

say the President, even the President, must follow law.

Please join with me, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. MCGOVERN in supporting the Sherman amendment.

DON'T GUT HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING FOR NEW YORK

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

Mr. MEEKS. The Homeland Security appropriations bill, which will be on the floor in just a few minutes, is a bad bill for America and an especially bad bill for New York, but it cuts funding for New York substantially.

Almost 10 years after the attack on New York, we tracked down and killed Osama bin Laden, but the threat to the city of New York has not dissipated. New York is a prime target for terrorists because of what it symbolizes, a vibrant economic atmosphere where entrepreneurs can flourish, and a land of opportunity and freedom that serves as a gateway for the "poor and the huddled masses." Unfortunately, this bill takes a hacksaw to the city's counterterrorism and security efforts.

According to Mayor Bloomberg, this bill would jeopardize the continuity and operations of counterterrorism programs in New York City that New York City has under way. Cutting more than \$100 million in Homeland Security funding for New York is not only nonsensical, it is dangerous. As my friend PETER KING has said, this bill puts New York "at risk."

These cuts place an unconscionable burden on New York, and I will therefore vote against the bill.

NEGATIVE IMPACT OF DODD-FRANK

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss yet another negative impact the Dodd-Frank Act is having on the U.S. economy and job growth.

As agencies here in the United States are scrambling to meet the unrealistic deadlines proposed by this act, and as community banks struggle under a mountain of new regulations that strangle our economic recovery, we have also done great damage to the competitiveness of the United States in the international financial marketplace.

Other nations have yet to even consider the stringent regulations similar to the ones proposed in Dodd-Frank. Most important are the new proposed regulations that will require over-the-counter derivatives to be traded and cleared on exchanges.

G-20 nations have stated a goal for the end of 2012 as the implementation date of any global derivative reforms. Our earlier upcoming deadline of July 16, 2011, for U.S. implementation of the

derivatives reforms, puts the U.S. financial market at a significant global disadvantage and will further disrupt our economic recovery and job growth. Let's repeal these damaging economic provisions and let's get America back to work again.

FEMA SAFER GRANTS

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am deeply concerned about my community's ability to address its emergency response needs.

FEMA SAFER grants are designed to assist cities with maintaining first responders on the street. The challenge is that FEMA has a stipulation that cannot have employees in layoff status.

The cities that are most in need of these funds are financially challenged. It is difficult for them to avoid laying off employees when they have no funds in the budget to retain them, as required by the FEMA grants.

This is a situation that people in my community are being confronted with. The city of Cleveland applied for and received two grants from FEMA.

Due to State-level budget cuts, Cleveland needs these FEMA grants now more than ever. FEMA should be granted the authority to waive the no-layoff clause. This way the funding system would be better able to live up to the intent of the grant, and our streets and communities would be safer.

SUPPORT MEDICARE

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of Medicare. It's a decades-old promise that my grandmother made to my mother and that I make to my son. For the last 5 months Republicans have played political theater with our Nation's most pressing issues, putting tax breaks for millionaires and oil companies ahead of the health care of our seniors.

Just yesterday, in procedural silliness, it was yet another act by the Republican majority's quest to end Medicare and jeopardize the health of our seniors. Yet again Republicans told our seniors loudly and clearly that they are willing by any means necessary to end Medicare, and that's just wrong.

They have also tried to trick our seniors into believing that their budget plan wouldn't affect them today, but that's wrong too. The fact is the end of Medicare would mean that our seniors and individuals with disabilities would pay \$12,500 in health care costs. The plan would force seniors to pay nearly \$6,800 out of their own pockets in the first year alone.

So I am going to urge all of us and our colleagues on the other side to stop

the political theater, to stand with the American people, to stop their quest to end Medicare and support our seniors.

How about creating jobs instead of ending Medicare?

□ 1220

AMERICA'S FISCAL CHALLENGES

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, this Congress and this country face two great fiscal challenges. One is long term, and one is urgent and immediate. Long term, we know we have to restore balance to our budget, and negotiations are under way in an effort to accomplish that.

There are significant differences in approach. Do you follow the outlines of the Ryan budget, which basically cut taxes for very wealthy Americans in the hope that will create jobs and pay for that by slashing or ending Medicare? Or do you proceed along the outline in the Obama budget which essentially would put everything on the table, including the Pentagon and including revenues?

But either way, the urgent and immediate responsibility is that we pay our bills. And either side that engages in a game of chicken with the obligation of this country to maintain its full faith and credit is playing with fiscal fire and using a loaded gun for a game of Russian roulette. That gun is pointed at the heart of the American economy.

America pays its bills. We must do that and do whatever is required in order to maintain our reputation for doing so.

THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues of the Congressional Progressive Caucus to ask the President to appoint a Presidential appointee to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which is law. It is to protect the American people. That nominee so far has been Professor Elizabeth Warren who has acted as an adviser. The CFPB has earned praise from the banking community for working to simplify and improve mortgage foreclosure forms. This consumer protection board will protect the American people from predatory lending, from foreclosures, and from excessive rates on your credit card.

