because they will be able to keep more, an added benefit is that family members and perhaps the government will be relieved of the burden of caring for these individuals as they grow older.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in co-sponsoring this important legislation.

WILLIE O. STEAM TRIBUTE
HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON
COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the life and service of Willie O. Steam, of Denver, Colorado. Patrolman Steam was killed in the line of duty in 1921 and was one of a few black police officers of his time.

Patrolman Steam, employed under the administration of Chief H.R. Williams, was a Special Policeman who worked full-time as a night watchman at City Hall. The week prior to his murder Patrolman Steam enforced an ordinance that prohibited illegal dances. Steam's
HONORING ALICE MUELRATH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with sadness today to honor Alice Muelrath who passed away January 6, 2011, in Santa Rosa, California, at the age of 93. Mrs. Muelrath was deeply involved in the local dairy farming community, having grown up in a ranching family before marrying a ranch hand who later acquired two dairy operations of his own.

Alice’s parents, John and Maria Albini, were part of a wave of immigrants from Italy who settled the area in the early 1900s, and Alice grew up in Bodega Bay. She and her three siblings spoke fluent Italian which was useful for both translating between cultures and keeping secrets from the kids.

In 1936, Alice married Peter Muelrath. The couple acquired a ranch in Bodega Bay and later second one near Santa Rosa. At the Santa Rosa ranch, Alice developed a skill for growing colorful flowers and was known for the beauty and variety of her plantings. They had two children, Bob and Mary; Bob, who is also a Sonoma County farmer, served as president of the Sonoma County Farm Bureau.

Alice was a cheerful and energetic woman who contributed with enthusiasm to a variety of community causes such as North Bay Dairy Women, Sonoma County Historical Society, Marin and Sonoma Italian Club, Sonoma County Farm Bureau, and Palm Drive Hospital.

Alice’s husband passed away in 1983. In addition to her son and daughter, she is survived by her sisters Elsie Carmody and Jennie Ponia, five grandchildren, and 11 great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Alice Muelrath exemplifies the proud Italian-American ranching tradition of Sonoma and Marin Counties. She and her family demonstrated the importance and importance of agriculture in our community, and I am proud to honor her long life.

WE MUST ENSURE SAFE ROADS AND BRIDGES
HON. BOB FILNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced the Safety, Efficiency and Accountability in Transportation Projects through Public Inspection Act of 2011 (H.R. 328) to require public employees to perform the inspection and related essential public functions on all state and local transportation projects. My bill is intended to ensure that public safety is protected, transportation funds are not wasted and projects are delivered in a timely manner.

On transportation projects, the construction inspector is the eyes, ears and voice of the public. Inspectors ensure that construction and seismic standards are met, that projects meet safety standards, and that the materials used will stand the test of time. In short, inspectors are there to ensure that the motoring public gets what they pay for and public safety and the public interest are protected.
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TRIBUTE FOR RILEY KING

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Riley King of Durango, Colorado, for his efforts in co-founding Unite Our World, a non-profit charity that provides medical assistance and builds schools for impoverished children abroad.

Ms. Raggio was inspired by her predecessor in the women’s suffrage movement. She felt she was taking up the torch for all they had achieved. Her work was a continuation of other battles fought and won, but there was still much to be accomplished.

It also noted in 1986, Ms. Raggio served as the first female assistant district attorney in Dallas County, and argued and won one of the first Texas cases to be heard in front of an all-woman jury. She was inducted to the Texas Women’s Hall of Fame in 1985 and received the Margaret Brent Women Lawyers of Achievement Award in 1995.

Ms. Raggio was preceded in death by her husband, Grier Raggio in 1988. She is survived by her three sons, Grier Jr., Thomas and Kenneth, and seven grandchildren and six great grandchildren. She will be missed, but her spirit and contributions will not be forgotten.

ON THE INTRODUCTION OF H.R. XXXX, SCAAP REIMBURSEMENT PROTECTION ACT

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. XXXX, the SCAAP Reimbursement Protection Act of 2011.

When I was a new Member of Congress, local police officials came to me and explained how a change in the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program—also known as SCAAP—was having a profound impact on their budgets.

Securing our nation’s borders is the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government. However, communities across the country continue to face extraordinary costs associated with incarcerating undocumented criminals at a time when they can least afford it.

