

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

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 in opposition to this amendment introduced by Congressman TED POE. This amendment would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from enforcing common-sense protections against carbon dioxide pollution and other greenhouse gases from big polluters.

The underlying legislation, H.R. 1, is replete with provisions like this. Instead of eliminating tax breaks for the oil and gas industries and choosing to adhere to the scientific evidence that carbon pollution is changing the climate and endangering our health and the environment, the Republican majority's continuing resolution slashes EPA's funding by almost a third and prohibits EPA from enforcing existing greenhouse gas monitoring and reporting requirements. The bill attacks the Clean Air Act directly so that EPA will be prevented from protecting public health and fighting climate change.

The Clean Air Act has a proven 40-year track record of cutting dangerous pollution to protect human health in a cost-effective manner that spurs innovation. According to EPA, the Clean Air Act prevented an estimated 843,000 asthma attacks, 18 million cases of respiratory illness among children, 672,000 cases of chronic bronchitis, 21,000 cases of heart disease, and 200,000 premature deaths.

The Clean Air Act continues to reduce air pollution and improve the health of children, seniors, and adults: the Clean Air Act has decreased lead emissions from cars by 95 percent, decreasing by 86 percent the number of children whose development is affected by lead exposure; by requiring all new diesel engines to be more than 90 percent cleaner, EPA will prevent more than 21,000 premature deaths and \$160 billion in health costs every year by 2030; by phasing out the most dangerous ozone-depleting chemicals, EPA will cut the American incidences of non-melanoma skin cancer by 295 million by 2075; by launching the acid rain program, EPA has dramatically reduced soot and smog by levels that will reduce premature deaths by between 20,000 and 50,000 per year in 2010.

Since its enactment in 1970, the health benefits of the Clean Air Act have far outweighed industry's compliance costs, reducing toxic and health-threatening air pollutants by 60 percent while at the same time the economy grew by over 200 percent.

Now this legislation attempts to gut the Clean Air Act's pollution standards and repeal EPA's authority to limit health-threatening pollution in order to protect the profits of the big polluters.

It also prevents EPA from continuing to improve our health by updating its pollution standards and improving safeguards for public health. In addition, it repeals important Clean Air Act safeguards that are needed to create American clean energy jobs, reduce energy costs, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and increase our economic competitiveness.

It's time for us to stand up for clean air and the health of the American people rather than work for the polluters who want to interfere with EPA's efforts to reduce life-threatening pollution and turn back the clock on air quality.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and oppose the continuing resolution.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 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. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Amendment, Amendment No. 199, to H.R. 1 "Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011", offered by Mr. POE of Texas and provides that none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Justice, or any other Agency to litigate the continuation of the case *United States of America v. The State of Arizona and Janice K. Brewer* regarding Arizona law S.B. 1070.

As a Senior Member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I have vast experience in dealing with the issues of immigration and border security. And as a member of these committees, I can unequivocally say that this amendment and talk of supporting state immigration laws is absolutely inappropriate. It is a clear violation of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution and the long established tenets of federalism, which grant the United States government the exclusive, preemptive power to establish laws on Immigration and Naturalization.

It is necessary to oppose this amendment offered on the floor today. The Department of Justice has a federal mandate to pursue litigation in matters that constitute violations of federal law. This authority includes actions against states such as Arizona. The Arizona immigration statute appears to violate federal law and we must not strip the Department of Justice of the funding it needs to carry out its mission.

The laws of the United States do not allow state-by-state legislation of immigration policy. If we allow states to enact immigration statutes and regulate and enforce immigration policy, we would be granting permission for the separate states of our country to set up a severely disconnected patchwork of immigration laws and policies that will be extremely difficult to enforce, invite discrimination and make our country dangerously unstable and unsafe.

Our forefathers had the wisdom and insight to realize the importance of handling certain issues exclusively on a national level and saw fit to enshrine them in the Constitution. In this instance, we must not depart from the long established doctrine of exclusive federal control of immigration and naturalization. If we tread on the dangerous path of deconstruction of appropriate federal exclusivity in the area of immigration law, we will certainly force the federal courts to take corrective action and restore the exclusive role of the federal government in this area. Moreover, it would take a constitutional amendment and not the mere passage of federal or state statutes to overturn this long established legal principle.

The Department of Justice must be provided with the necessary funds to continue litigation

of its case against the state of Arizona. To do otherwise would erode the constitutional protections of our Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. Therefore I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to this amendment. Thank you Madam Chair; I yield back the balance of my time.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE MCINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 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. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Broun amendment that would eliminate funding for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers coastal projects.

Simply put—this is a "penny wise/pound foolish" effort.

Representing a coastal district I can speak first hand to the importance of coastal projects.

Beaches are of incredible economic importance to the local, state, regional, and national economy contributing nearly \$35 billion in annual Federal revenues.

There are over 2 billion visits made to our nation's beaches each year, with the Federal Government collecting \$320 per beach tourist for every \$1 spent on beach renourishment!

And more people visit our nation's beaches each year than all of our national parks combined!

North Carolina beaches create about 50,000 jobs, \$1.6 billion in spending revenues, \$78 million in state revenue and beach-related tourism provides a total payroll of \$350 million!

But the coast is also something much more important than numbers—it is a place where our batteries can be recharged, where family memories are built, and where many choose to live out the sunset of their lives.

Let's reject this amendment and support the coastal communities which support and provide much-needed employment and enjoyment for our Nation!

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. JON RUNYAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 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. RUNYAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Broun amendment No. 246. This amendment would prohibit the use of funds