

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my colleague Congresswoman COLLEEN HANABUSA that would restore funding for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program.

The Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant is an authorized program under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act.

The block grant is used to carry out affordable housing activities for Native Hawaiian families who are eligible to reside on Hawaiian Home Lands, which were established in trust by the United States under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920.

In 1903, Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaʻole was elected to serve as Hawaii's delegate to Congress. One of his most notable achievements was the passage of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, which set aside some 200,000 acres of land for Native Hawaiians. The reason for the legislation was the landless status of so many Native Hawaiians, who were displaced by newcomers to the islands and became the most disadvantaged population in their native land. Congress passed the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, which is still in force, in recognition of its responsibility toward Native Hawaiians.

As with other indigenous people, Native Hawaiian views on land tenure were different from that of the newcomers, resulting in loss of much of the land that had been traditionally occupied and cultivated by Native Hawaiians to these newcomers.

Despite the good intentions of the Congress and the State of Hawaii, progress in meeting the goal of delivering land to native Hawaiians was slow. Most of the Hawaiian Homelands were located in areas far from jobs and infrastructure like roads and utilities, were non-existent. There are currently 23,000 native Hawaiians on the waiting list for residential, farm or ranch lots. Some families have been on the waiting lists for decades.

I want to share the story of the Lincoln family. Aloysius Lincoln first applied for Hawaiian Home Lands in 1949. In 2006, a wait of 57 years, his daughter, Frances Segundo, claimed a lease for a Department of Hawaiian Home Lands home in Kapolei on the island of Oahu. Frances claimed the lease because her father had unfortunately passed away two years earlier. Frances herself was just a baby when her father signed up for the program.

The \$13 million that the amendment restores to the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program provides the opportunity for Native Hawaiian families to live the dream of homeownership.

The Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) is one of the most efficient users of funds provided under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act. The majority of these funds have been used for infrastructure development on Hawaiian Home Lands benefiting low-income residents. DHHL has also been able to use these funds to: Assist families in applying for FHA mortgage insurance and HUD loan guarantees; operate a direct loan program to provide new housing units and improve existing structures; support local housing and housing service providers such as Habitat for Humanity; and initiate highly successful pre- and post-purchase homeownership counseling programs.

I urge my colleagues to support reinstating funding for the successful Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant Program.

Mahalo nui loa (thank you very much).

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word in strong opposition to the Price Amendment and the underlying bill.

This amendment would make this atrocious CR even worse. Section 1517 of the CR already cuts the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection by 40 percent. And as if that wasn't enough to cripple this new bureau, the Price Amendment would prohibit funding for salaries and expenses—ending the agency as it's just getting started.

Although, I guess we shouldn't be surprised. Mr. PRICE and his colleagues have fought long and hard for their friends on Wall Street to allow them to continue gouging families and small businesses with predatory mortgages and credit cards.

But last year the Democratic majority overcame their corporate lobbyists and special interests to finally bring an end to these Wall Street abuses. We enacted historic credit card reforms and established the new independent Consumer Financial Protection Bureau tasked specifically with protecting consumers—the first of its kind. This new Bureau will finally ensure that mortgage and credit card agreements are safe for the families and small busi-

nesses most vulnerable to predatory practices. The Bureau's Office of Service Member Affairs, led by Holly Petraeus, is specifically tasked with protecting our men and women in uniform who all too often are preyed upon by unscrupulous lenders.

No more hidden fees. No more arbitrary interest rate hikes. No more twisted contracts that lawyers can't even understand. This is the type of protection the American people expect from their government. Reasonable, responsible measures to ensure our troops and consumers aren't taken advantage of.

But, for some reason, Mr. PRICE and those who support this amendment believe our troops and the American people don't deserve these protections. They're unabashedly trying to destroy the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau before it even gets started. They're trying to return to the days when Wall Street ran amok and did as it pleased. They're trying to return to the same failed policies of the past that caused the financial crisis we're still climbing out of.

One would think that such a ridiculous maneuver would at least be disguised as something less destructive. But then again, the Majority has made no secret of its pursuit of political gimmicks over substantive measures to create jobs.

Just look at this CR—hundreds and hundreds of pages that do nothing but undercut our fragile economic recovery and destroy jobs. Nothing but page after page of absurd cuts to proven programs that protect consumers, stimulate growth and create jobs.

Not to mention that we have yet to consider a single bill on the House floor that would actually create jobs. Not one.

Mr. Chair, the American people expect better. They sent us here to create jobs, not destroy them.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the PRICE Amendment and the underlying bill. I yield back.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I rise today to call up my amendment at the desk, amendment number 504, which would restore the cuts made to the defense appropriations section of H.R. 1. I am pleased that so many of my Republican colleagues in the House Armed Services Committee supported this amendment and are willing to stand with me

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

against these cuts. HASC Chairman MCKEON, Ms. HARTZLER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RIGELL and Mr. SCHILLING should all be recognized for their commitment to our men and women in uniform.

We cannot in good conscience stand by while this body takes an ax to the defense budget.

My amendment restores cuts to the Department of Defense to the level authorized by Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act of 2011. The C.R. contains approximately \$516 billion in defense appropriations found in Division A, about \$14 billion below the defense appropriations authorized in the 2011 NDAA. We should honor that budget authorization with this amendment.

We have watched the Obama Administration develop a pattern of raiding the defense accounts first, not last, as it should be. We have a Constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense and yet, the Administration sees defense as an account that can be gutted at the expense of our national security. The government has already asked the Pentagon to find \$100 billion in efficiencies and to cut \$78 billion over the next five years. The cuts proposed in H.R. 1 are just the beginning of a downward spiral.