The SCAAP program was established to reimburse state and local governments for these costs. From the SCAAP’s inception in 1994 until 2003, states were permitted to seek reimbursement for the costs of detaining deportable immigrants charged with a felony or two or more misdemeanors.

In 2003, the Department of Justice reinterpreted the SCAAP statute in a way that caused a drastic drop in every state’s reimbursement. Under this interpretation, states only receive reimbursement if a criminal alien is convicted of a felony or two misdemeanors and the arrest and conviction occur in the fiscal year of the incarceration and conviction—just like it was before the Department of Justice’s reinterpretation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in correcting this flawed Department of Justice interpretation and help our local police departments.

SUPPORT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. BOB FilNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. FilNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced the Department of Defense and Civilian Law Enforcement Coordination Act of 2011 (H.R. 324). My bill would amend federal law to permit Department of Defense law enforcement officers to better coordinate and cooperate with civilian law enforcement agencies.

I drafted this legislation in cooperation with the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) because many DOD law enforcement officers in my district have informed me that they are prohibited from basic coordination and cooperation with civilian agencies near DOD facilities. We need to ensure that federal, state, and local law enforcement are able to work together to apprehend criminals and to prevent and solve crimes. I hope that my colleagues will join me in co-sponsoring this important legislation.

CHARLIE AND JUDY McNEIL TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Charlie and Judy McNeil of Cherry Hills Village, Colorado, for a lifetime of contributions to their local community and continued leadership in the non-profit sector. The couple was recently named Man and Woman of the Year by their local newspaper.

Charlie McNeil has an impressive professional career, as well as a distinguished track record in community service and leadership. Mr. McNeil is an engineer by trade, a graduate of the Colorado School of Mines, and received the prestigious Distinguished Achievement Medal from his alma mater. After a career managing mines and working in corporate offices, Mr. McNeil became President and CEO of a major mine in the southwest.
IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CALHOUN COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. MIKE ROGERS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a very special occasion today—the 100th anniversary of the Calhoun County Chamber of Commerce.

Originally, the Anniston Chamber of Commerce was formed in 1910 and celebrated their first year at their Annual Meeting in 1911. Two neighboring cities and a town, Oxford, Jacksonville and Piedmont also formed chambers of commerce. In 1979, Oxford and Jacksonville merged with Anniston to create the Calhoun County Chamber of Commerce, and in 1984, Piedmont also joined, truly creating a “Voice of Business.”

The Chamber solicits input from member businesses, forms policy and acts as a spokesperson for the business and professional community. As the first stop for new-comers, the Chamber serves as the area’s “front porch” and referral center. The Chamber provides specific services such as training, marketing tools, networking opportunities and information to assist members in growing their businesses, thus strengthening the local economy.

Over 300 volunteers carry out the annual Program of Action. The chamber is independent of government funding and its entrepreneurial spirit has led the organization to a point in which it delivers three dollars of service value for every dollar paid in dues. The chamber has played a crucial role in many community milestones including the establishment of Fort McClellan and Anniston Army Depot, continuing safe destruction of stored chemical munitions, easing of tensions during the Civil Rights era, recruitment of industries, formation of the Calhoun County Development Council and construction of the Veterans’ Memorial Parkway.

As Calhoun County and northeast Alabama move forward, the Calhoun County Chamber of Commerce is poised for continuing growth and success in order to honor the 100th anniversary of this important organization in my hometown. Congratulations to the Calhoun County Chamber of Commerce.

IRANIAN EXECUTIONS

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, in late 2009, Iranian dissidents took to the streets to protest the fraudulent election of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in what would become Iran’s Green Movement. These protesters stood up to hard-line government militias, which fired on crowds and raided universities, killing dozens, injuring scores more, and imprisoning thousands.

Today, the thugs of Iranian regime went a step further. In what was undoubtedly meant as a message to the pro-democracy opposition, two political activists who had protested the 2009 election—Ja’far Kazemi and Mohammad Ali Haj Aghaie—were executed. Hanged, Mr. Speaker. Death by hanging. . . .

Last Congress, the President signed into law an Iran sanctions bill. One provision targets those in Iran committing the human rights abuses. So far, the Administration has targeted just eight individuals for their involvement in beatings and torture. Sadly, Monday’s events show there are many, many more human rights abusers to target. Anybody who has quashed the human rights of those seeking democracy deserves to be on this list.