But, yet, Republicans in the Senate, in the other body, want to make ridiculous accusations to hold the hostage position and take this individual into a hostage position and to suggest that

she could not counsel with a State attorney general to help that State attorney general fight against mortgage foreclosures.

When have you forbidden a Federal representative, a Federal representative of the United States Government, from talking to the States to be helpful? What is the purpose of the Federal Government other than to be helpful?

It is time to stop the charade and stand with the American people. Get someone working on that consumer board to protect the American people from reckless and unfair mortgage practices.

MISSOURI RIVER FLOODING

(Mrs. NOEM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to empathize and to stand with those in my home State of South Dakota who are experiencing flooding along the Missouri River. Up and down the Missouri River, people continue to hope for the best and to prepare for the worst as floodwaters continue to rise, and are going to rise, to record levels over the coming days and weeks.

I was in our State capital of Pierre and in the Fort Pierre area this past weekend with residents helping sandbag with my family and surveying the looming damage. While the forecasts for flooding grow grim, neighbors continue to help neighbors, and an unshakeable sense of community remains strong. I also commend the hard work of the South Dakota National Guard for swiftly responding to the call of those that are in need.

Many of those affected have worked tirelessly over the past week on short notice to protect their homes. Even so, thousands could be displaced for months until the water recedes, not knowing if they'll even have a home they can go back to.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that our thoughts and that our prayers would be with all of those who have been affected by these floodings and natural disasters in South Dakota and across our great country.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2017.

□ 1225

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the

fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. WESTMORELAND (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 2, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 92, line 7.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BALDWIN

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to design, develop, or procure any vessel of the Coast Guard Offshore Patrol Cutter class of ships unless the main propulsion diesel engines of the vessel are manufactured in the United States by a domestically operated entity, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the application of this section if only one domestically operated entity exists to design, develop, or procure the main propulsion diesel engines.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It would prohibit funds from being used to design, develop or procure Coast Guard Offshore Patrol Cutters unless the main diesel engines are manufactured in the United States and made by American workers. To address any concerns that this could be a single-source contract, this provision may be waived to ensure competition and best value to the American taxpayer.

The Coast Guard plans to build and procure 25 or more Offshore Patrol Cutters in the coming years. And I fully support this acquisition program. However, I believe that the Coast Guard should be required to purchase engines manufactured in the United States made by American workers.

For some reason, though, the Coast Guard has a history of buying ship engines from foreign manufacturers. We also know that the Coast Guard has a history of designing ship platforms which give preference to overseas manufacturers, resulting in major contracts going to foreign manufacturers.

This practice is driving American manufacturers out of business.

Although Congress required that vessels for the Coast Guard be manufactured in the United States starting back in 1993, in recent years, the Coast Guard has continued to procure vessel engines from foreign manufacturers.

Mr. Chairman, this is just plain wrong. The Offshore Patrol Cutter is a 25-ship class, one of the Coast Guard's largest cutter classes. Making these ships here in America would generate a

lot of U.S. manufacturing jobs for many years to come. But absent some direction from this Congress, I believe that the Coast Guard will continue to send American manufacturing jobs overseas. With unemployment at 9 percent, Mr. Chairman, we can no longer tolerate this situation. Let's bring these jobs back home. Let U.S. manufacturers compete for taxpayer dollars.

I want to offer at least one specific example of the Coast Guard's current shortsighted procurement policy—the contract that they gave to MTU, a German manufacturer, for the May propulsion diesel engine of the first National Security Cutter.

This vessel, the US CGC *Bertholf*, suffered a catastrophic failure, including an explosion and destruction of the piston and connecting rod that had to be replaced. Now, in its solicitation for this replacement, the Coast Guard noted that “a number of the critical parts are only currently available from the MTU factory in Germany, where these engines are manufactured. These critical parts must be specifically manufactured and have a lead time of 6 to 8 weeks from receipt of order. In addition, these parts must pass through U.S. Customs, which may entail additional delays.”

□ 1230

The Coast Guard purchased these repairs on a sole-source basis from Germany at an estimated cost to the taxpayer of \$265,000. U.S. manufacturers never had a chance to compete for these engines and any repair work necessary down the road.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is just plain wrong.

Getting Americans back to work is my number one priority, and I believe my colleagues would agree with me on this. I know full well these are challenging economic times in my home State of Wisconsin and across the Nation.

Recently, I visited a manufacturing plant located in my district. Workers there are confused. They don't understand why any branch of the Federal Government, much less a branch of homeland defense, would choose to give a major contract to a foreign competitor. The workers I spoke with share the worries of working families across the country: Will they be able to support their families? Will their children have the same opportunities they had, or will they see their jobs shipped overseas?

At the end of the day, this is about doing what is right by our fellow Americans.

Mr. Chairman, isn't keeping capable, hardworking Americans working the essence of homeland security?

In matters of national security in particular, I believe we should ensure that American workers build what we need to keep America safe.

My amendment is a small, but very needed change to the current Coast Guard procurement process. It will