Our government has a constitutional mandate to protect the American people. America must retain her qualitative edge in the world. Weakness will invite aggression and lead to instability throughout the world.

As I have said before, I wholeheartedly support finding cost savings through efficiencies in all areas of the Federal Government. In the area of national defense, I believe we must reinvest those savings in other defense priorities such as an effective and robust homeland missile defense system, equipment that increases protection and combat effectiveness for our servicemembers, and modernizing our aging defense infrastructure. As vital as it is to cut our national budget so we can live within our means, my hope and desire is that we do so in a way that does not sacrifice our military capability.

Again, I thank my colleagues who have vocally supported this amendment and I ask other Members in the House to do the same.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. PAYNE. I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would prohibit any United States assistance to a country that opposed the position of the United States in the United Nations. If passed tomorrow, this amendment would prohibit assistance to over 130 countries including Cote D'Ivoire, Rwan-

da, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, and Jordan. (It prohibits assistance to countries whose recorded votes at the UN were the same as the United States less than 50 percent of the time.

This amendment does not take into account the voting realities of the UN. It only focuses on recorded votes or non-consensus issues. But the fact is, similar to the workings our own Senate, a significant amount of votes—or consensus resolutions—are adopted by the UN. According to the State Department's Voting Practices in the United Nations, when consensus resolutions are factored in as votes identical to those of the United States, average overall General Assembly voting coincidence of all UN members with the United States in 2009 was 84.3%. So, in reality, most member states are agreeing with the position of the United States.

Finally, if the logic of this bill was utilized in our own Congress, how could we ever reach bipartisan agreement? Because a Member does not support your bill, would that mean you would never work with them on anything again? Or, if the Texas delegation to the House voted against a transportation appropriation, should they receive no money to build roads?

I urge my colleagues to vote NO on this amendment.

VOTING PRACTICES IN THE UNITED NATIONS
2009

(Report to Congress submitted pursuant to Public Laws 101-246 and 108-447, Mar. 31, 2010.)

I: INTRODUCTION

This publication is the 27th annual Report to the Congress on Voting Practices at the United Nations. It is submitted in accordance with Section 406 of Public Law 101-246. This law provides, in relevant part:

"The Secretary of State shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a full and complete annual report which assesses for the preceding calendar year, with respect to each foreign country member of the United Nations, the voting practices of the governments of such countries at the United Nations, and which evaluates General Assembly and Security Council actions and the responsiveness of those governments to United States policy on issues of special importance to the United States."

This report reviews voting practices in the UN Security Council and General Assembly (UNGA) in calendar year 2009 and presents data in a variety of formats. All Security Council resolutions for the entire year are described, and voting on them is tabulated (Section II). The report also statistically measures the overall voting of UN member states at the 64th General Assembly in the autumn of 2009 in comparison with the U.S. voting record (Section III). It also lists and describes UNGA resolutions selected as particularly important to U.S. interests, again with tables for regional and political groupings (Section IV). It then presents all data by country (Section V). Finally, an annex is included to present the voting patterns on General Assembly resolutions relating to Israel and opposed by the United States.

The Security Council and the General Assembly deal with a full spectrum of issues—including threats to peace and security, disarmament, economic and social development, humanitarian relief, and human rights—that are considered critical to U.S. interests. A country's behavior at the United Nations is always relevant to its bilateral re-

lationship. Nevertheless, a country's voting record in the United Nations is only one dimension of its relations with the United States. Bilateral economic, strategic, and political issues are at times more directly important to U.S. interests.

VOTING COINCIDENCE WITH THE UNITED STATES

On non-consensus issues, i.e., those on which a vote was taken, the average overall General Assembly voting coincidence of all UN members with the United States in 2009 was 39 percent, up significantly from 2008, when it was 25.6 percent, and more than twice the figure from 2007 (18.3 percent).

When consensus resolutions are factored in as votes identical to those of the United States, a much higher measure of agreement with U.S. positions is reached—84.3 percent in 2009. (See Section III—General Assembly—Overall Votes for additional comparisons.)

FORMAT AND METHODOLOGY

The format and presentation of this report are consistent with provisions of Public Law 101-246 as amended by Public Law 108-447, and the methodology employed is the same as that used since the report's inception.

The tables in this report provide a measurement of the voting coincidence of UN member countries with the United States. However, readers are cautioned about interpreting voting coincidence percentages. In Section III (General Assembly Overall Votes), Section IV (General Assembly Important Votes and Consensus Actions), and the Annex, the percentages in the last column of the tables, under "votes only," are calculated using only votes on which both the United States and the other country in question voted Yes or No; not included are those instances when either state abstained or was absent. Abstentions and absences are often difficult to interpret, but they make a mathematical difference, sometimes significant, in the percentage results. The inclusion of the number of abstentions and absences in the tables of this report enables the reader to consider them in calculating voting coincidence percentages.

The percentages in the second-to-last column of the tables, under "including consensus," offer another perspective on General Assembly activity. These figures, by presenting the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including consensus resolutions as additional identical votes, more accurately reflect the extent of cooperation and agreement in the General Assembly. Since not all states are equally active at the United Nations, the report credits to each country a portion of the 184 consensus resolutions based on its participation in the 84 recorded Plenary votes. Each country's participation rate was calculated by dividing the number of Yes/No/Abstain votes it cast in the Plenary (i.e., the number of times it was not absent) by the total number of Plenary votes. However, this calculation assumes, for want of an attendance record, that all countries were present or absent for consensus resolutions in the same ratio as for recorded votes.

Questions about this report may be directed to the Bureau of International Organization Affairs in the Department of State.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under