LET’S PROTECT MOBILE HOMES

HON. BOB FILNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Mobile Home Protection Act, H.R. 326. The purpose of this bill is to provide Section 8 assistance to low-income owners of mobile homes. Owning one’s home is a central part of the American Dream. For many low-income Americans, mobile homes provide the opportunity to achieve this goal of homeownership.

However, in many cases, while the family owns their home, they do not own the land on which the home sits. In some cases, the landlord will not accept Section 8 vouchers for the land on which the mobile home sits. I have introduced the Mobile Home Protection Act to correct this problem. This bill would provide this Section 8 assistance directly to the homeowners to apply toward their rent costs for the land on which their homes sit.

Many mobile home owners have invested their life savings into buying their mobile homes. As mobile home park rents increase, these low-income homeowners are not able to keep up with this cost. This legislation will help keep these homeowners in their homes and maintain these established communities.
CLEAN AIR FOR OUR BORDER

HON. BOB FILNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Foreign Air Impact Regulation (FAIR) Air Act (H.R. 325). The purpose of this bill is to combat air pollution along our borders and to ensure that our communities are not unfairly penalized.

Our border communities are being besieged by toxic pollutants from neighboring countries. This is making the air quality along our border worse than ever—and leaves our communities with little recourse to improve the situation.

The FAIR Air Act says that if pollution from another country causes non-attainment of air pollution regulations, then the EPA and the Secretary of State should work together to lower it. Furthermore, the effective date of re-classification should be delayed until the Secretary of State and local leaders develop a plan with the neighboring country to improve the air quality.

We cannot put this international problem on the backs of those who simply happen to live along the border. There truly needs to be a bi-national cooperative solution to address this important issue. We all breathe the same air and it is only with bi-national cooperation and working together to achieve better air quality standards for all.

REEVES BROWN TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Reeves Brown of Grand Junction, Colorado, for his lifetime of contributions in promoting agricultural interests and effective government in the State of Colorado.

Mr. Brown has an impressive agricultural pedigree and has proven himself to be a valuable leader in the field. Mr. Brown grew up on a cattle ranch in Montana and received a B.S. in Agriculture Business from Montana State University. He began his career at the National Cattlemen’s Association, serving two years with the organization. Afterwards, Mr. Brown spent nearly a decade at the Colorado Cattlemen’s Association as Executive Vice President, during which time he elevated the Association as a national leader in animal care and natural resources issues. During Brown’s tenure the Colorado Cattlemen’s Agricultural Land Trust was created in 1993, preserving over 250,000 acres of Colorado farmland. His leadership in agricultural conservation has spilled over into other States, too. Similar ag land initiatives have been preserved in over 1 million acres of land. His efforts speak to his commitment in preserving the agricultural business in the United States.

For the past ten years, Mr. Brown has led the non-profit CLUB 20 as Executive Director, which aims to provide a dialogue and recommend public policy for the Western Colorado region. Mr. Brown’s leadership earned him the recognition of Colorado’s newly elected Governor—Governor Hickenlooper. Mr. Brown was appointed director of the Colorado Department of Local Affairs, overseeing the diverse needs of Colorado communities. The department’s responsibilities include areas such as education, land management, transportation, energy, water, and health care.

Mr. Brown’s commitment to good public policy and track record of effective, collaborative decision-making will surely serve the people of Colorado well. Mr. Speaker, for his years of service in the public and agricultural sectors, Mr. Brown deserves the commendation of this body. We wish him the best of luck on his next endeavor.

CELEBRATING THE SERVICE OF ROLLIE SMITH

HON. JIM COSTA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Rollie Smith, Fresno Field Director with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). After 12 years of dedicated service in Fresno, Rollie is moving to Washington, D.C. to be closer to his family.

Rollie Smith first came to Fresno, California in 1997 when he began work with Catholic Charities of Fresno. One year later, HUD hired Rollie as a community activist to help revitalize the City of Fresno. Rollie originally planned to help out for a few years, however his passion and commitment to the community quickly moved him up the ladder within HUD. Rollie became the Fresno Field Director in 2004 and has been doing a great job for the past seven years.

Rollie received his Masters’ degrees from Loyola University, Chicago Jesuit Theological School, and the University of Chicago. A natural born leader and teacher, Rollie also taught classes at Loyola University, California State University, and the University of Hawaii. One of Rollie’s specialties was his unique ability to bring groups of people together to help solve issues affecting people in the Central Valley. One of these groups, the Federal Interagency Task Force, is a group that meets regularly and works together to tackle issues such as inadequate housing, poor education, health care, and low-paying jobs. Rollie will be truly missed in Fresno.

I applaud Rollie Smith for his many years of tireless work on behalf of families in California and the Central Valley. I know he will enjoy more time with his wife Bernie, his son Aaron Smith and his wife Carolyn, his daughter Suzanne Chartol and her husband J.P. Chartol, and his three grandchildren Adeline, Claire, and Remy Chartol.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that in addition to his contributions to our community, Rollie has been a top champion for my constituents. He and his team have always been available to discuss issues and work together to make our Central Valley a better place.

ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the commitment, dedication and success of Rollie Smith and wish him well as he embarks on new endeavors.

OUR MILITARY MUST BE ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE

HON. BOB FILNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Military Environmental Responsibility Act (H.R. 332). The purpose of this bill is to require the Department of Defense to fully comply with Federal and State environmental laws.

Military exemptions from requirements and enforcement provisions under environmental, public safety, and worker protection laws harm the environment and human health. Our constituents who border military bases should have the same protections as other municipalities.

This bill will not compromise military readiness. Environmental laws currently include exemptions for the military in the event of “paramount interest of the United States”. These exemptions have only been used a handful of times, and the President would retain that authority over this legislation.

Americans believe that their government should be accountable to them and play by the same rules that they have to follow. Much of the cynicism and apathy of recent years can be traced directly to public perception that government officials and agencies are not accountable to anyone. We can only begin to restore faith in government and participation in democracy by ensuring that the federal government works under the same laws and regulations as private businesses and individuals.

DESTINEE REED TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Destinee Reed of Grand Junction, Colorado, for winning a statewide talent competition. Ms. Reed’s entry into the competition earned her the opportunity to perform at Governor Hickenlooper’s inaugural celebration on January 11, 2011.

Ms. Reed, 15 years old, composed and sang her song “My Colorado,” where she sings about the beauty of her home state, mentioning wild mustangs, Palisade peaches, and skiing. The statewide competition accepted applications from elementary, middle and high school students, and while others won prizes as well, she was the only one allowed to perform at the Governor’s inaugural party. Ms. Reed recognizes the performance as a unique and privileged opportunity for a young musical artist.

Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled to congratulate Ms. Reed on her musical accomplishments at such a young age. We wish her the best of luck with her academic and musical ambitions.
ON THE DOORSTEP OF PROMISING HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENTS

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, when talking to non-partisan health care financing experts about the ideal health care system, their preference is clear: they usually agree that a single-payer system that prevents the health insurance companies from getting between you and your doctor is the way to go. But they usually follow up with a caveat—the health insurance industry and the pharmaceutical industry are too powerful to allow it to happen: it is not politically feasible.

I am thrilled to say that argument is now a relic. On January 19, Harvard economist William Hsiao released a report that examined three health care systems for Vermont, whose new governor campaigned on a single-payer platform. The report found that a true single payer system would save Vermont 8–12 percent off their health care spending upon implementation and another 12–14 percent as the system gets up and running. The result is that 5000 new jobs will be created because of the burden lifted off of businesses. And it would cover every Vermont resident.

An article by VTDigger.org announced that “Even the private insurance companies, many of whose policy-holders would presumably be diverted to the new ‘single pipe’ which would channel all payments to doctors and hospitals through set rates for procedures cautiously welcomed” Hsiao’s proposal.

We are at the doorstep of one of the most promising developments in health care of our time.

JUSTICE FOR THE PERRONE-LEMOS FAMILY

HON. BOB FILNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a private bill (H.R. 355) on behalf of two extraordinary individuals, Pablo Perrone and Cristina Lemos.

In 1987, Pablo and Cristina, labor union leaders in Uruguay, were persecuted by the radical socialist group, the Tupamaros. After receiving multiple death threats for refusing to join forces with the group, they fled to the United States and immediately claimed asylum after entry. Due to an incompetent lawyer, the judge denied their asylum cases. An appeal was made but was mishandled by the lawyer and eventually lost by the Department of Justice for 10 years. As a result of this injustice, Pablo and Cristina were never given an opportunity to state their case, a case that if heard, would have granted them lawful presence in the United States.

Now, over 20 years later, the same party that persecuted Pablo and Cristina is now in power. Pablo and Cristina have two U.S. citizen children, Loredana and Victoria, who speak limited Spanish and have lived in San Diego, California all their lives as excellent students. As contributing members of their community, Pablo and Cristina pay taxes every year and devote countless hours to community service. Pablo and Cristina have no living family members in Uruguay. It deported, they will be forced to take their two U.S. citizen daughters with them, to a country where they risk persecution, and face exceptional economic, educational, and emotional hardship.

SUE TUFFIN TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Sue Tuffin of Grand Junction, Colorado, for her dedication to her community. She has a unique and exceptional success story and has quickly risen through the ranks in her career in public service.

Ms. Tuffin is of exceptional character, and has shown discipline, tenacity, and savvy in her career and personal life. As a single mother, Tuffin realized she needed to go back to school to provide a better life for her son and herself—she was making 90 cents an hour to make ends meet. When she was married, she had worked in an office to put her then husband through college. Wanting to do the same, Ms. Tuffin enrolled at Southern Colorado State College to pursue a four-year degree. She finished her coursework in two. During this time, she worked four jobs to support herself and raise her young son.

Following college, Ms. Tuffin quickly received promotions at Manpower, an employment services company in Pueblo. She jumped from receptionist to counselor to supervisor. After Manpower, Tuffin worked at the Delta Department of Human Services, and eventually became director of both the Delta Health Department and Human Services Department. Ms. Tuffin spent a decade working for the State of Colorado reforming welfare. Recently, she was chosen to direct the Mesa County Workforce Center which provides employment resources and training programs.

Tuffin’s own success story will surely inspire those she serves at the Workforce Center. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask this body to commend Sue Tuffin for her perseverance in her personal and professional life. We wish her the best of luck in her new position.

IN HONOR AND RECOGNITION OF CAPTAIN DAN HOFFMAN

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of the contributions of Captain Dan Hoffman, a longtime public servant and Chief of the Parma Police Department. A natural leader and dedicated law enforcement officer, Captain Hoffman devoted himself—she was making 90 cents an hour to provide a better life for her son and herself. She was making 90 cents an hour to make ends meet. When she was married, she had worked in an office to put her then husband through college. Wanting to do the same, Ms. Tuffin enrolled at Southern Colorado State College to pursue a four-year degree. She finished her coursework in two. During this time, she worked four jobs to support herself and raise her young son.

Following college, Ms. Tuffin quickly received promotions at Manpower, an employment services company in Pueblo. She jumped from receptionist to counselor to supervisor. After Manpower, Tuffin worked at the Delta Department of Human Services, and eventually became director of both the Delta Health Department and Human Services Department. Ms. Tuffin spent a decade working for the State of Colorado reforming welfare. Recently, she was chosen to direct the Mesa County Workforce Center which provides employment resources and training programs.

Tuffin’s own success story will surely inspire those she serves at the Workforce Center. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask this body to commend Sue Tuffin for her perseverance in her personal and professional life. We wish her the best of luck in her new position.

STOP THE OVERPRINTING (STOP) ACT

SPEECH OF
HON. ERIC CANTOR
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 2011

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, Washington has a dangerous spending problem that poses grave risk to future American prosperity. The only way we can start getting results for the people again is to transform the culture of spending in this town into a culture of savings.

Over at least the past two years, the House did not cut spending on any single occasion. Those days are over. Under our majority, government will learn to do more with less.

We may not eliminate the entire deficit overnight, but this House will fight to make tangible progress by cutting unnecessary spending and needless regulation, and growing jobs and the economy. We call it cut and grow.

It is in this light that we will bring spending back down to 2008 levels, and bring to the floor a spending cut each and every week. Two weeks ago, we sent a clear signal of fiscal discipline by trimming our own congressional budgets by 5 percent. This week, we have brought to the floor a spending cut picked by the public through our YouCut program begun last year. This reduction would eliminate mandatory printing of bills and resolutions by the Government Printing Office for the use of Members of the House of Representatives and Senators. In the digital age, there’s no reason we can’t save taxpayer dollars by forcing congressional offices to receive bills and resolutions through the Internet.
This legislation is a small but still important and largely symbolic step towards getting spending under control. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

IN HONOR AND REMEMBRANCE OF
ASHLEY TURTON

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Ashley Turton, a loving wife, mother, daughter, sister and friend. Mrs. Turton’s devotion to public service, and her passionate love for her family and children, has left a mark on countless lives.

Mrs. Turton dedicated her life to serving the American public. She served as press secretary, and later, chief of staff to Congresswoman DeLauro. She also worked as an aid to Congressman Richard Gephardt. She was a leader during her career as a public servant and she worked for the benefit of the people.

Upon leaving the public sector, Mrs. Turton continued to promote responsibility and good work ethics as a regulatory analyst for Progressive Energy. She was a valued employee and a cooperative colleague, always happy and enjoying life’s pleasures.

For everything Mrs. Turton was, she was a kind and caring mother first. A mother of three, Mrs. Turton was an active part of her neighborhood, where she was commonly seen playing with her children.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in remembering Ashley Turton, whose legacy of professionalism, service to others, and love and cheerful radiance will forever remain in our hearts and minds. I extend my sincere condolences to Mrs. Turton’s husband, Dan Turton, a colleague of ours and a friend to many, and to Mrs. Turton’s parents, siblings and children. Mrs. Turton’s commitment to the common good and love will remain an example for us and those to come.

TRIBUTE FOR MARTA TAYLOR

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Marta Taylor, a beauty and joy for her family and children, and to support the legislation.

Ms. Taylor moved to the United States in 2005, after several failed appeals were made to inhumane conditions at an overcrowded detention facility near the U.S.-Mexico border. She was accompanied by her four-year-old daughter, Jane Drury, now serving in the U.S. Navy on the USS Bunker Hill. In 2005, after several failed appeals were made to correct a mistake she made on her original naturalization application, Flavia was taken from her home in January and was subjected to inhumane conditions at an overcrowded detention facility near the U.S.-Mexico border for two weeks. Flavia is a hardworking, law-abiding woman who has lived her life being of service as a nurse and volunteer. If deported, Flavia will most certainly face economic and emotional hardship without family or financial support.

TRIBUTE FOR BOB LUNA

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Mr. Bob Luna before this Congress today. The efforts of Bob Luna’s actions speak volumes about his dedication to our country.
SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week. Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 25, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 26

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the report and recommendations, including any recommendations for legislative action, issued by the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling.

10 a.m.
Environmental and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine transportation’s role in supporting the economy and job creation.

10 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine protecting American taxpayers, focusing on accomplishments and ongoing challenges in the fight against fraud.

JANUARY 27

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the results of the investigation by the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force into the release of proprietary data in the KC-X competition.

10 a.m.
Budget
To hold hearings to examine the budget and economic outlook for fiscal years 2011–2021.

10 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine the Affordable Care Act, focusing on the impact of health insurance reform on health care consumers.

10:30 a.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine counterterrorism lessons from the U.S. government’s failure to prevent the Fort Hood attack.

11:30 a.m.
Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine encouraging entrepreneurship in economically disadvantaged, rural and traditionally under-served areas.

1:30 p.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Disaster Recovery Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine claims and social services in the aftermath of Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

2:15 p.m.
Foreign Relations
European Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine crackdown in Belarus, focusing on responding to the Lukashenko regime.

FEBRUARY 3

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the energy and oil market outlook for the 112th Congress.

FEBRUARY 16

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the U.S. Department of Energy’s budget for fiscal year 2012.
**Monday, January 24, 2011**

### Daily Digest

#### Senate

**Chamber Action**

The Senate stands in recess pursuant to the provisions of S. Con. Res. 1, until 10 a.m., on Tuesday, January 25, 2011.

**Committee Meetings**

(Committee not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

---

### House of Representatives

#### Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 5, 394–410; 1 private bill, H.R. 411; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 22; and H. Res. 49–51 were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Report Filed: A report was filed on January 3, 2011 as follows:

Legislative Review Activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the 111th Congress (H. Rept. 111–713).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Foxx to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Recess: The House recessed at 12:18 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m.

Recess: The House recessed at 2:12 p.m. and reconvened at 5:15 p.m.

Recess: The House recessed at 6:25 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m.

Reducing non-security spending to fiscal year 2008 levels or less—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to the rule (H. Res. 43) that is providing for consideration of H. Res. 38, to reduce non-security spending to fiscal year 2008 levels or less, by a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 168 noes, Roll No. 18, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 174 nays, Roll No. 17.

---

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** One yea-and-nay vote and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H415–16. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

**Committee Meetings**

REINS ACT—PROMOTING JOBS AND EXPANDING FREEDOM BY REDUCING NEEDLESS REGULATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law held an oversight hearing on the REINS Act—Promoting Jobs and Expanding Freedom by Reducing Needless Regulations. Testimony was heard from former Representative David McIntosh of Indiana; and public witnesses.

---

**CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD**

**Week of January 25 through January 29, 2011**

**Senate Chamber**

On *Tuesday,* at 10 a.m., Senate will be in a period of morning business.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.
Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Armed Services: January 27, to hold hearings to examine the results of the investigation by the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force into the release of proprietary data in the KC–X competition, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on the Budget: January 27, to hold hearings to examine the budget and economic outlook for fiscal years 2011–2021, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: January 26, to hold hearings to examine transportation’s role in supporting the economy and job creation, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: January 27, Subcommittee on European Affairs, to hold hearings to examine crackdown in Belarus, focusing on responding to the Lukashenko regime, 2:15 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: January 27, to hold hearings to examine the Affordable Care Act, focusing on the impact of the health insurance reform on health care consumers, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: January 27, to hold hearings to examine counterterrorism lessons from the U.S. government’s failure to prevent the Fort Hood attack, 10:50 a.m., SD–342.

January 27, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Disaster Recovery, to hold hearings to examine claims and social services in the aftermath of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, 1:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: January 26, to hold hearings to examine protecting American taxpayers, focusing on accomplishments and ongoing challenges in the fight against fraud, 10 a.m., SD–226.

January 27, Full Committee, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: January 27, to hold hearings to examine encouraging entrepreneurship in economically disadvantaged, rural and traditionally underserved areas, 10:30 a.m., SR–428A.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture: January 25, to meet for organizational purposes, 2 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services: January 26, hearing on proposed Department of Defense budget reductions and efficiencies initiatives, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget: January 26, to meet for organizational purposes and to consider Committee Oversight Plan for the 112th Congress, 9 a.m.; and to hold a hearing on the Fiscal Consequence of the Health Care Law, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce: January 25, to meet for organizational purposes. 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

January 26, hearing on State of the American Workforce, 2 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, January 26, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “The Views of the Administration on Regulatory Reform,” 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, January 25, to meet for organizational purposes, 10:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

January 26, hearing to discuss Promoting Economic Recovery and Job Creation: The Road Forward, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, January 25, briefing on the United Nations: Urgent Problems that Need Congressional Action, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, January 26, to meet for organizational purposes, 10 a.m, 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, January 25, to meet for organizational purposes, 2 p.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, January 25, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing on Data Retention as a Tool for Investigating Internet Child Pornography and Other Internet Crimes, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.


January 26, full Committee, to mark up the following: H.R. 394, Federal Courts Jurisdiction and Venue Clarification Act of 2011; a measure to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll, during active-duty service abroad in the Armed Forces, the periods of time to file a petition and appear for an interview to remove the conditional basis for permanent resident status; H.R. 386, Securing Aircraft Cockpits Against Lasers Act of 2011; H.R. 368, Removal Clarification Act of 2001, and H.R. 347, Federal Restricted Buildings and Grounds Improvement Act of 2011, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

January 26, Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement, hearing on ICE Worksite Enforcement—Up to the Job? 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, January 25, to meet for organizational purposes, 9:30 a.m., 201–HVC.


Committee on Rules, January 25, to consider H.R. 359, To reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions, 10 a.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Small Business, January 26, to meet for organizational purposes, 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, January 26, to meet for organizational purposes, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, January 25, to continue to meet for organizational purposes, and to hold a hearing on pending Free Trade Agreements, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.
January 26, hearing on the impact of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Tuesday, January 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will be in a period of morning business.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Tuesday, January 25

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Joint Session with the Senate to Receive the State of the Union Address from the President of the United States.
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